Encyclopedia of
Language and Education
Series Editor: Stephen May

SPRINGER
REFERENCE

Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl
Stephen May *Editors*

Second and Foreign Language Education

Third Edition

Springer

Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Series Editor
Stephen May
Faculty of Education and Social Work
The University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand

In this third, fully revised edition, the 10 volume *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* offers the newest developments, including an entirely new volume of research and scholarly content, essential to the field of language teaching and learning in the age of globalization. In the selection of topics and contributors, the Encyclopedia reflects the depth of disciplinary knowledge, breadth of interdisciplinary perspective, and diversity of sociogeographic experience in the language and education field.

Throughout, there is an inclusion of contributions from non-English speaking and non-Western parts of the world, providing truly global coverage. Furthermore, the authors have sought to integrate these voices fully into the whole, rather than as special cases or international perspectives in separate sections.

The Encyclopedia is a necessary reference set for every university and college library in the world that serves a faculty or school of education, as well as being highly relevant to the fields of applied and socio-linguistics. The publication of this work charts the further deepening and broadening of the field of language and education since the publication of the first edition of the Encyclopedia in 1997 and the second edition in 2008.

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/15111

Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl • Stephen May
Editors

Second and Foreign Language Education

Third Edition

With 5 Figures and 4 Tables

Springer

Editors
Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl
Center Language Study
Yale University
New Haven, CT, USA

Stephen May
Faculty of Education and Social Work
The University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand

ISBN 978-3-319-02245-1 ISBN 978-3-319-02246-8 (eBook)
ISBN 978-3-319-02247-5 (print and electronic bundle)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016962189

1st edition: © Kluwer Academic Publishers 1997
2nd edition: © Springer Science+Business Media LLC 2008
© Springer International Publishing AG 2017
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Editor in Chief's Introduction to the "Encyclopedia of Language and Education"

This is one of ten volumes of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* published by Springer. The *Encyclopedia* – now in this, its 3rd edition – is undoubtedly the benchmark reference text in its field. It was first published in 1997 under the general editorship of the late David Corson and comprised eight volumes, each focused on a single, substantive topic in language and education. These included: language policy and political issues in education; literacy; oral discourse and education; second language education; bilingual education; knowledge about language; language testing and assessment; and research methods in language and education.

In his introductory remarks, David made the case for the timeliness of an overarching, state-of-the-art review of the language and education field. He argued that the publication of the *Encyclopedia* reflected both the internationalism and interdisciplinarity of those engaged in the academic analysis of language and education, confirmed the maturity and cohesion of the field, and highlighted the significance of the questions addressed within its remit. Contributors across the 1st edition's eight volumes came from every continent and from over 40 countries. This perhaps explains the subsequent impact and reach of that 1st edition – although no one (except, perhaps, the publisher!) quite predicted its extent. The *Encyclopedia* was awarded a Choice Outstanding Academic Title award by the American Library Association and was read widely by scholars and students alike around the globe.

In 2008, the 2nd edition of the *Encyclopedia* was published under the general editorship of Nancy Hornberger. It grew to ten volumes as Nancy continued to build upon the reach and influence of the *Encyclopedia*. A particular priority in the 2nd edition was the continued expansion of contributing scholars from contexts outside of English-speaking and/or developed contexts, as well as the more effective thematic integration of their regional concerns across the *Encyclopedia* as a whole. The 2nd edition also foregrounded key developments in the language and education field over the previous decade, introducing two new volumes on language socialization and language ecology.

This 3rd edition continues both the legacy and significance of the previous editions of the *Encyclopedia*. A further decade on, it consolidates, reflects, and expands (upon) the key issues in the field of language education. As with its

predecessors, it overviews in substantive contributions of approximately 5000 words each – the historical development, current developments and challenges, and future directions – of a wide range of topics in language and education. The geographical focus and location of its authors, all chosen as experts in their respective topic areas, also continue to expand, as the *Encyclopedia* aims to provide the most representative international overview of the field to date.

To this end, some additional changes have been made. The emergence over the last decade of "superdiversity" as a topic of major concern in sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and language education is now a major thread across all volumes – exploring the implications for language and education of rapidly changing processes of migration and transmigration in this late capitalist, globalized world. This interest in superdiversity foregrounds the burgeoning and rapidly complexifying uses of language(s), along with their concomitant deconstruction and (re) modification, across the globe, particularly (but not exclusively) in large urban environments. The allied emergence of multilingualism as an essential area of study – challenging the long-held normative ascendancy of monolingualism in relation to language acquisition, use, teaching, and learning – is similarly highlighted throughout all ten volumes, as are their pedagogical consequences (most notably, perhaps, in relation to translanguaging). This "multilingual turn" is reflected, in particular, in changes in title to two existing volumes: *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* and *Language Awareness, Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (previously, *Bilingual Education* and *Language Awareness*, respectively).

As for the composition of the volumes, while ten volumes remain overall, the *Language Ecology* volume in the 2nd edition was not included in the current edition, although many of its chapter contributions have been reincorporated and/or reworked across other volumes, particularly in light of the more recent developments in superdiversity and multilingualism, as just outlined. (And, of course, the important contribution of the *Language Ecology* volume, with Angela Creese and the late Peter Martin as principal editors, remains available as part of the 2nd edition). Instead, this current edition has included a new volume on *Language, Education and Technology*, with Steven Thorne as principal editor. While widely discussed across the various volumes in the 2nd edition, the prominence and rapidity of developments over the last decade in academic discussions that address technology, new media, virtual environments, and multimodality, along with their wider social and educational implications, simply demanded a dedicated volume.

And speaking of multimodality, a new, essential feature of the current edition of the *Encyclopedia* is its multiplatform format. You can access individual chapters from any volume electronically, you can read individual volumes electronically and/or in print, and, of course, for libraries, the ten volumes of the *Encyclopedia* still constitute an indispensible overarching electronic and/or print resource.

As you might expect, bringing together ten volumes and over 325 individual chapter contributions has been a monumental task, which began for me at least in 2013 when, at Nancy Hornberger's invitation, Springer first approached me about the Editor-in-Chief role. All that has been accomplished since would simply not have occurred, however, without support from a range of key sources. First, to Nancy

Hornberger, who, having somehow convinced me to take on the role, graciously agreed to be Consulting Editor for the 3rd edition of the *Encyclopedia*, providing advice, guidance, and review support throughout.

The international and interdisciplinary strengths of the *Encyclopedia* continue to be foregrounded in the wider topic and review expertise of its editorial advisory board, with several members having had direct associations with previous editions of the *Encyclopedia* in various capacities. My thanks to Suresh Canagarajah, William Cope, Viv Edwards, Rainer Enrique Hamel, Eli Hinkel, Francis Hult, Nkonko Kamwangamalu, Gregory Kamwendo, Claire Kramsch, Constant Leung, Li Wei, Luis Enrique Lopez, Marilyn Martin-Jones, Bonny Norton, Tope Omoniyi, Alastair Pennycook, Bernard Spolsky, Lionel Wee, and Jane Zuengler for their academic and collegial support here.

The role of volume editor is, of course, a central one in shaping, updating, revising, and, in some cases, resituating specific topic areas. The 3rd edition of the *Encyclopedia* is a mix of existing volume editors from the previous edition (Cenoz, Duff, King, Shohamy, Street, Van Deusen-Scholl), new principal volume editors (García, Kim, Lin, McCarty, Thorne), and new coeditors (Lai, Or). As principal editor of *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*, Teresa McCarty brings to the volume her longstanding interests in language policy, language education, and linguistic anthropology, arising from her work in Native American language education and Indigenous education internationally. For *Literacies and Language Education*, Brian Street brings a background in social and cultural anthropology and critical literacy, drawing on his work in Britain, Iran, and around the globe. As principal editors of *Discourse and Education*, Stanton Wortham has research expertise in discourse analysis, linguistic anthropology, identity and learning, narrative construction, media, and the new Latino diaspora, while Deoksoon Kim's research has focused on language learning and literacy education, and instructional technology in second language learning and teacher education. For *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl has academic interests in linguistics and sociolinguistics and has worked primarily in the Netherlands and the United States. As principal editors of *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, Ofelia García and Angel Lin bring to the volume their internationally recognized expertise in bilingual and multilingual education, including their pioneering contributions to translanguaging, along with their own work in North America and Southeast Asia. Jasone Cenoz and Durk Gorter, principal editors of *Language Awareness, Bilingualism and Multilingualism*, bring to their volume their international expertise in language awareness, bilingual and multilingual education, linguistic landscape, and translanguaging, along with their work in the Basque Country and the Netherlands. Principal editor of *Language Testing and Assessment*, Elana Shohamy, is an applied linguist with interests in critical language policy, language testing and measurement, and linguistic landscape research, with her own work focused primarily on Israel and the United States. For *Language Socialization*, Patricia Duff has interests in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics and has worked primarily in North America, East Asia, and Central Europe. For *Language, Education and Technology*, Steven Thorne's research interests include second language acquisition, new media and online gaming environments, and theoretical and empirical

investigations of language, interactivity, and development, with his work focused primarily in the United States and Europe. And for *Research Methods in Language and Education*, principal editor, Kendall King, has research interests in sociolinguistics and educational linguistics, particularly with respect to Indigenous language education, with work in Ecuador, Sweden, and the United States. Finally, as Editor-in-Chief, I bring my interdisciplinary background in the sociology of language, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and educational linguistics, with particular interests in language policy, Indigenous language education, and bilingual education, along with my own work in New Zealand, North America, and the UK/Europe.

In addition to the above, my thanks go to Yi-Ju Lai, coeditor with Kendall King, and Iair Or, coeditor with Elana Shohamy. Also, to Lincoln Dam, who as Editorial Assistant was an essential support to me as Editor-in-Chief and who worked closely with volume editors and Springer staff throughout the process to ensure both its timeliness and its smooth functioning (at least, to the degree possible, given the complexities involved in this multiyear project). And, of course, my thanks too to the approximately 400 chapter contributors, who have provided the substantive content across the ten volumes of the *Encyclopedia* and who hail from every continent in the world and from over 50 countries.

What this all indicates is that the *Encyclopedia* is, without doubt, not only a major academic endeavor, dependent on the academic expertise and good will of all its contributors, but also still demonstrably at the cutting edge of developments in the field of language and education. It is an essential reference for every university and college library around the world that serves a faculty or school of education and is an important allied reference for those working in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. The *Encyclopedia* also continues to aim to speak to a prospective readership that is avowedly multinational and to do so as unambiguously as possible. Its ten volumes highlight its comprehensiveness, while the individual volumes provide the discrete, in-depth analysis necessary for exploring specific topic areas. These state-of-the art volumes also thus offer highly authoritative course textbooks in the areas suggested by their titles.

This 3rd edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* continues to showcase the central role of language as both vehicle and mediator of educational processes, along with the pedagogical implications therein. This is all the more important, given the rapid demographic and technological changes we face in this increasingly globalized world and, inevitably, by extension, in education. But the cutting edge contributions within this *Encyclopedia* also, crucially, always situate these developments within their historical context, providing a necessary *diachronic* analytical framework with which to examine *critically* the language and education field. Maintaining this sense of historicity and critical reflexivity, while embracing the latest developments in our field, is indeed precisely what sets this *Encyclopedia* apart.

University of Auckland, Auckland,
New Zealand

Stephen May

Introduction to Volume "Second and Foreign Language Education"

The 3rd edition of the *Second and Foreign Language Education* volume of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* has been substantially revised, expanded, and updated to reflect the significant changes that have occurred over the past decade in the field. It aims to present a rich picture of language education across a range of pedagogical and geographical contexts. This volume includes more current insights from second language acquisition theory and applied linguistics, such as sociocultural theory (see, for example, the contributions by Ohta; Lynch; Kramsch; and Kinginger, this volume) and task-based instruction (cf. East; Brandl; Butler, this volume), and connects these to new curricular and methodological approaches (for example, Urlaub; Magnan; East; Nikula, this volume). Overall, the volume attempts to provide a more comprehensive and balanced representation of language education across the world regions. In addition to including a broad range of international perspectives that highlight various approaches and practices within specific regions of the world (see, for example, the contributions by Kamwangamalu on South Africa; Lage-Otero on Southeast Asia; Al-Khatib on the Middle East and North Africa; Early, Dagenais, and Carr on Canada; Fernandez and Gearon on Australia; Kubota on Japan; Holmen on the Nordic countries in Europe; Butler on the Asia-Pacific region; and Hinton, Kagan and Dillon, and Met and Brandt on the Unites States), the issue of globalization itself is central to a number of contributions (see, for example, Warner; Kubota, both this volume).

In view of the rapidly changing global context which has led to increasingly plurilingual and pluricultural societies, it is necessary to begin by contextualizing the very terms "foreign" and "second" language education (see Oxford, this volume), since these are increasingly challenged and contested. Furthermore, the dichotomies of "first" vs. "second" language or "native" vs. "foreign" are being replaced by more nuanced perspectives on the complex contexts in which languages are used and learned (see Lynch, this volume). For example, in the United States, the term "World languages" is now generally preferred over "foreign languages" within the K-12 (elementary-secondary school) curriculum to underscore that most languages taught in the schools are no longer truly foreign but represent both the larger world in which they occur and the local community where they may be spoken as immigrant or heritage languages (see Magnan; Met and Brandt; and Kagan and Dillon, this volume).

Some of the terms used in this volume reflect the relative status of the languages within a specific region or in a particular pedagogical context. For example, in societies or regions where English is dominant as the language most frequently spoken or taught, it is not uncommon to speak of languages other than English (LOTEs). A more recent term in the Nordic countries in Europe has been "parallel languages," which plays an important role as institutions of higher education address "the issue of finding a balance between English and the local language(s) and in some cases also a balance between English and other foreign languages" (cf. Holmen, this volume). In the United States, a difference is often made between languages that are more commonly taught and the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs). The most recent Modern Language Association Report on Foreign Language Enrollments 2009–2013 (Goldberg et al. 2015), for example, identifies 15 languages other than English as the most commonly taught in the United States (with total enrollments of 1,562,179 – a 6.7% decrease from 2009) versus the 248 that represent the less frequently taught languages (with total enrollments of 40,059). Despite a small decline, Spanish remains the most studied language with 790,756 enrollments, which represent nearly 50% of the total foreign language enrollments in the United States. In addition to the broad term "heritage language," which is most commonly used in the United States to refer to languages used by speakers who may have a cultural connection to the language or who may have grown up speaking the language at home (cf. Wiley 2014; Van Deusen-Scholl 2003; Valdés 2000; Kagan and Dillon, this volume), a variety of other terms are used across different geographic regions and contexts. Some examples are Native American, Indigenous, or endangered languages (see, for example, Hinton; Zavala; Early, Dagenais, and Carr, this volume) or community or minority languages (Fernandez and Gearon, this volume).

The volume is divided into four sections: Theoretical Underpinnings; Current Approaches; International Perspectives; and Teacher Preparation and Professional Development. The separate section on technology that had been included in the second edition has been removed from this volume, as a new volume on *Language, Education and Technology* is now entirely dedicated to this rapidly growing area of specialization. The field of language education is informed by a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives that are broadly – though not exhaustively – represented throughout this volume. The first section, "Theoretical Underpinnings," specifically highlights the contributions of some of the major disciplines within the field of foreign and second language education (for example, applied linguistics (Kramsch), sociolinguistics (McKay), and second language acquisition (Lynch)). However, the 34 chapters in this new edition represent a range of perspectives that reflect new directions in research, touching on a number of key issues that have emerged in the field of language education in recent years: the role of globalization; postcommunicative pedagogical approaches; curricular reform and the integration of language and content; and professionalization of the field. I will touch on each of these new developments in the next section.

Key Issues and New Directions

Globalization

When the second edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* was published nearly a decade ago, foreign and second language education, particularly in the United States, had been significantly and at that point very recently affected by the events of September 11, which – similar to earlier major world crises – had an immediate effect on the choice of languages being studied (a spike in the so-called "critical" languages, such as Arabic or Urdu) and on the motivations for justifying foreign language study (favoring the more instrumentalist objectives, such as national security and international trade). In the past decade, the emphasis has shifted to the role of globalization as an issue of central concern for language education, and recent research has focused specifically on the complexities of an increasingly plurilingual world and the challenges of the growth of global English. This global context demands a more "socially and culturally aware language education" (Kramsch, this volume) and calls for new approaches that enable nonnative speakers to not only "make themselves understood linguistically, but how to position themselves in the world, i.e., find a place for themselves historically and subjectively on the global market of symbolic exchanges" (Kramsch, this volume).

Various contributions address the complex set of "contradictions and tensions" that are inherent in the discourses of internationalization and globalization (cf. Kubota, this volume). Warner (this volume), for example, discusses the implications of globalization for programs and pedagogies at postsecondary institutions and questions how the destabilization and diversification of linguistic conventions and codes could "be reconciled with institutional imperatives to prepare students for global economic realities and national political interests." Inevitably, she argues, institutional choices must be made with respect to the teaching of additional languages, which will affect the availability of the "less commonly taught and less readily commodifiable languages."

In many regions of the world, the role of English is regarded as problematic and hegemonic, yet at the same time often deemed essential for economic and social advancement. Gunnarsson (this volume), for example, in her discussion of research on professional communication practices in a globalized world, notes that most transnational enterprises have of necessity chosen English as their corporate language. Language policies across the world reflect the complex historical backgrounds against which the status of the national and local languages as well as – increasingly – global English must be negotiated. Kubota (this volume) links the discourses of globalization with the neoliberal language education policies and practices in Japan and cautions that "despite the linguistic, cultural, and racial heterogeneity implied by globalization, language education policies and practices in Japan have been influenced by monolingual, monocultural, and monoethnic ideologies that resist heterogeneous understandings of language and language

speakers." Another perspective comes from the European context where English is strongly promoted as the major language of academic discourse at the institutional level. Holmen (this volume) focuses on the parallel language strategy, a language policy adopted in the Nordic countries that promotes the parallel use of English and one of the Nordic national languages in academia and seeks to find a balance not only between English and the local language(s) but also between English and other foreign languages. She points out some of the limitations of the policy, which may, for instance, not fully take into account local students from minority language backgrounds and may limit institutions from adopting more plurilingual goals.

Australia has had a longstanding tradition of community language schools where children of immigrant families could maintain their language and culture. However, Fernandez and Gearon (this volume) caution that "[t]he dominant use of English and the pervasiveness of what Clyne (2005) termed 'a monolingual mindset', together with a lack of resources for small languages and those of newer migrant groups has resulted in many challenges to the maintenance of [these] language and cultural practices."

In his broad overview of the language policy situation in Southeast Asia, Lage-Otero (this volume) characterizes the use of English in education in the larger region as "contentious" and notes that it "is inevitably associated with political and cultural shifts away from mother tongues and more traditional value systems." Yet, he acknowledges that at the same time it is considered necessary for development and for participation in the global knowledge economy. However, in Asia, Mandarin Chinese is now also becoming accepted as equally essential for global trade and – similar to English – has risen in status and use.

In North Africa and the Middle East, multiple languages, including Arabic, English, and French, play different roles, depending on the historical contexts and social conditions. However, even in areas where there is a strong resistance toward English, such as in Iran, there is nevertheless a growing trend across the region toward increasing English language education and introducing the language at an earlier level (Al-Khatib, this volume). Given the diversity of the region, further work is needed to develop textbooks and materials that take into consideration the specific needs of the different countries and better address the variety of sociocultural contexts within which the language is learned.

As Warner (this volume) cautions, globalization may have a largely homogenizing effect on language education, and she calls for more pluralized methods that legitimize "local knowledge, identities, and roles." Lage-Otero similarly asserts that "policies and instructional approaches need to be adapted to local contexts and the unique idiosyncrasies of each country." It has become increasingly clear that pedagogical approaches cannot offer a "one-size fits all" solution to language education. Rather, they must be implemented thoughtfully and, in particular, remain mindful of the plurilingual and multicultural context within which the language(s) are used. For example, in South Africa, the multilingual language-in-education policy is problematic as it is being implemented within the context of that country's complex history. While there has been a recent initiative to incrementally introduce African languages in primary (elementary) and secondary schools as instructional languages alongside

English, such a move is "viewed with suspicion and would be interpreted as a disguised return to the much documented, despised and controversial apartheid policy of Bantu education, which sought to deny black South African students access to English" (Kamwangamalu, this volume). He argues that English is widely considered as a pathway to social mobility, and economic variables must therefore be factored into language policy decisions.

The choice of methodology can also provide a source of potential conflict. While communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based teaching and learning (TBLT) are generally accepted as the prevailing methodologies in many Western countries, implementing these approaches within the Asia-Pacific region requires more flexibility and an adaptation to Asian contexts (Butler, this volume). The underlying assumptions of these methods, such as a student-centered orientation and an emphasis on oral communication, can create tensions with longstanding traditional practices that have an expectation of teacher expertise and a preference for a focus on grammar. A final example comes from the implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Europe, which is predominantly offered through English given that it is perceived as the primary language for global competitiveness (Nikula, this volume). As she argues, however, "[t]his has raised questions with respect to what extent the positive CLIL outcomes reflect the favourable attitudes and ideologies attached to English. Overall, there is a need for more research exploring the political and language ideological underpinnings of CLIL and the ways in which it carves its way into the educational systems and political landscapes in different countries."

The "Social Turn" in Language Education: Postcommunicative Approaches

A second major issue is the evolving theoretical second language acquisition (SLA) context within which language education is situated. In the mid-1990s, the prevailing cognitivist or psycholinguistic orientation in second language acquisition research was challenged by more socially oriented approaches to L2 learning, and this "social turn" (cf. Block 2003; May 2011; Ortega 2011) has resulted in a reconceptualized SLA with implications for foreign and second language education (cf. Firth and Wagner 2007). Among these more recent perspectives are, for example, sociocultural theory (cf. Ohta; Lynch; Magnan, this volume), research on language socialization, and identity theory, which all have influenced pedagogical practice and classroom teaching and assessment. These approaches call for less dichotomous perspectives on language learning (challenging, for example, the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy; cf. Lynch, this volume) and for more process-oriented methodologies that consider the learners' social practices, values, and identities (cf. Butler; Kamwangamalu; Li and Edwards, this volume). With respect to research on study abroad, Kinginger (this volume) also notes a change in emphasis from outcomes-oriented to more process-oriented investigations, along with an increased focus on qualitative studies that look more broadly at issues of

language socialization and student engagement and that consider sociocultural competence in addition to language proficiency.

As Kramsch (this volume) notes, the more recent theoretical perspectives are linked to "their concomitant recommendations for pedagogic practice, e.g., task-based, activity-based, or participation/collaboration-based pedagogies." Communicative language teaching, while long the dominant model in language education, has been criticized for its emphasis on instrumentalist rather than academic goals and its perceived focus on basic oral proficiency. Postcommunicative approaches take into consideration both the broader social and cultural context in which languages are learned and the multiple goals and purposes of language education within a plurilingual and pluricultural environment (cf. Kramsch; McKay, this volume). Within the context of sociocultural theory, Ohta (this volume) discusses the potential of concept-based instruction (C-BI – not to be confused with content-based instruction (CBI) discussed below) in "helping learners to develop new conceptual frameworks such that they can integrate the material being learned." Kinginger (this volume) also notes the potential of C-BI, explaining that it begins "with the presentation of fully developed scientific concepts such as identity, indexicality and speaker intention, then explicitly assisting students' performance as they learn to interpret and use the forms in order to express their own desired social identity within contexts of solidarity, social distance or hierarchy."

Pointing out the methodological limitations of CLT, East (this volume) outlines task-based approaches which seek to promote more authentic language use through real-world tasks. He notes, however, that a major challenge for task-based teaching and learning (TBLT) is its implementation in the real-world classroom and argues for more professional development for language teachers regarding both the theory and practice of TBLT. Brandl's contribution (this volume) specifically addresses the issue of teacher training within TBLT and points to the lack of agreement on task definition, assessing task difficulty, and enacting a task-based syllabus as the major issues to be addressed. He calls for a more hands-on and experiential approach to involving instructors in TBLT methodologies.

In addition to changing classroom practices, these new methodological approaches necessarily have implications for testing and assessment practices as well. Malone (this volume) points out the increased emphasis on oral assessment, which "provides an opportunity for students to understand how the language they have learned is applicable in the real world, through oral communication with other speakers of the language." As content becomes more central, there is a need to develop more integrated assessments, as is currently being done, for example, in the context of CLIL in Europe (cf. Nikula, this volume). There is increasing interest in more holistic and longitudinal approaches to assessing learners' ongoing development of language and literacy skills in the target language, and student self-assessments are being viewed as valuable components of such ongoing evaluation. One model, LinguaFolio, was developed by the National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL) and is patterned after the European Language Portfolio. Met and Brandt (this volume) summarize the three components of this assessment portfolio: "a language passport that describes students' experiences

and abilities with languages, including formal diplomas, certificates, or assessment scores; a language biography, in which students record their language learning history and reflect on their goals and experiences; and a dossier, in which students place evidence of their language skills, achievements, and performances (LinguaFolio 2014; see also Toulouse and Geoffrion-Vinci; and Magnan, this volume).

Toulouse and Geoffrion-Vinci (this volume) discuss the emergence of the electronic language portfolio as a tool for assessment of deep learning in language and cultural literacy. They note that electronic "portfolio use affords a digital space and a unique opportunity to evaluate skill development on a broader horizon that represents a learner's holistic evolution over time and across a wider array of domains including but not limited to critical thinking, technical literacy, creativity, and citizenship." An ongoing challenge is how to embed it into the appropriate structural, administrative, and financial support structures to ensure that it is "sticky" or long-lasting at all levels of instruction. This requires, however, a strong commitment at the departmental or institutional level with respect to the broader goals of language education.

Curricular Reform and the Integration of Language and Content

In 2007, the widely cited report by the Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World," called for both "a restructuring of foreign language departments to move beyond the two-tiered language-literature configuration that still prevails in many postsecondary institutions" and for a refocusing of the goals of foreign language education on "translingual and transcultural competence," notions that Kramsch (2014, p. 304) already finds in need of recontextualization in the face of globalization. While the report stimulated a much-needed national discussion, the process of curricular transformation and departmental reform has not been without its challenges and the overall impact of the MLA Report has fallen short of expectations (cf. Byrnes 2008; Walther 2009; Maxim 2015). Urlaub (this volume) addresses this issue from the perspective of second language literacy research and discusses the potential of literacy-based approaches for curricular innovation and for a better integration of language and content (see also Paesani and Allen 2012; Urlaub 2015). In the United States, this has led to a rethinking of foreign language curricula and departmental reformat in a number of institutions at the postsecondary level, including Georgetown and Emory, but much work in this area remains to be done (cf. Maxim 2009).

A similar approach has been implemented in the Canada-wide multiliteracies project that was started in 2002 and which included "the creation of multimodal dual language texts; digital sister-class projects, the use of the students' home languages in cross-language transfer to facilitate subject-area and academic literacies learning, both L1 and L2; and the design of multimodal pedagogical activities and spaces that afforded ELL students opportunities and capacities to access knowledge from

multiple perspectives and to forge links between the discourses of school, family and community lives" (Early, Dagenais and Carr, this volume). They report on a number of multilingual/multimodal projects that are mediated by digital tools, including i-pads, digital storytelling, and web-based applications. The role of technology in curricular transformation is an issue of growing interest, and Kern, Ware, and Warschauer (this volume) discuss "the impressive potential of network-based teaching to transform language learning." They describe how network-based language teaching (NBLT) is moving from a primarily task- and product-oriented perspective of online interactions toward a broader focus that includes cultural, communicative, and social aspects of online teaching and learning, exploring learning beyond the classroom and in a variety of multimodal learning contexts.

A number of contributions in this volume address the issue of content-based instruction (CBI) as it has developed over the past several decades and is implemented in regions across the world. An early adaptation was integrated language and content teaching (ILC) for English language learners, which was implemented in elementary (primary) and secondary classrooms across Canada in the 1970s and 1980s (Early, Dagenais, and Carr, this volume). The chapter by Stoller and Fitzsimmons-Doolan (this volume) provides a comprehensive overview of a range of current models for content-based instruction, which they define as "instructional approaches that make a dual, though not necessarily equal, commitment to additional language- and content-learning objectives." They highlight several more recent frameworks in light of current research and evolving pedagogical practices, such as the sheltered instruction observation protocol (SIOP), content and language integrated learning (CLIL), and learning English for academic purposes (LEAP). One such approach, languages for specific purposes (LSP), was developed primarily within foreign language departments and concerned itself initially mostly with written products, such as specific terminology or text types and registers (cf. Gunnarsson, this volume). However, research has evolved toward gaining a deeper understanding of the complexity of discourse in professional settings and of the social and cultural dimensions in increasingly diverse workplace contexts. Gunnarsson discusses discourse practices across a range of professional contexts, such as economic-technical, medical-social, legal and bureaucratic, and science and academic settings.

While CBI has been largely connected with a North American context, the CLIL model, with its dual focus on language and content, has been implemented widely across Europe, primarily in K-12 classrooms. However, as Nikula (this volume) points out, CLIL is increasingly recognized in other geographic areas as well, such as Latin America, Australia, and Asia. CLIL has a strong and evolving research base that is focused on the conceptualization of language and content integration, including recent studies that "have called for a reorientation in approaching language and language competence in ways that acknowledge subject literacies as an inherent component of such competences" (Nikula, this volume) as well as mapping CLIL within a "pluriliteracies approach."

In the United States, the recently revised *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (ACTFL 2014) have established goals for language education at the

K-16 levels (cf. Magnan, this volume; Magnan et al. 2014). Magnan notes that the Standards "have . . . created a newfound unity of purpose within foreign language education and a stronger relationship between language and other disciplines." Foreign Languages Across the Curriculum (FLAC) at the postsecondary level and dual language or two-way immersion programs at the K-12 levels are other examples of instructional approaches that have emphasized the integration of content, culture, and language learning within the language curriculum (Met and Brandt, this volume).

Beyond the issue of reforming curricular content, there is also an urgent need to establish better program and curriculum articulation across grade and levels, particularly crossing the gap between the K-12 and postsecondary levels (see Magnan; Met and Brandt, this volume). This will require greater attention to instructor training, curriculum design, and program coordination. Magnan (this volume) suggests that especially "professional development of instructors across levels will strengthen articulation of K-16 and, at the college level, reduce the divide between language courses in basic programs and upper-level literature and culture courses."

New Directions in Teacher Development

As language teaching is gradually being recognized as a profession that is informed by current perspectives on how languages are acquired in formal and informal contexts, more attention is shifting to the professional preparation of language instructors as well as the training of graduate students (Von Hoene, this volume). Although the recent directions in language education research have clear implications for teacher training and professional development, a number of contributions point to a disconnect between theory and practice as an issue of serious concern. Among the major challenges are the overall lack of appropriate training, as a significant number of teachers may be trained in fields other than applied linguistics or second language acquisition, and the gap between what teachers *believe* they do and what they *actually* do in the classroom.

Brandl (this volume), for example, notes that despite the fact that teachers may have received training in more student-centered approaches, many still practice more transmission-oriented ways of teaching. He discusses some of the problems in training teachers to adopt a task-based approach and notes that "[l]ittle research on effective teacher training practices specific to TBLT exists." He provides several guidelines and principles that should inform teacher training, such as ensuring a deeper understanding of the concepts and of the pedagogical and hands-on teacher involvement in course and materials development. Other areas of concern include the limited opportunities for preservice teacher training or in-service professional development. Despite the widespread acceptance of the National Standards, Met and Brandt note that an ACTFL survey finds that not all teachers are prepared to implement them, which they ascribe to limitations in instructor training.

Gunnarsson (this volume) finds that the teaching of languages for specific purposes (LSPs) and professional communication tends to lack a solid theoretical

foundation and ascribes this to a gap in the transfer of knowledge from research on professional communication to the actual teaching of such specific purposes courses as Business Spanish or Legal German, an issue which she considers "quite problematic." As CBI, in its various configurations, takes on more predominant roles in educational settings, increased attention should be paid to pre- and in-service teacher preparation. As Stoller and Fitzsimmons-Doolan (this volume) observe: "Opportunities for dual certification and specializations in CBI will prepare a new generation of teachers to enter the work force well-prepared for the challenges of CBI. Partnerships between teacher-training institutions and schools, between researchers and teachers, and across disciplines are likely to result in better prepared, more enthusiastic teachers, and more abundant classroom resources, the end result being students who learn subject matter and language more effectively."

Malone focuses on recent research in assessment literacy among language instructors and on the development of knowledge and skills in oral proficiency assessment. She points to three deficiencies: a lack of a shared understanding of what oral proficiency is on any international, national, or local level; a lack of evidence on what proficiency any teachers have and apply in the classroom; and a lack of structured programs for both preservice and in-service teacher education to develop, maintain, and improve this understanding so as to lead to instructor proficiency. This common understanding, she argues, is of benefit not just to individual students and instructors but to the broader curriculum as well.

The training of graduate teaching assistants is another issue of concern, specifically the limited amount of time (usually just one semester) that is given to methodology seminars and the fact that the content of such courses "has not kept up with the most recent research in applied linguistics" (Von Hoene, this volume). Despite the fact that the job market increasingly demands evidence of preparation in language pedagogy and an understanding of the underlying principles of language acquisition, graduate students tend to not be adequately prepared for the needs of their future careers (see Von Hoene, this volume). Similarly, the professional development of non-tenure-track language faculty in the United States remains quite limited at many institutions. Von Hoene suggests that future research should address training in applied linguistics for language program directors and for graduate students to provide a better understanding of the gaps "between current practice and the development of the competencies advocated by the MLA report."

In addressing the issue of teacher training within an international context, the expanding role of global English must be taken into consideration (cf. Li and Edwards; Tarnopolsky, this volume). Tarnopolsky focuses on the specific challenges of nonnative speaking teachers of English in contexts where access to English may be very limited for both instructors and students. He advocates a team-based approach to teaching English that leverages the complementary strengths of both native and nonnative speakers of English. Li and Edwards (this volume) stress the need for continuing professional development (CPD) for Chinese teachers of English and note that a growing number of these teachers "have had the opportunity to participate in short training courses overseas in predominantly English-speaking countries such as the UK, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand." Among the

major challenges they discuss are a limited competence in English and a mismatch between Western and Chinese "education ideologies, curricula and pedagogical practices." Butler identifies a number of constraints in implementing more current teaching approaches, such as CLT or TBLT: (1) conceptual, which stem both from "a conflict between the central principles of CLT and the traditional local values of teaching and learning in Asia" and from a misunderstanding of CLT as focusing mainly on oral communication and de-emphasizing explicit grammar instruction; (2) lack of training for teachers and lack of appropriate materials; and (3) the rigorous system of college examinations, for which emphasis on oral communication is felt to be a less efficient preparation.

While much of the recent research has focused on the hegemonic and expanding role of English, less attention has been paid to the tensions present in many regions of the world and among different languages. As Hinton points out, many of the world's languages are "under increasing pressure from the forces of colonialism, industrialization and globalization to shift to a majority language" and in the process, the minority language is often abandoned. She adds: "[t]hus we have a worldful of endangered languages – languages going out of use, no longer being learned at home by children, languages which seem to be disappearing from the face of the earth." Working within the context of the Andean and Amazonian region in Peru, Zavala (this volume) outlines the challenges and multiple struggles in teacher education in intercultural bilingual education (IBE) in Peru, which "is imparted almost exclusively in Spanish, the dichotomy of mother tongue/second language is insufficient to encompass the wide spectrum of bilingualism that characterizes the students involved, indigenous literacy is still not assumed within a social practice perspective, language and culture are addressed within purist ideologies, homogenizing policies for the admission process erase students' diversity, among others."

Conclusion

Much of the research within the field of language education has traditionally been either English-dominant or its focus limited to the major European languages, and there is an urgent need to develop more nuanced insights into the ways in which a wide range of languages, including Indigenous and minority languages, are learned and used in diverse and plurilingual societies across the world. As the contributions in this volume show, there is a growing interest in expanding these perspectives and in moving from overly simplistic dichotomies toward increasing recognition of the complex interactions in multilingual and multicultural contexts. This will have profound implications for both the theory and practice of foreign and second language education and will require major changes in the ways in which we approach language instruction in formal and informal settings, including:

- Rethinking the language curriculum at all levels of instruction to create a better integration of language and content

- Implementing new pedagogical approaches that go beyond mere communicative goals toward targeting translingual and transcultural competence
- Developing instructional approaches that can be adapted to the range of cultural and linguistic contexts within which languages are learned
- Improving teacher training by addressing the wide gap between theory and practice
- Creating greater awareness of the roles of local, community, heritage, minority, and Indigenous languages within the broader context of plurilingual societies
- Promoting the learning of languages that reflect learners' cultural heritage, identity, history, and traditions and balancing these interests against the perceived economic and educational advantages of the dominant global languages, especially English
- Assessing learning as a reflective and ongoing process that involves both formal instruction as well as informal interactions and intercultural encounters and that includes both language and content

As language education is no longer viewed as simply taking place in classrooms where learners must strive to reach the unattainable goals of native speaker competence, teaching approaches and methodologies must be adapted to the multiple and diverse environments in which languages are learned. Beyond the boundaries of the increasingly linguistically and culturally diverse classroom itself, learning now takes place more and more in authentic environments in which learners engage with the language(s) in multiple ways within their local communities, through international experiences, and through technology-mediated interactions with peers from across the world.

Yale University Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2014). World-readiness standards for learning languages. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/publications/all/world-readiness-standards-learning-languages

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

Byrnes, H. (2008). Perspectives. Transforming college and university language departments. *Modern Language Journal, 92*(ii), 284–287.

Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's language potential*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(s1), 800–819.

Goldberg, D., Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2015). Enrollments in languages other than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2013. Modern

Language Association web publication. Retrieved from https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Enrollments-in-Languages-Other-Than-English-in-United-States-Institutions-of-Higher-Education

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal, 98*(1), 296–311.

LinguaFolio. (2014). Resource document. National Council of State Supervisors for Languages. Retrieved from http://www.ncssfl.org/LinguaFolio/index.php?linguafolio_index

Magnan S., Murphy, D., & Sahakyan, N. (2014). Goals of collegiate learners and the Standards for Foreign Language Learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 98* (Suppl.).

Maxim, H. (2009). An essay on the role of language in collegiate foreign language programmatic reform. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 42*(2), 123–129.

Maxim, H. (2015). Curricular integration and faculty development: Teaching language-based content across the foreign language curriculum. In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming postsecondary language teaching in the United States* (pp. 79–102). Dordrecht: Springer.

May, S. (2011). The disciplinary constraints of SLA and TESOL: Additive bilingualism and second language acquisition, teaching and learning. *Linguistics and Education, 22*(3), 233–247.

Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). *Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world*. Modern Language Association web publication. Retrieved from https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World

Ortega, L. (2011). SLA after the social turn. Where cognitivism and its alternatives stand. In D. Atkinson, (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 95–116). New York, NY: Routledge.

Paesani, K., & Allen, H. W. (2012). Beyond the language-content divide: Research on advanced foreign language instruction at the postsecondary level. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(S1), S54–S75.

Urlaub, P. (2015). On language and content: The stakes of curricular transformation in collegiate foreign language education. In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming postsecondary language teaching in the United States* (pp. 7–15). Dordrecht: Springer.

Valdés, G. (2000). Introduction. In *Spanish for native speakers: AATSP professional development series handbook for teachers K-16* (pp. 16–20). Orlando: Harcourt College Publishers.

Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2003). Toward a definition of heritage language: Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 2*(3), 211–230.

Walther, I. (2009). Curricular planning along the fault line between instrumental and academic agendas: A response to the Report of the Modern Language

Association on Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 42*(2), 115–22.

Wiley, T. (2014). The problem of defining heritage and community languages and their speakers. On the utility and limitations of definitional constructs. In T. Wiley, J. Peyton, D. Christian. S. Moore, & N. Liu. (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States. Research, policy, and educational practice* (pp. 19–26). New York: Routledge.

Acknowledgment

Thanks to the following for their key editorial support:
Consulting Editor: Nancy Hornberger
Editorial Assistant: Lincoln Dam

Contents

Part I Theoretical Underpinnings 1

Applied Linguistic Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education 3
Claire Kramsch

Sociolinguistics and Language Education 15
Sandra Lee McKay

Conditions for Second Language (L2) Learning 27
Rebecca L. Oxford

Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition 43
Andrew Lynch

Sociocultural Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education 57
Amy Snyder Ohta

Part II Current Approaches to Second and Foreign Language Education 69

Content-Based Instruction 71
Fredricka L. Stoller and Shannon Fitzsimmons-Doolan

Task-Based Teaching and Learning: Pedagogical Implications 85
Martin East

Professional Communication 97
Britt-Louise Gunnarsson

CLIL: A European Approach to Bilingual Education 111
Tarja Nikula

Second Language Learning in a Study Abroad Context 125
Celeste Kinginger

Second Language Literacy Research and Curriculum Transformation in US Postsecondary Foreign Language Education 137
Per Urlaub

Electronic Portfolios in Foreign Language Learning 151
Mary Toulouse and Michelle Geoffrion-Vinci

Foreign Language Education in the Context of Institutional Globalization 167
Chantelle Warner

The Role of the National Standards in Second/Foreign Language Education 179
Sally Sieloff Magnan

Network-Based Language Teaching 197
Richard Kern, Paige Ware, and Mark Warschauer

Part III International Perspectives on Second and Foreign Language Education **211**

Learning and Teaching Endangered Indigenous Languages 213
Leanne Hinton

Community Language Learning in Australia 225
Suzanne Fernandez and Margaret Gearon

Second/Foreign Language Learning in South Africa 237
Nkonko M. Kamwangamalu

Innovative Second and Foreign Language Education in the Middle East and North Africa 251
Mahmoud A. Al-Khatib

Innovative Second and Foreign Language Education in Southeast Asia 265
Eduardo Lage-Otero

Globalization and Language Education in Japan 287
Ryuko Kubota

Parallel Language Strategy 301
Anne Holmen

Second Language Education in Canada 313
Margaret Early, Diane Dagenais, and Wendy Carr

Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in the Asia-Pacific Region 327
Yuko Goto Butler

Issues in Heritage Language Learning in the United States 339
Olga Kagan and Kathleen Dillon

Foreign Language Learning in K-12 Classrooms in the USA 357
Myriam Met and Adriana Melnyk Brandt

Part IV Teacher Preparation and Professional Development 371

Overseas Training of Chinese Secondary Teachers of English 373
Daguo Li and Viv Edwards

The Professional Development of Foreign Language Instructors in Postsecondary Education 385
Linda von Hoene

Teacher Training in Bilingual Education in Peru 399
Virginia Zavala

Nonnative-Speaking Teachers of English as a Foreign Language 413
Oleg Tarnopolsky

Task-Based Instruction and Teacher Training 425
Klaus Brandl

Developing Instructor Proficiency in Oral Language Assessment 439
Margaret E. Malone

Index 453

About the Editors



Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl (Ph.D. Linguistics, University of Florida) is Associate Dean of Yale College, Director of the Center for Language Study, and Adjunct Professor of Linguistics at Yale University. Her research interests focus on applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, heritage language learning, and technology-enhanced language teaching and learning. Current publications include "The Shared Course Initiative: Curricular collaboration across institutions" (in J. Watzinger-Tharp and P. Urlaub, *The Interconnected Language Curriculum: Critical Transitions and Interfaces in Articulated K-16 Contexts*, AAUSC Volume 2016), "The role of language centers in the professional development of non-tenure track language faculty" (in F. Kronenberg, *From Language Lab to Language Center and Beyond: The Past, Present, and Future of the Language Center*), and "Assessing outcomes in online foreign language education. What are the key measures for success?" (*Modern Language Journal*, 2015). She serves as coinvestigator of a 5-year grant project funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to share less commonly taught languages among Yale, Columbia, and Cornell via videoconferencing. With Nina Spada, she is Series Editor of the *Language Learning and Language Teaching* book series published by John Benjamins.



Stephen May is Professor of Education in Te Puna Wānanga (School of Māori and Indigenous Education) in the Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Auckland, New Zealand. He is an international authority on language rights, language policy, bilingualism and bilingual education, and critical multicultural approaches to education and, to date, has published 15 books and over 90 articles and chapters in these areas. His key books include *The Multilingual Turn* (2014), *Language and Minority Rights* (2nd edition, 2012), and, with Christine Sleeter, *Critical Multiculturalism: Theory and*

Praxis (2010). In addition to being Editor-in-Chief of the 3rd edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, he is a Founding Editor of the interdisciplinary journal, *Ethnicities*, and was from 2005–2015 Associate Editor of *Language Policy*. He is also a Fellow of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). His homepage is http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/stephen-may.

Advisory Board

Suresh Canagarajah Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

William Cope Common Ground Publishing, Champaign, IL, USA

Jim Cummins University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

Viv Edward University of Reading, Reading, UK

Eli Hinkel Seattle University, Seattle, WA, USA

Francis Hult Lund University, Lund, Sweden

Nkonko Kamwangamalu Howard University, Washington, DC, USA

Gregory Kamwendo University of Kwazulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

Claire Kramsch University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

Rainer Enrique Hamel Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico City, Mexico

Constant Leung King's College, London, UK

Li Wei University College London, London, UK

Luis Enrique Lopez Universidad Mayor de San Simón, Cochabamba, Bolivia

Marilyn Martin-Jones University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK

Bonny Norton University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Tope Ominiyi Roehampton University, London, UK

Alastair Pennycook University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Bernard Spolsky Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

Lionel Wee National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore

Jane Zuengler University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA

External Reviewers

Second and Foreign Language Education

Dinny Aletheiani

Catherine Baumann

Maria Carreira

Stéphane Charitos

Seungja Choi

Marion Gehlker

Anne Holmen

Olga Kagan

Celeste Kinginger

Mary Jo Lubrano

David Malinowski

Anna Moldawa-Shetty

Mukul Saxena

James Tierney

Suzanne Young

Contributors

Mahmoud A. Al-Khatib Faculty of Science and Arts, Department of English Language and Linguistics, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan

Klaus Brandl Department of Germanics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

Yuko Goto Butler Educational Linguistics Division, University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Wendy Carr Department of Language and Literacy Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Diane Dagenais Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Kathleen Dillon University of California at Davis, Davis, CA, USA

Margaret Early Department of Language and Literacy Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Martin East Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

Viv Edwards Institute of Education, University of Reading, Reading, UK

Suzanne Fernandez Wesley College Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Shannon Fitzsimmons-Doolan TAMUCC Department of English, Texas A&M University Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, TX, USA

Margaret Gearon Faculty of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Michelle Geoffrion-Vinci Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Lafayette College, Easton, PA, USA

Britt-Louise Gunnarsson Department of Scandinavian Languages, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

Leanne Hinton Linguistics Department, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

Linda von Hoene Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) Teaching and Resource Center, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

Anne Holmen Centre for Internationalisation and Parallel Language Use, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Olga Kagan Department of Slavic, East European and Eurasian Languages and Cultures, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Nkonko M. Kamwangamalu Department of English, Howard University, College of Arts and Sciences, Washington, DC, USA

Richard Kern French Department, UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

Celeste Kinginger Department of Applied Linguistics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Claire Kramsch Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

Ryuko Kubota Language and Literacy Education, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Eduardo Lage-Otero Humanities (Spanish), Saga College, Yale-NUS College, Singapore, Singapore

Daguo Li International Study and Language Institute (ISLI), University of Reading, Reading, UK

Andrew Lynch Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA

Margaret E. Malone Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

Sandra Lee McKay M.A. TESOL Program Department of English, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA, USA

Adriana Melnyk Brandt School of Education, Dixie State University, Saint George, UT, USA

Myriam Met National Foreign Language Center, The University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

Tarja Nikula Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland

Sally Sieloff Magnan Department of French and Italian, University of Wisconsin, Madison, College of Letters and Science, Madison, WI, USA

Amy Snyder Ohta Asian Languages and Literature, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

Rebecca L. Oxford College of Education, University of Maryland (Professor Emerita), College Park, MD, USA

Fredricka L. Stoller English Department, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ, USA

Oleg Tarnopolsky Department of Applied Linguistics and Methods of Foreign Language Teaching, Alfred Nobel University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Mary Toulouse Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Lafayette College, Easton, PA, USA

Per Urlaub University of Texas, Austin, TX, USA

Paige Ware School of Education, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX, USA

Chantelle Warner Department of German Studies, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

Mark Warschauer School of Education, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA

Virginia Zavala Sección Lingüística y Literatura, Departamento de Humanidades, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, Peru

Part I

Theoretical Underpinnings

Applied Linguistic Theory and Second/ Foreign Language Education

Claire Kramsch

Contents

Introduction 4
Early Developments 4
Major Contributions 6
Applied Linguistic Theory and Language Learning 6
Work in Progress 8
Applied Linguistic Theory and SL/FL Education 8
Problems and Difficulties 10
Research Issues 10
The Limits of Applied Linguistics in SL/FL Education 11
Future Directions 11
Cross-References 13
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 13
References 13

Abstract

As a multidisciplinary field of research, applied linguistics has drawn on a variety of linguistic, psychological, and sociological theories to explain the processes by which foreign/second languages are acquired, learned, and studied and the principles that have guided foreign language education in institutional settings. With globalization, the links between language, culture, communication, and identity have become more problematic, and it is less clear what foreign language educators should prepare learners to do with the language in the real world of language use. Researchers agree, however, that it is not enough to teach how to say things grammatically accurately and idiomatically. Language educators need to teach the symbolic value of words and their historical resonances and help

C. Kramsch (✉)
Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA
e-mail: ckramsch@berkeley.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_1

S/FL learners learn how to respect each other's values without betraying their own.

Keywords
Applied linguistics • Second language learning • Foreign language education • Communicative language teaching • Ecological perspectives

Introduction

Given the interdisciplinary nature of the field of applied linguistics, there is no one applied linguistic theory but various approaches to studying language learning and language use in everyday life based on various cognitive and social theories of language development. This entry passes in review the most prevalent approaches in the last 45 years to studying second language acquisition: the psycholinguistic approach of the 1970s and 1980s, the sociolinguistic and sociocultural approach of the 1990s, the ecological and the complexity approach of the first decade of the 2000s, and the bi- and multilingual approach in the 2010s. Each of these approaches corresponds to a different view of language and of second/foreign language (S/FL) teaching or education.

If language was viewed at first as a rule-governed system that had to be taught through audiolingual drills and structural exercises, it came to be seen in the 1980s as a communicative process of expression, interpretation, and negotiation of meaning that led to communicative language teaching. In the 1990s, the success of sociocultural and sociocognitive views of language and language learning brought about collaborative, interaction-based, and task-based pedagogies. In the first decade of the twenty-first century, more decentered views of language such as those espoused by language ecologists or complexity theorists mostly found their usefulness in S/FL education in natural settings. They yet have to be applied to language learning in instructional environments, which have strict requirements of assessment and accountability. However, greater access to the Internet and social networks have made context-based approaches to S/FL education more relevant than ever. Today, S/FL education increasingly has to deal with the growth of English as a Lingua Franca, the neoliberal orientation of language education, and the growing multilingual character of modern societies.

Early Developments

The emergence of Applied Linguistics at the end of the 1950s was brought about by the need to develop principled methods to solve practical problems in language teaching after the Second World War, particularly the teaching of English as a second/foreign language. It was keen on moving away from a concern for designing the best language teaching methodology, i.e., how languages should be

taught (e.g., Berlitz, audiolingual, direct method) to a concern for understanding how languages are *learned* and how learners use language in authentic settings for solving problems in the real world.

It is worth reflecting on the revolution that the field of Applied Linguistics was thereby ushering into S/FL education. Foreign languages, including English, had been taught before the war according to a grammar-translation approach that valued reading, writing, and the memorization of grammatical rules and lists of vocabulary because it was modeled on the learning of such dead languages as Greek and Latin and were meant mainly to give learners access to written texts in the original. Speaking was not the primary goal in classrooms; to speak the language, one went to the country where the language was spoken. The spread of English after WWII for business and transactional purposes and the need to train teachers of English as a second language around the world required quite a different understanding of what it meant to learn a language as an adult, an immigrant or a professional. Oral proficiency, fluency, idiomaticity, and authenticity became major goals for acquiring what the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) called "usable level of skill" (Liskin-Gasparro 1984, p. 13). This instrumentalization or functionalization of language education slowly got adopted by all the other second/foreign language teachers, particularly after the publication of the Threshold Level (van Ek 1975) that was translated into various European languages and formed the basis for the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach of subsequent decades.

Early second language (L2) acquisition theories were thus mostly of the psycholinguistic kind; they drew heavily on research methods from cognitive and social psychology. For example, they explained L2 acquisition through a contrastive analysis of the L2 and the L1 or drew attention to the psycholinguistic significance of learners' errors, and how these errors served to build the learner's *interlanguage* or rule-governed transitional system of linguistic development toward native speaker performance. Early theories explained a learner's sequences of acquisition, the individual differences between learners, and the role of cognitive/social factors in the success or failure of S/FL learning (see also: "▶ Conditions for Second Language (L2) Learning" by Oxford, this volume).

These early developments, however, sought to explain second/foreign language *learning*, not language *education*. Already in the late 1970s, the distinction that Krashen made between acquisition and learning (Krashen 1976) drew a wedge between language taught in institutional settings under the monitoring of an instructor who taught rules of grammar and vocabulary (e.g., learning) and language acquired in natural environments as a result of communicating with native speakers in the real world (e.g., acquisition). Krashen insisted that learning did not lead to acquisition, thus putting second/foreign language instructors, who were in charge of language education, in somewhat of a quandary. Their contribution, in Krashen's Monitor Theory, was reduced to checking the grammatical and lexical correctness of students' output, but communicative competence itself was to be ensured not by learning the rules, but through the comprehensible input provided by native or near native speakers in noninstructional or in communicatively rich instructional environments.

Thus, the distinction was made in those early years between language acquisition and learning, language study, and language education. The first two can be learned in natural or in instructional environments, whereas the last two can only take place in institutional environments. While *acquisition and learning* evoke the development of communicative abilities, the term *study* implies the development of linguistic and cultural awareness, social, historical, and political consciousness and aesthetic sensibility. The term *education* indexes mostly elementary or secondary schooling and its general educational objectives, but it encompasses also "higher education" at colleges and universities. While L2 acquisition occurred through language use in authentic contexts of communication both within and outside of institutional settings and was the focus of SLA research, SL/FL education was an institutional process of socialization into an educated L2 habitus that included L2 linguistic and cultural literacy, and was the focus of spoken and written literacy research. By contrast, L2 study fell into the domain of the human sciences and focused on translation, stylistics, and literary and cultural studies. All three strands of research were within the remit of Applied Linguistic Theory, but SLA research remained the primary scientific source of knowledge in subsequent decades, owing to English learners' overwhelming need of oral communication skills for business, work, and entertainment purposes in an economy that was becoming more and more global. SLA research also claimed to offer a scientifically attested way of predicting learners' success, whereas SL/FL education research only offered a way of assessing learners' performance. Interestingly, the two major assessment instruments for measuring SL/FL learners' communicative competence, the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines in the USA (Liskin-Gasparro 1984) and the Common European Framework of Reference in Europe (Council of Europe 2000; see also Leung 2014), are based less on SLA research insights than on general educational principles and functional needs analysis. Both assessment scales remain to this day the guiding frameworks for evaluating and measuring language learners' communicative competence in instructional and noninstructional settings.

Major Contributions

Applied Linguistic Theory and Language Learning

Because it emerged in the second half of the twentieth century when the demand for English was growing around the globe for employment and business purposes, much of the research on language learning has focused on the learning of English as a second/foreign language. Its main research focus has been the acquisition of spoken language, pragmatic skills, conversational strategies, and the learning of the conventional written genres – for example, the academic essay, the research report, the job application, the statement of purpose. Many aspects of ESL pedagogy have been an inspiration for developing the pedagogy of other second languages, for example, Spanish as a second language in Spain, German as a second language in Germany, and foreign language education in general.

The construction of an applied linguistic theory of second language learning has grown out of the empirical research findings of applied linguists studying, for example, the acquisition of French by Anglophone children in immersion programs in Canada, the acquisition of English by immigrant children in American schools, of German by Turkish immigrants to Germany, the speech act realizations in nonnative speakers' speech or interlanguage pragmatics, sociolinguistic phenomena in situations of language hybridity and linguistic crossing in British schools, and the cognitive strategies used by school learners in group activities mediated by language. These empirical studies have given rise to various theories of language learning, for example, psycholinguistic theory (Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991), sociolinguistic theory (Rampton 1995; see also "► Sociolinguistics and Language Education" by Sandra McKay, this volume, sociocognitive theory (Atkinson 2011), pragmatic and conversational analytic theory (Kasper 2001), sociocultural theory (Lantolf 2000; Lantolf and Thorne 2006), and their concomitant recommendations for pedagogic practice, for example, task-based, activity-based, or participation/collaboration-based pedagogies.

The changes brought about in the last 35 years by the rise of a multinational business class and the explosion of information-processing technologies have transformed English from just another foreign language into *the* world language of trade and industry. The case of English, more than any other foreign language, is emblematic of the close link between language teaching and the clash of national interests and international power struggles taking place at the present time in the technological, economic, and cultural spheres. These changes have created conditions favorable to the emergence of what has been called a communicative approach to language pedagogy or communicative language teaching (CLT). CLT and its variations (task-based language learning, content-based instruction) have imposed themselves on the teaching of all foreign languages around the world. It is slowly causing some backlash on the part of some language educators who question the appropriateness of applying to non-Western contexts a pedagogy that was designed within a Western context (Lin 1999).

Unlike language teaching based on philology, CLT has been based on social scientific applied linguistic research. Applied linguistic theory posits that:

- Language is not primarily a mode of representation of some textual truth, but interpersonal communication; not historical knowledge, but information to be exchanged. The target model is not primarily the truth and accuracy of the written text, but the authenticity and trustworthiness of the native speaker. The purpose of language learning is to communicate with native and other nonnative speakers of the language in a grammatically accurate, pragmatically appropriate, and discursively coherent way (Canale and Swain 1980).
- The emphasis is on spoken language and the focus is on lexical knowledge and lexicalized grammar, on idiomatic phrases, prefabricated chunks, procedural know how, fluency in production, and the skillful management of conversation.
- Language learning emerges from comprehensible input, interaction, participation, and collaboration in authentic contexts of use in which meanings are expressed,

interpreted, and negotiated (see "► Conditions for Second Language (L2) Learning" by Rebecca Oxford, this volume).
- It is a cognitive process of structuring and restructuring knowledge that can be facilitated by a task-based pedagogy (see "► Task-Based Teaching and Learning: Pedagogical Implications" by Martin East, this volume)
- The learning and communication strategies of good language learners can and should be taught explicitly.
- Pair and group work in a student-centered classroom aimed at collaboratively solving real-world tasks greatly facilitate language learning.

With regard to second language acquisition, applied linguistic theory has been keen on describing the necessary conditions for the successful acquisition of a language at various stages of development and at predicting success or failure based on those conditions. It has thus enjoyed scientific recognition and scholarly validity. Applied linguistics has enormously enriched the learning of second/foreign languages through its careful empirical investigation of the linguistic, cognitive, affective, and social processes at work in an individual's acquisition of a foreign symbolic system and through its painstaking observations of the way actual speakers and writers, listeners, and readers use language for communicative purposes. It has spawned pedagogic methodologies that endure to this day.

The globalization of information, communication, and the media and the mobility of people, goods, and capital have changed the nature of the real-world problems studied by applied linguists, among which SL/FL education. The growing multiplicity of languages in use in international encounters has turned the attention of applied linguists away from mainly psycholinguistic aspects to sociolinguistic (Block 2003) and sociocognitive aspects of SL/FL learning (Atkinson 2011), issues of bilingualism (Ortega 2013), English as a Lingua Franca (Seidlhofer 2011), and multilingual practices in global environments (Pennycook 2010; Cenoz and Gorter 2011; Canagarajah 2013; May 2014). But in so doing they have turned to theories that are less able to predict success in SLA, in part because it has become more and more difficult to define "success" now that the native speaker target has been put into question (Rampton 1995). With English as a Lingua Franca native like proficiency is no longer absolutely necessary for communication purposes nor does it guarantee social acceptability and economic success. The question has become: what is the relation of applied linguistic theory and SL/FL education or teaching?

Work in Progress

Applied Linguistic Theory and SL/FL Education

CLT has had a considerable impact on SL/FL education, especially English, in countries around the world through institutional, national, and international guidelines. In the USA, this impact has been informed less by applied linguistic theory, but by a proficiency-oriented methodology that is used in US government language schools

(American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages 1986) or by an ESL methodology that has been extended to the teaching of other languages. This methodology has generally assumed a rather harmonious and symmetrical relationship between native and nonnative speakers and a willingness to cooperate in the negotiation of meanings. It has not taken into consideration what language education also has to deal with, namely: cultural and moral conflicts, historical incompatibilities, identity politics, and the struggle for symbolic recognition. To explain these social and cultural aspects of language education, researchers have had to draw on social and cultural theories like those of Bhaskar and Habermas (Corson 1997), Marx and Foucault (e.g., Canagarajah 1999), Bourdieu (e.g., Lin 1999); see also: "► Identity, Language Learning and Critical Pedagogies in Digital Times" by Bonny Norton, and Butler (Ibrahim 1999), and on the educational theories of Bakhtin and Vygotsky (e.g., Lantolf 2000), thus creating a strand of socioculturally aware applied linguistics (Pennycook 2001). It has also drawn on Halliday's functional systemic linguistics and its applications to language education (Byrnes and Maxim 2003). Indeed, critical applied linguistic theory has had a substantial impact on second language literacy education in secondary schools in Australia and is slowly beginning to have an impact on foreign language education at the postsecondary level in the USA (Kern 2000).

The impact of applied linguistic theory has been felt in secondary and collegiate FL education at the beginning levels of instruction. At colleges and universities, much of language education has been indirectly inspired by methodologies and pedagogic practices derived from SLA research, not from research in L2 literacy nor from literary and cultural scholarship. This in turn has exacerbated the split between language studies and literary/cultural studies in foreign languages and literature departments (Byrnes and Maxim 2003). But at the more advanced levels, the potential benefits of a socioculturally aware applied linguistics are becoming more apparent both for the undergraduates who are increasingly interested in issues of language rather than literature and for the graduate student instructors in search of educational, rather than merely communicative, goals for their teaching (see also: "► Second Language Literacy Research and Curriculum Transformation in US Postsecondary Foreign Language Education" by Per Urlaub, this volume).

This is where applied linguistic theory can be of use by offering theoretically validated tools of inquiry. These can enable learners to:

- Critically approach texts and understand their textuality and the intertextualities they afford (e.g., Widdowson 2004; Bazerman and Prior 2004)
- Understand the link between culture, ideology and identity, language, and power (e.g., Norton and Toohey 2004; Pennycook 2001; Schieffelin et al. 1998)
- Understand the link between grammatical choice and authorial style (e.g., Ivanic 1998)
- Make connections between various symbolic systems (across languages, across modalities) and their meaning potential (e.g., Kress 2003)
- Appreciate the importance of genre in all its forms, including the literary
- Become critically aware of the relation between socialization and acquisition in SL/FL education (Kramsch 2002).

Problems and Difficulties

Research Issues

In the wake of geopolitical changes without precedent – the explosion of information technologies, a global market causing global migrations and increasingly plurilingual and pluricultural societies – researchers in applied linguistics are confronted with a series of issues that they did not have to confront in the early days of the discipline. The first is: What is the link between language and culture? And what is culture: a way of life, an ideology, a discourse, a national history? To what extent does the learning of a language entail an acculturation into in a specific way of life and specific ideological values? Even though an international language like English is not seen to belong to any particular culture, it is still linked historically to British or American dominance, or at least to economic globalization and its neoliberal ideology. The question of culture in language education is particularly urgent for teachers of English (Pennycook 2001), but also for FL educators (Kramsch 1993). The difficulty in researching the issue of language and culture in a positively inclined field like applied linguistics is that there is no culture-neutral place from where to examine it and that it intersects with moral, religious, and political interests. This makes objective research with universally recognized research findings a difficult enterprise.

A second research issue is: What is the link between language and social/cultural identity? What is the ultimate goal of language learning and language education: Socialization? Understanding of self? General education.? Job opportunities? In the case of immigrants learning the language of the host country, it can no longer be assumed that all learners want to blend into the host society and relinquish their ethnic, social, and cultural identity (see also: "▶ Identity, Language Learning and Critical Pedagogies in Digital Times" by Bonny Norton. In the case of FL education, issues of identity have not been as salient as in SL learning, because learners have been assumed to be well established in their national and social identity, but recently questions of learner identity have been posed at the institutional level. What are educational institutions preparing language learners to be: regional community members? national citizens? global citizens? Even in countries that have national education systems, there is a great deal of debate about what kinds of citizens nation-states want to educate through their educational institutions. For example, while the Chinese and the French national educational systems see it as their primary mission to form future citizens who can play a political role on the national and international scene (Kramsch and Yin in press), the more economically oriented American educational system strives to form future consumers who can play a productive role on the local and global market (Donato, pers.comm.).

Other difficult issues in applied linguistics include: How should foreign language education be framed within plurilingual/pluricultural environments, for example, the

European Union? How should language learning technologies be theorized, beyond their attractive use to teach languages in authentic contexts? (see also: "► Computer-Assisted Language Assessment" by Paula Winke). Notions like authenticity, historicity, and communication become problematic in electronic environments where the axes of time and space have been redefined. Finally, how should the outcomes of SL/FL learning and education be defined, measured, and evaluated fairly and in a valid and reliable manner? Applied linguistic theory nowadays is less focused on predicting outcomes of successful L2 acquisition than on describing the psycho- and sociolinguistic processes of L2 development in all their unpredictable complexity. To find answers to all these questions, applied linguists are increasingly turning to poststructuralist and ecological theories of language, culture, and learning (Kramsch 2002; Larsen-Freeman and Cameron 2008). See also: "► Ecological Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition and Socialization" by Claire Kramsch and Sune Vork Steffensen.

The Limits of Applied Linguistics in SL/FL Education

The field of applied linguistics has traditionally had more to do with language learning than with language education, in part because it has been based on psycholinguistic research that has studied universals of second language acquisition rather than culture-specific modes of learning. As a respected branch of the social sciences, it has developed an authority in the field of language education because of its scientifically attested findings. But what is pedagogically valid for the teaching of English in Japan might not be appropriate for the teaching of Chinese or Arabic in the USA, for example.

Furthermore, language education includes more than just the acquisition of communicative competence. Education in FL literacy, as well as in the appreciation of social, literary, and cultural traditions, requires educators to draw on other fields than applied linguistics in its original sense. Applied linguistic theory must be supplemented by educational theory, aesthetic theory, literary theory, and even political theory to deal with all facets of FL education. The difficulty for the researcher is that FL education straddles the social and the human sciences that have quite different research paradigms and methods of inquiry.

Future Directions

Today, globalization is presenting a challenge of unprecedented scope for SL/FL educators. What should they prepare youngsters for in a world that is increasingly diverse, changing, plurilingual, and pluricultural, and where language is increasingly misused, even abused by politicians, pundits, and marketing strategists alike? The notion of "textual competence" was well suited to the *national* need for law

and order in the public sphere. "Communicative competence" was appropriate for the *international* demand for smoother economic transactions and exchanges of information. But neither seems to be sufficient in a *global* world where symbolic, historical, cultural, and ideological values are taking on ever greater importance. What can applied linguistic theory offer SL/FL education in global times?

Applied Linguistics can serve as the theoretical basis for a socially and culturally aware language education. Today, miscommunication might occur not because two interlocutors make imperfect use of the English language, but because one considers himself to be superior to the other while the other sees him as his equal (i.e., they do not share the same symbolic reality); one comes from a country that used to be a colony of the other or was at war with the other (i.e., they have different views of history); one might say something that evokes bad stereotypes in the mind of the other, for example, he might be heard as being condescending when he intended to be friendly, she might sound deceitful when she wanted to be tactful, he might come across as aggressive when he was trying hard to be truthful (i.e., they have different cultural values); and they might mean different things even as they use the same words (i.e., their words conceal different ideologies). It is said that the more a language is used in a variety of contexts by native and nonnative speakers who have nothing in common (no common history, no common point of reference, no common worldview), the more they have to restrict themselves to the immediate task at hand. Such a view is predicated on the assumption of a common purpose for the task, but in a global world interlocutors must be ready to negotiate not only how to complete the task, but how to define the very nature and purpose of the task itself.

Nowadays, rather than communicative strategies, language learners might need much more subtle semiotic tactics that draw on a multiplicity of perceptual clues to make and convey meaning. These tactics are especially necessary in situations where power, status, and speaking rights are unequally distributed and where ideology superimposes itself on referential meanings. Second/foreign language learners need to understand the different historical experiences evoked by the words spoken and the different subjective resonances that the memory of these experiences elicits in the participants in cross-cultural encounters. A socially and culturally aware applied linguistic theory can show nonnative speakers not only how to make themselves understood linguistically, but how to position themselves in the world, i.e., find a place for themselves historically and subjectively on the global market of symbolic exchanges.

The recent attack (January 2015) by two terrorists on the satirical newspaper *Charlie Hebdo* in Paris raises urgent questions on the limits of free speech in a global world and the distinction between satire, opinion and hate speech. As we teach second/foreign languages for communicative purposes, such events make us acutely aware that it is not enough to teach how to say things grammatically accurately and idiomatically. As educators, we need to teach the symbolic value of words and their historical resonances and help S/FL learners learn how to respect each other's values without betraying their own (Kramsch 2011).

Cross-References

- ▶ Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition
- ▶ Conditions for Second Language (L2) Learning
- ▶ Second Language Literacy Research and Curriculum Transformation in US Postsecondary Foreign Language Education
- ▶ Sociolinguistics and Language Education
- ▶ Task-Based Teaching and Learning: Pedagogical Implications

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Paula Winke: Computer-Assisted Language Assessment. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

Sune Vork Steffensen: Ecological Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition and Socialization. In Volume: Language Socialization

Bonny Norton: Identity, Language Learning and Critical Pedagogies in Digital Times. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1986). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. Revised 2012, available from http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012

Atkinson, D. (2011). *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. London: Routledge.

Bazerman, C., & Prior, P. (2004). *What writing does and how it does it. An introduction to analyzing text and textual practices*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Byrnes, H., & Maxim, H. (Eds.). (2003). *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs*. Boston: Heinle.

Canagarajah, C. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). From intercultural rhetoric to cosmopolitan practice: Addressing new challenges in Lingua Franca English. In D. Belcher & G. Nelson (Eds.), *Critical and corpus-based approaches to intercultural rhetoric*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

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

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Introduction. A holistic approach to multilingual education. *Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 339–343.

Corson, D. (1997). Critical realism: An emancipatory philosophy for applied linguistics? *Applied Linguistics, 18*, 166–188.

Council of Europe. (2000). *Common European Framework for language learning, teaching and evaluation*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Ibrahim, A. E. K. (1999). Becoming Black: Rap and hip-hop, race, gender, identity, and the politics of ESL learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 349–370.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity. The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics, 22*, 502–530.
Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kramsch, C. (Ed.). (2002). *Language socialization and language acquisition. Ecological perspectives*. London: Continuum.
Kramsch, C. (2011). The symbolic dimensions of the intercultural. *Language Teaching, 44*(3), 354–367.
Kramsch, C., & Yin, P. (in press). Teaching foreign languages in the glocal contact zone. The case of France and China. In: A. F. Selvi & N. Rudolph (Eds.), *Contextualizing education for glocal interaction.* Berlin: Springer.
Krashen, S. (1976). Formal and informal linguistic environments in language learning and language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 10*, 157–168.
Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.
Lantolf, J. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lantolf, J., & Thorne, S. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.
Leung, C. (2014). Communication and participatory involvement in linguistically diverse classrooms. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn. Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 123–146). London: Routledge.
Lin, A. (1999). Doing-English-Lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 393–412.
Liskin-Gasparro, J. (1984). The ACTFL proficiency guidelines: A historical perspective. In T. Higgs (Ed.), *Teaching for proficiency, the organizing principle* (pp. 11–42). Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company.
May, S. (2014). Disciplinary divides, knowledge construction, and the multilingual turn. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn. Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 7–31). London: Routledge.
Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Ortega, L. (2013). SLA for the 21st century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and the bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning, 63*(Suppl 1), 1–24.
Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London: Routledge.
Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing. Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
Schieffelin, B., Woolard, K., & Kroskrity, P. (1998). *Language ideologies. Practice and theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Van Ek, J. (1975). *Threshold level English*. Preface and foreword by J. L. M. Trim. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext. Critical issues in discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sociolinguistics and Language Education

Sandra Lee McKay

Contents

Introduction 16
Early Developments 17
Major Contributions 18
Language Variation 18
Language Contact 19
Language Change and Language Standards 21
Work in Progress: Language and Globalization 22
Problems and Difficulties: Future Directions 23
Pedagogical Implications 24
Cross-References 25
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 25
References 25

Abstract

This chapter begins by distinguishing various meanings of the term *sociolinguistics*. It then traces early developments in the field of sociolinguistics, beginning with the work of geographical dialectologists and then moving to the seminal work of Hymes (on communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. London: Penguin, 1972) and Bernstein (*Class, codes and control.* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1971). The author next describes three major strands of investigation in sociolinguistics: language variation, language contact, and language change. Work in the area of language variation is based largely on the groundbreaking

S.L. McKay (✉)
M.A. TESOL Program Department of English, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA, USA
e-mail: 2sandra.mckay@gmail.com

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_2

work of William Labov, whose findings have been challenged by current research on language hybridity. Research in the area of language contact includes work on pidgins and creoles, as well as work on World Englishes. Finally, in reference to language change, the chapter highlights the manner in which the linguistic changes that are occurring today raise critical questions about the construct of a standard variety of a language. The paper ends with a summary of current work on language and globalization where there is far greater emphasis on the symbolic value of particular languages within the messy and complex exchanges of global interaction – exchanges where speakers come with different language resources, as well as different pragmatic norms. The final section discusses the pedagogical implications of the issues raised in the paper.

Keywords
English as a global language • Language change • Language standards • Language variation • Sociolinguistics

Introduction

Sociolinguistics is concerned with the relationship between language use and social variables. One of the major debates in the field of sociolinguistics is whether to take social or linguistic factors as primary in investigating this relationship. As evidence of this debate, Wardhaugh (1992) and others make a distinction between *sociolinguistics* and the *sociology of language*. Whereas sociolinguistics takes linguistic factors as primary in its investigations of language and society, the sociology of language investigates the manner in which social and political forces influence language use. Trauth and Kazzazi (1996) in the *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* make a similar distinction, noting that sociolinguistics can have either a sociological or linguistic orientation. The dictionary, however, adds a third possibility, namely, an ethnomethodological orientation. Hence, three areas of sociolinguistic investigation are delineated:

> (a) A primarily sociologically oriented approach concerned predominately with the norms of language use (When and for what purpose does somebody speak what kind of language or what variety with whom?). . .. (b) A primarily linguistically oriented approach that presumes linguistic systems to be in principle heterogeneous, though structured, when viewed within sociological parameters. . .. (c) An ethnomethodolically oriented approach with linguistic interaction as the focal point, which studies the ways in which members of a society create social reality and rule-ordered behaviour. (p. 439)

In this review, sociolinguistics will be viewed as encompassing all three areas listed above. The review will show how all three strands have contributed to a field of inquiry that has significant implications for language education.

Early Developments

Many contend that early work in sociolinguistics was sociologically uninformed, concentrating primarily on an analysis of language structure (Fishman 1968; LePage 1997). A major exception to this characterization occurred in 1968 with the publication of Fishman's (1968) seminal book, *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. In this collection of studies on the relationship of between language and society, Fishman (1968) argued for the benefit of a greater emphasis on the social aspects of language use. He maintained that it was only natural that, since society was broader than language, social structures should provide the primary focus of sociolinguistic studies. Ultimately, Fishman argued that sociologists and linguists would both gain from developing a robust interdisciplinary field. Sociologists could arrive at some reliable linguistic indicators of social class and demonstrate how the diversity inherent in language use is patterned. Linguists, on the other hand, might come to discover that what appears to be free variation in language use is in fact socially patterned.

One of Fishman's major criticisms of early fieldwork in linguistics was that it was devoid of a theoretical orientation. He questioned the value of linguistic fieldwork that provided an extensive inventory of the patterns of use of a single informant without any theoretical justification. His criticism was largely directed at early work in geographical dialectology which tended to investigate the language use of older uneducated informants in rural areas. LePage (1997) also criticized early work in dialectology, maintaining that it tended to assume a static social structure. In his view, early dialectologists mistakenly focused on finding reasons for language change in the language use of their rural informants rather than assuming that language diversity was the baseline.

The study of geographical dialectologists has a long history, beginning in the nineteenth century with historical-comparative linguistics. One of the earliest and most intensive investigations of geographical dialects in the United States was Kurath et al. (1939–1943), whose fieldwork resulted in a comprehensive linguistic atlas of New England. More recently, a comprehensive fieldwork project of American regional dialects led by Cassidy (1985) resulted in a *Dictionary of American Regional Dialects*. In both projects, a large number of fieldworkers were employed to interview individuals of various communities and age groups in order to map out specific features of dialect regions.

The belief that sociolinguistics should give greater emphasis to the social aspect of language use was shared by Hymes, who argued that researchers interested in describing how language is used need to consider the context in which particular interactions take place and how this context affects the interaction. Specifically, Hymes (1972) maintained that the following four questions must be raised in analyzing language use:

1. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally **possible**
2. Whether (and to what degree) something is **feasible** in virtue of the means of implementation available

3. Whether (and to what degree) something is **appropriate** (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated
4. Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually **performed**, and what its doing entails [emphasis in original] (p. 281)

These questions have significant implications for language education since they suggest that language education should examine standards of correctness in relation to language use and address issues of language appropriateness.

A concern with the social context of language use was also evident in the controversial work of Bernstein (1971), who examined early language socialization. Based on his research in England, he maintained that particular family structures tend to foster a closed communication system that results in the development of a *restricted code* in which there is a great deal of assumed background knowledge. On the other hand, some family structures promote an open communication system that results in an *elaborated code* where the speaker assumes that the audience needs to be supplied with necessary background knowledge. Bernstein contended that children who have access to the latter code have greater chances of success in formal educational contexts.

The work of Fishman, Hymes, Bernstein, and others, which challenged investigations that assumed a static linguistic situation, was brought about to a large extent by an interest in urban rather than rural dialectology. Linguistic communities were viewed as heterogeneous with languages and language varieties coming into regular contact. Emphasis was now placed on linguistic diversity. The new emphasis on linguistic diversity resulted in investigations of language variation, language contact, and language change.

Major Contributions

Language Variation

One of the major contributors to modern sociolinguists is William Labov. Labov's work provided a significant shift in how sociolinguists approached linguistic variation. His MA thesis entitled, "The Social Motivation of a Sound Change," published in *Word* in 1963, was based on work he did in the resort area of Martha's Vineyard. In this study he demonstrated how linguistic variation served as a means for individuals to mark their identity as natives of the area as opposed to summer visitors. Labov's most important contribution came from his doctoral thesis, published in 1966 and titled *The Social Stratification of English in New York City.*

In this study, Labov worked with a random sample of New Yorkers from the Lower East Side stratified into four socioeconomic classes based on occupation, income, and education. He investigated to what extent variables like *ing* vary in how they are pronounced based on an individual's socioeconomic class. Using interview data, Labov mapped the percentage of time that speakers dropped their *gs* (using "in" rather than "ing") in casual speech, careful speech, and reading style. What he found

was a consistent pattern of the lower-working class using the reduced form more than the upper-middle class. However, like the upper-middle class, the lower-working class had a lower frequency in their use of the reduced form in the reading style than in the casual speech.

What was significant in Labov's study was that he drew on natural data to quantify the existence of particular linguistic variants among specific groups of individuals. He then used this information to write a variable rule that described general tendencies in the use of a particular variant like *ing*. The quantities he used were not based on individual use of a variant but rather on the mean score for a social group. His methodology was highly innovative in that he used naturalistic speech to make generalizations regarding linguistic variation. Even more importantly the generalizations he made from this data demonstrated the relative frequency of a particular linguistic feature rather than the mere presence or absence of this feature.

During the 1950s and 1960s, Labov's work in developing variable rules that characterize the use of a particular linguistic feature in a specific social group was applied to the Black community in the United States. In 1965, Labov with Cohen and Robins carried out a study for the US Office of Education and Welfare on the structure of English used among black American and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City. In a later study, Labov (1969) developed a variable deletion rule to account for the deletion of the copula (e.g., The man rich) among the speech of Harlem street gangs. An interest in delineating the features of a Black English Vernacular led to many investigations in the 1960s such as the studies undertaken by Stewart (1964) and Wolfram (1969). More recently, there has been a vigorous debate over the role that African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) or Ebonics should play in the schools, with some arguing that it should be recognized and promoted in its own right as a legitimate variety of English and others arguing that the role of the school should be to replace this variety of English with Standard American English (see Rickford 1996). There has also been continuing research on teachers' attitudes toward AAVE. (See, e.g., Blake and Cutler 2003; Denny 2012.)

Language Contact

Another area of sociolinguistics that has been investigated in recent years is language contact and the development of pidgins and creoles. Pidgins come into being through the interaction of individuals who have minimal needs to communicate with one another and no shared language. Typically they develop in coastal areas for trade or forced labor purposes. Because pidgins are used for limited communication between speakers, they typically have a simple vocabulary and uncomplicated morphological and syntactic structure. In general the language of the economically and politically more powerful group provides the lexicon (the superstrate language) and the less powerful (the substrate language) the syntactic and phonological structure. Technically, a *creole* is a pidgin that has native speakers, namely, children of pidgin speakers who grow up using the pidgin as their first language. Because the code is

now the only language the speaker has available, the lexicon expands and the syntactic structure becomes more complex.

One of the major pedagogical issues surrounding the use of pidgins and creoles is to what extent they should be used in a classroom. In some contexts creoles are used in initial literacy instruction under the assumption that early education is most successful if it is conducted in the child's first language. However, there is great resistance to this option, particularly when a standardized version of the superstrate language exists in the same region, as, it does, for example, in Hawaii. Often this resistance develops from negative attitudes toward the pidgin and creole rather than on any linguistic basis. In response to such negative attitudes, Hawaiian educators have been instrumental in undertaking a successful revitalization of Hawaiian creole (see Cowell 2012).

An interest in language contact has also led to investigations of the language use of bilingual individuals and communities. Ferguson (1959) coined the term *diglossia* to describe the situation of a community in which most of the population is bilingual and the two codes serve different purposes. The term was originally used by Ferguson to describe a context in which two varieties of the same language are used by people of that community for different purposes. Normally one variety, termed the *high or H variety*, is acquired in an educational context and used by the community in more formal domains such as in churches or universities. The other variety, termed the *low or L variety*, is acquired in the home and used in informal domains like the home or social center to communicate with family and friends. As examples of diglossia, Ferguson pointed to situations like the use of classical and colloquial Arabic in Egypt or the use of Standard German and Swiss German in Switzerland. Later, Fishman (1972) generalized the meaning of diglossia to include the use of two separate languages within one country in which one language is used primarily for formal purposes and the other for more informal purposes. The expansion of the meaning of the term made it applicable to countries in which English is one of the official languages of the country such as South Africa, Singapore, and India. In these countries, English often assumes the role of what Ferguson calls the high variety being used in formal contexts with the other languages of the country used in informal domains. The term has also been applied to countries like Peru where the indigenous language, Quechua, is used by many in informal contexts, while Spanish serves the functions of a high variety.

Investigations have also been undertaken on the code switching behavior of bilinguals. One of the main questions addressed in research on code switching is what leads a bilingual to shift from one language to another. In answer to this question, Blom and Gumperz (1972) posit two types of code switching. The first is *situational code switching* in which the speaker changes codes in response to a change in the situation such as a change in the setting or the speakers involved in the conversation. The second type is *metaphorical code switching* in which the shift in languages has a stylistic or textual function to mark a change in emphasis or tone. Some, like Poplack (1980) and Singh (1996), maintain that code switching is closely related to language proficiency. Singh, in fact, argues that this relationship can be

summarized in the following aphorism: "A strong bilingual switches only when he wants to and a weak one when he has to" (p. 73).

One of the most comprehensive theories of code switching is Myers-Scotton (1993). She explains code switching in terms of a theory of rights and obligations. She proposed a markedness model of code switching which assumes that speakers in a multilingual context have a sense of which code is the expected code to use in a particular situation. This is termed the *unmarked* code. However, speakers can also choose to use the *marked* code. Myers-Scotton suggests several reasons why a speaker might make this choice as, for example, to increase social distance, to avoid an overt display of ethnicity, or for an aesthetic effect. In multilingual communities in which English has an official status, English is often the unmarked code in formal educational contexts. When the other languages are used in the classroom, they are often the marked choice chosen to signal such things as anger or social intimacy.

Studies in language contact have several implications for the teaching and learning of another language. Research in creoles has demonstrated that such variants are highly patterned and inherently equal to other variants of a language. However, because they have less social prestige in contexts in which a more standardized version of the language exists, students will be at a disadvantage by not learning the prestige form.

Studies on code switching have illustrated the regularity of code switching behavior and the purposes that code switching can serve for bilinguals. Given the many contexts today where English is used as one of the additional languages within a country, more research is needed regarding how individuals make use of English in reference to the other languages they speak. Such research will be valuable in establishing classroom objectives that complement the students' use of English within their own speech community. In addition, in classrooms in multilingual contexts where the teacher shares a first language with their students, teachers need to carefully consider how they can best make use of their students' first language to further their competency in a target language. (For a discussion of translanguaging, see Garcia and Li Wei 2014.)

Language Change and Language Standards

One common effect of language contact is language change. In such cases the various languages used within a multilingual context may undergo phonological, lexical, and grammatical changes as bilinguals make use of two or more languages on a regular basis. This situation is occurring in many countries today where English has an official role in the society as in India or South Africa. It is also occurring in countries where English is widely studied and used such as in many Scandinavian countries.

Many studies have been undertaken to determine the types of grammatical changes that are occurring in various multilingual contexts in which English plays a significant role. (See, e.g., Kachru 2005.) Frequently researchers begin by

examining a written corpus of English of a particular multilingual context to determine what kinds of grammatical innovations exist and how acceptable these structures are to both native speakers of English and local speakers of English. In general, when investigations of language change use a written corpus of published English, only very minor grammatical differences are found. (See, e.g., Parasher 1994.)

Often the kinds of grammatical changes that occur tend to be minor differences such as variation in what is considered to be a countable noun (e.g., the standard use of *luggages* in the use of English in the Philippines and the use of *furnitures* in Nigeria) and the creation of new phrasal verbs (e.g., the use of *dismissing off* in the use of English in India and *discuss about* in Nigeria). In contexts in which such features become codified and recognized as standard within that social context, there arises what Kachru (1986) has termed a *nativized variety* of English.

What is perhaps most puzzling in the development of alternate grammatical standards in the use of English is that fact that whereas lexical innovation is often accepted as part of language change, this tolerance is generally not extended to grammatical innovation. In Widdowson's (1994) view, the reason for this lack of tolerance for grammatical variation is because grammar takes on another value, namely, that of expressing a social identity. Hence, when grammatical standards are challenged, they challenge the security of the community and institutions that support these standards.

Work in Progress: Language and Globalization

Rampton (1995, 1997) maintains that globalization, as well as late/post modernity, warrants a fresh look at the issues important to sociolinguistics and second language research. He contends that while current sociolinguistic research assumes that neither language nor societies are homogeneous, "when it meets diversity and variation, one of its strongest instincts is to root out what it supposes to be orderliness and uniformity beneath the surface, an orderliness laid down during early socialization" (Rampton 1997, p. 330).

Rampton believes that the time has come for sociolinguists to challenge the notion that societies are compact and systematic entities and instead to recognize the heterogeneity and fluidity of modern states. In keeping with much of the discourse of postmodernism, he argues persuasively that sociolinguistics should give more attention to investigating issues related to fragmentation, marginality, and hybridity and recognize that "being marginal is actually a crucial experience of late modernity. Being neither on the inside nor the outside, being affiliated but not fully belonging, is said to be a normal condition. . ." (Rampton 1997, p. 330).

The tremendous shift that has taken place in sociolinguistics during the past two decades, as signaled by Rampton, is rooted in a new interest in the effect of globalization on language use. This interest in globalization has resulted in several significant shifts in the way language is viewed. To begin, the entire concept of nationhood is being challenged (see, e.g., Pennycook 2010) so that language is no

longer seen as a discrete system related to concepts of space based on nationhood; rather there is growing recognition that linguistic diversity today is greatly influenced by the global flow of people and cultures. The hybridity of language is particularly evident in popular culture and in the exchanges that take place in spaces where people from diverse language backgrounds and cultures come together. The language that is used in these contexts presents major challenges to traditional views of languages and of language standards. These shifts led Canagarajah (2006) to argue that to be relevant to language use in the present era, sociolinguists need to shift their emphasis from "language as a system to language as a social practice, from grammar to pragmatics, from competence to performance" (p. 234). In defining language as performative, Canagarajah contends that sociolinguists need to consider how "language diversity is actively negotiated in acts of communication under changing contextual conditions" (p. 234).

A view of linguistic diversity as a factor of contextualized social practice rather than nationhood has resulted in a focus on the relationship between language and power, as well as language and identity. Currently, there is a growing recognition that particular linguistic systems have semiotic value. Blommaert (2010), for example, refers to the messy new marketplace of present-day linguistic diversity where specific languages and language varieties have symbolic value because of the prestige and power associated with people who speak that language. Because of the economic and political power ascribed to many English-speaking societies, English often has great semiotic value, appearing in pop culture and advertisements where it used emblematically rather than linguistically. In addition to the relationship between language and power, there is growing interest in the manner in which language use in this messy marketplace affects personal identity. As Norton (2010) points out, every time we speak, "we are negotiating our sense of self in relation to the larger social world, and reorganizing that relationship across time and space. Our gender, race, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, among other characteristics, are all implicated in this negotiation of identity" (p. 350).

Problems and Difficulties: Future Directions

In keeping with these new trends in sociolinguistics, further research is needed on present-day linguistic diversity without preconceived ideas about language and nationhood and on native speakers and language standards. Such research should examine how particular varieties of language illustrate the fluidity of modern society. This type of research is presently underway in investigations of English as a lingua franca (ELF) negotiations, in which the speakers are neither insiders (i.e., so-called native speakers) nor outsiders; rather they are users of English in spaces of cross-cultural contact. (See Seidlhofer 2004 for a review of ELF research.) It is exactly these kinds of exchanges that exemplify the marginality of present-day communication. In addition, some research exists on the hybridity and diversity that exists in the language of hip-hop culture. (See, e.g., Pennycook 2007.)

In its ongoing effort to add to existing knowledge on the relationship between sociolinguistics and language education, educational sociolinguistics will continue to face major methodological issues (e.g., gaining access to educational sites and obtaining naturally occurring data) as well as sociopolitical challenges (e.g., convincing policy makers to implement sociolinguistically sound educational programs even though they may not have popular support).

Pedagogical Implications

The previous discussion on language variation, language contact, and language change has several implications for second language classrooms. First, second language pedagogy should be informed by current sociolinguistic research on linguistic diversity. As was demonstrated above, the manner in which individuals use language will often vary based on geographical region, social class, and ethnicity. For second language learners of any language, but particularly languages with wide geographical reach, such as English and Spanish, it is important for teachers to develop materials that will raise students' awareness of such differences and to help them understand the manner in which these differences serve to indicate membership in a particular speech community. Second, globalization has resulted in greater language contact so that many individuals today are multilingual/multicultural and the languages they use are negotiated in particular social contexts, resulting in the blending and hybridity of language use. Such hybridity needs to be acknowledged in pedagogical contexts. Third, a recognition of the complexity of language use today has resulted in greater pedagogical attention to developing a critical view of language in which literacy is not just about reading the word but also on reading the world (Freire 1972). This has led to an interest in formulating pedagogical strategies that develop critical language awareness (e.g., Janks 2010; Wallace 2012) so that readers examine not just what is said but more importantly how issues of power affect what was said and how it was said.

Finally, the teaching of standards should be based on sociolinguistic insights regarding language contact and language change. As was discussed previously, language contact will inevitably result in language change. Since today many individuals are using English in contact with other languages on a daily basis, their use of English is changing, and they are in the process of establishing their own standards of English grammar and pronunciation. In general the research on these emerging varieties of English indicates that the codified and accepted standard of English that exists in these communities has few differences from other standard varieties of English. The situation of multiple standards is important not just for English but for many other widely used languages. Hence, it is important for second language teachers to recognize the integrity of the varieties of the language they teach, to realize that they are important sources of personal identity and signs of the fluidity of late modernity, and to not promote negative attitudes toward such varieties.

Cross-References

- ▶ Conditions for Second Language (L2) Learning
- ▶ Foreign Language Education in the Context of Institutional Globalization
- ▶ Globalization and Language Education in Japan
- ▶ Second Language Learning in a Study Abroad Context
- ▶ Sociocultural Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education
- ▶ The Role of the National Standards in Second/Foreign Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Lin, A.: Code-switching in the Classroom: Research Paradigms and Approaches. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Li Wei.: Research Perspectives on Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Park, J.: Researching Globalization of English. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Block, D.: Researching Language and Social Class in Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Garrett, P.: Researching Language Socialization. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

References

Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, codes and control*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Blake, R., & Cutler, C. (2003). AAE and variation in teachers attitudes: A question of school philosophy. *Linguistics and Education, 14*(2), 163–194.

Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 407–434). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2006). Changing communicative needs, revised assessment objectives: Testing English as an international language. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 3*(3), 229–242.

Cassidy, F. G. (1985). *Dictionary of American regional English (Vol. 1: Introduction and A-C)*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

Cowell, A. (2012). The Hawaiian model of language revitalization: problems of extension to mainland native America. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 218*, 167–193.

Denny, S. (2012). Looking back while moving forward: When teacher attitudes belie teacher motive in bidialectal classrooms. *International Journal of Learning and Development, 2*, 289–306.

Ferguson, C. (1959). Diglossia. *Word, 15*, 325–340.

Fishman, J. (Ed.). (1968). *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J. (1972). *The sociology of language*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Garcia, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. London: Penguin.
Janks, H. (2010). Language, power and pedagogies. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 40–61). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the cannon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
Kurath, J., Hanley, M. L., Bloch, B., & Lowman, G. S. (1939–1943). *Linguistic atlas of New England (3 Vols.)*. Providence: Brown University Press.
Labov, W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound change. *Word, 19*, 273–309.
Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Labov, W. (1969). Contraction, deletion and inherent variability of the English copula. *Language, 45*, 715–762.
LePage, R. B. (1997). The evolution of a sociolinguistic theory of language. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 15–32). Oxford: Blackwell.
Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivation for codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Norton, B. (2010). Language and identity. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 349–369). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Parasher, S. V. (1994). Indian English: Certain grammatical, lexical and stylistic features. In R. K. Angihotri & A. L. Khanna (Eds.), *Second language acquisition: Socio-cultural and linguistic aspects of English in India* (pp. 145–164). New Delhi: Sage.
Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global English and transcultural flows*. London: Routledge.
Pennycook, A. (2010). Nationalism, identity and popular culture. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 62–87). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Poplack, S. (1980). "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol": Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics, 26*, 47–104.
Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. New York: Longman.
Rampton, B. (1997). Second language research in late modernity. *The Modern Language Journal, 15*(3), 329–333.
Rickford, J. (1996). Regional and social variation. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 151–194). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 209–239.
Singh, R. (1996). *Lectures against sociolinguistics*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
Stewart, W. A. (1964). Urban negro speech. In R. W. Shuy et al. (Eds.), *Social dialects and language learning* (pp. 10–18). Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, #6#.
Trauth, G., & Kazzazi, K. (Eds.). (1996). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. London: Routledge.
Wallace, C. (2012). Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language: Teaching critical reading. In L. Aslsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 261–281). New York: Routledge.
Wardhaugh, R. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 377–388.
Wolfram, W. (1969). *A sociolinguistic description of Detroit negro speech*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Conditions for Second Language (L2) Learning

Rebecca L. Oxford

Contents

Introduction 28
Early Developments 29
Gagné's Conditions 29
Vygotsky's Theory of Dialogic Learning 30
Lave and Wenger's Theories of Situated Cognition in Communities of Practice 31
Major Contributions Within the L2 Field 31
Norton's Sociocultural Theories of Identity and Investment 31
Spolsky's Conditions for L2 Learning 32
Brown's Principles 33
Ellis' Model of Instructed Second Language Acquisition 34
Zhao and Lai's Theory of Technology-Enhanced L2 Learning 34
Work in Progress 35
Problems and Difficulties 37
Future Directions 38
Cross-References 38
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 39
References 39

Abstract

In this chapter on conditions for second and foreign language (L2) learning, the introduction provides key definitions. Key early developments include learning theories offered by Gagné, Vygotsky, and the Lave and Wenger team. These scholars' works, although created outside of the L2 learning field, have influenced the thinking of many who are concerned about L2 learning. Major contributions within the L2 learning field include varied and often contradictory theories related

R.L. Oxford (✉)
College of Education, University of Maryland (Professor Emerita), College Park, MD, USA
e-mail: rebeccaoxford@gmail.com

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_4

to conditions for L2 learning: Norton's sociocultural theory, Spolsky's umbrella theory of 74 conditions, Brown's theory of the whole L2 learner and his or her needs, Ellis' theory of instructed L2 acquisition, and Zhao and Lai's theory of technology-enhanced L2 learning. The section on works in progress hones in on promising, positive psychological efforts tied to L2 learning conditions. The author then mentions several problems hindering an effective understanding of L2 learning conditions: the fact that all learning condition theories have cultural, academic, philosophical, historical, and personal roots and that many individuals accept or reject a given theory without thinking about those roots; the frequent lack of awareness of the complexity of both L2 learners and L2 learning conditions; and the excessive number of L2 learning theories and the lack of expressed connectivity among those theories. The final section focuses on complexity theory as a potential path for understanding conditions for L2 learning.

Keywords
Second language learning • Foreign language learning • L2 learning • Conditions for learning • Contrasting theories

Introduction

In this chapter, a *second language* is a language (beyond a person's native language or L1) that is learned in a community where that language is commonly spoken by the majority of people. An example is English when learned by a Syrian refugee in the UK. A *foreign language* is a language (beyond the individual's L1) that is learned in a community where that language is *not* commonly spoken by most people. An example is Russian when learned by a native Spanish speaker in Mexico.[1]

A second language or a foreign language is often loosely dubbed *L2* or Language 2, signifying that it is a language that is developed beyond the individual's native language, or L1. An L2 can actually be the individual's second, third, fourth, fifth, or (for an extreme polyglot) tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth or higher language beyond the L1.[2]

This chapter uses the term *language learning* or *L2 learning*[3] to refer to the ongoing growth of capabilities in any language(s) beyond the L1 into more

[1]The second/foreign language distinction is now weakening for because of (1) today's exponentially expanded, Internet-based, border-spanning linguistic and cultural sharing and (2) the complexity of multicountry movements of individual immigrants and refugees. However, the terms are still in popular use and will be employed here.

[2]Dewaele (2011) employed *LX*, defined as any languages(s) that a multilingual person has learned after the age of three, i.e., after the period when the L1 has typically been well established. The *L1*, or first language/mother tongue, can be technically defined as any native language developed before the age of three (Dewaele and Pernelle 2015).

[3]Larsen-Freeman (2015) called this SLD, or second language development.

advanced, more effective states by means of any of the following: informal experience, individual study, formal instruction, or a combination.[4] *Learning conditions* (or *conditions for learning*) may be portrayed as (1) typical of learners, learning, or the learning environment; (2) potentially useful but not always necessary for learning; or (3) causal or necessary for learning.

Early Developments

Early theories about learning conditions arose outside of the L2 field but have influenced the work of L2 learning specialists. Early theories came from Gagné, Vygotsky, and the team of Lave and Wenger. The ideas of these theorists could be broadly considered conditions for learning.

Gagné's Conditions

Robert Gagné's work (especially 1965, 1970, 1985) clearly embodied behaviorism but also went beyond it by promoting higher-level cognition. Gagné described five categories of learning, each with its own tailored sequence of instructional procedures. These categories included verbal information, intellectual skills, motor skills, attitudes, and cognitive strategies. He proposed a system for analyzing different levels of learning from simple to complex. The first four levels (signal learning, stimulus-response learning, chain learning, and verbal association) focus on simpler aspects of learning, while the last four (discrimination learning, concept learning, rule learning, and problem solving) focus on increasingly complex cognitive aspects. Gagné argued that a lower-level skill should be mastered before moving ahead to the next higher-level skill.

He identified internal learning conditions, such as the learner's readiness, mental processing, and states of mind. He was even more interested in external learning conditions, i.e., instruction, which he argued must be designed in specific ways and carried out in nine prescribed steps (gain attention, present the learning objective, stimulate recall of learned knowledge, present stimulus/content, provide learning guidance, elicit performance, provide feedback, assess performance, and enhance retention and transfer of learning). It seems clear that these steps are not relevant to very low learning levels, e.g., signal learning and stimulus-response learning.

The value of Gagné's theory lies in the simple but profound understanding that different types of learning require different instructional conditions. However, most

[4]In this chapter I avoid any sharp distinction between learning and acquisition, although Ellis's theory focuses on instructed second language acquisition.

L2 learning experts now reject the rigid principles of behaviorism and the regimented sequencing reflected in Gagné's approach. Another shortcoming is that his theoretical model does not promote strategic self-regulation (Oxford 2011), especially in areas such as affective, social, and metacognitive strategies.

Vygotsky's Theory of Dialogic Learning

The famed Russian "cultural-historical" psychologist Vygotsky (published in the West in 1978 and 1986) created ideas that can be viewed as conditions for learning. Vygotsky published on language, thought, child development, disabilities, and the psychologies of art, play, and learning (see Miller 2011 for a perspective). He was born in the Russian Empire; received massive scholarly criticism during his lifetime, even from his protégés; was excoriated by the Soviet government; died in his 30s from tuberculosis in the shadow of communism; and yet soon after his death was acclaimed by his government and later by Western scholars.

His learning psychology concepts, which follow, were explained to the English-speaking world by Wertsch (1985), Kozulin et al. (2003), and others. First, humans inherit sociocultural artifacts and knowledge that can actually add to their genetic inheritance. Emotion, sensation, perception, and all human learning, including L2 learning, are suffused with social concepts. Second, children, as well as older learners, learn through receiving mediation offered by a more capable person, such as a teacher, and through interacting with and through language, which Vygotsky described as humanity's most important semiotic (symbolic), mediational tool. Books and other media are also sources of mediation for learning. Third, the more capable person offers dialogues with the learner and provides supportive scaffolding. The learner internalizes the key elements of the dialogues and transforms them into higher mental functions, such as planning, organizing, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing. (At some point, Vygotsky might have abandoned the higher-lower distinction for mental processes.) Fourth, three stages mark this scaffolded internalization and transformation: social speech ("other-regulation"), egocentric speech, and inner speech (which moves into "self-regulation"). Fifth, the zone of proximal development (ZPD) is the difference between the individual's current level of development and the potential level that can be reached with assistance of a more capable person. Sixth, "dynamic assessment" measures the area of potentiality, not just the learner's current level of development, and provides significant opportunities to learn during the assessment process itself. "Static assessment" is limited to measuring only the learner's current level of development.

In the 1990s, a few applied linguists, such as Donato and McCormick (1994), and Lantolf and Appel (1994), began applying Vygotsky's concepts to L2 learning. Many of these concepts are by now widely known and understood by applied linguists and L2 teachers in numerous parts of the world. Unfortunately, the ZPD-based concept of dynamic assessment is little known among L2 learning specialists. An exception is Poehner (2008).

Lave and Wenger's Theories of Situated Cognition in Communities of Practice

One definition of situated cognition is learning that is situated in a community of practice, i.e., "a group of people who share an interest in a domain of human endeavor and engage in a process of collective learning that creates bonds between them" (Wenger 1998, p. 1). Lave and Wenger (1991) coined the term "communities of practice" while studying apprenticeship as a model for learning. We all have experience as apprentices in various communities of practice: at home, at work, in educational institutions, and so on.

Situated cognition in communities of practice is captured in the following concepts or conditions from the team of Lave and Wenger. First, apprenticeship is not a relationship between a student and a master but instead a set of complex social relationships. The apprentice's learning is an integral part of generative (creative) social practice in the lived-in world (Lave & Wenger). Second, the whole community learns, because learning occurs not just in an individual mind; learning also occurs collectively, in a "distributed" way. Third, a community of practice consists of mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire (Wenger).[5]

Major Contributions Within the L2 Field

Unlike the theories above, which first arose outside of the L2 field, the theories in this section, proposed by Norton, Spolsky, Brown, Ellis, and the Zhao and Lai team, came directly from the L2 arena. Their theories include elements that I consider to be learning conditions.

Norton's Sociocultural Theories of Identity and Investment

Norton (2010, 2014) defined identity as revealing "how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is structured across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future" (Norton 2013, p. 4). Identity is often a site of struggle, particularly in contexts where learners experience sexism, racism, or other types of discrimination. Any given learner's identity is complex, multiple, fluctuating in space and time, and often contradictory.

Rejecting motivation theories that simplistically portrayed L2 learners as detached from the sociohistorical context and as either motivated or unmotivated, Norton created the theory of investment. Almost by definition, the learner's

[5]Previously, Lave and Wenger (1991) discussed "legitimate peripheral participation" in which novices or "newcomers" (apprentices) participated at the periphery of a community of practice while learning from the "old-timer" (expert) in the community's center. Wenger abandoned that concept in his 1998 book.

investment is a necessary condition for L2 learning. Investment indicates the learner's historically and socially constructed relationship to the target language and is linked to the way relations of power are manifested in language learning and teaching in specific contexts, such as the classroom or community. Building on Bourdieu's theories, Norton contended that if learners invest in an L2, they do so because they believe they will acquire a wider range of material and symbolic resources, thus increasing their social power and cultural capital. The decision to invest is much easier in circumstances in which learners perceive the sociocultural power relations to be welcoming rather than marginalizing, discriminatory, or punitive. Norton (2007) discussed Canagarajah's (1999) concern that in some locations, "there is a daily struggle for food, clothing, shelter, and safety" that precludes much involvement in literacy development. It would be logical that investment in L2 learning would also be greatly diminished in locations marked by drastic poverty and struggles for survival, though investment was not a direct focus of Norton's discussion of Canagarajah's concern.

Darvin and Norton (2015) designed a model in which identity, capital, and ideology intersect, with investment at the intersection point. In this model, investment is influenced by effective positioning, perceived affordances (potential resources inviting possible engagement)/perceived benefits, and systemic patterns of control embodied in institutions and relationships and supported by ideologies. Learners in this model have the opportunity to question control patterns and reposition themselves, thus claiming their right to the L2.

An expansion of Norton's investment theory might include the affordances offered by personally and socioculturally appropriate instruction in learning strategies (Oxford 2011). These affordances include but are not limited to (1) development of social and affective strategies that can enhance repositioning and increase L2 investment; (2) discovery of cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies that are beneficial for each individual in developing various certain aspects of the L2 (e.g., syntax, semantics, pragmatics, phonology, listening, speaking, reading, and writing) in multiple contexts; and hence (3) actualization of anticipated benefits of L2 learning, such as increased symbolic and material resources and thus greater cultural capital and social power.

Spolsky's Conditions for L2 Learning

Spolsky's (1989) goal was to create a general theory of L2 learning. His theory includes 74 conditions ("rules"). His central question was, "Who learns how much of which language under what conditions?" Spolsky asserted that the theory is indirectly based on a social context. "Language learning is individual but occurs in society, and while the social factors are not necessarily direct in their influence, they have strong and traceable indirect effects. . ." (p. 15).

Conditions 1–7 relate to the nature of L2 knowledge. The learner's L2 knowledge forms a systematic whole but is marked by variability. Analyzed L2 knowledge is recombinable and creative but can also be enriched with unanalyzed knowledge.

Conditions 8–15 concern L2 use. Receptive skills (listening, reading) usually develop before productive L2 skills (speaking, writing) and to a higher level. Some L2 knowledge might be intuitive and implicit (rules not expressible by the learner). Learners vary in automaticity (fluency) of speaking, accuracy, and amount of control. Conditions 16–20 are focused on testing and measurement of L2 knowledge and skills. Knowing an L2 involves not only knowing discrete items but also controlling integrated functional skills. Conditions 22–31 and 50–56 focus on individual learner factors, while conditions 34–41 involve linguistics. Social context is the focus of conditions 42–49, and conditions 57–62 concern opportunities for the learner to analyze the L2 and to recombine, embed, remember, practice, and match knowledge. Conditions for natural learning (63–73, odd numbers) are communicative use, many fluent speakers, open space, and uncontrolled language but possibly modified for comprehensibility. Conditions for formal learning (64–74, even numbers) are only one fluent speaker (the teacher), enclosed space, controlled and simplified language, and much practice.

Spolsky deserves significant praise for this attempt to produce a comprehensive, organized, detailed, and influential theory of conditions for L2 learning. However, the theory could benefit by including conditions involving self-regulation-focused L2 learning strategies and by more strongly emphasizing sociocultural influences on L2 learning. Users of the theory should consider whether the distinction between "natural learning" and "formal learning" must be as sharp as Spolsky made it seem.

Brown's Principles

H.D. Brown (2007, 2014) took a whole-person approach, which he crystallized into principles. These might be considered learning conditions, and I will summarize them briefly. First, by definition, meaningful L2 learning is relevant to learners' goals and interests. It also stimulates learners' anticipation of rewards, the most powerful of which are intrinsic. Second, efficient L2 learning involves timely movement from control of a few L2 forms to automatic processing of a relatively unlimited number of L2 forms, with a focus on both fluency and accuracy. This suggests that L2 teaching should not focus just on isolated items but should also give learners authentic communication opportunities. Third, although teaching methods are important, L2 learning strategies are equally important, and teachers should teach such strategies. Fourth, L2 learners develop new social identities or language egos. While this is occurring, teachers should support learners who might feel inhibited, unconfident, or defenseless in the classroom. Teachers must encourage risk-taking by creating an encouraging classroom atmosphere and providing tasks at the right level of difficulty. Fifth, teachers must be culturally sensitive and must remember that learning an L2 involves learning its culture. Sixth, learners and teachers must be aware that the L1 can facilitate or interfere with learning an L2, depending on the closeness of the languages. They must also recognize that there is a systematically operating interlanguage.

One of the strongest aspects of Brown's theory is the inclusion of multiple psychological and social factors, such as anticipation of reward, intrinsic motivation, language ego, self-confidence, risk-taking, and learning environments. There is very little for which this theory should be faulted, but a greater sociocultural focus could be valuable.

Ellis' Model of Instructed Second Language Acquisition

In Ellis' (2005) theory, acquisition is defined as occurring when an item or feature is truly internalized and entered into the learner's interlanguage for communicative use. The theory includes several principles or conditions regarding what L2 instruction must do in order to foster acquisition. L2 instruction must ensure that learners develop both a rich repertoire of formulaic expressions and a rule-based competence; ensure that learners focus mainly on meaning (semantic and pragmatic) but also on form; be predominantly directed at developing implicit (fluency-related) knowledge of the L2 while not neglecting explicit knowledge (accuracy); take into account learners' "built-in" syllabus, with the order of acquisition approximately the same for learners' instructed acquisition as for natural acquisition; provide extensive input in the L2; offer opportunities for output through communicative interaction and meaning negotiation; emphasize interaction at a level beyond learners' current level in a range of contexts; recognize learners' individual differences, such as motivation and learning strategies; offer appropriate strategy instruction; and assess both free and controlled production.

A potential drawback is that Ellis' principles contain little information about sociocultural factors. However, this theorist helpfully emphasized meaning and implicit knowledge while never ignoring form and explicit knowledge, and he appropriately emphasized both input and output. Like Brown, Ellis noted the importance of learning strategies. Among Ellis' other theoretical foci are task-based L2 learning and analyzing learner language. His more recent work (Ellis 2012) concerns how language teaching research can inform language pedagogy.

Zhao and Lai's Theory of Technology-Enhanced L2 Learning

Zhao and Lai (2007) explained four basic instructional principles (or conditions) to enhance L2 learning with the help of technology. Technologies mentioned by Zhao and Lai at that time ranged from ordinary TVs, audiotapes, videos, and mobile phones to the most sophisticated computerized hardware and software, even involving artificial intelligence. The principles are as follows: First, learners need high-quality input. Technologies offer authentic input of various types. Second, learners require ample opportunities to practice. Technology provides practice via computer-mediated communication, mobile phones, and human-computer interaction. Third, learners need high-quality feedback. Technology contributes to feedback through error tracking, speech recognition, adaptive feedback, and learner control of

feedback. Fourth, learners require individualized content. Technology allows greater customization and individualization and greater sharing across lines of culture and language.

The theory by Zhao and Lai is elegant in its simplicity and rich in its research foundation. An update of the theory could mention sociocultural factors, learning strategies taught through technology (e.g., Cohen et al. 2011), and the instructional use of ever-increasing applications of social media, such as Facebook and Twitter.

Work in Progress

Excellent work is now being conducted to establish the positive psychology of L2 learning (MacIntyre 2016; MacIntyre et al. 2016). This work, perhaps without intent, echoes elements of Brown's emotionally supportive, whole-person stance, mentioned earlier.

In my view, reducing language anxiety, fostering a sense of belonging or engagement, and increasing the presence of positive emotions such as confidence and happiness constitute the first positive psychological condition for L2 learning. Most research on L2 learning emotions has focused on language anxiety, which has a demonstrable host of negative outcomes, such as guilt, insecurity, sadness, confusion, unwillingness to communicate, lack of self-confidence and agency, and inability to express and recognize emotions (Dewaele 2011; Dewaele and MacIntyre 2014; Horwitz 2001). These disturbing effects diminish when learners, often with the aid of affective strategy instruction (Oxford 2011), learn to lower their anxiety. On a related track, L2 learning scholars Murphey et al. (2010) cited existing research showing that individuals' feelings of rejection[6] can affect their emotional states by (1) weakening their intelligence, (2) leading to emotional numbing, (3) reducing empathy, and (4) increasing aggression toward others. Murphey et al. stated that L2 learners who feel excluded tend to avoid developing new relationships, which are often essential for progress. Therefore, they recommended that teachers should use specific techniques to help lonely, isolated learners develop a sense of belonging or engagement.

Following the tenets of positive psychology, a second condition for L2 learning is to promote positive emotions and their benefits more directly, rather than focusing only on ways to overcome negative emotions. Oxford and Cuéllar (2014) noted that outstanding L2 learners, in describing their learning-related emotions, often reported experiencing very positive emotions, such as confidence, joy, amazement, contentment, and love, although they sometimes reported less exuberant emotions as well. Learners and teachers can benefit from recognizing research-based benefits of positive emotions, benefits that include (1) broadening learners' field of vision in order to allow us to take in more information and increase what they notice and (2) building up new resources for achievement and for averting or handling difficult

[6]Norton (2010, 2014) explored the rejection caused by sociocultural discrimination (2010, 2014).

emotions in the future (Frederickson 2004).[7] In addition to emphasizing positive emotions and their advantages, a third condition for L2 learning is for learners, with the help of their teachers, to actively (re)structure their learning environments and tasks so that positive emotions arise more frequently.

The last two paragraphs sharply distinguished between, on the one hand, "negative" emotions, their harmful outcomes, and ways to ameliorate those outcomes and, on the other hand, "positive" emotions, their beneficial effects, and the importance of fostering those effects. However, emotions are not always distinguishable as purely positive or purely negative. Sometimes an emotion that is usually viewed as negative, such as language anxiety, can have positive roles, e.g., heightening anticipation and thus stimulating learning (Dewaele and MacIntyre 2014). Additionally, I have discovered that for certain L2 learners, emotions traditionally viewed as positive can sometimes have bad outcomes; for instance, contentment or confidence, if too strong, can result in complacency. Therefore, a fourth condition for L2 learning is for learners, with assistance, to discern when the time is ripe the positive possibilities in emotions that are usually viewed as "negative" and the negative possibilities of the extreme forms of emotions that are typically called "positive." This discernment would give L2 learners a greater sense of control, agency, and choice.

A fifth positive psychological condition for L2 learning is for learners to be resilient in the face of adversity or risk (see resilience research outside of the L2 learning field, see Frederickson et al. 2003, and for such research inside the L2 arena, see Oxford et al. 2007). In learning a language, adversity or risk might relate to perceived failure, personal embarrassment, or the process of being rejected, discriminated against, or marginalized in a sociocultural context. Conditions for resilience, and thus for successful L2 learning in a situation of risk or adversity, include at least some of the following: (1) personal protective factors, such as a sense of purpose and mastery experiences that increase L2 learners' self-efficacy; (2) social protective factors, such as attachment relationships with L2 teachers, opportunities for participation and responsibility, and supportive institutions; and (3) adequate assets, such as books, computers, materials, and relevant and interesting lessons. For more about protective factors and assets, see Oxford (2016).

Any positive psychological discussion of conditions for L2 learning or for learning in general should probably also mention the development of autonomy by means of learning strategies (see Benson 2006; Oxford 2011) and the imagining of future selves as part of the motivation process (see Dörnyei 2009). Although these concepts emerged within the L2 learning field before positive psychology arrived here, the concepts fit well into positive psychological conditions for L2 learning.

A small note of conceptual and terminological caution would be useful. Compared with the phrase "positive psychological conditions for L2 learning," the phrase "positive psychological and sociocultural conditions for L2 learning" is more

[7] In contrast to Frederickson, Ricard (2003) viewed happiness as involving the acceptance of both pleasant and painful emotions.

comprehensive and more accurate, if less mellifluous. Positive psychological theorizing in the L2 learning field (see, e.g., MacIntyre 2016; MacIntyre et al. 2016) stresses the importance of sociocultural contexts interacting with individual characteristics.[8] Positive psychological theorists outside this field need to work much harder to address sociocultural contexts adequately (Oxford 2016).

Problems and Difficulties

Several problems and difficulties exist in considering conditions for L2 learning. First, no matter how objective or neutral a particular theory of learning conditions might seem, that theory directly or indirectly reflects cultural, academic, philosophical beliefs, which sometimes conflict within the individual and which, for some people but not others, fluctuate over time. In addition, theories echo historical (and contemporaneous) actions, including political shifts, conditions of war or peace, advances in technology, changes in educational structures, and economic and social perturbations. Additionally, theories of learning conditions reflect their creators' personal experiences as teachers, learners, family and community members, travelers, and often spiritual beings. However, theories of learning conditions are often accepted or rejected superficially, without any exploration of such roots. I contend that a consideration of a learning theory's foundations might shed much light on why the theory strikingly differs from another learning theory covering the same phenomena. While a theory should be judged on its own merits, it greatly helps to know why and how that theory emerged in the first place.

Second, theories often gloss over the complexity of the L2 learner and L2 learning in sociocultural contexts. The following learner- and learning-related factors were cited in various theories in this chapter or in my responses to those theories: interactions with a more capable person, relationship to a community of practice, linguistic background, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, anticipated symbolic and material resources, technology, emotions, resilience, agency, self-regulation, learning strategies, types of L2 learning (e.g., fluency-oriented and accuracy-oriented), and many more. A general theory of conditions for L2 learning would systematically include all or most of these factors.

Third, more than 30 years ago, Long (1983) noted that our field already possessed more than 60 different theories. Theories tend to proliferate rather than consolidate, so there are even more theories now. Few people in our field have pulled together theories into larger-scale, more comprehensive theories that fulfill academically accepted criteria, although Spolsky certainly tried his best. Intercultural teams working together on an expansive program of theory and research could test current theories in new ways. These teams could unite related theories into more

[8]Other L2 theorists, such as Dörnyei (2009), Norton (2014), and Ushioda (2009), who might not specifically align themselves with positive psychology, have stressed the importance of sociocultural contexts in L2 learning.

comprehensive theories and ascertain the value of those larger theories. Mixed methodologies would be very suitable to this work. An understanding of complexity would also be essential, as noted below.

Future Directions

L2 learning is a complex system (Dörnyei 2009; Larsen-Freeman and Cameron 2008). A well-known complex system within the overall complex system of L2 learning is called the L2 motivational self system (Dörnyei 2009). Complexity theory suggests that relationships among a complex system's elements are nonlinear, organic, holistic, and typically in flux, except when a period of relative stability emerges through the action of an attractor. In a complex system, each element affects all other elements in intricate ways.

In the past, when quantitative analysis dominated L2 learning research, the gold standard was experimental (or, if this were impossible, quasi-experimental) design to search for statistically significant, unidirectional, causal relationships between the independent variable (treatment) and the dependent variable. This design and some other quantitative designs are now challenged as being too simplistic for the complex realities of L2 learning.

At the same time as certain research designs are under sharp scrutiny, teachers, researchers, and theorists are urged to rethink some beliefs about L2 learning and to accept a picture of much greater complexity than they held before. For instance, the group of factors (guilt, insecurity, sadness, confusion, unwillingness to communicate, and so on) usually believed to be outcomes of language anxiety might not actually be "outcomes" in any traditional, linear, static sense. Instead, these factors are likely to be nonlinearly, dynamically interwoven with each other and to have a two-way, continually evolving interaction with language anxiety rather than a one-way, causally fixed relationship. Complexity theory would help us understand such phenomena.

In the future, the complex system of L2 learning could be explored using varied approaches, such as narrative studies (Oxford and Bolaños 2015[9]), idiodynamic research (Gregersen et al. 2014), and retrodictive qualitative modeling (Dörnyei 2014). If employed, these approaches could spark the new, expansive, much-needed program of theory and research mentioned at the end of the preceding section. Such a program could confirm the complexity of L2 learning and of conditions for L2 learning, aid in theory consolidation, and provide insights for improving L2 learning and teaching. This chapter stands as a formal call for coordinated efforts toward that aim.

Cross-References

► Sociocultural Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education

[9]This study has not yet been analyzed via complexity theory, but it will be in the future.

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Alastair Pennycook: Critical Applied Linguistics and Education. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Bonny Norton: Language and Social Identity. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

Benson, P. (2006). State-of-the-art article: Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching, 40*, 21–40.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (6th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, A. D., Pinilla-Herrera, A., Thompson, J. R., & Witzig, L. E. (2011). Communicating grammatically: Evaluating a learner strategy website for Spanish grammar. *CALICO Journal (Journal of the Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium), 29*(1), 145–172.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 192–201.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2011). Reflections on the emotional and psychological aspects of foreign language learning and use. *Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies, 22*(1), 23–42. http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/5096/

Dewaele, J.-M., & MacIntyre, P. (2014). Two faces of Janus? Anxiety and enjoyment in the foreign language classroom. In P. MacIntyre, & T. Gregersen (Eds.), *Positive psychology and language learning.* Special issue, *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 4*(2), 237–274.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Pernelle, L. (2015). Emotion recognition ability in English among L1 and LX users of English. *International Journal of Language and Culture, 2*(1), 62–86. doi:10.1075/ijolc.2.1.03lor.

Donato, R., & McCormick, D. E. (1994). A socio-cultural perspective on language learning strategies: The role of mediation. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 453–464.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2014). Researching complex dynamic systems: "Retrodictive qualitative modelling" in the language classroom. *Language Teaching, 47*(1), 80–91.

Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review.* Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Education.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy.* Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Frederickson, B. L. (2004). The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London (Biological Sciences), 359*, 1367–1377.

Frederickson, B. L., Tugade, M. M., Waugh, C. E., & Larkin, G. (2003). What good are positive emotions in crises? A prospective study of resilience and emotions following the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(2), 365–376.

Gagné, R. M. (1965). *The conditions of learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Gagné, R. M. (Ed.). (1970). *Basic studies of learning hierarchies in school subjects: Final report*. Berkeley: University of California.

Gagné, R. M. (1985). *The conditions of learning and theory of instruction* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Gregersen, T., MacIntyre, P. D., & Meza, M. D. (2014). The motion of emotion: Idiodynamic case studies of learners' foreign language anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 98*(2), 574–588.
Horwitz, E. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 112–126.
Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V. S., & Miller, S. M. (2003). *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood: Ablex.
Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Saying what we mean: Making a case for "language acquisition" to become "language development". *Language Teaching, 48*(4), 491–505.
Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Long, M. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5*, 177–193.
MacIntyre, P. D. (2016). So far so good: An overview of positive psychology and its contributions to SLA. In D. Gabryś-Barker & D. Gałajda (Eds.), *Positive psychology perspectives on foreign language learning and teaching*. New York: Springer.
MacIntyre P. D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (Eds.). (2016). *Positive psychology in SLA*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Miller, R. (2011). *Vygotsky in perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Murphey, T., Prober, J., & Gonzáles, K. (2010). Emotional belonging precedes learning. In A. M. F. Barcelos & H. S. Coelho (Eds.), *Emoções, reflexões e (trans)formações de professores e formadores de línguas* [Emotions, reflections, and (trans)formations of language teachers and teacher educators] (pp. 43–56). Sao Paulo: Campinas.
Norton, B. (2007). Critical literacy and international development. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 1*(1), 6–15. www.criticalliteracy.org.uk
Norton, B. (2010). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Longman.
Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Norton, B. (2014). Identity and poststructuralist theory in SLA. In S. Mercer & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA* (pp. 59–74). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies*. Essex: Pearson Longman.
Oxford, R. L. (2016). Toward a psychology of well-being for language learners: The "EMPATHICS" vision. In P. MacIntyre, T. Gregersen, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Positive psychology in second language acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Oxford, R. L., & Bolaños, D. (2015). A tale of two learners: Discovering motivation, emotions, engagement, perseverance, and mentoring. In C. Gkonou, D. Tatzl, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *New directions in language learning psychology* (pp. 113–134). New York: Springer.
Oxford, R. L., & Cuéllar, L. (2014). Positive psychology in cross-cultural learner narratives: Mexican students discover themselves while learning Chinese. In P. MacIntyre, & T. Gregersen (Eds.), *Positive psychology and language learning*. Special issue, *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 4*(2), 173–203.
Oxford, R. L., Meng, Y., Zhou, Y., Sung, J., & Jain, R. (2007). Uses of adversity: Moving beyond L2 learning crises. In A. Barfield & S. Brown (Eds.), *Reconstructing autonomy in language education: Inquiry and innovation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic assessment: A Vygotskian approach to understanding and promoting second language development*. Berlin: Springer.
Ricard, M. (2003). *Happiness: A guide to developing life's most important skill* (trans: Browner, J.). New York: Little, Brown.

Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Ushioda, E. (2009). A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation and identity. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity, and the L2 self* (pp. 215–228). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social development of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Zhao, Y., & Lai, C. (2007). Technology and second language learning: Promises and problems. In L. A. Parker (Ed.), *Technology-based learning environments for young English learners: In and out of school connections*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition

Andrew Lynch

Contents

Introduction 44
Early Developments 44
Major Contributions 46
Work in Progress 49
Problems and Difficulties 51
Future Directions 52
Cross-References 53
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 54
References 54

Abstract

Language researchers have traditionally drawn distinctions between phenomena of "bilingualism" and the processes and features of "second language acquisition" (SLA). Accounts have generally relied upon factors of context, age of acquisition, degree of proficiency or ability, "nativeness," or "native-likeness," and social identity. In this chapter, I provide a cursory explanation of the potential relationship between bilingualism and SLA, pointing to the common ground between these two areas of inquiry.

Keywords

Bilingualism • Language contact • Second language acquisition • Context • Proficiency

A. Lynch (✉)
Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA
e-mail: a.lynch@miami.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_5

Introduction

The criteria that may be used to classify someone as a "bilingual" or as a "second language" (L2) speaker are quite diverse, and it is difficult to distinguish between the two on objective, empirical grounds alone. Much like the general population, language researchers tend to draw a distinction based upon some combination of the following considerations:

- *Context of acquisition*: Did the individual acquire both languages in naturalistic settings (i.e., at home) or in institutional settings (i.e., in the classroom)?
- *Age of acquisition*: Did she acquire both languages during early childhood or was one of the two acquired later, i.e., during adolescence or adulthood?
- *Degree of proficiency*: Does she demonstrate basic or low-level abilities within limited topic ranges or does she produce complex and sophisticated discourse on a wide range of topics?
- *Identity and "native" or "native-like" qualities*: Does she self-identify as a "speaker" of both languages, laying some sort of personal claim to their use, and do other "in-group" speakers of both languages also consider her as such? Does she "sound" or behave like an imagined native speaker, or does she give the impression of someone who is "foreign" or "nonnative-like" (in terms of pronunciation, grammar, lexical usage, pragmatic patterns, and stylistic and discursive repertoires)?

I take up these questions in this chapter, emphasizing the factors that make responses to them a rather complicated matter. As we will see, complications arise because a great number of variables enter into answering each of these questions, and in some cases, there are few conventionally objective criteria involved, particularly in the case of the latter two questions, e.g., "she can talk about anything with no problem" or "she sounds native in both languages." Probably for these reasons, researchers have focused mostly on the first two questions, which involve more easily definable criteria for empirical observation and analysis, and also on the third question – though to lesser extent – since phonological, grammatical, and lexical aspects of proficiency can be assessed with relative ease (but not without some caveats). Answers to the fourth question lie much more on perceptual and social-psychological grounds, usually involving subjective sorts of criteria and more qualitative methodologies.

Early Developments

The reluctance to draw any parallels between "bilinguals" and "second language" (L2) speakers has its roots in the paradigm of Western modernity. Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, language was an essential feature of nationhood, and "one language-one nation" ideology prevailed. Saussurean structuralist thought in linguistics, which would emerge as an autonomous scientific discipline during the early twentieth century, reflected this ideology in the sense that it conceptualized

geopolitically delimited languages as bounded and sovereign systems residing fundamentally in the minds of speakers who belong to an idealized, homogeneous speech community. This ideology or philosophy of language sensu stricto implied that people who spoke two or three languages would have to maintain them mentally separate from each other; if they did not, they could become linguistically and psychologically confused and hence be uncertain and untrustworthy with regard to their national allegiance. This ideology was readily apparent during the period of the two World Wars, when nationalism literally became a cause to die for. In the USA, for example, laws against speaking non-English languages in public (aimed at German speakers) were enacted in Iowa and Nebraska in the wake of WWI, and as late as the 1960s, Chicano schoolchildren were physically punished for speaking Spanish on school premises in the Southwest, even in Los Angeles. In Spain, during the early years of the Franco regime (1939–1975), people were imprisoned for speaking Catalan.

The different ways in which the fields of "bilingualism" and "second language acquisition" (SLA) were articulated in terms of theory and research also explain in part why they have generally remained rather separate from each other. Uriel Weinreich's landmark book *Languages in Contact* (1953) provided much of the basis and subsequent stimulus for contemporary inquiry into bilingualism from a sociolinguistic perspective (also commonly referred to as "language contact"), and, from a psycholinguistic perspective, behavioral psychology prepared the ground for the development of a continuing research paradigm of bilingual language and cognition. While the sociolinguistic study of language contact took "naturally produced" language – preferably in situ – as the object of analysis, studies of cognition (i.e., psycholinguistics) were controlled and experimental, usually taking place in laboratory or institutional settings. It is important to note that the field of SLA emerged during the late 1960s and 1970s more within the framework of the latter. These differences of methodological paradigm were the source of contentious debates among linguists throughout the latter half of the twentieth century. Weinreich's work focused principally on the longstanding multilingual situation of Switzerland, where French, German, Romansch, and Italian are all spoken within the same national boundaries. The argumentation and analysis presented in *Languages in Contact* was focused on phenomena of societal multilingualism and language use in situ, not on the situation of languages that were acquired and used mostly in institutional settings. Weinreich drew a distinction between bilinguals who possessed a singular semantic system encompassing two languages ("compound bilingualism"); those who possessed two different semantic systems, each one corresponding to a respective language ("coordinate bilingualism"); and those who depended on the interpretation of words in a weaker language (L2) through concepts of a more dominant language ("sub-coordinate bilingualism"). He based this distinction roughly on the context of acquisition and use; if the two languages had been learned and used within a same context, "compound bilingualism" was more likely the outcome.

Haugen (1953) highlighted the relativity of the criteria involved. He argued that anyone capable of producing meaningful utterances in more than one language could

be considered bilingual. Mackey (1968) also emphasized that distinctions between bilingualism and L2 use were arbitrary, since it is impossible to identify a particular point in life at which the L2 learner *qua* L2 speaker becomes "bilingual" for classificatory purposes of linguistic research. Context and age were undoubtedly the broadly defined criteria that served to make the distinction as SLA – concerned almost exclusively with adult L2 learners in classroom settings – emerged as an autonomous field of inquiry. One of the first important theoretical arguments for the nascent discipline was made by Larry Selinker in 1972, in an article titled "Interlanguage." Selinker reasoned that L2 learners are involved in an attempt to approximate a "native language" target. He termed the approximant variety that they acquire and use *interlanguage*, a system somewhere between their native language and the target language. The characteristics of this learner variety became the topic of substantial research and lively debate during the 1970s, with many arguments continuing from the 1950s and 1960s, e.g., that "transfer" of structures from the learner's first language is the most prevalent feature of IL, that learner errors are systematic and largely developmental, and that the strategies underlying L2 learning are substantially the same ones involved in L1 acquisition (Corder 1967). Some scholars at the time emphasized the lack of uncontroversial criteria for defining a "native language" – or for that matter *any* language – from a linguistic or institutional perspective, e.g., Roeming (1966) who affirmed that: "No one can define language in such terms that one can ever objectively set standards of proficiency. . .. In second language learning standards of proficiency have been devised which are not relevant even to one's native language or to one's ability to transfer meaning" (p. 10). Valdés and Figueroa (1994) would restate this same concern nearly three decades later in their argument regarding institutional bias in the testing of bilingual language abilities: "it is doubtful that one could construct an instrument or even a set of procedures that would meaningfully assess the differences in articulateness among two adult native speakers" (p. 67).

Major Contributions

In language contact situations and in language learning environments the world over, four common linguistic phenomena have been amply studied: (1) *simplification*, (2) *overgeneralization*, (3) *transfer*, and (4) *code switching* or language mixing. The latter has been the subject of extensive discussion and analysis, which I will not take up here (see Bullock and Toribio 2009). Simplification affects oppositions in the grammatical system to forge a "simpler" system, e.g., noun gender and number, morphological agreement, and distinctions in verb tense, aspect, and mood. Forms that occur with greater frequency (e.g., the lexeme *to have* rather than *to possess*) or that bear surface similarities to particular forms in the dominant or primary language may be overgeneralized at the expense of lower-frequency or less "parallel" forms in the secondary language (the less-dominant language of the bilingual or the target language being learned by L2 students), e.g., overextension of the usage of indicative forms in contexts that normatively require subjunctive in the discourse of both

heritage language (HL) and L2 Spanish speakers in the USA. Linguistic *markedness* may also be relevant, as particular forms that are perceived as less salient or as having more general functions take the place of others perceived as more context specific or linguistically constrained.

A good example of the effects of markedness in processes of L2 learning and bilingual usage is found in Mougeon et al. (2010) analysis of the acquisition of *stylistic variants* among French-language immersion learners in Ontario, Canada. These authors distinguished between five different types of variants along a socio-stylistic continuum in the local variety of French spoken in eastern Ontario: (1) "marked informal variants," which are most typical of the informal speech of males of lower social strata and are stigmatized in formal registers (e.g., pronunciation of object pronouns *toi* and *moi* as [twe] and [mwe] rather than the normative [twa] and [mwa]); (2) "mildy marked informal variants," which are characteristic of informal speech but may occur in formal registers (e.g., absence of the particle *ne* in negative sentences); (3) "neutral variants," which can serve as a default stand-in for more marked variants (e.g., usage of *auto* to refer to a car rather than the markedly informal *char* or the markedly formal *voiture*); (4) "formal variants," which are typical of formal registers or careful speech, especially among women of upper social strata (e.g., use of the verb *demeurer* [to reside] rather than the more informal *rester*); and (5) hyper-formal variants, which are low-frequency forms used almost exclusively in formal registers and by speakers of upper social strata (e.g., use of the construction *ne. . .que* rather than *juste* to express restriction) (pp. 9–10). Mougeon et al. found that all of the L2 students used marked formal variants much more than local bilingual speakers, as a result of the formal register input they had been receiving in course text materials and in teacher discourse. Those students who had greater exposure to local French L1 speakers beyond the school setting used mildly marked informal variants more than the other students, establishing greater similarity of their repertoires with those of local bilinguals, although more highly marked variants were absent from the immersion learners' speech (cf. Rampton 1995, 2013). The authors noted, in comparison, that the use of the marked informal variant *so*, likely the result of transfer from English, was highest among socially restricted French-English bilinguals (i.e., those Francophone-background speakers who were exposed to and used English much more than French), whose speech would potentially serve to amplify its use among L2 immersion learners (pp. 152–153).

Mougeon et al.'s findings reflect a general principle of HL acquisition and use with regard to the context of acquisition and modality and type of input, i.e., the HL is acquired principally in home and community environments, so HL oral repertoires are characterized by greater use of informal variants; L2 learners, on the other hand, often evidence more standard usage, explicitly acquired in classroom contexts where an emphasis is placed on written modes of expression. In the language produced by both non-dominant bilinguals and L2 users, instantiations of transfer of particular forms, functions, or patterns from the more dominant language or L1 are usually evident. As Silva-Corvalán (1994) cogently demonstrated, transfer may be "indirect," as through the preference demonstrated for more surface-similar or parallel

variants in the dominant language or L1, or it may be "direct," as in the case of lexical or syntactic calques and borrowings. As Klee and Lynch (2009) point out, it is noteworthy that all of the types of *lexical-syntactic calques* identified by Silva-Corvalán (1994) in the bilingual speech of Mexican-Americans are also quite common among English-speaking L2 learners of Spanish, e.g., *tener un buen tiempo* ["to have a good time" – divertirse]; *¿Cómo te gustó la película?* ["How did you like the movie?" – ¿Te gustó la película?]; *Mi padre es seis pies* ["My father is six feet" – Mi padre mide seis pies]; *llegar en tiempo* ["to arrive on time" – llegar a tiempo]; *la más importante persona* ["the most important person" – la persona más importante]. Klee and Lynch concluded that the use of the same sorts of calques across both groups is more likely the result of language transfer, owed to interlinguistic factors, and less probably the result of a culturally based bilingual modeling process, as some others have argued (p. 236).

Lynch (2008) provided further evidence of similarities in the lexical and grammatical repertoires of English-dominant HL and L2 speakers of Spanish in the USA (see Montrul 2012 for a general overview of similarities and differences between HL and L2 speakers). As in the research conducted by Sankoff and her colleagues (1997) with advanced L2 users of French in Montreal, Lynch (2008) demonstrated that, among L2 speakers of Spanish in Miami, the usage of more "native-like" grammatical forms and particular socio-stylistic variants (e.g., discourse markers) is correlated with the degree of social exposure and regular use of the language in the local bilingual environment. In both Montreal and Miami, accuracy of gender agreement appeared to be correlated with frequency of local discourse markers, and in both studies, more "native-like" repertoires were observed in those who had greater personal ties to social networks in which the languages were regularly used. In Lynch's (2008) study, this correlation was irrespective of one's self-identification as a Hispanic-background bilingual speaker of Spanish or as a non-Hispanic L2 speaker of the language (cf. Montrul et al. 2008).

HL speakers are of special interest to those concerned with questions about the relationships and parallels between bilingualism and SLA traditionally defined. Because they are generally exposed to the HL since birth, and in some cases acquire and use the HL exclusively during childhood, they certainly fulfill the age-of-acquisition criterion for "successful" learning of the language. However, for the majority, be they simultaneous or sequential bilinguals, the HL becomes a "secondary" language in the sense that it is not the preferred language of interaction in most settings and with most interlocutors, nor is it the politically or culturally dominant language of society and the vehicle of formal education. For this reason, Lynch (2003) proposed that four general questions guiding SLA research be taken as a basis upon which to build in studies of bilingual HL acquisition and use. These are the following: (1) What do HL learners acquire, and (2) how do they acquire it? (3) What differences are there in the way in which individual learners acquire a HL? (4) What effects does instruction have on HL acquisition? Montrul (2005) echoed Lynch's (2003) proposal that comparative studies of L2 and HL speakers should be undertaken, asserting that: "in many respects, L1 loss in a bilingual context is the flip side of the L2 acquisition coin" (p. 201).

The potential similarities of L2 and (HL) speakers had already been hinted at by Silva-Corvalán (1990), who remarked that: "language attrition in societal bilingualism is in fact to a large extent the mirror image of development in creolization, and in first and second language acquisition.... This correspondence may in fact reflect the freezing. . .of the bilingual's secondary language" (pp. 167–168). Silva-Corvalán's (1990) thought resonated with debates that had occurred more than a decade earlier regarding the potential relationship of *interlanguage* in SLA (Selinker 1972) to theories of pidginization and creolization (Schumann 1978; Anderson 1983). While the concept of *interlanguage* is still very much present in SLA debates today, *creolization theory* was largely abandoned by SLA researchers during the 1980s. Scholars of language contact, on the other hand, have remained considerably engaged with creolization theory, though perhaps more reluctant to take up the concept of *interlanguage* or its hallmark theoretical feature "fossilization" (the persistent and apparently entrenched usage of particular forms or constructions considered incorrect, ungrammatical, or nontarget-like). Montrul (2008) discussed "arrested language development" among HL speakers, and Valdés and Geoffrion-Vinci (1998) made passing mention of the possibility of an "approximative register" or "interregister" in the speech of US Chicano bilinguals, i.e., "a variety that has characteristics similar to those discussed in Selinker" (p. 494).

Work in Progress

One might conjecture that had Weinreich undertaken his work in the present day, rather than in the 1940s and 1950s, he would have found himself addressing the situation of English in Switzerland – a language acquired principally in academic settings and used mostly in formal sorts of domains (i.e., commerce, finance, education, etc.) as well as through the consumption of global culture (Internet, television and film, music, etc.). In this regard, it is quite possible that bilingualism would not have been construed as a phenomenon independent of – and largely different from – SLA had the discussion begun within the past couple of decades, in the age of *globalism*. Indeed, the contemporary realities of globalism blur the dichotomy traditionally drawn between classroom learning (i.e., language as construct) and social use (i.e., language as practice). This is particularly true in the case of English use among younger-aged, urban, and upwardly mobile populations the world over. According to Blommaert (2010), in the age of *globalization*, it has become apparent ". . .that the mobility of people also involves the mobility of linguistic and sociolinguistic resources, that 'sedentary' or 'territorialized' patterns of language use are complemented by 'translocal' or 'deterritorialized' forms of language use, and that the combination of both often accounts for unexpected sociolinguistic effects" (pp. 4–5). Blommaert suggests that, for this main reason, language must be conceptualized as "in motion" rather than as a fixed object "in place," as was typically the case in twentieth-century paradigms of linguistics (cf. Kachru et al. 2009).

Mass migration, the advent of information and communication technologies, cyberspace, mass media, and the late capitalist "global marketplace" economy are all factors that exert definitive influences on language use patterns, linguistic variation, discursive styles, repertoires and identities, as well as ideologies of language as construct (Heller 2007). These factors may contribute to destabilizing the notion of "*context*" in language theory. In truth, most people do not acquire languages strictly in the classroom versus strictly outside the classroom, but in diverse sorts of settings, to different degrees. Just as many L2 learners observe and use the language beyond academic confines, most people study at least one of their "native" languages (as a separate subject) during their years of formal education. In other words, some aspects of native language acquisition and use are largely confined to academic or institutional settings, and some aspects of SLA are "naturalistic," i.e., the language is used with "real-world" speakers in socially meaningful interactions. This is certainly true for millions of (im)migrant individuals across the globe, especially for those who develop close friendships or romantic relationships with speakers of the L2. First-generation immigrant parents usually find themselves in the very high-stakes situation of maintaining relationships with their own children through the L2, which is the socially dominant or preferred language of the latter (Pavlenko 2006). Precisely for these reasons, one must be skeptical about drawing a definitive boundary between "L2 speakers" and "bilinguals" based strictly on context.

This matter brings us to a growing area of research in recent years: *identity* and perception in SLA and bilingualism. For most people beyond the realm of linguistics, the question of whether one is a "native" or "nonnative" speaker of the particular language(s) used in everyday interactions with strangers may be of little concern, especially in global cities such as Miami, New York, London, Barcelona, Hong Kong, etc. As Rampton (2013) affirmed, "judgments of proficiency are themselves always relational and socio-ideologically positioned, and in a great many interactions the fact that one participant learnt to speak the language in use later in life is irrelevant to the encounter" (p. 362). Typically, it is only when a more personal or intimate social relationship begins to evolve that linguistic identity becomes relevant. In an ethnographic analysis of language use in cross-cultural marriages, Piller (2002) found that 27 out of the 73 L2 speakers of English and German included in her study reported "passing" as a native speaker of the L2 in some contexts. She observed that acts of passing were not identity related, but rather performative, contextually realized practices that were audience and medium specific (cf. Rampton 1995, on "language crossing"). She affirmed that in intimate or private contexts, "the passing performance is just the highest form of linguistic performance that expert L2 speakers are capable of but it does not involve any sort of mistaken identity at all. The audience knows that the performer is a highly skilled bilingual and native or nonnative identities just do not matter in this context" (p. 198). Piller's conclusion echoes Roeming's (1966) affirmation published nearly four decades earlier: "An audience will listen with interest, satisfaction and involvement to a discourse by a foreigner using the native language of the group he is addressing. . .. [M]eaning is transferred to receptive minds without consideration of barriers that in instructional settings would be causes for failure" (p. 10). In this

regard, identity as a "bilingual" or a "second language speaker" is highly contextual and depends much on settings of use and interlocutors involved.

Problems and Difficulties

Inherent in the notion of context is the distinction that must be made between *explicit and implicit processes in language acquisition* and use. DeKeyser (2013) explains that: "The difference that everybody can observe within one and the same immigrant family, where the children soon overtake their parents, reflects implicit acquisition processes only; adolescents and adults do not have any more problems than children with the kind of learning that is typical of most foreign language learning, on the contrary" (pp. 54–55). In other words, children often appear to be "better" L2 learners than adults in particular social settings and situations that involve more implicit types of learning, while adults appear "better" at explicit types of learning and usually find social interaction in the L2 more taxing than do children. Indeed, in classroom settings, adults appear to acquire L2s more quickly than children; due to the dearth of longitudinal research, we cannot confidently claim that ultimate attainment for child learners is generally superior to the long-term outcomes of adult learners (DeKeyser 2013). Among the proponents of a "critical period" or "fundamental difference hypothesis" (Bley-Vroman 2009), which states that the outcomes of language acquisition will be fundamentally different if the process is begun after a certain age, there is little consensus regarding its constitution or cause. Is an apparent "critical period" attributable to maturational phenomena of cognition and experience, to biological constraints posed by neuroanatomical development, or to social phenomena of identity and opportunities for exposure, input, and use? Or is ultimate attainment determined by the complex interplay of all of these factors?

Some scholars have proposed different critical periods for different language modules (phonology, syntax, semantics), with the apparent "cut-off" age for phonology earlier than that for syntax. Knightly et al. (2003) observed that Spanish heritage language (HL) speakers (i.e., English-dominant Hispanic bilinguals) were significantly more "native-like" on phonological measures than L2 learners. However, the two groups performed essentially the same on grammaticality judgment tasks and narrative tasks, leading these authors to conclude that early childhood acquisition of the HL brought phonological advantages but not morpho-syntactic advantages. However, in a more fine-grained phonological analysis of Spanish HL speakers in which he distinguished between those who spoke the language regularly, those who spoke it only during early childhood, and those who were only minimally exposed to or overheard the language during childhood, Rao (2015) observed that the pronunciation of HL speakers in his study was comparable to that reported in some studies of Spanish L2 speakers. In light of this finding, Rao emphasized that duration and extent of exposure to the language during adulthood – and not just childhood – is a crucial variable conditioning phonological production.

The relative contradiction of findings between the studies of Knightly et al. (2003) and Rao (2015) is but one example of the source of DeKeyser's

(2013) concern regarding the purported critical period, to wit: across studies, there is a wide range of conceptual and methodological approaches, and conclusions are based on highly disparate samples taken from very limited strata of the population (mostly classroom L2 learners). Reaching any consensus regarding age effects is precluded by the lack of control of fundamental variables, similar instrumentation, and methodological procedures. Just as one can assert that some researchers have provided good and convincing empirical evidence in support of a "critical period" or fundamental difference hypothesis (particularly in terms of phonology), one must also assert that other researchers have offered good and convincing empirical evidence against such a hypothesis. At this point, the most truthful conclusion is that there is no clear consensus regarding the alleged disadvantages of learning a language beyond childhood vis-à-vis the purported advantages of being exposed to a language early in life, as in the case of HL speakers (cf. Benmamoun et al. 2013a, b).

Within the four decades separating Roeming and Piller's articles, and in the years since the latter, numerous scholars (notably among them Cook 1992, and Firth and Wagner 1997) have remarked upon the inadequacies and biases inherent in the construct of proficiency as implemented in both institutional practice and language research. Just as the assessment of bilingual proficiency remains highly enigmatic still more than 20 years after Valdés and Figueroa's (1994) compelling criticism of the native speaker construct in the measurement of bilingualism, a reliable, nuanced, and objective method of appraising the language proficiency of advanced and "near-native" L2 speakers still eludes SLA researchers and practitioners. As Piller (2002) wrote, "While it is clear that it is neither scientifically nor ethically sound to measure ultimate attainment against native speaker baseline data, the prevailing disregard of expert L2 users has led to a situation where we do not have any idea of what other yardstick to use" (p. 181). For that reason, Piller took as criterion the self-identification and reported incidence of "passing for native" among nearly 40% of L2 users in her study, pointing out that many began to study the language after puberty and most reported not encountering it in natural social settings until adulthood (average age of 20.9 years). Rampton (2013) highlighted three factors that should be accounted for in claims regarding L2 status and proficiency: (1) the way speakers classify themselves and the ways that they are classified by local others; (2) the speech of those who inhabit the same environment; and (3) situated expectations with regard to particular interlocutors, interpreters, analysts, genres, and footings (361). Concerning the second dimension, Rampton pointed out that in diasporic settings, "what sounded foreign 30 years ago may now no longer do so" (p. 362).

Future Directions

As late modernity ensues (see Heller 2007) and neuroscience advances, language researchers will likely make significant strides toward establishing a better founded understanding of the phenomena that lie somewhere in the fold of bilingualism and SLA as they are currently defined. Although the brain still remains largely a mystery,

a growing body of research has begun to debunk the notion of a biologically based critical period and reveal the crucial importance of social exposure and use, and concomitantly, degree of proficiency. Abutalebi et al. (2009) have affirmed that these factors appear to condition neural activity during language processing and use more significantly than age of acquisition: "The available evidence indicates that an L2 seems to be acquired through the same neural structures responsible for L1 acquisition. This observation extends to grammar acquisition in late L2 learners contrary to what one may expect from critical period accounts" (pp. 51–52). Abutalebi and colleagues' call for more longitudinal, socially based evidence in *neurolinguistic research* concurs with the recommendations of DeKeyser (2013) regarding the study of age effects in language acquisition. The former stated that: "[R]esearchers should put more effort on extended longitudinal investigations addressing the natural course of L2 acquisition (follow-up studies in L2 teaching classrooms). . .. [T]here is an apparent lack of interest toward one of the factors that crucially influences the neural basis of L2 processing: the relative exposure toward a language" (Abutalebi et al. 2009, p. 53).

In a recent editorial for the journal *Behavioral Neurology*, Abutalebi and Weekes (2014) highlighted that, in the age of globalization, bilingualism will become ever more prevalent. Quite clearly, their definition of the "bilingual" individual in the global era was highly inclusive of L2 users:

> In general, a bilingual speaker may be someone with different levels of proficiency in the two languages, using the two languages in different contexts or learning a new language due to educational requirements, immigration, or other business and life demands. By this definition, a bilingual individual is not only necessarily someone who has acquired both languages from birth, or early in life, but also one who learns a second language (L2) later in life. (p. 1)

From a sociolinguistic perspective, Rampton (2013) made a strikingly similar statement: "as the old predictabilities dissolve in contemporary globalized *super-diversity*, and as it becomes more and more difficult to find the co-occurrences of people, acts, and signs that we once expected, empirical analyses tuned to the total linguistic fact will become increasingly important" (p. 377). These recent affirmations by leading scholars from two distinct fields of linguistic inquiry (i.e., neurocognitive linguistics and sociolinguistics), which throughout the twentieth century were rather "opposed" at times, are suggestive of an emergent common ground – with highly mutual interests – for language research in the decades ahead. Within a more global or "postmodern" paradigm, accounting for what Rampton refers to as the "total linguistic fact," L2 users are unquestionably bilinguals.

Cross-References

► Issues in Heritage Language Learning in the United States
► Sociolinguistics and Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Tae-Hee Choi: Identity, Transnationalism and Bilingual Education. In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

Bonny Norton: Language and Social Identity. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Anna Verschik: Language Contact, Language Awareness and Multilingualism. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

Li Wei: Research Perspectives on Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

References

Abutalebi, J., & Weekes, B. (2014). Editorial: The cognitive neurology of bilingualism in the age of globalization. *Behavioral Neurology*. doi:10.1155/2014/536727. Article ID 536727.

Abutalebi, J., Tettamanti, M., & Perani, D. (2009). The bilingual brain: Linguistic and non-linguistic skills. *Brain and Language, 109*, 51–54.

Anderson, R. (Ed.). (1983). *Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2013a). Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. *Theoretical Linguistics, 39*, 129–181.

Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2013b). Defining an "ideal heritage speaker". *Theoretical Linguistics, 39*, 259–294.

Bley-Vroman, R. (2009). The evolving context of the fundamental difference hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 31*, 175–198.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bullock, B., & Toribio, J. (Eds.). (2009). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning, 42*, 557–591.

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 4*, 161–170.

DeKeyser, R. (2013). Age effects in second language learning: Stepping stones toward better understanding'. *Language Learning, 63*(s1), 52–67.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 285–300.

Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Heller, M. (Ed.). (2007). *Bilingualism: A social approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kachru, B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. (2009). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Klee, C., & Lynch, A. (2009). *El español en contacto con otras lenguas*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Knightly, L., Jun, S., Oh, J., & Au, T. (2003). Production benefits of childhood overhearing. *Journal of the Acoustic Society of America, 114*, 465–474.

Lynch, A. (2003). The relationship between second and heritage language acquisition: Notes on research and theory building. *Heritage Language Journal*, *1*. www.international.ucla.edu/languages/heritagelanguages/journal/volume1.asp. Accessed 10 Apr 2015.

Lynch, A. (2008). The linguistic similarities of Spanish heritage and second language learners. *Foreign Language Annals, 41*, 252–281.

Mackey, W. (1968). The description of bilingualism. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 554–584). The Hague: Mouton.
Montrul, S. (2005). Second language acquisition and first language loss in adult early bilinguals: Exploring some differences and similarities. *Second Language Research, 21*, 199–249.
Montrul, S. (2008). *Incomplete acquisition in Bilingualism: Re-examining the age factor*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Montrul, S. (2012). Is the heritage language like a second language? *EUROSLA Yearbook*. http://www.nhlrc.ucla.edu/media/files/eurosla-yearbook-2012-text-yz-rvu.pdf. Accessed 10 Apr 2015.
Montrul, S., Foote, R., & Perpiñán, S. (2008). Gender agreement in adult second language learners and Spanish heritage speakers: The effects of age and context of acquisition. *Language Learning, 58*, 503–553.
Mougeon, R., Nadasdi, T., & Rehner, K. (2010). *The sociolinguistic competence of immersion students*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning, second edition*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Pavlenko, A. (2006). *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression and representation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Piller, I. (2002). Passing for a native speaker: Identity and success in second language learning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 6*, 179–206.
Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Rampton, B. (2013). Styling in a language learned later in life. *Modern Language Journal, 97*, 360–382.
Rao, R. (2015). Manifestations of /bdg/ in heritage speakers of Spanish. *Heritage Language Journal, 12*, 48–74.
Roeming, R. (1966). The predictability of language learning results. *Contact, 9*, 2–11.
Sankoff, G., Thibault, P., Nagy, N., Blondeau, H., Fonollosa, M.-O., & Gagnon, L. (1997). Variation in the use of discourse markers in a language contact situation. *Language Variation and Change, 9*, 191–218.
Schumann, J. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury House.
Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 209–231.
Silva-Corvalán, C. (1990). Current issues in studies of language contact. *Hispania, 73*, 162–176.
Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Valdés, G., & Figueroa, R. (1994). *Bilingualism and testing: A special case of bias*. Norwood: Ablex.
Valdés, G., & Geoffrion-Vinci, M. (1998). Chicano Spanish: The problem of the 'underdeveloped' code in bilingual repertoires. *Modern Language Journal, 82*, 473–501.
Weinreich, U. (1968). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton. [First edition 1953].

Sociocultural Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education

Amy Snyder Ohta

Contents

Introduction 58
Early Developments 58
Major Contributions 59
Work in Progress 63
Problems and Difficulties 64
Future Directions 66
Cross-References 66
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 66
References 66

Abstract

Sociocultural theory approaches SLA via its understanding of human cognition as developmentally formed through social and cultural mediation of mind. Founded by L.S. Vygotsky and his colleagues, the approach was not applied to second/foreign language education until recently, as seminal works had not been translated. Major contributions underscore the role of symbolic mediation in L2 development and involve second language (L2) researchers' application of Vygotskyan and neo-Vygotskyan understandings of regulation and internalization to various areas of L2 development. Researchers apply Vygotsky's genetic method, in analyses of L2 developmental microgenesis. Areas of L2 research include the zone of proximal development, private and inner speech, dynamic assessment, and concept-based instruction.

A.S. Ohta (✉)
Asian Languages and Literature, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
e-mail: aohta@uw.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_6

Keywords
Sociocultural theory • Vygotsky • Dynamic assessment • Zone of proximal development • Private speech • Second language acquisition • Foreign language education • Concept-based instruction • Mediation

Introduction

Sociocultural theory (SCT) has its origins in cultural-historical psychology, an area of psychology founded by L.S. Vygotsky in his work from 1924 to 1934, and collaboratively developed by his students and colleagues in the Soviet Union (van der Veer and Yasnitsky 2011). Vygotsky's approach to understanding cognition was profoundly developmental, rooted in an understanding of the human brain/mind as developmentally (historically) formed via social and cultural processes (Newman and Holzman 1993). The framework has only relatively recently been applied in the area of second/foreign language (L2) education. L2 researchers interested in exploring primary source materials will find the heavily edited compilation of lectures and papers (Vygotsky 1978), to be an accessible and relevant introduction. Vygotsky (1987) which contains the volume *Thinking and Speech* is another widely cited primary source. Researchers who have worked to develop SCT include Wertsch (1985) and Newman and Holzman (1993). Lantolf and Thorne (2006) present a thorough overview of L2-oriented SCT research, appropriate for a scholarly audience. Swain et al. (2013) textbook *Sociocultural Theory in Second Language Education* provides an accessible introduction to Vygotskyan thought, oriented toward those who would like an overview of SCT-related terminology and concepts as they relate to L2 development and education.

Early Developments

With the exception of a handful of translations prior to 1940, primary source materials were not available in English until the 1962 translation of *Thought and Language*, with other translations following through the 1990s (van der Veer and Yasnitsky 2011). Vygotsky and his students and colleagues of the Vygotsky Circle were prolific in developing a new approach to understanding human development, yet suppression of this work in the Stalinist era, combined with lack of Western scholars who could read Russian, delayed international access. Psychologists (such as Michael Cole and James Wertsch), anthropologists (e.g., Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger), and educational researchers (e.g., James Bruner and Gordon Wells) did research that provided a foundation that was productively built upon by L2 researchers. Perhaps the earliest L2-related publications in English are Carpay's (e.g., Carpay 1974) studies in the area of *praxis.* The term praxis involves integrating "theory and practical activity . . . for the purpose of promoting development through direct instruction" (Lantolf and Beckett 2009, p. 460). Carpay's sources, however,

are nearly all in Russian, German, and Dutch. It took till the mid-1980s before English-based researchers began publishing L2-related work using SCT.

James Frawley and James Lantolf's work (see, e.g., Frawley and Lantolf 1985), published in well-regarded L2-oriented research journals, marks the beginning of a gradual spread of interest in SCT among L2 researchers. SCT was more quickly accepted in educational circles, with marginalization of SCT-oriented work (see Verity 2012) within the field of second language acquisition (SLA) perhaps impeding progress in this area among linguists. Lantolf, in addition to collaborative research with his colleague Frawley and with graduate students, founded the multidisciplinary, international, Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning Working Group in 1993 (Verity 2012). This group served as an incubator to early SCT/L2 research and continues to hold annual meetings where work in progress is presented and collaboratively discussed. The first edited collection of papers to appear (Lantolf and Appel 1994), along with a special issue of *The Modern Language Journal* published in that same year, covered areas of interest which continue to be researched today. Calling SCT the "new kid on the block," Lantolf and Pavlenko (1995) point to three research streams that were most prominent at the time of their writing, "activity theory and the relevance of motives and goals for L2 learning; the role of private speech in L2 learning; and learning in the zone of proximal development" (p. 108), though early work considered a number of other themes as well.

Major Contributions

The predominant accomplishment of L2-oriented work in SCT has been to show how symbolic mediation functions in L2 development and education, with an understanding of the human mind as fundamentally mediated by language and other semiotic tools. Because Vygotsky little considered second/foreign language development, SCT-oriented L2 researchers have broken new ground in applying these concepts in L2 contexts (see Lantolf and Thorne 2006). SCT/L2 work has made a major impact by introducing a richer understanding of the interpenetrated nature of individual development and social interaction for L2 learners, with dialogue not merely a vehicle of transmission of ideas from person to person (as in the conduit metaphor of human communication), but a mediator of mind, comprising formative and transformative developmental processes. SCT sees people as embodying the history of their social and cultural interactions through transformative processes which are imbedded in broader cultural and interactional histories.

This set of understandings, or values, results in streams of research which are respectful of interactional processes, working to understand how human development and creativity unfold in real time, through microgenesis. Discourse and conversation analytic tools are commonly used in analyzing data in SCT-oriented research. Following Vygotsky (1987), L2-oriented SCT researchers seek holistic units of analysis, working to apply various understandings of the genetic method, which approaches development longitudinally, whether over a species

(phylogenesis), culture (sociocultural history), lifespan (ontogenesis), or moment by moment in social interaction (microgenesis) (Lantolf and Thorne 2006).

A major contribution of this area of research has been a more complex and nuanced understanding of L2 developmental and instructional processes. As noted by Swain and Deters (2007), "SCT takes into account the complex interaction between the individual acting with mediational means and the sociocultural context" such that "the social environment is not the context for, but rather the source of, mental development" (p. 821). Thus, SCT researchers carefully document and analyze L2 interactions in various learning environments.

Lantolf and Beckett (2009) state that L2 researchers using SCT tend either to apply SCT as an analytical framework for analysis and interpretation of data or to do what is called *praxis*. The latter has become more common as time has passed. Lantolf and Beckett's (2009) research timeline lists a useful set of 48 foundational studies in SCT "all of which in some way implicate the basic claim of the theory that all mental activity is symbolically mediated" (p. 459). They list an overlapping set of research themes covered in this work, including the zone of proximal development, dynamic assessment, internalization, private and inner speech, regulation, activity theory, and the genetic method. They also list theoretical papers that do not present new data analysis but rather work to resolve misunderstandings or to develop theoretical concepts in application to L2 development. One might guess that it would be a simple exercise to simply list the accomplishments of research in each category, noting major developments; however, because SCT concepts all deal with mediation, there is a great deal of overlap. For example, the *zone of proximal development* (ZPD) overlaps with *regulation* (as the ZPD is a zone where *other-regulation* allows an individual to do what she/he could not have done without that assistance), *internalization* (as social interactive processes are cognitive processes and constitute part of internalization processes), *dynamic assessment* (which involves a teacher/tutor deliberately working to provide instruction in the ZPD), the *genetic method* (as analyzing ZPDs emerging in discourse entails analysis of *microgenesis*, or cognitive development as it occurs moment by moment in social interaction), *private* and/or *inner speech* (to the extent that the learner does subvocalization, whispering, or verbal thought), and *activity theory* (as the ZPD is not a static event, but a collaboratively created activity that emerges from an activity setting). All of these notions may not be explicitly called upon by the author of a particular research study, but all clearly overlap with the notion of the ZPD. Since the focus of this entry is L2 education, this section will review some of the most significant applied L2 work on the ZPD, private speech, and dynamic assessment, along with considering one or more newer studies that further develop the same research area. Concept-based instruction (CBI) will be covered in the section "Work in Progress."

Private speech, which can be simply defined as language (spoken, whispered, or subvocally articulated) that is addressed to the self, has been studied by L2 researchers in both laboratory settings and naturalistic settings, in particular, among language learners in foreign language classrooms while participating in writing tasks in Spanish (Antón and DiCamilla 1998) and speaking tasks in pair and teacher-fronted classroom interaction in Japanese foreign language classes (Ohta 2001).

The earliest private speech research studies were laboratory studies, where analysis focused on the concept of *regulation,* how people use a variety of mediational tools to manage their own cognitive processes. Laboratory studies involving storytelling/retelling (such as Frawley and Lantolf (1985); see also Steven McCafferty's work in this area and Gale Stam's work on gesture) show how verbal language and gesture, whether social or self-addressed, function as tools of thought, regulating and comprising the individual's mental functioning. Gánem-Gutiérrez and Roehr's (2011) recent study builds on these themes showing how L1 and metalanguage function in regulating cognition for L2 learners engaged in a grammatical task. The importance of L1 in mediating thinking for learning L2 is a prominent theme in L2 sociocultural research and has demonstrated that even as teachers work to create L2-rich environments, L1 has a necessary role to play in mediating learning processes as the L2 gradually develops into becoming a cognitive tool in its own right.

A foundational classroom study of L2 private speech is Ohta's (2001) longitudinal study of classroom Japanese language learners, which found a much higher incidence of L2 private speech in teacher-fronted settings where learners had been thought to be passive. Students spoke in the absence of an interlocutor, formulating their own whispered answers (vicarious response), repetition, language manipulation, etc., serving as part of *internalization* processes and reemerging as social language in pair work. Internalization is the process through which the L2 moves from being a social tool to becoming a tool of thought. Internalization processes are evident in regulatory processes, as the L2 learner is first *other-regulated* (needing the social interactive support of others to function in the L2) and *object-regulated* (obtaining support from objects or other environmental artifacts) prior to becoming *self-regulated* or being able to manage his/her own L2 functioning. More recently, Smith's (2007) study of L2 private speech focusing on ESL learning children playing specially designed board games shows how, in the context of social speech, speech for the self emerges in the process of solving language problems. Smith developed a nuanced method of identifying private speech within the social interactive setting (where utterances, though self-addressed, may receive replies) by carefully observing the children's video-recorded language and behavior and identifying "shift in the linguistic, paralinguistic, and nonlinguistic behaviour" that indicated private speech (p. 354). Smith's work demonstrates the importance of video recording to allow more accurate identification of private speech in social settings. In her data, when children used L2 private speech, they "used the private speech utterances . . . to regulate their thinking in and about English. Private speech seemed to function primarily as some sort of focus or holding device, prolonging 'the availability of the language he or she [was] working to learn (Ohta 2001, p. 14)'" (Smith 2007, p. 352). More recently, Guerrero and Commander (2013) have investigated L2 private speech in a shadow-reading task, showing how imitative and transformative private speech functions as part of internalization processes for classroom ESL learners. Findings on private speech evoke the concept of *languaging*, using written or spoken language in mediating cognitively challenging task performance that is "the use of speaking and writing to mediate cognitively complex activities" (Swain and Deters

2007, p. 822). Private speech presents teachers and analysts with audible or visible cognitive processing, providing clues to learners' present levels of understanding and what they are working to learn.

The *zone of proximal development* (ZPD) is arguably the most familiar concept in Vygotsky's work, though with familiarity has come also a great deal of misunderstanding (see the section "Problems and Difficulties"). As understood in SCT, the ZPD is not a pedagogical technique but is a locus of development in progress. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) and Donato (1994) are the earliest ZPD studies that relate to L2 education, the former showing how learners who may appear to be at similar proficiency are developmentally very different in terms of the level of support needed to work through L2 problems, and the latter examining the emergence of ZPDs in French L2 group work, as learners joined their strengths to support one another in constructing L2 forms. While Vygotsky's definition states that a more capable adult or peer provides support in the ZPD, Ohta (2001) documented interactions where students who had the same difficulty with L2 grammar were each able to support the other by providing correct prompts, while unable to independently produce the same form when the task necessitated production of a whole sentence. Thus, ZPDs form as learners act upon the affordances available to them, including other more or less capable learners, proficient L2 teachers and speakers, varying working memory capacity as speakers or interlocutors, and other artifacts, such as texts (e.g., Swain et al. 2009). The *collective ZPD* has also been fodder for recent investigation.

The area of *dynamic assessment,* a more recent area of L2 educational inquiry, also draws upon the ZPD. Dynamic assessment involves instruction, assessment and *praxis*, or the integration of theory and practice that works to transform direct instruction while also developing theory (Lantolf and Poehner 2004). Dynamic assessment builds most strongly upon the notion that instruction in the ZPD not only promotes learning potential by focusing interaction on the cusp of the learner's future development, but simultaneously, by identifying areas of potential, or next, development, dynamic assessment capitalizes on the assessment function of the ZPD. While Lantolf and Beckett (2009) do not classify Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) as a study of dynamic assessment, the study's design, method of data analysis, and findings provided important groundwork for application of dynamic assessment to L2 instruction. In particular, Aljaafreh and Lantolf's (1994) insight that effective support in the ZPD is flexibly provided, dynamic, and contingent on the learner's progress, their elucidation of a nondiscrete regulatory continuum from implicit to explicit provision of help, and their finding that development is apparent not only in the language used by the tutee but also in the manner in which the tutor mediates the tutee's learning and sets the stage for further studies of instruction designed to both promote and assess development. The first publication in L2 dynamic assessment (DA), however, did not appear until 10 years later, in a theoretical paper (Lantolf and Poehner 2004), when Matthew Poehner was writing his dissertation study of DA applied to instruction in advanced French.

Researchers investigating L2 development using a sociocultural theoretic lens have explored a wide variety of teaching/learning settings, as well as considering the

development of particular L2 skills. Besides citing studies in foreign/second language classrooms, tutoring sessions, and laboratories, like those mentioned above, researchers have also investigated L2 developmental processes in immersion classrooms (such as Dorner and Layton's (2014) studies following up Maggie Broner's work on language play), online (Thorne 2003; Darhower 2008), and in study abroad (see Celeste Kinginger's case studies and Brown 2014), as well as considering behavior outside the classroom (see, e.g., Kurata's (2014) work on social networks). In terms of skill learning, there is significant work on L2 developmental grammar (Swain et al. 2009), writing (Dobao 2012), and reading (Roebuck 1998). Mediation is a common theme, whether the analyst uses regulation, the ZPD, private speech, or languaging as an analytical device. What distinguishes SCT studies is that language use is not considered as "output" which results from the interlanguage system but rather as audible or visible cognitive processing, comprising L2 development in process. In SCT-oriented work, learning, development, and education are viewed as socially and culturally situated processes in which individuals are involved in learning as a process of interaction and adaptation. This work has helped to make researchers accountable to understanding learning processes that had been overlooked by earlier studies. Swain and Deters (2007), in fact, identify a group of trends in L2 research which they call "New" Mainstream SLA Theory; these trends are all broadly sociocultural in nature, including sociocultural theory and also language socialization, situated learning theory, poststructuralism, and dialogism and, I would add, socioculturally and educationally oriented applications of conversation analysis as a research tool in SLA.

Work in Progress

While all areas of SCT research related to L2 education can be said to be in progress, the newest area of L2 application of SCT is in the area of concept-based instruction (CBI). Also called systemic-theoretic instruction, CBI is a research area that involves praxis: it works to restructure classroom foreign language education using what we understand about mediated mind. CBI prioritizes helping learners to develop new conceptual frameworks such that they can integrate the material being learned. The newness of this area of research is evidenced in that Lantolf and Thorne's (2006) thorough review of L2 work in SCT does not touch on CBI; in contrast, at the 2014 meeting of the Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning Research Working Group, nearly one-third of the presentations related to CBI.

So, what is CBI? Teachers and researchers have long been aware that instruction in a new concept does not mean that students will readily internalize the new material – when students do not have established conceptual structures that are needed to integrate a new way of thinking into their mental processes, then the learners often continue to see (and, actually, misconstrue) the new material by filtering it through their established concepts, which prevent them from appropriately internalizing the new material. Galperin's work on mental actions (see, e.g., Galperin 1992) is foundational in conceptualizing this approach. Instruction is a place for development

of scientific concepts, which are distinct from the spontaneous concepts of everyday life (Vygotsky 1987); CBI applies the Vygotskyan notion that instruction leads development: "instruction is useful when it moves ahead of development" (Vygotsky 1987, p. 212). Negueruela and Lantolf (2006) describe CBI as "predicated on the Vygotskyan principle that schooled instruction is about developing control over theoretical concepts that are explicitly and coherently presented to learners as they are guided through a sequence of activities designed to prompt the necessary internalization of the relevant concepts" (p. 80).

According to Galperin (1992), "every human action is accomplished on the basis of some specific orientation that also determines its quality" (p. 49). Before learning new concepts, the learner already has an orienting basis she/he would use to solve tasks that require the new, yet-unlearned, concepts – this is called the orienting basis of action, or OBA. CBI entails developing a unified system for the concept(s) being taught, presented in a didactic model termed the "scheme of a complete orienting basis of an action," or SCOBA. The SCOBA generally consists of some combination of icons, drawings, flow charts, and/or explanations that make the conceptual material both comprehensible and accessible to the learners. The teacher presents the SCOBA, and when learners have comprehended the SCOBA, then they are guided to apply it in practical activity. This latter step is critical; through practical activity, students are guided to re-materialize the model through different media, most commonly by verbalizing, often accompanied by drawing (e.g., White 2012), and practical application of the concept. Through this process, new conceptual knowledge can be formed or learned. Galperin distinguishes "comprehended" from "learned," with the former comprising the foundation upon which, mediated by practical activity, the latter can be achieved.

Recent research has investigated the use of CBI for teaching grammatical concepts that differ from those in students' L1, such as verbal aspect in Spanish (Negueruela-Arazola 2011), phrasal verbs in ESL (White 2012), sociopragmatics in French (van Compernolle 2014), and French prepositions (Strauss and Buescher 2015). The Pennsylvania State University's Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research (CALPER) has initiated a new pedagogical project which involves instructional intervention in the area of CBI. CALPER researcher/teachers are in the process of developing 24 instructional modules – eight each for Spanish, French, and Chinese – to be implemented at three different American universities. Feedback from teachers will provide useful information for further material development in these and other languages.

Problems and Difficulties

SCT/L2 researchers have worked to broaden our understanding of L2 development from a narrower understanding of the human mind to make the field of L2 education and SLA accountable to the fact that human cognition is not merely *influenced by* interaction, culture, and history but rather that human cognition (and thus human mind/brain) is *formed and transformed* as the individual is interdependently

imbedded in a world that is necessarily interactive, social, cultural, and historical. In the late 1980s and early 1990s when numbers of L2 researchers working with SCT gradually began to increase, researchers had difficulty finding venues for presentation and publication of this new way of viewing human development, as well as in finding acceptance of SCT as a legitimate approach to L2 developmental questions (Lantolf 1996). More scholars began collaborating and sharing their work, aided by informal gatherings at academic conferences and by annual SCT/L2 working group gatherings. The problem was partially solved when the American Association for Applied Linguistics, in its strands for paper/panel submission for its annual conference, included a strand for SCT for a number of years. This allowed a space for this new area of research to grow and develop, till in recent years the SCT strand is no longer needed. Today, SCT is an accepted area of research in L2 development, with recent SLA textbooks including chapters or sections on this approach (e.g., VanPatten and Williams 2014).

Related to understandings of SCT, some have misunderstood SCT terms as synonymous with mainstream L2-related terminology, seeing SCT as simply overlaying a new set of terminology over old terms. For example, the ZPD has been inappropriately said to be the same as "*i* + 1," from Krashen's monitor model (Dunn and Lantolf 1998). In addition, some who use the term ZPD hold a mechanistic view of the ZPD as an instructional strategy or process by which assistance promotes learning. In this view, the ZPD and scaffolding may be seen as interchangeable terms, or simply as meaning that one learner helps another (Chaiklin 2003), rather than as a transformative, developmental process. However, the ZPD is not the same as development or learning but rather the ZPD provides a view of *potential* learning and gives a prospective view of development that may or may not be realized (Negueruela 2008) and which developmentally appropriate assistance may work to promote. Also, *assisted performance* is not identical to the ZPD but rather is something that happens in the ZPD – it is an appealing term for discourse analysts (such as Ohta 2001) because it can be readily identified and its presence, if the assistance is developmentally appropriate, suggests that a particular interaction may be taking place in the ZPD.

Research that reflects SCT understandings of mediated mind and developmental processes may use a variety of terms to describe theoretical approaches. The term sociocultural theory is not ubiquitous, for example. Some say cultural-historical psychology or use other related terminology. Leo van Lier's ecological approach to SLA is fundamentally sociocultural. The recent work of Merrill Swain and her coauthors on *languaging* embodies SCT understandings of human development and cognition while coining new terms, such as *languaging* and *grammaring* (Swain et al. 2009). There are even more terms than this – ecological, Vygotskian, sociocultural, sociocultural theory (SCT), activity theory (ACT), sociocognitive, neo-Vygotskian, cultural psychology – all of these terms may be referring to SCT. For the newcomer, this diversity of terminology may be daunting. In addition, there are theoretical frameworks applied in L2 education that use Vygotskyan concepts and share the same roots but also aren't called SCT, such as *language socialization theory*, an approach used by linguistic anthropologists (e.g., Elinor Ochs) and L2 researchers (such as Patsy Duff) that considers how newcomers become appropriate

members of the society, socialized through language, and socialized to use language. Language socialization theory follows Vygotsky in seeing language as a semiotic tool that is simultaneously social and cognitive. The theory's view of mediated mind is fundamentally compatible with SCT. Understanding to what extent an approach overlaps with SCT, therefore, involves more than looking at terms used – it is important to understand the researchers' broader perspective and, in particular, how they understand the role of mediation as related to human cognition and development. In addition, SCT is also not alone in seeing the enterprise of SLA beyond a narrow understanding of the human brain (see the work of Diane Larsen-Freeman and her colleagues on chaos-complexity theory in L2 development).

Future Directions

Because SCT is a developing area of research in L2 education and development, work in all of the areas described above is continuing. There seems to be growing interest in praxis and concept-based instruction, but publication in other areas is not flagging. SCT-related L2 research is available in an increasing range of academic journals, with scholars who work with SCT finding positions in departments of language, education, linguistics, psychology, and anthropology, around the world. As these scholars train graduate students and practitioners, we can expect interest in SCT in relation to L2 education to continue to grow.

Cross-References

- ▶ Applied Linguistic Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education
- ▶ Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition
- ▶ Second Language Learning in a Study Abroad Context

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Warriner, D., Anderson, K.: Discourse Analysis in Educational Research. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Melzi, G., Caspe, M.: Research Approaches to Narrative, Literacy, and Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Abbuhl, R., Mackey, A.: Second Language Acquisition Research Methods. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

References

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(4), 465–483.

Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 54*, 314–342.

Brown, L. (2014). An activity-theoretic study of agency and identity in the study abroad experiences of a lesbian nontraditional learner of Korean. *Applied Linguistics*. doi:10.1093/applin/amu075.

Carpay, J. A. M. (1974). Foreign-language teaching and meaningful learning: A Soviet Russian point of view. *ITL, Review of Applied Linguistics, 25–26*, 161–187.

Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In A. Kozulin (Ed.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 39–64). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darhower, M. A. (2008). The role of linguistic affordances in telecollaborative chat. *CALICO Journal, 26*(1), 48–69.

Dobao, A. F. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom. Comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(1), 40–58.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Norwood: Ablex.

Dorner, L. M., & Layton, A. (2014). "¿Cómo se dice?" Children's multilingual discourses (or interacting, representing, and being) in a first-grade Spanish immersion classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 25*, 24–39.

Dunn, W., & Lantolf, J. P. (1998). I + 1 and the ZPD: Incommensurable constructs; incommensurable discourses. *Language Learning, 48*, 411–442.

Frawley, J., & Lantolf, J. P. (1985). Second language discourse: A Vygotskyan perspective. *Applied Linguistics, 6*, 19–44.

Galperin, P. (1992). Stage-by-stage formation as a method of psychological investigation. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology, 30*(4), 60–80.

Gánem-Gutiérrez, G. A., & Roehr, K. (2011). Use of L1, metalanguage, and discourse markers: L2 learners' regulation during individual task performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 21*(3), 297–318.

de Guerrero, M. C. M., & Commander, M. (2013). Shadow-reading: Affordances for imitation in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 17*(4), 433–453.

Kurata, N. (2014). Construction of L1/L2 use in informal social networks: A study of learners of Japanese in Australia. *Linguistics in Education, 27*, 14–29.

Lantolf, J. P. (1996). SLA theory building: "Letting all the flowers bloom!". *Language Learning, 46* (4), 713–749.

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Lantolf, J. P., & Beckett, T. G. (2009). Research timeline: Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Language Teaching, 42*(4), 459–475.

Lantolf, J. P., & Pavlenko, A. (1995). Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 15*, 108–124.

Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2004). Dynamic assessment: Bringing the past into the future. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*, 49–74.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Negueruela, E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2006). Concept-based instruction and the acquisition of L2 Spanish. In R. Salaberry & B.A. Lafford (Eds.), *The Art of Teaching Spanish: Second Language Acquisition from Research to Praxis* (pp. 79–102). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Negueruela, E. (2008). Revolutionary pedagogies: Learning that leads (to) second language development. In J. P. Lantolf & M. E. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and second language teaching* (pp. 189–227). London: Equinox.

Negueruela-Arazola, E. (2011). Beliefs as conceptualizing activity: A dialectical approach for the second language classroom. *System, 39*(3), 359–369.

Newman, F., & Holzman, L. (1993). *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary scientist*. New York: Routledge.
Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Roebuck, R. (1998). *Reading and recall in L1 & L2: A sociocultural approach*. Stamford: Ablex.
Smith, H. J. (2007). The social and private worlds of speech: Speech for intermental and intramental activity. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(3), 341–356.
Strauss, S., & Buescher, K. (2015). A cognitive linguistic analysis of French prepositions à, dans, and en and a sociocultural theoretical approach to teaching them. In K. Masuda, C. Arnett & A. Labarca (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics and sociocultural theory: Applications to foreign/second language teaching* (pp. 155–182). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Swain, M., & Deters, P. (2007). "New" mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(Focus Issue), 820–836.
Swain, M., Lapkin, S., Knouzi, I., Suzuki, S., & Brooks, L. (2009). Languaging: University students learn the grammatical concept of voice in French. *The Modern Language Journal, 93*(1), 5–29.
Swain, M., Kinnear, P., & Steinman, L. (2013). *Sociocultural theory in second language education: An introduction through narratives*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Thorne, S. L. (2003). Artifacts and cultures-of-use in intercultural communication. *Language Learning & Technology, 7*(2), 38–67.
Van Compernolle, R. A. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and L2 instructional pragmatics*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Van der Veer, R., & Yasnitsky, A. (2011). Vygotsky in English: What still needs to be done. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science, 45*(4), 475–493.
VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*. New York: Routledge.
Verity, D. P. (2012). *Lantolf, James P. The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. New York: Blackwell.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds.), *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky* (Vol. 1, pp. 39–288). New York: Plenum Press.
Wertsch, J. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
White, B. J. (2012). A conceptual approach to the instruction of phrasal verbs. *The Modern Language Journal, 96*(iii), 419–438.

Part II

Current Approaches to Second and Foreign Language Education

Content-Based Instruction

Fredricka L. Stoller and Shannon Fitzsimmons-Doolan

Contents

Introduction 72
Early Developments 73
Major Contributions 74
Work in Progress 77
Problems and Difficulties 79
Future Directions 80
Cross-References 82
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 82
References 82

Abstract

Content-based instruction (CBI) is an overarching term that refers to instructional approaches that make a dual, though not necessarily equal, commitment to additional language- and content-learning objectives. Since early developments in the second half of the twentieth century, a variety of CBI models and frameworks have been developed, implemented, and researched in a host of contexts for learners with a multiplicity of learning goals. During this time, major contributions have focused on the language- and content-learning specifications of various CBI models and frameworks, the language of academic content areas, an examination of teacher practices in CBI classrooms, and an understanding of the relationships among second language acquisition (SLA)

F.L. Stoller (✉)
English Department, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ, USA
e-mail: fredricka.stoller@nau.edu

S. Fitzsimmons-Doolan (✉)
TAMUCC Department of English, Texas A&M University Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, TX, USA
e-mail: shannon.fitzsimmons-doolan@tamucc.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_7

processes and CBI curricula. More current work examines the effectiveness of various CBI models and frameworks, especially with respect to scaffolded instructional techniques and academic skill development, with particular attention paid to reading skills. In addition, current efforts document the evolution and spread of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programs in Europe and beyond. CBI approaches, in their various configurations, are not without their challenges, which include paucity and suitability of instructional materials; language and content teacher qualifications, recruitment, and training; effectiveness of professional development and teacher collaboration; and teacher and public perceptions (and misperceptions) of CBI approaches – especially in highly politicized contexts. A call for future research in these areas as well as others arises from the implementation of CBI in a range of instructional contexts.

Keywords

CBI • CBI models and frameworks • CLIL • Content and language integrated learning • Content-based instruction • Immersion • Learning objectives • Sheltered instruction • Sheltered instruction observation protocol • SIOP

Introduction

Content-based instruction (CBI) is an umbrella term that refers to instructional approaches that make a dual, though not necessarily equal, commitment to language- and content-learning objectives. CBI has been translated into practice in diverse ways around the world in response to student needs at primary, secondary, tertiary, and adult education levels and in second, foreign, and multilingual contexts. Unlike other language teaching approaches that are defined by linguistic foci on grammatical structures, communicative language functions, vocabulary, and/or language skills (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, listening), in CBI, content refers to nonlanguage subject matter that is closely aligned with traditional school subjects (e.g., history, tourism, geography) or themes of interest to students (e.g., recycling). Most CBI settings have strong academic orientations, emphasizing the linguistic, cognitive, and metacognitive skills as well as subject matter that students need to succeed in their educational endeavors. In highly diversified linguistic contexts, CBI is often adopted to promote plurilingualism as a social and political necessity (Dalton-Puffer 2011). Depending on the setting, content-based classes are taught by content specialists, language specialists, or a combination of the two. Despite differences in content- and language-learning emphases, target subject matter, location, and instructional staff, what most content-based approaches share is the assumption that content and language create a symbiotic relationship, that is, the learning of content contributes to the learning of language and a mastery of language gives learners easier access to content (Lightbown 2014; Snow 2014).

Early Developments

It is often said that the prototypical content-based approach is the Canadian immersion program, adopted in the mid-1960s, that taught traditional school subjects to Canadian children in their second language (Swain and Lapkin 1982). Since that time, the Canadian immersion model has been adapted worldwide to include full, partial, late, and two-way immersion options, with goals for bilingualism, multilingualism, biculturalism, and/or multiculturalism (Tedick et al. 2011). From the prototypical model emerged new CBI models that combined language- and content-learning objectives. Mohan (1986) characterized academic discourse in terms of knowledge structures typical of school subject matter: description, sequence, choice, classification, principles, and evaluation. He proposed an instructional model that explicitly taught knowledge structures, using corresponding graphic representations, to assist students in mastery of content and academic discourse. Enright and McCloskey's (1988) Integrated Language Teaching Model emphasized the integration of language and subject matter learning, as well as language and learning experiences at home and school. Other CBI scholars showcased ways in which teachers could integrate instruction to help limited English proficient students master mathematics, science, and social studies while at the same time learn academic English. At about the same time, sheltered instruction emerged as an approach for making subject area content comprehensible for English learners in secondary and postsecondary classrooms, while also developing students' language proficiency (Echevarría et al. 2017). The term *sheltered* was used at that time to refer to classes (e.g., sheltered social studies) offered to English learners who studied separately from their native English-speaking counterparts.

Concurrent with these efforts was the emergence of a greater variety of CBI frameworks and models. The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA; Chamot and O'Malley 1987) made a three-way commitment to academic content, academic language skills, and strategy training. During the same decade, Brinton et al. (1989) showcased three prototype postsecondary CBI models: sheltered (i.e., content courses taught by content specialists to groups of nonnative speakers of the target language), adjunct (i.e., language support courses linked to content courses), and theme based (i.e., language courses structured around topics or themes).

After the 1980s, numerous extensions of these CBI models emerged. In North America, the Six T's framework (Stoller and Grabe 1997; for an update, see Stoller and Grabe in press) endorsed the use of themes, topics, texts, tasks, threads, and transitions as design criteria for more coherent content-based curricula. The Content-Based Language Teaching with Technology (CoBaLTT) initiative, launched in 1999 by the University of Minnesota's Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), assisted foreign language and immersion teachers in creating curricula that utilized technology to support CBI. Short's (2002) Language-Content-Task (LCT) framework emphasized the importance of and interactions among knowledge of the target language (L), content area (C), and tasks (T) required for students' academic success. And finally, sustained-content language teaching

(SCLT) promoted the exploration of a single carrier topic as a way to promote language learning in the language classroom.

During the same time period, models for North American foreign language education that combined content- and language-learning objectives appeared. Content-enriched FLES (Foreign Language in the Elementary School) programs integrated content matter from other classes (e.g., math) into foreign language classes. In these settings, the foreign language served as reinforcement for subject matter classes, and the content served as a stimulus for contextualized language learning. At the tertiary level, Foreign Language Across the Curriculum (FLAC) and Languages Across the Curriculum (LAC or LxC) programs and institutions extended the reach of foreign languages by providing students with opportunities to use foreign languages in areas of academic interest. Foreign Language Immersion Programs (FLIP) made it possible for university foreign language and content area majors to enroll in full sets of language and content courses taught in the target language. The Monterey Model, developed at the Monterey Institute for International Studies, integrated advanced foreign language study into programs such as international business and international policy studies, thereby making a dual commitment to content and language learning.

In Europe, content and language integrated learning (CLIL), a term coined in 1994, was adopted in contexts where an additional language (i.e., not the most widely spoken language of the setting) was used for the teaching and learning of subject matter other than the language itself. CLIL emerged as a response to the European Union's plurilingual education agenda, commitment to the preservation of linguistic and cultural diversity, and recognition of the political and economic necessity to increase multilingualism (Coyle et al. 2010). Since the 1990s, CLIL, sometimes referred to as modern languages across the curriculum, has been translated into diverse configurations, within and across countries, reflected by differences in curricula, targeted content, designated languages, selection of students, methodology, materials, assessment, and teacher development.

Major Contributions

The early models of CBI, with their dual commitments to language and content learning, have evolved over time in response to the expanding reach of CBI and results of related research. One major contribution to the field is Met's (1998) conceptualization of CBI models that depicts the different degrees of emphasis placed on language and content in early and more recent models. Met proposed a CBI continuum, bounded by content-driven models at one end and language-driven models at the other. In immersion programs, at the content-driven end of the continuum, school subject matter is taught primarily through the medium of the target language, and the programmatic focus is on content knowledge acquisition. At the other end of the continuum are topical, thematic, and sustained-content CBI models, typically adopted in language curricula with strong commitments to language-learning objectives. Topical courses make use of content, often confined to a single reading passage, as springboards for language practice; theme-based

courses make a stronger commitment to content exploration, using themes (often brought alive with multiple related readings and/or listening passages) to provide the content for language-learning activities. Sustained-content courses make a stronger commitment to content learning by centering instruction around a carrier topic that is explored in more depth.

In between the two end points on the continuum are other content-based models, two of which grant more equal weighting to content- and language-learning objectives. In sheltered instruction, nonnative speakers of the target language are either deliberately separated from native speakers or, more recently, enrolled in the same class with native speakers; in either case, teachers "shelter" instruction to make content accessible and language learning possible. They do so by deliberately using comprehensible language; contextualizing subject matter; modeling tasks and useful strategies; making use of visual aids, modified texts, and scaffolded assignments; and paying explicit attention to students' linguistic needs, among other sheltering techniques (Echevarría et al. 2017). Also placed toward the center of the continuum is the adjunct or linked CBI model. In the linked model, students are concurrently enrolled in a language support class and a content class, the former designed to assist students with the language- and content-learning demands of the latter.

Met's (1998) continuum showcases the underlying distinctions among numerous CBI models, focusing on differences in language and content emphases. Since the publication of that often-cited continuum, more fine-tuned CBI frameworks have appeared, some of which have made major contributions to the field. They include the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), recent developments in CLIL, and Project LEAP (Learning English for Academic Purposes).

The empirically validated Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarría et al. 2017) represents a highly detailed vision of the sheltered model. SIOP offers teachers templates for lesson planning and implementation that give English learners access to grade-level content. The framework also serves as an instrument for observing and quantifying teachers' implementation of quality sheltered instruction. The framework has been refined over the years, in response to research conducted by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE), and the Center for Research on the Educational Achievement and Teaching of English Language Learners (CREATE), in addition to the training of thousands of teachers and administrators. At present, SIOP is characterized by 30 lesson features, including content and language objectives that are to be aligned with (a) state and local content area standards, language objectives, language proficiency benchmarks, or language-arts standards and/or (b) standards set forth by the International TESOL Association. Additional SIOP lesson features include techniques for building background, providing comprehensible input, teaching vocabulary, scaffolding instruction, addressing strategic processing, promoting interaction, and integrating language skills. SIOP is now being used in all levels of education, including tertiary-level classes, and in a variety of class types, including sheltered content classes, dual language programs, content-based ESL classes, and general education classes (Echevarría et al. 2013).

CLIL has also evolved over time. Early on, five overarching dimensions – culture, environment (focused on internationalization and European Union integration), language, content, and learning (the latter focused on learning strategies and learner motivation) – were combined, though in different ways and to different degrees. More current conceptions of CLIL make reference to a three-way focus on language, content, and learning skills and suggest 20 core features grouped within emphases such as scaffolding, authenticity, and active learning (Mehisto et al. 2008). CLIL has become an umbrella term because of its various conceptions in primary, secondary, tertiary, and vocational schools in Europe and beyond (Breidbach and Viebrock 2013). Supporting CLIL efforts are EuroCLIC (European Network for Content and Language Integrated Classrooms) and TIE-CLIL (Translanguage in Europe-CLIL), which represent multinational efforts that promote the exchange of information, experience, and materials among CLIL professionals.

Dalton-Puffer (2007) conducted an ambitious, large-scale mixed-method study of classroom discourse in Austrian CLIL secondary classrooms. She examined CLIL classrooms as a "discourse space" (p. 15) from various discourse-analytic perspectives. She analyzed the interpersonal pragmatics of classroom discourse, genre aspects of classroom talk, classroom registers, speech acts and the management of interpersonal relations, questions asked and their role in shaping classroom discussions, academic language functions, the handling of communication breakdowns, and much more. Dalton-Puffer's findings, which reveal patterns of language use and the language forms commonly used in Austrian CLIL classrooms, have major implications for classrooms across Europe and elsewhere that make a dual commitment to language and content learning. Dalton-Puffer's book-length accounting of her study and its results represents a major contribution to the field.

Other notable contributions to CBI focus more directly on the language of the content areas. The conceptual framework proposed by Snow et al. (1989) introduced the important notions of *content-obligatory language* and *content-compatible language*, the former referring to the specific language required for students to master and communicate about a particular content area and the latter referring to academic language that can be taught within the context of a given content area but that is not required for content mastery. Equally notable is the work of Short (2002), who focused on the characteristics of disciplinary language, specifically social studies and history, and the demands that they place on target language learners. Short's work has resulted in teacher guidelines for integrated language and content instruction, with an emphasis on scaffolding, graphic organizers, and language and content teacher collaboration. Short's work, as well as the efforts of others at CAL in Washington, D.C., has contributed greatly to an understanding of the intricacies of the language of different disciplines, the tasks commonly associated with those disciplines, and the challenges faced by teachers and students in content-based classrooms.

In addition to the exploration of disciplinary language, attention has been paid to the practices of content teachers, leading to the creation of guidelines to assist them

in reaching linguistic minority students in their classes. Project LEAP (Learning English for Academic Purposes; Snow 1997), a large-scale project begun in the 1990s, focused on strategies that can be used by university instructors to make their content instruction more accessible to language minority students, while maintaining the academic rigor of their courses. Emphasis has been placed on instructional enhancements to improve lectures, make textbooks accessible, scaffold instruction, prepare students for exams, and involve students actively in learning.

Other major contributions to CBI, in its various forms, stem from second language acquisition (SLA) research, in particular studies on the role of comprehensible input, output, and explicit attention to relevant and contextually appropriate language forms (Lyster 2007). Further support has been provided by sociocultural approaches to SLA that have demonstrated that the Vygotskian-based concepts of negotiation in the zone of proximal development, private speech, and student appropriation of learning tasks are important components in language learning and readily compatible with CBI. Interaction theory suggests that language learning is facilitated by opportunities to use language to interact genuinely with others. Because content classes can provide opportunities for interaction among students and teachers, during which they grapple with and work toward content mastery, CBI classes provide good environments for SLA (Dalton-Puffer 2011).

Research in educational and cognitive psychology also provides compelling support for CBI. Of particular relevance is research on cognitive processes of learning, depth of processing, discourse comprehension processing, optimal experiences, expertise, motivation, attribution, and learner interest. Additional support for CBI stems from classroom training studies on cooperative learning, metacognitive and learning strategy instruction, and extensive reading, all readily incorporated within CBI (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al. in press).

Work in Progress

Approaches to CBI continue to evolve internationally, in locations as distinct as Australia, Europe, Israel and the Middle East, Japan, North America, South Africa, Turkey, and West Africa. While many programs have designated English as the language of instruction, other languages are also the target of CBI, including Chinese, Dari, French, German, Japanese, Pashto, and Spanish. CBI is being adapted in these diverse settings for students at beginning, intermediate, and advanced proficiency levels. In recent years, SIOP, CLIL, frameworks for second language reading instruction, and research investigating links between CBI instruction and academic outcomes have been areas of change and progress for CBI scholars and practitioners.

Multiple research projects investigating the effectiveness of the SIOP model and the professional development of teachers making use of the model have been reported. Short et al. (2011) describe findings from several studies of the SIOP

model. The two most recent studies were driven by questions about (a) the amount of SIOP professional development for teachers and its relation to classroom implementation of the model and (b) the relationship between professional development opportunities for SIOP teachers and student achievement data reflecting language and content learning. The researchers found that not only time but also local and political climates affected uptake of professional development (in both positive and negative directions). The researchers also found slight significant differences favoring students of high-implementing SIOP teachers for both language and content measures. In addition to SIOP-centered research, SIOP continues to grow as a professional development model. As part of this growth, an increasing number of updated materials are available to educators. For example, the most recent overview version of the model for educators (Echevarría et al. 2017) contains elaborated sections for, among other topics, (a) teaching with technology, (b) aligning the SIOP Model to the US Common Core Standards, and (c) offering opportunities for self-assessment.

CLIL scholarship, too, represents a work in progress. As CLIL programs have expanded in recent years throughout Europe and to other regions of the world (Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés 2015), so too has scholarship examining the framework. Much of the work has focused on defining the framework theoretically and in practice (Eurydice 2006) and examining contextual factors affecting CLIL implementation. Though CLIL is typically described as a method of teaching a foreign language using content instruction, more recent definitions have expanded the framework to appear synonymous with CBI and to mirror the additive linguistic goals of dual language immersion programs. Contextual factors affecting implementation include linguistic distance between the students' first languages and language of instruction, teaching resources, and teacher bilingualism (Turner 2013).

CBI professionals whose students have reading skill development needs are also exploring the relevance of empirically supported Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI) and Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) for their classrooms. CORI emphasizes thematic instruction, students' personal engagement with themes, wide reading and information gathering across multiple information sources, reading strategy instruction to assist with comprehension, and project work. CORI has been used and researched extensively in first language settings (e.g., Guthrie et al. 2013), though it is also being used in second language classrooms with language- and content-learning goals. Similarly, CSR is an instructional framework that combines cooperative learning principles and reading comprehension strategy instruction to promote content learning, language mastery, and reading comprehension (Hitchcock et al. 2010).

Other recent research explores linguistic and academic outcomes for CBI students. Valeo (2013) explored the role of form-focused instruction and awareness in a CBI classes and found that while students were able to demonstrate awareness of a lesson's learning objectives (content vs. language), such awareness did not correlate positively with language learning. Other work has documented outcomes for CBI students after their CBI courses were completed. James (2010), as an example, found that while CBI learning did transfer to mainstream university courses, factors such as

task and content mediated that transfer. Other studies suggest that students who participate in CBI courses have more success on academic achievement measures.

Problems and Difficulties

The integration of content- and language-learning objectives presents challenges for policy makers, program planners, curriculum designers, teachers, material writers, teacher educators, teacher supervisors, test writers, and learners. A perennial problem is linked to the paucity of target language content materials and the time-consuming nature of creating suitable materials (Snow 2014). When faced with selecting from among available materials, CBI teachers struggle with determining levels of sufficient challenge to ensure student engagement and finding a good match with students' ages, students' cognitive levels, and curricular expectations. Practitioners often report the difficulties associated with (a) selecting and sequencing language items dictated by content sources rather than predetermined language syllabi and (b) aligning content with language structures and functions that emerge from the subject matter.

Another commonly cited set of challenges concerns CBI teacher recruitment, qualifications (including target language proficiency), certification, training, and assessment. In some settings, debates center around the assignment of subject or language specialists to CBI classes. At times, what plague efforts to advance CBI are (a) the lack of expertise among language teachers in content areas and discipline-specific pedagogy and (b) the lack of experience among content teachers in addressing learners' language needs. Short et al. (2011) note that professional development of both content and language specialists improves with increased amounts of training and increased time over which training is spread. They also note that a professional development model that includes coaching and lesson plan feedback is more successful than one which does not. Little research or curriculum development, from within the disciplines, guides teachers in accommodating language learners as they strive to master content knowledge and improve their language skills. Furthermore, among foreign language teachers who implement CBI, Cammarata (2010) reports challenges centered on conceptualizing syllabi not driven by previous language curricula, sequencing content objectives, aligning content with language, and changing patterns in long-held teaching practices.

As CLIL programs and scholarship have increased in recent years, several recurring challenges have been identified. As with CBI more generally, the identification of qualified teachers and the provision of comprehensive professional development for CLIL teachers have proven problematic (Breidbach and Viebrock 2013; Eurydice 2006; Mehisto et al. 2008). Other problems relate to resource allocation, including securing curriculum development time for CLIL teachers (Mehisto et al. 2008) and coping with the costs of CLIL implementation (Eurydice 2006). More broadly, some scholars worry that the CLIL movement promotes English as a *lingua franca* (Breidbach and Viebrock 2013; Coyle et al. 2010).

One political challenge related to CBI implementation centers on clarifying the differences between CBI and non-CBI models for educators and the public. To the less informed, in particular, mainstream (or submersion[1]) and structured English immersion (SEI) models might appear to be CBI because the language of instruction is not the learners' native language. However, neither model is CBI (Lightbown 2014) because there is no systematic instructional support for the acquisition of content through an additional language. Furthermore, submersion and SEI models have been found to inhibit the academic progress of large groups of language learners in academic contexts (Lillie and Markos 2014). Nevertheless, from the nonexpert perspective, submersion (not CBI) and immersion (a version of CBI, as previously described) may appear equivalent, and in contexts in which nonexperts make policy decisions, submersion is sometimes selected. Similarly, Coyle et al. (2010) note that CLIL implementation has varied widely across contexts; Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés (2015), documenting the shift from English for Specific Purposes to CLIL programming in Europe, note that some CLIL classes do not provide language support nor specify language objectives, suggesting they may resemble mainstream/submersion classes.

Perceptions of and attitudes toward CB represent other challenges. In CLIL settings, as in other CBI settings, educators often encounter negative perceptions about content coverage, with critics accusing CLIL educators, especially in secondary schools, of simplifying content, resulting in learners' limited grasp of subject matter knowledge (Dalton-Puffer 2011; Mehisto et al. 2008). An example of a challenge associated with attitudes is linked to teachers who view the "simple" adoption of CLIL as innovative; yet, instead of striving to implement innovative teaching practices to achieve CLIL aims, these same teachers turn to conventional teaching practices meant for more traditional classrooms (Coyle et al. 2010). In other settings, language teachers' knowledge and skills are perceived to have lower status than subject area teachers' knowledge and skills. The undermining of language teachers' contributions to language and content teacher partnerships marginalizes not only the language teacher but also the students who are supposed to benefit from language teachers' contributions.

Future Directions

Because content-based instruction does not lend itself to a fixed method, the future is likely to bring with it a continued proliferation of content-based models customized for different instructional settings. Expansions into vocational sectors will likely require considerable adaptations. Case studies, anecdotal accounts, and research on adaptations of current models are likely to contribute to an understanding of the intricacies of the approach and its various configurations in a wide range of contexts.

[1]Submersion classes for language learners are content classes taught in a language learner's nonnative language without instructional support for language acquisition (Lightbown 2014).

Qualitative and quantitative investigations of numerous aspects of CBI are sorely needed. Particularly fruitful would be research on (a) the selection, sequencing, and weighting of content and language in different CBI models; (b) the relationships among input, output, and feedback to ensure improved student mastery of content and language; (c) student engagement with information gathering, compiling, and reporting and the language demands at each point of the process; (d) strategy training and its influence on student learning; (e) the contextualization of grammar instruction in content-based classes; and (f) the relationship between tasks and texts in CBI curricula. Equally valuable would be research on factors critical for academic success, on specific professional outcomes, and processes involved in, and interactions among, the acquisition of literacy competence, subject matter learning, and target language learning. Furthermore, investigations into how to sustain student motivation and engagement, by combining learner choice, autonomy, and challenge, could offer insights into more effective CBI frameworks.

The CBI field would also benefit from future work focused on educator support. Horn (2011) proposes that future CBI professional development schemes focus on (a) promoting advanced and register-specific target language proficiencies for teachers, (b) preparing teachers to carry out high levels of academic work such as research, (c) attending to specific pedagogical knowledge and skills, and (d) developing proficiency in skills at the intersection of language and content, such as an understanding of how language development relates to content knowledge development. Snow (2014) echoes the importance of professional development for the future of the field and calls for the continued development of standards which integrate content and academic language use. Projects such as the WIDA English Language Development Standards project (http://www.wida.us/standards/eld.aspx), which integrates theoretical principles of language development, contextualized and developmentally appropriate academic language, and performance definitions for US-based K-12 English learners, serve as helpful exemplars for such work. In addition, though Snow (2014) notes that publishers are beginning to market textbooks appropriate for CBI courses at the language-driven end of the continuum, there are still many CBI course types for which educators do not have published materials readily on hand.

As CLIL programs and scholarship continue to expand, additional areas for future growth become apparent. In Breidbach and Viebrock (2013), CLIL is envisioned with additive goals that are similar to those of dual language programs and inclusion of any additional language for instruction; most definitions of CLIL do not include instruction in the language of wider communication. Furthermore, there are calls for (a) research that documents CLIL washback and contextual variables that affect CLIL implementation and (b) further policy development to specify language proficiency goals for each content area based on national needs. To capitalize on the strengths of both language and content specialists, work on more collaborative CLIL models is also advocated (Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés 2015; Coyle et al. 2010). Finally, policies that have encouraged CLIL growth – particularly in Europe – deserve more focus. Dalton-Puffer (2011) asks whether CLIL programs are capable of producing individuals with the multilingual language proficiencies that policies aim for.

Finally, as CBI, in its various configurations, takes on more predominant roles in educational settings, increased attention should be paid to pre- and in-service teacher preparation. Opportunities for dual certification and specializations in CBI will prepare a new generation of teachers to enter the work force well prepared for the challenges of CBI. Partnerships between teacher-training institutions and schools, between researchers and teachers, and across disciplines are likely to result in better-prepared, more enthusiastic teachers, and more abundant classroom resources, the end result being students who learn subject matter and language more effectively.

Cross-References

▶ CLIL: A European Approach to Bilingual Education
▶ Task-Based Teaching and Learning: Pedagogical Implications

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Lorena Llosa: Assessing Students' Content Knowledge and Language Proficiency. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment
Yolanda Ruiz de ZarobeL: Language Awareness and CLIL. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism
Constant Leung: Second Language Academic Literacies. In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

References

Arnó-Macià, E., & Mancho-Barés, G. (2015). The role of content and language in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at university: Challenges and implications for ESP. *English for Specific Purposes, 37*, 63–73.
Breidbach, S., & Viebrock, B. (Eds.). (2013). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in Europe: Research perspectives on policy and practice*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
Brinton, D., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Newbury House.
Cammarata, L. (2010). Foreign language teachers' struggle to learn content-based instruction. *L2 Journal, 2*(1), 89–118.
Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*, 227–249.
Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content and language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 182–204.
Echevarría, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2017). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP® Model* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Enright, D. S., & McCloskey, M. (1988). *Integrating English*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
Eurydice (Ed.). (2006). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice European Unit.
Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S., Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (in press). Research support for content-based instruction. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: new perspectives on integrating language and content* (2nd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Guthrie, J. T., Klauda, S. L., & Ho, A. N. (2013). Modeling the relationships among reading instruction, motivation, engagement, and achievement for adolescents. *Reading Research Quarterly, 48*, 9–26.
Hitchcock, J., Dimino, J., Kurki, A., Wilkins, C., & Gersten, R. (2010). *The impact of Collaborative Strategic Reading on the reading comprehension of grade 5 students in linguistically diverse schools*. (NCEE 2011–4001). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
Horn, B. (2011). The future is now: Preparing a new generation of CBI teachers. *English Teaching Forum, 49*(3), 2–9.
James, M. A. (2010). Transfer of learning from a university content-based EAP course. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(4), 783–806.
Lightbown, P. M. (2014). *Focus on content-based language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Lillie, K., & Markos, A. (2014). The four hour block: SEI in classrooms. In S. C. Moore (Ed.), *Language policy processes and consequences: Arizona case studies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford, UK: Macmillan.
Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 35–63). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
Short, D. J. (2002). Language learning in sheltered social studies classes. *TESOL Journal, 11*, 18–24.
Short, D. J., Echevarría, J., & Richards-Tutor, C. (2011). Research on academic literacy development in sheltered instruction classrooms. *Language Teaching Research, 11*, 363–380.
Snow, M. A. (1997). Teaching academic literacy skills: Discipline faculty take responsibility. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 290–304). New York: Longman.
Snow, M. A. (2014). Content-based and immersion models of second/foreign language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed., pp. 438–454). Boston: Cengage/National Geographic Learning.
Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 201–217.
Stoller, F. L., & Grabe, W. (in press). Building coherence into the content-based curriculum: Six Ts revisited. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: new perspectives on integrating language and content* (2nd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Stoller, F. L., & Grabe, W. (1997). A six-Ts approach to content-based instruction. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 78–94). New York: Longman.
Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Tedick, D. J., Christian, D., & Fortune, T. W. (Eds.). (2011). *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Turner, M. (2013). Content-based Japanese language teaching in Australian schools: Is CLIL a good fit? *Japanese Studies, 33*(3), 315–330.

Valeo, A. (2013). Language awareness in a content-based language programme. *Language Awareness, 22*(2), 126–145.

Task-Based Teaching and Learning: Pedagogical Implications

Martin East

Contents

Introduction 86
Early Developments 86
Major Contributions 88
Work in Progress 91
Problems and Difficulties 92
Future Directions 93
Cross-References 94
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 94
References 94

Abstract

Task-based language teaching (TBLT) has been developing since the 1980s as a learner-centered and experiential means of fostering real language use in second and foreign language (L2) classrooms through learners' engagement in tasks. TBLT has aimed to address some of the limitations of more established procedures aligned with so-called communicative language teaching (CLT), most particularly by challenging top-down teacher-centered grammatical emphases (weak CLT) and addressing the limitations of a pure focus on meaning (strong CLT) through the phenomenon of focus on form. TBLT has gained considerable support through empirical studies that have demonstrated the efficacy of tasks to promote second language acquisition. Nevertheless, TBLT has not been without its critics. Also, more recent research among teachers has revealed teacher uncertainty about what TBLT is, with eclecticism often more highly favored by teachers than a task-based framework. In turn, the claim that TBLT is a more

M. East (✉)
Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
e-mail: m.east@auckland.ac.nz

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_8

effective pedagogical approach than more traditional CLT models is arguably more ideological than evidential. If TBLT is to become a more established approach to L2 teaching and learning than it currently is, more work is needed to develop greater understanding of how a task-based framework can be utilized more successfully in real classrooms. The agenda for the future must include investigating and encouraging the implementation of TBLT in ways that will increase teacher certainty about the effectiveness of what they do in their classrooms.

Keywords
Task-based language teaching • Innovation • Teacher development • CLT

Introduction

Task-based language teaching (TBLT) is an approach to second and foreign language (L2) teaching and learning built on a learner-centered and experiential premise. Willis and Willis (2007), for example, support this premise with their claim that "the most effective way to teach a language is by engaging learners in real language use in the classroom." This, they argue, is "done by designing tasks – discussions, problems, games, and so on – which require learners to use language for themselves" (p. 1). Put another way, the premise is reinforced when it is believed that language learners participating in undertaking a communicative language use task are "maximally engaged in language acquisition because they are required to draw on their emerging language skills and resources in an integrated way" (Nunan 2004, p. 20).

Since the 1980s, the phenomenon of TBLT has been attracting growing attention from a range of people who have a stake in language pedagogy. This has included researchers into second language acquisition (SLA), curriculum developers, language teachers and teacher educators, and language testers (Van den Branden et al. 2009). This worldwide interest has enabled TBLT to achieve something approaching the prestige of a "new orthodoxy" (Littlewood 2004). Nevertheless, TBLT, especially when applied in time-limited instructed contexts (such as L2 courses in schools), has not been without its critics. The following discussion explores some of the tensions, with particular reference to pedagogical implications in instructed contexts.

Early Developments

For almost half a century, an emphasis on L2 teaching for purposes of communication has informed the aims and goals of L2 programs in many contexts worldwide.

In the UK, for example, the early 1970s witnessed the birth of the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach. The emphasis of programs following a

CLT model came to be knowledge of a language. This was not, however, understood in the sense of knowing its vocabulary, rules, and grammar in an abstract way, but in the sense of being able to put knowledge of vocabulary, rules, and grammar to use through genuine communicative interaction with others in a range of authentic contexts. In the USA, a parallel development heralded the beginning, at the start of the 1980s, of the "proficiency movement" and the "proficiency-oriented curriculum." Once more, language became viewed as primarily a means of interpersonal communication, and learning programs began to focus on the development of learners' ability to use the L2 effectively in real-life situations.

The introduction of CLT, informed by theoretical frameworks of communicative competence, marked an important pedagogical shift. There was a move away from the linguistic/grammatical emphases represented in approaches such as grammar translation and audio-lingualism. Instead there was a step toward emphases built on an underlying understanding that L2s are learnt for purposes of *real* communication with *real* individuals in *real* situations. CLT has now become a dominant model that underpins L2 curricula, at least in Western contexts.

The early days of CLT represented a formative period during which several key principles became established, which continue to influence thinking and practice today. Nevertheless, the principles, at least as operationalized within what Richards (2006) referred to as the "classic" stage of CLT, led to several challenges.

Put simply, the early phase of CLT witnessed the emergence of two polarizations to practice that would signal the need to consider refinements – although, in reality, it must be acknowledged that the polarizations led to "gradations of pedagogical choice" rather than two "mutually exclusive extremes" (Van den Branden et al. 2009, p. 3).

At one end of CLT in practice, and largely no doubt as a reaction to what were seen as the clear limitations of the formal grammar-translation approach that had existed for many years prior, a so-called "strong" version of CLT emerged. Strong CLT emphasized communication in a way that negated any place for formal grammar explanation. This approach represented "a radical pendulum swing" and "a shift of allegiance" away from foregrounding the formal teaching of grammar and toward "an equally single-minded focus on meaning" (Long 2000, p. 182). In other words, accuracy became unimportant, and fluency was everything – what Savignon (1983) described as an "'anything-goes-as-long-as-you-get-the-message-across' approach to second language teaching" (p. 1).

The "non-interface" or "zero grammar" position was built on an early theoretical argument that comprehensible input was all that was necessary for SLA to occur (Krashen 1982). There was really no need to make the rules of the language explicit, and there was therefore really no need to teach students anything about those rules. A problem began to emerge, however. As Long (2000) argued, even though meaning-focused or *purely* communicative lessons might be enjoyable for students, "focusing purely on meaning is inefficient. Studies show rate advantages for learners who receive instruction with attention to code features . . . comprehensible second language input is necessary, but not sufficient" (p. 184).

At the other end of classroom practice were more conservative and traditionally minded teachers emerging from the grammar-translation model. Many of these teachers were open to the aims of CLT but tended to incorporate CLT ideas into their established teacher-fronted practices, thereby developing what came to be known as "weak" CLT. Although acknowledging in theory the communicative purposes of L2 teaching, these teachers continued to pay explicit attention to grammar, using what Long (2000) described as a focus on forms approach. Focus on forms continued to draw on a top-down, teacher-centered, deductive approach to grammar in which the teacher would carefully explain grammatical rules and features before the students made any use of them. This resulted in a lesson structure that came to be known as Presentation-Practice-Production or PPP: first the teacher would present the grammatical rule explicitly; next the students would practice the rule in some way through various grammar exercises; and then the students would produce the rule in some kind of constrained communicative activity (i.e., an activity that required the use of the grammatical rule to complete it successfully). The weak CLT model came to dominate classroom practice in many contexts and will be a familiar pattern to communicatively oriented teachers today. However, one critical weakness of a focus on forms approach, according to Long, was that it tended to lead to "boring lessons, with resulting declines in motivation, attention, and student enrollments" (p. 182).

As the polarizations within CLT began to appear in practice, reflection on refinements gave rise to a range of approaches. TBLT emerged as one such refinement. It came to be viewed as a pedagogical solution to the limitations of CLT that had theoretical and empirical backing. TBLT thus became "a logical development to the CLT paradigm that might address some of the apparent weaknesses of CLT" (East 2012, pp. 22–23).

Major Contributions

Since the advent of CLT in the 1970s, a consensus view had been developing around effective SLA, and there was a pedagogic call for greater focus on communicative activities in L2 classrooms. Brown (2007), for example, noted an emerging "wave of interest" that began to focus on "language as interactive communication among individuals." Teachers choosing to ride this wave began to treat the language classroom as "a locus of meaningful, authentic exchanges among users of language," and language learning was coming to be seen as "the creation of meaning through interpersonal negotiation among learners" (p. 218). Nunan (2004) reinforced this idea when he argued that "learners learn to communicate by communicating" (p. 8). TBLT was therefore a means through which there could be "an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language" (p. 1). Essentially, as Cook (2010) put it, TBLT saw L2 learning as "arising from particular *tasks* that students do in the classroom" (my emphasis). Cook went on to explain that TBLT "reconceptualizes communicative language teaching as tasks rather than the language or cognition-based syllabuses of communicative language teaching" (p. 512).

In other words, in TBLT "task" became the central organizing principle, in contrast to arranging programs along linear and hierarchical rule-based lines (i.e., a form of analytic syllabus focusing on communicative purpose rather than a synthetic syllabus that views acquisition as grammatically accumulative). Engagement in tasks became the fundamental goal of task-based lessons.

For TBLT to be effective, however, it needed to address certain issues. First, the concept of task needed to be differentiated from the kinds of communicative activity that might be drawn on in the traditional PPP-based weak CLT classroom. A range of theoretical and operational definitions of task were developed (see Samuda and Bygate 2008, for an exhaustive appraisal of various task definitions). In essence, a task could be differentiated from a communicative activity in that, in the latter, the focus would be on using predetermined language to achieve a communicative goal (e.g., use a list of set phrases to buy a railway ticket), whereas, in the former, the focus would be on achieving a nonlinguistic outcome using any language appropriate to the task at hand (e.g., win the debate, win the game). The principal focus therefore became fluency or meaning.

An emphasis on meaning led to a second theoretical issue that TBLT would need to address. At a theoretical level, there was a requirement for TBLT to reconcile fluency and accuracy, that is, following Long's (2000) argument about the inefficiency of a meaning focus, the rules could not be ignored. In order to account for attention to grammar that did not see a return to direct top-down teaching of rules, TBLT began to draw on what Long called a focus on form approach. Focus on form essentially "involves briefly drawing students' attention to linguistic elements (words, collocations, grammatical structures, pragmatic patterns, etc.) *in context,* as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning, or communication" (p. 185). Central to focus on form was the concept that learners could begin to acquire a grammatical rule or pattern when they "noticed" or "attended to" the rule or pattern as they were in the process of using language. From a theoretical perspective, once a structure or form was noticed in the language input, it could become acquired and available for further use.

The major contributions of TBLT to the field of language teaching and learning have therefore been that "[u]nlike weak CLT, grammar is not fore-grounded in a teacher-dominated way. Unlike strong CLT, grammar is not ignored and learners are not left entirely to their own devices to work out the rules" (East 2012, p. 23). East went on to explain that focus on form did not mean that there could be no explicit teaching or practice of grammatical rules which would lead the way to explicit language knowledge, that is, opportunities existed, *after* engagement with language, to *deconstruct* forms that had been noticed and to provide more explicit attention to these forms. However, the grammar that would be focused on was not predicated on having to teach a particular rule at a particular time in a particular way, isolated from language in actual use; instead the grammar to be focused on would arise out of the communication or, rather, the difficulties in communication that students might encounter when using language. The rules would become the means of solving a linguistic challenge through task completion as appropriate to the context.

Allied to task as the central operational unit of TBLT, and focus on form as the guiding principle for attention to grammar, other issues have dominated theorizing about TBLT and have influenced work in the TBLT space over the last 30 years. A range of research agendas around TBLT have emerged, and many experimental studies have sought to investigate the efficacy of tasks in promoting SLA. Research agendas have included investigating task variables such as task complexity (Robinson 2001), task planning (Foster and Skehan 1996), and task repetition (Bygate 2001). Robinson (2011) provides a useful overview of several key research studies in the field, including "early and more recent proposals for how task-based learning can stimulate acquisition processes and the theoretical rationales that have guided research into them" (p. 1).

More practical considerations for TBLT implementation have been included: approaches to task-based syllabus design (Long and Crookes 1992) whereby "task" becomes the unit of analysis for designing a teaching program, kinds of tasks and how students interact with them (Pica et al. 1993), and structuring a task-based lesson to maximum effect (Willis 1996; Willis and Willis 2007).

Thus, emerging support for TBLT found its basis in theoretical considerations about optimal conditions for SLA, informed by empirical studies that aimed to test hypotheses about effective SLA. Robinson (2011) argued, however, that "[a]lthough SLA research has subsequently informed it, TBLT was, initially, a proposal for improving pedagogy with only a slight foundation in empirical research" (p. 4). Pedagogically speaking, it was perhaps not surprising that, coming as it did on the back of polarizations to the overarching CLT approach, different emphases in TBLT in practice began to emerge.

On the one hand, a "strong" view of TBLT (in parallel with strong CLT) became built on the understanding that "the need to transact tasks is seen as adequate to drive forward language development" (Skehan 1996, p. 39). This made task execution "the necessary and sufficient condition of successful second language acquisition" (Nunan 2004, p. 21). As East (2012) argued, however, a strong version of TBLT can lead to the perception that TBLT is "effectively a teacher-free zone, in which tasks work their effect without any need for mediation" (p. 82). The limitations inherent within a strong CLT model also impact on strong TBLT.

On the other hand, "weak" TBLT came to utilize a framework whereby tasks would still be central, but their use "may be preceded by focused instruction, and after use, may be followed by focused instruction which is contingent on task performance" (Skehan 1996, p. 39). Skehan's model effectively creates "pre-task," "during-task," and "after-task" phases of the lesson. Pre-task work "can aim to teach, or mobilize, or make salient language which will be relevant to task performance" (p. 53). At its simplest, this might involve direct teaching of required lexis or, more indirectly, getting students to research for themselves, individually or in groups, the words they might need. Post-task work enables a focus on language form. As Skehan acknowledged, the weak TBLT model is pretty close to a weak CLT model. Its operational differences come in terms of how task is defined and where grammar fits within the stages of the instructional process (i.e., not as antecedent to communication, as in weak CLT, but proceeding from communication).

In light of emerging interpretations to TBLT in practice, it is not surprising, and it is also highly important, that works in progress have turned the spotlight on TBLT as enacted in real-world classrooms.

Work in Progress

In terms of research and its influence on operationalization, Robinson (2011) argued that SLA researchers have been "concerned with explaining the effects of design features of tasks, and their implementation, on learning" (p. 5). These researchers have gone on to draw conclusions from their findings that they believed had implications for what should happen in classrooms. However, as Robinson noted, studies into the effects of tasks are usually conducted in experimental settings. It can be hard to draw generalizable implications for actual real-world classrooms.

A more recent strand of research has focused not on task in experimental settings but on task as understood and put into operation by real teachers in real classrooms (Andon and Eckerth 2009; Carless 2003, 2007; East 2012; Van den Branden et al. 2009; Xiongyong and Samuel 2011). This strand of research has highlighted the reality that teachers hold an eclectic range of interpretations and understandings of TBLT and make context-specific adaptations to TBLT.

For example, Andon and Eckerth (2009), studying four teachers' conceptualizations of TBLT in a Western context, found that teachers' understandings and pedagogical choices were influenced, on a lesson-by-lesson basis, by student expectations and contextual factors. Additionally, a range of sometimes contradictory and contrasting beliefs held by the teachers seemed to exert an influence. In practice teachers did not claim any buy-in to a wholesale task-based approach, even though they were happy to consider components that aligned with a task-based theoretical framework. In other words, they would make eclectic choices, drawing on a range of approaches to fit the context. In light of these findings, Andon and Eckerth argued that it was "entirely appropriate" to draw on TBLT theories and concepts as "provisional specifications" (p. 306), rather than as determinants for action.

Working in a contrasting Confucian heritage culture (CHC) context for L2 learning, Carless (2007, 2009) was interested in investigating a Hong Kong initiative to officially adopt TBLT in primary schools (since the mid-1990s) and secondary schools (since 2001), enacted through prescribed syllabi. Drawing on semi-structured interviews with teachers and teacher educators, Carless (2007) concluded, similarly to Andon and Eckerth (2009), that TBLT specifications had become in practice part of an "an eclectic compromise," this time leading to a realization of TBLT "with local characteristics" (p. 600). In this case, the "local characteristics" were essentially a CHC emphasis on transmission and mastery of knowledge and the rote learning of rules and meanings which conflicted with the learner-centered and experiential emphases of TBLT and which required context-specific interpretation of TBLT.

Recent studies that have focused on the teachers' perspective bring to the surface several underlying tensions for TBLT. It seems that, when faced with making

decisions about what to do in their classrooms, teachers who may have some level of theoretical appreciation of TBLT nevertheless make choices to select elements of a TBLT framework and to integrate these elements alongside other (no doubt more familiar or established) elements that may not be "task based" at all. As East (2012) argued, despite growing interest in the power of TBLT to transform language teaching and learning, TBLT represents an innovation, and its introduction into L2 programs is neither straightforward nor easy. The issue of effective implementation of TBLT points to challenges that still need to be overcome.

Problems and Difficulties

As Robinson's (2011) useful summary made clear, theorizing and empirical research appear to have been largely supportive of the TBLT endeavor. Nevertheless, a substantial difficulty facing TBLT is that it has been subject to different emphases which have confounded teachers' understanding of what task and TBLT are. Also, TBLT has been subject to critique and counterarguments that bring its efficacy, particularly in instructed L2 contexts, into question. Swan (2005), for example, was highly critical of the effectiveness of TBLT in instructed contexts. In his view, a purely task-based approach cannot guarantee that language learners will encounter all of the most frequent and useful language items they may need. Also, a good deal of what students may notice may be inadequately processed and quickly forgotten. According to Swan, a remedy for these limitations requires planned approaches, careful selection and prioritizing of what is to be taught, and thorough rehearsal of key material.

From a theoretical perspective, Swan's (2005) arguments against TBLT can be refuted somewhat by reference, for example, to Skehan's (1996) task-based lesson sequence (which would surely allow for adequate scaffolding of the task at hand). However, research into teachers' contemporary perspectives appears to suggest that eclecticism is more highly favored than a task-based framework. More work is needed to develop greater understanding of how a task-based framework can be presented and utilized in ways that are convincing both to teachers and to theorists who argue against the positive claims of TBLT.

Certainly, the studies that have investigated the teachers' perspective have raised significant issues around the operationalization of TBLT in real-world classrooms. On this basis East (2012) asserted that theorists, researchers, and curriculum developers may well promote and investigate TBLT because of its potential power as a beneficial approach to L2 learning, but getting teachers to make TBLT work at the "chalk-face" is not without considerable challenges.

Taking both theoretical definitions and actual practices into consideration, it appears that the notion of task is still "somewhat fuzzy" (Richards 2006, p. 31) and that there remain "numerous interpretations and orientations to the concept" of TBLT (Nunan 2004, p. 14). It can therefore be "difficult to identify what, exactly, TBL [task-based learning] is, as significant differences can be seen in the way its various proponents have conceptualized the approach" (Hall 2011, p. 97).

In practice, therefore, it appears that there is no one right way of "doing TBLT." In turn (and notwithstanding empirical support), the argument that TBLT is a more effective pedagogical approach in practice than, say, an approach that focuses more strongly on rules and grammar (i.e., analytic vs. synthetic), is arguably more an ideological than an evidential position. Certainly, contrasting standpoints on the effectiveness of TBLT in instructed L2 contexts need to be taken into account (e.g., Swan 2005; Van den Branden et al. 2009). Alongside that, more research is needed into teachers' (and students') understandings of TBLT and task and their reception of tasks in actual classrooms.

Future Directions

At first sight, TBLT appears to have much to offer to L2 pedagogy as a foil for the limitations that became apparent within CLT. On closer inspection, it is apparent that there is still work to do if TBLT is to become more established in classroom practices worldwide.

Teachers represent a key element to the successful implementation of TBLT. Despite his claim to TBLT as having status approaching the "new orthodoxy," Littlewood (2004) went on to argue that "teachers and others are often not at all certain as to what a task-based approach really does mean" (p. 319). Herein lies a genuine weakness for TBLT going forward, which recent research into TBLT from the teachers' perspective has illuminated. Moving into the future, teachers require a range of levels of support so that they can come to their own theory, research, and practice-informed understandings of what TBLT might mean for them in their own local contexts.

There is in fact considerable support for TBLT going forward, in particular in the arena of creating a nexus between research and practice. For example, a series of biennial international conferences on TBLT has now become established, founded under the auspices of the International Consortium on Task-Based Language Teaching. These conferences provide opportunities for researchers and practitioners to meet and for sharing of both research and practice.

Additionally, teachers need support with understanding what a task is in practice and how to implement tasks in their classrooms. The establishment, in 2015, of an International Association for Task-Based Language Teaching (IATBLT vzw) in place of the International Consortium provides a forum for teachers to tap into and share resources, support, and information.

Finally, theoretical definitions of task and research findings on tasks need to be presented to teachers in a range of teacher education fora in ways that enable teachers to engage with both theory and practice. Widdowson (1993) argued that "new ideas do need to be mediated effectively and appropriately, that is to say, evaluated for relevance by critical appraisal and application." He went on to assert that "this is where teacher education comes in" (p. 271). His argument, although presented over 20 years ago, is as apposite now as it was then. Intensive teacher education will ideally be delivered through dedicated professional development opportunities that

enable teachers both to be confronted with TBLT and task in theory and to have opportunities to try out those theories in their own classrooms.

In the opening plenary of the very first TBLT conference in 2005, Long (2015) set the scene for future directions. He argued, on the one hand, that TBLT is consistent with research findings into effective instructed SLA. He spoke, on the other hand, of TBLT as "no panacea," but rather a "work in progress" (p. 20) and a journey along "a road as yet unbuilt" (p. 21). Building on teacher education initiatives among practitioners, the agenda for the future needs to include encouraging and investigating the implementation of TBLT in ways that will increase teacher certainty about what they do in their classrooms. Perhaps the most pressing future direction for TBLT research is to investigate what TBLT means in practice for teachers who have encountered and reflected on TBLT in theory and are working toward trying things out in classrooms. Their reflections on what the theories mean for actual practice have the potential to enhance both their and our understanding of TBLT in practice (see, e.g., East 2014a, b). Findings would provide an important next step to those studies that have investigated teachers' current reception and understanding of TBLT. They will also add practical value to what empirical and experimental studies into tasks have so far told us.

Cross-References

► Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in the Asia-Pacific Region
► Task-Based Instruction and Teacher Training

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Gillian Wigglesworth: Task and Performance Based Assessment. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment

References

Andon, N., & Eckerth, J. (2009). Chacun à son goût? Task-based L2 pedagogy from the teacher's point of view. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*(3), 286–310.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Bygate, M. (2001). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of language. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning and testing* (pp. 23–48). Harlow: Longman.

Carless, D. (2003). Factors in the implementation of task-based teaching in primary schools. *System, 31*, 485–500.

Carless, D. (2007). The suitability of task-based approaches for secondary schools: Perspectives from Hong Kong. *System, 35*(4), 595–608.

Carless, D. (2009). Revisiting the TBLT versus P-P-P debate: Voices from Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 19*, 49–66.

Cook, V. (2010). Linguistic relativity and language teaching. In V. Cook & A. Bassetti (Eds.), *Language and bilingual cognition* (pp. 509–518). New York: Psychology Press.

East, M. (2012). *Task-based language teaching from the teachers' perspective: Insights from New Zealand*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

East, M. (2014a). Encouraging innovation in a modern foreign language initial teacher education programme: What do beginning teachers make of task-based language teaching? *The Language Learning Journal, 42*(3), 261–274.

East, M. (2014b). Mediating pedagogical innovation via reflective practice: A comparison of pre-service and in-service teachers' experiences. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives, 15*(5), 686–699.

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 299–323.

Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English language teaching: Language in action*. New York: Routledge.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal, 58* (4), 319–326.

Long, M. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In R. D. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 179–192). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Long, M. (2015). TBLT: Building the road as we travel. In M. Bygate (Ed.), *Domains and directions in the development of TBLT: A decade of plenaries from the international conference* (pp. 1–26). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Long, M., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*, 27–56.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 9–34). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, cognitive resources, and syllabus design. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 287–318). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (2011). Task-based language learning: A review of issues. *Language Learning, 61*(s1), 1–36.

Samuda, V., & Bygate, M. (2008). *Tasks in second language learning*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative competence*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 38–61.

Swan, M. (2005). Legislation by hypothesis: The case of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(3), 376–401.

Van den Branden, K., Bygate, M., & Norris, J. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Introducing the reader. In K. Van den Branden, M. Bygate, & J. Norris (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching: A reader* (pp. 1–13). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Widdowson, H. G. (1993). Innovation in teacher development. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 260–275.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow: Longman Pearson Education.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Xiongyong, C., & Samuel, S. (2011). Perceptions and implementation of task-based language teaching among secondary school EFL teachers in China. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(24), 292–302.

Professional Communication

Britt-Louise Gunnarsson

Contents

Introduction 98
Early Developments 99
Major Contributions 100
The Economic–Technical Setting 100
Legal and Bureaucratic Settings 101
The Medical–Social Setting 102
Science and the Academic Setting 102
Work in Progress 103
Problems and Difficulties 106
Future Directions 107
Cross-References 107
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 107
References 108

Abstract

Language for special or specific purposes (LSP) was earlier the main term used for research on communication in professional settings. The history of this field reveals an early theoretical interest in the description of various *sublanguages*, which are assumed to exist within the general language system in response to specific professional needs. Early studies were concerned with the written products, e.g., with specific terminology, text types, and registers. Over time, however, there has been a growing interest in the communicative processes involved, and in their psychological and sociological dimensions, with a theoretical shift towards sociolinguistics, social constructivism, ethnography, conversation analysis, and critical linguistics. Studies have dealt with spoken as well as written discourse and

B.-L. Gunnarsson (✉)
Department of Scandinavian Languages, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden
e-mail: britt-louise.gunnarsson@nordiska.uu.se

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_9

with the complex and diversified interplay between these media. The term *professional discourse* or *professional communication* is preferred to delineate this wider field.

The early LSP traditions developed mainly within foreign language departments, with their orientation towards analysis of the language system. Practical problems relating to translation, standardization of terminology, and design of technical and commercial documents were dealt with. This connection between the study of foreign languages and professional communication still exists, though the problems focused on have shifted somewhat. The earlier interest in language differences has made way for an interest in problems relating to language-in-context, and a sociological approach has been used as well for macroanalysis of organization structure as for microanalysis of workplace interaction. This has meant a gradual acknowledgement of the complexity and multimodality of interaction at work and a broadened methodological frame. In a gradually more globalized professional world, we also find that the cross-cultural dimension, in all its social complexity, is becoming more and more central.

Keywords

Professional discourse • Professional communication • LSP • Plain language • Medical discourse • Academic genres • Scientific discourse • Legal language • Bureaucratic setting • Workplace interaction • Transnational companies • Corporate language

Introduction

The study of professional communication is a dynamic and expanding field. It covers different types of problem areas within society, not only educational problems, but practical and social problems of all kinds. It reflects the varied trends in linguistics and communication research over time, as well as societal and social changes related to the professional world.

Language for specific purposes, LSP, was recognized quite early on as a central field within applied linguistics. Standardization of terminology, computer aids, and document design were concerns for this field, which at a theoretical level was indebted to structuralism and functional stylistics. As linguistics has expanded to include pragmatics, text linguistics, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and critical linguistics, the study of text and talk in professional settings has undergone changes. An interest in more global text patterns and in spoken discourse, combined with a growing awareness of the relationship between text and context, has changed the focus of linguistic investigation. The earlier exclusive focus on verbal elements is now replaced with analyses of the various multimodal dimensions of text and talk.

As theoretical and methodological interests and insights have evolved, the analysis has been able to solve new types of problems. Disciplines like socio- and

psycholinguistics have brought a multidisciplinary approach to the study of professional language and discourse, as has cross-disciplinary collaboration between linguists, on the one hand, and sociologists, ethnomethodologists, psychologists, educationalists, and technicians, on the other. In theoretical terms, the field has travelled from structuralism to constructivism.

Early Developments

The use of language for special purposes is of ancient origin, stemming from the human need to moderate language to suit different types of activities. The systematic study of LSP and the establishment of LSP as a field of academic inquiry, however, has a much shorter history. The oldest branch is concerned with the study of terminology. In the early years of this century, German engineers elaborated lists of terms used within different fields, and the theoretical work of Eugen Wüster in the 1930s laid the foundations for international collaboration to standardize terminology (cf. Wüster 1970).

It is not as easy, however, to determine when the study of texts for specific purposes began. We can find individual studies on business, legal, and scientific languages, for example, quite early on. The 1960s, of course, saw an increase in such work, as with other types of linguistic research. Interest in readability and document design also emerged in the 1960s, leading to the creation of "document design centers." As regards the LSP field in a more organized form, we have to go to the 1970s to find its starting point. In the late 1970s, various activities were in progress, which seem to indicate that LSP had become established as a field of its own. The first European symposium on LSP was held in 1977, the LSP journal *Fachsprache* was launched in 1979, and the journal *English for Specific Purposes* in 1981.

The early history of the LSP field is to a large extent connected with European scholars and European thinking. The study of language for specific purposes was undertaken in a language-based functionalist theoretical framework. The emphasis was on general characteristics at different levels (lexicon, syntax, style) of different sublanguages, such as the medical, economic, legal, and technical sublanguages. The relevant knowledge base was fundamental to this differentiation into *sublanguages*, while functional aspects underlay a differentiation into *text types*.

Traditional, mainstream LSP research could thus be described as language based and product oriented, with the aim of describing and classifying different types of languages for specific purposes and different types of texts. From early on, translation of economic, technical, and other professional texts was a key area of interest to LSP scholars, and special attention has been devoted to the linguistic basis for the translation of documents. In parallel with this Germanistic European LSP tradition, an Anglo-American tradition developed, following a largely different course. The ESP (English for specific purposes) field developed in the USA and in Britain in English language departments, with their strong orientation towards literature and a more global and text-based analysis of different genres. It evolved within academic communities concerned with educational problems relating to teaching students how

to write different types of English texts in a socially acceptable and also a competitive way. The study of ESP therefore came to be combined with an interest in rhetoric, the art of persuasion, and in sociology, the art of socializing and conforming. This tradition, spread through a web of "writing across the curriculum" courses in the English-speaking countries, focused on text patterns – argumentative and persuasive patterns – and the actual writing process rather than on language structure and variation. The social dimension was also central. Writing was analyzed as taking place within a *discourse community*, a socio-rhetorical concept relating to the use of written texts for specialist professional purposes. There is a clear connection between the concepts of *discourse community* and *sublanguage*; those using a particular sublanguage for specific purposes are thus assumed to form a discourse community. Studies have been directed not only towards the genre but also towards the individual writers and their relationship to the discourse community. The interest in the linguistic structure of various sublanguages was replaced by a wider interest in communication in professional settings and in research on both text and talk.

Major Contributions

The following discussion of major contributions will be arranged around different professional settings.

The Economic–Technical Setting

The 1970s and 1980s were the decades of the plain language movement. The idea was to formulate strategies and rules for writers that would improve documents of different kinds. Perhaps the most widespread and enduring result of this movement was what were called "readability formulae." Based on a mechanistic view of reading and comprehension, formulae were developed, which could measure the difficulty – readability – of texts. Most of them were based on word and sentence length. The theoretical basis for these formulae is very weak, but they owe their popularity to their simplicity.

This movement, however, is much more than just readability formulae, and some work has been done under this umbrella, which is of a good theoretical standard. Basing their studies on psycholinguistics and cognitive psychology, Linda Flower and John Hayes managed to give their document design work a theoretical orientation. They conducted experiments with readers and writers and came to develop their famous writing model (Hayes and Flower 1980).

"Instructional science" was also used as a basis for document design work, for example, in Europe. Instructional research focuses on the development of procedures for optimizing learning in specific situations. Its aim is to establish rules that specify the most effective way of attaining knowledge or mastering skills. Another field that has contributed to document design work is that of "human factors." Here, methods

and techniques are developed for the application of experimental procedures in real-life situations.

The plain language movement has not ceased to exist, although its focus has shifted. Studies are oriented towards text linguistics and rhetoric with the goal of improving instructions, guidelines, and technical reports, finding adequate strategies for the drafting of sales promotion letters and job applications, and also popularizing difficult documents. The development of *The Journal of Business Communication*, the first number of which appeared already in 1963, reflects this change as does the journal *Information Design Journal + Document Design*. A good example of its broad application is also Shuy (1998), where a number of tools for communicating more clearly in government and business settings are given.

Legal and Bureaucratic Settings

Much work of interest has been carried out within legal and bureaucratic settings. The more purely descriptive work done on the characteristics of legislative language in terms of vocabulary, syntax, and textual patterns (Mellinkoff 1963; Kurzon 1986; Bhatia 1987) can be seen as forming the foundation for the more process-oriented studies. Other work had a sociological foundation, analyzing the functions of laws and other legal texts (Danet 1980).

One legal problem area relates to the asymmetries in reading comprehension between lay people and professionals. Being undertaken with the aim of facilitating reading and comprehension for the ordinary man or woman, these studies have come to clearly reflect the theoretical situation within psycholinguistics. In the 1960s, legislative texts were analyzed and assessed in relation to their readability, which involved a mechanical way of analyzing documents at a surface level. An analysis of jury instructions by Charrow and Charrow (1979) represented a step forward. Their ideas for reform derived from a number of linguistic factors, but they were not based on any theory of text comprehension or on a very searching analysis of the societal function of the texts.

Other studies have had a more theoretical foundation. On the basis of a critique of previous research, Gunnarsson (1984) rejected the concern with lexis or syntax, which went no further than memorization or ability to paraphrase, and developed a theory of functional comprehensibility focusing on perspective and function orientation (implications for action). The reading of laws and text comprehension is here viewed in a societal framework.

Difficulties due to asymmetries have also interested scholars of spoken legal discourse. Courtroom proceedings and police encounters have been analyzed by linguists, sociologists, and ethnographers. Studies have focused on different types of content and argumentative features, in order to reveal how utterances are part of a prior and anticipated context. Cross-examination, question–answer patterns, topic progression and recycling, argumentative structure, and story patterns have been analyzed (Atkinson and Drew 1979; Drew 1992). Other studies have focused on the understanding and interpretation of utterances. Within a sociolinguistic

theoretical framework, experiments have been carried out with different versions of utterances, in order to test powerful and powerless speech, gender differences, etc., in style, self-presentation, and tone of voice (Conley and O'Barr 1998; O'Barr 1982).

Important work has also been done on the pretrial phase, which is police interrogation. Cicourel (1968) analyzed the part played by police questioning in the long bureaucratic judicial process. In this pioneering work, he studied the social construction of "cases," particularly the formation and transformation of the images of young delinquents as the cases pass through the legal system (police, social workers, probation officers, prosecutors, courts). Lynch (1982) studied argumentation in pretrial versus trial situations, and Jönsson (1988), the interplay between police interrogation and the written police report. Other studies have examined the role and effectiveness of legal interpretation. As well in police interrogations as in the court room, interpreters play essential roles for the process (Berk-Seligson 1990, 2000).

The Medical–Social Setting

Medical discourse has also been studied from a variety of angles. The problems that arise between doctors and patients have been seen to a large extent as interactional, and it has been assumed that it is possible to do something about them. The asymmetries between doctor and patient have been analyzed in various ways. Mishler (1984) talked about the two different voices in doctor–patient interaction, the voice of medicine and the voice of the lifeworld, which represent different ways of conceptualizing and understanding patients' problems. The different perspectives in medical interaction have been the concern of Cicourel, one of the founders of doctor–patient research. By means of conversational analysis of extracts from doctor–patient encounters, he was able to reveal important sources of miscommunication (Cicourel 1981).

Among the different medical specialities, psychiatric treatment has been of particular interest to linguists. A well-known example is Labov and Fanshel's work on therapeutic discourse (1977). Analyses have also focused on neurotic and psychotic language, interaction with aphasia and dementia sufferers, and talk to and about old people. In Sarangi and Roberts (1999), several important analyses of discourse in medical settings are presented and placed in their theoretical and methodological framework.

Science and the Academic Setting

Writing at the college and university level and the different academic genres of writing have attracted the attention of many researchers. Much research has been steered by the practical need to improve the teaching of writing in the college

classroom. The so-called Freshman Writing Program in the USA, which involves all college students, has thus led to a large number of studies on genres and on the writing process. Many of these focus on the learner's adjustment to the academic discourse community from a sociological angle (e.g., Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995; Swales 1990), while other studies stress the negotiative character of writing in a truly Bakhtinian sense (e.g., Flower 1994).

Academic genres have also been studied from a cross-cultural angle, with the aim of revealing differences and improving L2 writing. The contrastive rhetoric tradition, which has been influenced by the pioneering work of Kaplan in the 1960s, has led to many important studies on differences between the writing of scholars with different language backgrounds (e.g., Connor 1996; Kaplan 1966; Mauranen 1993; Melander et al. 1997). **See also** "► Academic Literacies in Theory and Practice" by Mary Lea.

Additionally, the Australian school, using a systemic functional approach, has been steered by the practical need to elaborate tools to use in the teaching of text writing at different levels (Halliday and Martin 1993).

The complexity of the construction of knowledge and the historical development of scientific discourse has interested other scholars. In a pioneering study, Bazerman (1988) analyzed the rise of modern forms of scientific communication, focusing on the historical emergence of the experimental article. The sociohistorical development of academic genres has also been studied using the technique of text linguistics (Gunnarsson 2009, pp. 55–80).

In Hyland (2003), a complex methodological framework is used to describe social interaction in academic writing, including praise and criticism, citation and intertextuality, power and authority, and the construction of expertise.

Work in Progress

The studies, which will be discussed, under this heading all relate to discourse in organizations, institutions, or workplaces. With a theoretical orientation towards sociology and organization/network theory, social constructivism, critical linguistics, ethnography, and conversation analysis, these studies try to grasp and understand problem areas relating to the complexity and diversity of communication in the professions (see Bazerman and Paradis 1991; Gunnarsson et al. 1997). The aim is not mainly to describe differences relating to the various professions but to find macro- and microstructures in professional discourse as such. In many ways, these studies can be seen as pointing towards the future.

The relationship between organizational structure and culture, hierarchy and writing activities have earlier been elucidated in a variety of studies, using methods ranging from pure survey to ethnographic observation. What characterizes the work in progress in this area, however, is its close connection to sociolinguistics and to work on organizations within sociology.

Gunnarsson (2009) gives an account of research related to different types of organizations. In one study, the writing activities of a local government office were analyzed in relation to its internal structure – hierarchies, clusters, role patterns – as well as to the external networks to which the actors/writers belong. Within this workplace, complexity was found to be related to the roles played by the writer, the network structure, and also the intertwinement of spoken and written discourse. Complexity was also found central within larger organizations, which were the focus of a contrastive study. Banks and structural engineering companies were studied in three countries: Germany, UK, and Sweden. Based on interview data and analyses of texts, the relationship between discourse, organizations, and national cultures was explored. The organizational ideas and communicative policies of each enterprise are found to matter for the structure of discourse at the same time as national cultural patterns can be distinguished.

Sarangi and Roberts (1999, pp. 1–57) give a valuable theoretical perspective on the dynamics of institutional and interactional orders in work-related discourse, which are likely to form a background for future studies on institutional discourse. Another methodology to describe the orders and disorders of discourse is found in Wodak (1997), which focuses on the complexity due to the institutional structure in a medical setting, an outpatients' clinic at an Austrian hospital. The actual discourse between the medical actors – doctor, nurse, patient, and relatives – is analyzed in relation to a macro description of the institution as a working organization, comprising an analysis of roles, routines, and events. The research team found a clear relationship between the setting, the physical and mental state of the professionals, and the actual conversation. The doctors' behavior towards the patients, for instance, the length of the conversation, the tone, and the degree of mutual understanding, varies with the degree of stress and tension caused by the events occurring. The Wodak study was carried out within the critical discourse analysis paradigm, and it has also found a direct application in that the research team have based courses for doctors on their results.

Microanalysis of workplace interaction is another expanding research area, and also here a broad range of methodologies have been used for the analysis of talk at work: conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, politeness theory, and interactional sociolinguistics. The sociological approach is a common denominator for these studies, which aim at a description of the various *communities of practice* within professional life (Barton and Tusting 2005). Several studies have analyzed workplaces in New Zealand, then focusing on power, politeness, leadership, and ethnicity (Holmes and Stubbe 2003; Holmes et al. 2011).

A particular focus in workplace studies has been on interaction in multilingual settings. Analyzing studies of multilingualism in the workplace carried out in different regions, Gunnarsson (2013) reveals how workplace discourse have been influenced by a series of changes taking place in recent decades. Important studies have focused interaction involving immigrants with other mother tongue than the dominant language at work (Clyne 1994; Gunnarsson 2009, pp. 173–194; Nelson 2010).

Encounters in working life have also been focused on from the perspective of the complexity of the social and cultural dimensions involved. Kelly-Holmes and

Mautner (2010) give insights into how market forces affect the workplace practice and the language training of underprivileged workers, for instance, in Asia.

Considerable practical interest attaches to intercultural negotiations, and many studies have focused on negotiations between individuals from different cultures and with different mother tongues. Firth (1995) includes studies of negotiations in intraorganizational encounters, in commodity trading, and in professional–lay interactions. Professional communication in international settings is also dealt with in Pan et al. (2002), where the focus is on the communicative activities of telephone calls, resumés (or CV), presentations, and meetings.

A current theme within studies of professional discourse is related to the communicative practices within transnational companies.

In Jämtelid (2001), a study on the multilingual practices of a transnational company with its head office in Sweden is discussed. The term *parallel writing* is used to describe the practices established within the Electrolux group. This term relates to text writing in different languages based on a common raw material, which is sent out from the head office in Stockholm. The selling offices throughout the world receive this raw material, from which they can choose ideas and parts for the writing of customer brochures in their respective language and for their respective group of customers. The role of translating is thus minimized and mainly reserved for official documents like annual reports. For the designing of courses for translators, results like this are indeed of great relevance.

In a globalized business world, many companies are forced to choose one language as its corporate language. Most transnational enterprises have chosen English as their corporate language, as Nickerson (1998) could show over a decade ago. The important role of English as lingua franca in the internal e-mail correspondence and in cross-border meetings in Finnish–Swedish mergers are shown in Kankaanranta (2005) and Kangasharju (2007). English is the common denominator for staff and managers with Finnish and Swedish as their first language.

Other studies discuss problems relating to the adoption of English as corporate language. Lønsmann (2011), who analyzed a Danish pharmaceutical company, found that this company which newly had gone international was an extremely diverse environment with regard to language competence and language use. Beliefs about how language should function in a Danish company also created boundaries between groups. In addition, these studies are of great relevance for the teaching of language for specific purposes in the future. **See also** "► English as a Lingua Franca and Multilingualism" by Barbara Seidlhofer.

Another subarea where there is much work in progress relates to the complexity due to new technology. Since the 1990s, an increased number of studies have focused on the use of fax, e-mail, and other computer-mediated genres for business purposes (Bargiela-Chiappini and Nickerson 1999), and the multimodal character of discourse is explored in a variety of professional interactions (LeVine and Scollon 2004; Norris and Jones 2005). Meetings and negotiations by means of video technique have been recorded and analyzed as have interaction in call centers. In the modern, globalized world, Internet is used by large organizations for multiple purposes, such as marketing of products, recruitment of staff, and

construction of an attractive presentation of their organizational self (Gunnarsson 2014).

Problems and Difficulties

The first problem that should be considered is one touched on earlier. It relates to the historical disciplinary divide between studies of written discourse and work on spoken discourse. Studies of nonverbal communication and new technology, too, are often departmentally separated from studies of other types of discourse, as they are carried out in communication and technology departments, rather than in language and sociology departments. It should be said, however, that this problem can be solved and that many steps have already been taken to bridge the gap, including conferences and joint volumes, and multiplex studies of real-life communication.

The second major problem in this field is the complexity of professional life and the variation from one environment to another. It is not always possible to generalize from one workplace to another, and even less from one culture to another. In addition, continuous – and often very rapid – changes take place in the various organizations and institutions, which means that painstaking studies, taking years to complete, are sometimes obsolete before they are finished and made known to the public.

A third and related problem has to do with establishing the right research contacts. It is not always easy for the researcher to gain access to the authentic workplace situation he or she wishes to observe. Many situations are too sensitive, which means that the presence of an outsider could ruin the outcome. Much of what happens in the business world is cloaked in strict secrecy, and many professionals are afraid to reveal their strategies to outsiders and, of course, to competitors.

A fourth problem concerns the acceptance of one's results, on the one hand, among fellow researchers and, on the other, among practitioners. The researcher studying communication in the professions has to balance between two worlds – the academic and the practical – a task that is most certainly very complicated. Most of the studies presented in this chapter are accepted as solid research. It is probably safe to say, however, that most of this work is little known among the practitioners concerned.

The dissemination of research results to practitioners and to teachers of communication in the professions is, of course, of vital importance. Much teaching of LSP and professional communication, for example, in foreign languages, lack unnecessarily a solid theoretical foundation. The transfer of knowledge from studies on professional communication to the actual teaching of business Spanish, legal German, etc., does not always take place. Although far from impossible, it has to be said that bridging this gap is sometimes quite problematic.

Last but not least, I would like to focus on the problems arising from the dominance of the rich parts of the world and their special languages in relation to research and teaching. Though important work was done as early as the 1970s on the development of course materials and textbooks specifically for use on English for

science and technology courses in the developing countries, the rich-world bias still prevails in the great flood of books that have spread around the globe. It is also to be regretted that, here as elsewhere, we know so little about studies on the smaller and less known special languages, in particular those used in the developing world.

Future Directions

To grasp the complexity and diversity of authentic situations in the professional world, theoretical and methodological integration must – and is likely to – take place within the field of professional discourse and communication. Such studies will need to adopt a holistic approach, that is, to include all kinds of communication – written, spoken, and new technology. Analysis of the interplay between written and spoken discourse is already under way, but much more needs to be done in order to grasp what is really happening. A few studies have dealt with new technology – e-mail, fax, telephone, video conferences, etc. – but future research will have to explore these types of communication in greater detail. In particular, it will be necessary to analyze the new roles of and the interplay between traditional discourse types and this new technology in a changing professional world. What medium is used for what purpose, by whom, and in what situation?

The use and function of different languages in the professions is another area that has been touched upon, but in which a lot more needs to be done. In a more and more internationally oriented professional world, language choice is a complex issue. In a multilingual professional community, different languages are likely to serve different functions and also to have differing prestige. Translation issues are, of course, always central, but what is of growing importance in a rapid international interchange of information and ideas is the parallel production of discourse (spoken as well as written) in different languages.

In order to grasp the complexity of real life, it will be necessary to use a multiplex methodology, drawing on the traditional quantitative as well as qualitative traditions. It will also be necessary to analyze the practices in professional settings in different parts of the world, that is, to study medical communication in China, Korea, and Brazil, and the use of different languages and different language mixes for professional purposes.

Cross-References

► Content-Based Instruction

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Mary R. Lea: Academic Literacies in Theory and Practice. In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

Barbara Seidlhofer: English as a Lingua Franca and Multilingualism. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

Ifigenia Mahili: Language Awareness and Multilingual Workplace. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

References

Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court. The organization of verbal interaction in judicial settings*. London: Macmillan.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F., & Nickerson, C. (Eds.). (1999). *Writing business: Genres, media and discourses*. New York: Longman.

Barton, D., & Tusting, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Beyond communities of practice. Language, power, and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge. The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Bazerman, C., & Paradis, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Textual dynamics of the professions. Historical and contemporary studies of writing in professional communities*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication. Cognition/culture/power*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Berk-Seligson, S. (1990). *The bilingual courtroom: Court interpreters in the judicial process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berk-Seligson, S. (2000). Interpreting for the police: Issues in pre-trial phases of the judicial process. *Forensic Linguistics, 7*, 212–237.

Bhatia, V. K. (1987). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London/New York: Longman.

Charrow, R. P., & Charrow, V. R. (1979). Making legal language understandable: A psycholinguistic study of jury instructions. *Columbia Law Review, 79*(7), 1306–1374.

Cicourel, A. (1968). *The social organization of juvenile justice*. New York: Wiley.

Cicourel, A. (1981). Language and medicine. In C. A. Ferguson & S. Brice Heath (Eds.), *Language in the USA* (pp. 407–429). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, M. (1994). *Inter-cultural communication at work. Cultural values in discourse*. Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Conley, J., & O'Barr, W. (1998). *Just words: Law, language, and power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric. Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Danet, B. (1980). Language in the legal process. *Law and Society Review, 14*(3), 447–564.

Drew, P. (1992). Contested evidence in courtroom cross-examination: The case of a trial for rape. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Firth, A. (Ed.). (1995). *The discourse of negotiation. Studies of language in the workplace*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Flower, L. (1994). *The construction of negotiated meaning. A social cognitive theory of writing*. Carbondale/Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Gunnarsson, B.-L. (1984). Functional comprehensibility of legislative texts: Experiments with a Swedish Act of Parliament. *Text, 4*(1–3), 71–105.

Gunnarsson, B.-L. (2009). *Professional discourse*. London/New York: Continuum.

Gunnarsson, B.-L. (2013). Multilingualism in the workplace. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 33*, 1–28.

Gunnarsson, B.-L. (2014). Business discourse in the globalized economy: The construction of an attractive workplace culture on the Internet. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Discourse in context* (Contemporary applied linguistics, Vol. 3, pp. 91–112). London/New Delhi/New York/Sydney: Bloomsbury.

Gunnarsson, B.-L., Linell, P., & Nordberg, B. (Eds.). (1997). *The construction of professional discourse*. London/New York: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. R. (1993). *Writing science: Literacy and discursive power*. London: Falmer.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 3–30). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and politeness in the workplace. A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work*. London: Pearson Education.

Holmes, J., Marra, M., & Vine, B. (2011). *Leadership, discourse, and ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Disciplinary discourses. Social interactions in academic writing*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Jämtelid, K. (2001). Multilingual text production at an international company. In F. Mayer (Ed.), *Language for special purposes: Perspectives for the new millenium* (Vol. 2, pp. 797–805). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Jönsson, L. (1988). *Polisförhöret som kommunikationssituation* (Studies in communication, Vol. 23). Linköping: Linköping University.

Kangasharju, H. (2007). Interaktion och inflytande. Finländare och svenskar vid mötesbordet. In O. Kangas & H. Kangasharju (Eds.), *Ordens makt och maktens ord. Svenskt i Finland – Finskt i Sverige IV* (pp. 341–377). Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.

Kankaanranta, A. (2005). *'Hej Seppo, could you pls comment on this!' Internal Email Communication in Lingua Franca English in a Multinational Company*. Jyväskylä: Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä.

Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning, 16*, 1–20.

Kelly-Holmes, H., & Mautner, G. (Eds.). (2010). *Language and the market*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kurzon, D. (1986). *It is hereby performed. Legal speech acts* (Pragmatics & beyond, VII: 6). Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse. Psychotherapy as conversation*. Orlando: Academic.

LeVine, P., & Scollon, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Discourse and technology. Multimodal discourse analysis*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Lønsmann, D. (2011). *English as corporate language. Language choice and language ideologies in an international company in Denmark*. Roskilde: Roskilde University.

Lynch, M. E. (1982). Closure and disclosure in pre-trail argument. *Human Studies, 5*, 285–318.

Mauranen, A. (1993). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Melander, B., Swales, J., & Fredrickson, K. (1997). Journal abstracts from three academic fields in the United States and Sweden: National or disciplinary proclivities? In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and style of academic discourse*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mellinkoff, D. (1963). *The language of the law*. Boston: Little Brown, & Co.

Mishler, E. G. (1984). *The discourse of medicine. Dialectics of medical interviews*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Nelson, M. (2010). *Andraspråkstalare i arbete. En språkvetenskaplig studie av kommunikation vid ett svenskt storföretag* (Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk, 82). Uppsala: Swedish Science Press.

Nickerson, C. (1998). Corporate culture and the use of written English within British subsidiaries in The Netherlands. *English for Specific Purposes, 17*(3), 281–294.
Norris, S., & Jones, R. H. (2005). *Discourse in action. Introducing mediated discourse analysis*. London/New York: Routledge.
O'Barr, M. (1982). *Linguistic evidence: Language, power and strategy in the courtroom*. New York: Academic.
Pan, Y., Scollon, S., & Scollon, R. (2002). *Professional communication in international settings*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell.
Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (Eds.). (1999). *Talk, work and institutional order. Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Shuy, R. W. (1998). *Bureaucratic language in government and business*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis. English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis and the study of doctor-patient interaction. In B.-L. Gunnarsson, P. Linell, & B. Nordberg (Eds.), *The construction of professional discourse* (pp. 173–200). London/New York: Longman.
Wüster, E. (1970). *Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik besonders in der Eletrotechnik* (Dritte abermals ergänzte Auflage). Bonn: Bouvier.

CLIL: A European Approach to Bilingual Education

Tarja Nikula

Contents

Introduction 112
Early Developments 113
Major Contributions 115
Work in Progress 117
Problems and Difficulties 119
Future Directions 120
Cross-References 121
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 122
References 122

Abstract

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) is a term used especially in Europe for forms of bilingual education where an additional language, in most cases English, is used as the language of instruction in nonlanguage school subjects. This chapter outlines the development of CLIL, embedded both in European level policies and in growing awareness of the new orientations to language learning introduced, for example, in language immersion research. Because of its potential to serve as a context for meaningful language use and situated language learning, CLIL has been regarded by EU institutions as an important instrument to foster European citizens' bi- and multilingualism, to be offered alongside regular foreign language teaching for students in mainstream education. This chapter introduces the main strands of CLIL research that have revealed a great deal of the possibilities and challenges that CLIL as an educational approach entails, for both students and teachers. Overall, there has been a shift in emphasis in research from studies orienting to effects of CLIL on

T. Nikula (✉)
Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylän, Finland
e-mail: tarja.nikula@jyu.fi

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_10

language learning outcomes to studies that point towards the need to adopt a truly integrated view on language and content and to explore the potential that CLIL has in supporting the development of subject literacies.

Keywords
Content and language integration • Language learning • Content learning • Subject-specific language • Bilingual education • EU policy

Introduction

Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) refers to using an additional language as the means of instruction in nonlanguage school subjects. The term was established in mid-1990s in Europe where it received political support from the European Union as a key element in its multilingualism policy: CLIL was seen as an important means with which mainstream schools could foster their students' bi- and multilingual skills. As the term implies, attention to both content and language learning forms the core of CLIL. Yet, as Dalton-Puffer (2011, p. 184) notes, CLIL is content driven in that lessons are scheduled as content lessons (history, biology, chemistry, etc.), with subject curricula defining their learning goals. From the outset, CLIL definitions have been broad, allowing for a range of implementations. According to Marsh (2002, p. 58), for example, CLIL is "any activity in which a foreign language is used as a tool in the learning of a non-language subject in which both language and subject have a joint role." The broadness of the definitions has caused some debate and discussion regarding the relationship of CLIL to other forms of bilingual education, especially immersion (e.g., Cenoz et al. 2014; Lasagabaster and Sierra 2010; Nikula and Mård-Miettinen 2014). There are also obvious parallels between CLIL and content-based instruction, CBI, a curriculum model that has been applied in the North-American context since the 1980s to support L2 learners (e.g., Brinton et al. 1989; Snow and Brinton 1997). While points of convergence exist, such as the basic emphasis on the importance of integrating language and content, there are also different emphases between the approaches, deriving from their different sociocultural contexts. While both immersion and CBI involve teaching through learners' L2 – in a typical CBI scenario, the society's majority language for students with migrant/minority backgrounds and in a typical immersion setting the L2 of a bilingual society for majority language students – in CLIL the language of instruction is usually English or another lingua franca rather than a second language in the surrounding society. Another difference is that it is more common in CLIL than in immersion and CBI that teachers, who are often content rather than foreign language specialists, are nonnative speakers of the language they teach in, and that the target language continues to be offered as a foreign language subject in its own right alongside CLIL lessons (Dalton-Puffer and Smit 2013, p. 256). As this reference to lessons suggests, the term CLIL usually refers to content-based teaching in primary and secondary education, and the following discussion will also

concentrate on these levels. Teaching through languages other than learners' first language is, of course, widespread in tertiary education as well, in English-taught and international programs in particular, but whether to call this CLIL is open for debate (but see Fortanez-Gómez 2013). A point of contention, for example, concerns the extent to which English-medium university programs are explicitly geared towards the double focus of simultaneous learning of target language and content, a core concern in CLIL (for discussion, see Smit and Dafouz 2012; Dafouz and Smit 2014). (See also "► Content-Based Instruction" by Fredricka L. Stoller, this volume; "► Language Awareness in CLIL," by Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe).

Early Developments

Europe has a long history of forms of bilingual education. However, in the Europe of the 1990s, accelerated by the processes of political and economic integration, a need was felt for a unified orientation to bilingual education, strongly influenced by the various policy initiatives that urged the educational institutions to meet the demands of diversifying societies in the multilingual continent and in the rapidly globalizing era. This led to the establishment and adoption of the terms CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) and EMILE (Enseignement d'une Matière par l'Intégration d'une Langue Etrangère) in 1994 to mark a specifically European approach to bilingual education. CLIL draws on and acknowledges other forms of bilingual education, especially immersion, yet a new label was opted for to highlight the vision of CLIL as a mainstream European undertaking and as an initiative to introduce bilingual education also in areas where such concerns had not earlier been on the political agenda and where L1 instruction had been the norm. Especially influential in steering the educational policies was the 1995 *White Paper on Education* by the European Commission which outlined that European citizens should be able to communicate in three languages, the local/national language and two other European languages (European Commission 1995; see also Coyle 2008 for an overview of early developments). Apart from EU policies, CLIL was from the start also supported by the Council of Europe, in particular through the activities of its *European Centre for Modern Languages*, as well as promoted by the many cross-national expert groups formed to develop and define CLIL. The pan-European nature of CLIL was also visible in the establishment of many EU-funded networks for CLIL stakeholders such as *CLIL Compendium* or *CLIL Cascade Network* (CCN) which provided freely accessible models and guidelines for practitioners.

Due to these developments, CLIL started to spread across the continent right from the start. The 2006 Eurydice report indicated only a handful of countries with no CLIL provision. It also showed that CLIL provision was mostly small scale and that it tended to concentrate in (upper) secondary levels (Eurydice 2006). Reasons for introducing CLIL seem to vary across Europe. In countries such as Spain and more recently Italy, dissatisfaction with the results of foreign language teaching has led to top-down initiatives by educational authorities who have made CLIL provision (usually in certain specified subjects only) a compulsory part of the school system

(see Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe 2010; Di Martino and Di Sabato 2012). In other countries, the competitive edge gained by CLIL, for schools or for society at large, has been a driving force. In the Netherlands, for example, CLIL originates from a few schools for International Education and has resulted in a growing number of secondary level CLIL schools, with up to 50% of the school curriculum taught in English (Admiraal et al. 2006). Breidbach and Viebrock (2012, p. 6) argue that in Germany, CLIL tends to be geared towards "'upgrading' top level schools," the spread of CLIL being supported by the political agendas of local governments. In countries such as Austria and Finland, CLIL has been offered since the 1990s but usually as rather small-scale realizations, perhaps due to the lack of strict nation-level policy guidelines and perceived lack of concerted support from educational authorities (Nikula and Järvinen 2013; Dalton-Puffer et al. 2011).

The early publications on CLIL include general introductions to this form of education (e.g., Fruhauf et al. 1996; Marsh and Langé 1999). Given its context dependency, the main emphasis tended to be on publications that described forms of implementation and instances of good practice in different countries, such pooling of experiences being an important step towards coherent views of CLIL. One of the first major European reports on CLIL was *CLIL/EMILE The European Dimension*, edited by David Marsh in 2002. It consisted of reports by key European experts on the relevance and potential of CLIL, descriptive accounts of forms of implementation in different counties and educational contexts, as well as recommendations for good practice.

Because CLIL represented a completely new educational approach in many areas where L1 had traditionally been in use, there was a need to describe CLIL pedagogy to help teachers in their new undertaking of teaching subjects through a foreign language. An influential early contribution in this area was the 4Cs Framework by Coyle (1999). It highlights the importance of content as the starting point in CLIL, and the necessity to relate content learning to communication (language), cognition (thinking), and culture (awareness of self and others). This model and its further developments (Coyle 2007) also elucidate the role of language in learning as the means and objective of learning as well as the prerequisite for engaging in higher-order thinking skills, framed as a distinction between language *of* learning, *for* learning, and *through* learning. In Coyle's (2007, p. 552) words, this represents a view of language that "combines learning to use the language and using language to learn."

From the outset, questions concerning learning outcomes have been prominent within the CLIL research agenda. At first, the effects on language learning tended to be discussed mainly in terms of the possibilities that content-based teaching offers (e.g., contributions in Marsh 2002). Järvinen's (1999) study is an early example of empirical research on language learning in CLIL, with a focus on primary school students and syntactic development. The proliferation of studies in this research area started to gain full momentum around mid-2000s (see below). As regards studies on content learning outcomes, research in the early phases provided insights into conceptual and cognitive development (Bonnet 2004; Jäppinen 2005). The studies suggested that learning of content is not adversely affected by the use of a foreign

language, bearing in mind the factors relating to students' general cognitive development.

Major Contributions

Although CLIL is a relatively young research area, the research on language learning has accumulated particularly quickly, probably powered by questions concerning its suitability and functionality as a method to teach and learn foreign languages. There are a number of research overviews addressing language learning in CLIL (e.g., Dalton-Puffer 2011; Nikula and Mård-Miettinen 2014; Ruiz de Zarobe 2011). These suggest that the most obvious advantages of CLIL for language learning concern vocabulary expansion, which is understandable as content-based teaching brings along the specialized sets of lexicon in different subject areas. CLIL learners have also been found to display greater sensitivity to syntactic complexity and text structuring, even if findings in these areas are somewhat contradictory. Findings of a large-scale DESI project in Germany that investigated spoken and written language competences in the school subjects German and English, and which also included a subset of CLIL students, are along similar lines: CLIL students were found to score higher than their non-CLIL counterparts in all competence areas measured (text production, listening comprehension, reading comprehension, grammar, sociopragmatics, writing, and language awareness) (DESI-Konsortium 2008). CLIL thus clearly has the potential to support language learning. However, research to date has not to a sufficient degree explored to what extent positive language learning outcomes depend on greater exposure to L2 and motivational variables and to what extent they derive from CLIL pedagogies. As regards research evidence on the impact of CLIL on learners' communicative skills and courage to use the language, the results are two pronged, either suggesting benefits (Nikula 2005) or pointing to the inherent similarity of CLIL classrooms to any classroom in their tendency towards restricted opportunities for student communication (e.g., Dalton-Puffer 2007). This difference probably relates to pedagogies and classroom practices: mere switching of the instructional language will not turn CLIL classrooms into communicatively enriched environments for language use and learning unless proper attention is also paid to pedagogical solutions that support learner participation.

Content learning has received less comprehensive treatment in CLIL research. Dalton-Puffer (2011: 188) notes that this may be due to the lack of ready-made constructs of subject-specific competence which would allow for CLIL and non-CLIL comparisons as few countries conduct standardized testing for science and social studies subjects. However, the usual message conveyed by the studies that exist is that CLIL students' academic performance is on par with their non-CLIL peers, as suggested, for example, by Bonnet (2004) on scientific literacy and by Badertscher and Bieri (2009) on the development of conceptual knowledge. This suggests that even if the pace of learning may be slower in the beginning, the eventual learning and understanding of the subject does not seem to be adversely

affected by the use of a foreign language. On the other hand, there are also studies pointing to negative effects of CLIL on content learning. For example, Lim Falk's (2008) study on CLIL in science program classes in upper secondary level Swedish schools suggested that CLIL students used less relevant subject-based language in both speech and writing than their peers taught in L1 Swedish.

Classroom discourse has also grown into an important area of CLIL research. Different strands of research can be identified depending on the varied theoretical and methodological perspectives and on whether classroom discourse is studied to explore language learning or whether the focus lies on the examination of social-interactional and communicative aspects of talk and the nature of CLIL classrooms as contexts for language use (for a research overview, see Nikula et al. 2013). A seminal work on CLIL classroom discourse is Dalton-Puffer's (2007) book-length coverage of Austrian secondary school level CLIL classrooms which addressed language learning by exploring content knowledge construction, interactional features such as repair work and directives, and academic language functions. Her study points to the importance of discourse structures in either facilitating or inhibiting the possibilities for language use and learning: excessive focus on students delivering facts can result in impoverished opportunities to engage in meaningful interaction. One research orientation in studies on language use in CLIL classrooms has been to compare it with regular foreign language classrooms. For example, Nikula's (2005) study on secondary level CLIL and EFL classrooms focused on patterns of interaction and showed that CLIL classrooms provided learners with more space for interaction than EFL classrooms. This was indicated, for example, by more extensive student contributions to elaborate on the topics at hand; short, one-word responses to teacher questions were far less common in CLIL than in EFL classrooms. Unlike in EFL classrooms, students were also found to act as initiators of talk through questions addressed either to the teacher or other students.

As CLIL research has expanded, so has its orientation to language. Increasingly, research has emphasized that given the dual focus on language and content, it is not enough to address language learning outcomes solely from the perspective of language as a general, decontextualized set of skills. Instead, the varying roles that language plays in different subject areas and their processes of knowledge construction ought to be acknowledged when assessing language learning in CLIL. Research drawing on systemic functional linguistics and genre-based thinking has been especially influential in developing this line of work. For example, Llinares and Whittaker (2010) analyzed students' spoken and written productions in subject history in CLIL and non-CLIL secondary level classrooms and noted shortcomings in the mastery of genre-appropriate language in both. This suggests that the pivotal role that language plays in learning deserves more attention, and this is the focus in the comprehensive account of the roles of language in CLIL by Llinares et al. (2012). They address the use of appropriate register in CLIL classroom interaction, the language of academic subjects, the notion of genre, and its subject-specific grammatical and lexical features. They also discuss how students' subject-relevant language can be developed in CLIL, and how integrated assessment can be carried out. In the same vein, Lorenzo (2013) argues that genre-based thinking can help teachers

identify the genre and register features in their subjects and recognize how these serve as a major organizing principle of subject-specific discourse (see also "▶ Genres and Institutions: Functional Perspectives on Educational Discourse," by Frances Christie; "▶ Second Language Academic Literacies," by Constant Leung).

From its inception, CLIL has been described as a flexible approach that can be adapted to different contexts according to their specific needs, i.e., there is no one model for CLIL. However, recently there have been calls for more conceptual work on CLIL and for theorization that can help researchers to carve out the core features of CLIL and support practitioners in identifying areas that require attention in implementation. Examples of such conceptual work include the volume by Llinares et al. (2012) which, as discussed above, explores the multifaceted roles of language in CLIL. Another example of conceptualizing content and language integration is Dalton-Puffer's (2013) work on cognitive discourse functions (CDFs) as a point of convergence between subject and language pedagogies. According to Dalton-Puffer (2013, p. 232), CDFs constitute an inventory of discourse patterns that reflect cognitive processes; they are realized in different patterns in different subjects and have a fairly straightforward link to verbal realizations (such as "describe," "evaluate," "hypothesize"). Each subject will thus have its own inventory of the key cognitive discourse functions essential for both teaching and learning. Another recent contribution in this area is by Dafouz and Smit (2014) who in their conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university settings draw attention to six relevant, intersecting components, namely, roles of English (in relation to other languages), academic disciplines (language), management, agents, practices and processes, internationalization and glocalization, the six-way conceptualization making it possible to approach English-medium education as an inherently dynamic, contextually bound, and discursively constrained and constructed phenomenon.

Work in Progress

CLIL has grown into an active research field and, probably as a legacy to its pan-European ethos, has developed into an area involving a great deal of cross-national collaboration. As regards research topics, language learning continues to be a major area of interest. In this area, research based on large and/or longitudinal corpora is called for to complement the overall picture that has predominantly been based on relatively small-scale studies. An example of work in progress in this area is based on the project *CLISS: Content and language integration in Swedish schools* (2010–2014) at the University of Gothenburg, directed by Professor Liss Kerstin Sylvén. CLISS is a 4-year project on the relationship between learning and the language of instruction. It focuses specifically on the development of academic writing of CLIL and non-CLIL students in Swedish upper secondary schools but also examines attitudinal and affective factors involved (e.g., Sylvén and Thompson 2015).

It was pointed out that an important aspect of language learning in CLIL is the learners' socialization into subject-specific literacies. The past and ongoing work conducted in CLIL research projects based at the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid has been important in this area. Based on extensive corpus of classroom data, the work by the UAM team has greatly advanced our understanding of how CLIL students' academic language develops and how CLIL classroom discourse is an arena for both learning content and engaging in interpersonal and social aspects of talk (e.g., Evnitskaya and Morton 2011; Whittaker et al. 2011). The UAM projects have also furthered conceptual work on CLIL and explicated its theoretical and methodological development (e.g., Llinares et al. 2012; Llinares and Morton 2017).

Conceptualizing content and language integration is another one of the ongoing research ventures. The work based on the research project *ConCLIL: Content and language integration, towards a conceptual framework* (2011–2014), based at the University of Jyväskylä, is an example. The team's work is showing that apart from language and content concerns, integration is always also a matter of curriculum and pedagogies, participants as well as classroom practices and hence needs to be addressed in a multidimensional manner (Llinares 2015; Nikula et al. 2016). ConCLIL studies have called for a reorientation in approaching language and language competence in ways that acknowledge subject literacies as an inherent component of such competences. Similar ideas have been presented recently by Meyer et al. (2015) when they argue that it is important to map conceptual development and language development in CLIL within what they call a "pluriliteracies approach."

One aspect of CLIL that has received relatively little research attention so far but for which studies have recently started to emerge concerns the role of bilingual practices in CLIL, whether under the name of L1 use, code switching, language alternation, or translanguaging (e.g., Lasagabaster 2013; Moore and Nikula 2016). These studies have started to unravel the various interactionally and pedagogically motivated purposes for which multilingual resources are employed, to counterbalance what could be described as the "L1 as a problem" views that advocate strict adherence to the target language as a prerequisite for its learning (see also "► Translanguaging and Bilingual Education," by Ofelia García).

Given that CLIL is a relatively new research area, an important purpose of the research has been to establish the core areas of the field and to explore integrated content and language learning and teaching from CLIL-specific perspectives. It seems that a next phase is to consider CLIL in relation to other forms of bilingual and content-based instruction (e.g., Cenoz 2015). In particular, there have been calls to combine CLIL and immersion perspectives because despite the different labels and different emphases in their sociopolitical and research influences, the two fields share many similar concerns, especially at the level of classroom practices (e.g., Cammarata and Tedick 2012). Examples of such collaboration already exist: Llinares and Lyster (2014) examined patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake in CLIL classrooms in Spain, Japanese immersion classrooms in the USA, and French immersion classrooms in Canada, finding differences that

set CLIL and Japanese immersion apart from French immersion classrooms in the way recasts were handled, probably resulting from contextual features as well as teacher professional trajectories. Nikula and Mård-Miettinen (2014) combine immersion and CLIL insights to review the contribution of these areas to language learning research. They show how the two approaches, while sharing key assumptions concerning the benefits of meaningful and cognitively and academically challenging language use through language and content integration, partly draw on different research influences and tend to rely on different assumptions regarding the points of reference when evaluating the level of skills attained. While immersion students have usually been compared to native speakers of the target language, the typical point of comparison for CLIL students has been formed by the non-CLIL peers learning the target language in regular foreign language classrooms.

Problems and Difficulties

One of the strengths of CLIL at the same time constitutes a challenge for research: CLIL is contextual, variably adapted to specific institutions and localities, the broadness and flexibility of its definition allowing for versatile ways of implementation (see Cenoz 2015 for similar variability in forms of immersion and content-based instruction). This means that it is difficult to provide overarching answers to questions concerning its overall effectiveness and impact. However, the discussion above has shown that the accumulating research base from specific contexts has grown big enough to warrant a relatively good overall understanding of the issues that any institution planning to offer CLIL should consider, ranging from student selection and pedagogical principles to teacher training and support. Perhaps the main message conveyed by the 20 years or so of CLIL research is the importance of ensuring that there is a shared understanding of the aims of CLIL at the institutional level to help those participating steer towards the same goal. In other words, rather than aiming at fit-for-all blueprints of CLIL, it is more important to produce well-elaborated local descriptions that extend beyond vague or generalized statements of the rationale for CLIL. There already exist research that can provide tools for such elaboration, for example, studies on genre-based curricula, subject-specific literacies, and characteristics of academic language (e.g., Llinares et al. 2012; Lorenzo 2013; Dalton-Puffer 2013).

While research has provided a sound evidence base for the effects of CLIL on language learning, doubts remain whether CLIL fits all types of learners. The concerns are often based on the fact that despite the original aims of mainstreaming CLIL, student cohorts in many schools are selected, either through some type of language skill screening or, if CLIL is voluntary, due to possible self-selection driven by CLIL students' higher levels of interest and motivation (cf. the observations in the DESI project that the proportion of girls was noticeably higher in the CLIL subset than in the overall data). Another open question in relation to equity is whether CLIL

is suitable for students with learning difficulties. An example of the uneasiness around CLIL comes from Finland where general education, based on the comprehensive school system, is explicitly built on values of equity and securing the same opportunities for all (Sahlberg 2007). In this situation, the fact that availability of CLIL programs tends to concentrate in bigger towns and municipalities has raised concerns about CLIL compromising equity (Nikula and Järvinen 2013).

One of the contested issues in CLIL concerns the current strong connection to English: CLIL in Europe is predominantly offered through English, its role as a major international lingua franca associated with global competitiveness no doubt fuelling its success as the number one language choice. This has raised questions with respect to what extent the positive CLIL outcomes reflect the favorable attitudes and ideologies attached to English. Overall, there is a need for more research exploring the political and language ideological underpinnings of CLIL and the ways in which it carves its way into the educational systems and political landscapes in different countries. For example, Sylvén's (2013) observations indicate that nation-specific contextual factors relating to educational policy framework, teacher education, age of implementation, and extramural exposure play a role in the eventual success of CLIL. Overall, the close affinity between CLIL and English has meant that the EU policy goals of promoting European multilingualism through CLIL have in most cases resulted in strengthening the skills in English in continental Europe; the role of CLIL in diversifying language teaching in the Anglophone countries has been less evident (Eurydice 2006).

Future Directions

As pointed out above, CLIL makes it necessary to reassess the relationship between content and language pedagogies, as well as the nature of language skills aimed at (for recent discussions, see Llinares et al. 2012; Meyer et al. 2015; Nikula et al. 2016). These questions need to be addressed in the future CLIL research as well. Overall, as Leung and Morton (2016) point out, as the CLIL research field matures, it needs to seek a balance between increasingly articulated framing of expected outcomes without losing the sense of conviviality (Leung 2005) and of co-learning and creativity, which can be regarded as key characteristics of successful realizations of CLIL as a learning and teaching approach.

Regarding more specific areas for future CLIL research, integrated assessment is among the most topical issues. CLIL teachers have been shown to be ambivalent about their role in teaching and assessing learners' language skills, framing content teaching as their main concern and also arguing for the lack of explicit attention to formal aspects of language as an important CLIL success factor (e.g., Hüttner et al. 2013). Hence, the role of language in assessment easily remains vague. While research on assessment in CLIL and suggestions for integrated assessment guidelines have started to emerge (e.g., Llinares et al. 2012; Massler et al. 2014), this is an area where more work is needed in the future.

There is also the need for longitudinal studies on CLIL. For example, we know relatively little of how the transition points between different levels of schooling affect CLIL outcomes and experiences. Furthermore, outcome studies need to be accompanied by longitudinal process-oriented, in situ explorations of classroom interaction to capture participants' orientation to content and language learning and how learning evolves and emerges over time (cf. Jakonen 2014). Finally, it is also important to investigate CLIL in ways that extend beyond classrooms and learning outcomes to the complexity of its sociopolitical and ideological underpinnings. As pointed out above, Dafouz and Smit (2014) have already taken an important step towards this direction in conceptualizing the dimensions of English-medium instruction in university settings.

So far, a key purpose of CLIL research has been to identify and characterize features typical of CLIL and to come to an understanding of its possibilities and challenges as an educational approach. By now the research field has matured to the point where it is increasingly important to explore the opportunities offered by collaboration across fields and disciplines. An obvious point to strengthen is collaboration between applied linguists, scholars in the general field of education, and content specialists, because that can in significant ways further our understanding of CLIL as integration of language and subject pedagogies (see Dalton-Puffer 2013; Leung and Morton 2016). Another area where there is room for further study concerns combining CLIL research, multilingualism research, and research on sociolinguistics of globalization in order to attain a more nuanced picture of how CLIL in the future can and should respond to the increasingly multilingual realities. It has been argued that CLIL in fact often operates in largely monolingual contexts and mindsets, with the typical case being the use of an international lingua franca in instruction among the teacher and students who share the same L1. However, as societies grow more diverse, so will CLIL classrooms, and a question to explore, then, is how this will influence the role and impact of CLIL. Finally, an important future direction concerns international cross-continent collaboration, as CLIL, originally a specifically European approach to bilingual education, is in the process of expanding to other geographical locations. The current contexts of implementation using the label CLIL include, for example, Latin America, Australia, and Asia. No doubt the activities of the AILA research network on content and language integrated and immersion classrooms, in operation since 2006, can serve as a fertile ground to foster such collaboration (see http://www.aila.info/en/research/list-of-rens/content-language-integrated-learning.html).

Cross-References

► Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition
► Content-Based Instruction
► Parallel Language Strategy

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Christine Hélot, Marisa Cavalli: Bilingual Education in Europe: Dominant Languages In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe: Language Awareness and CLIL In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

References

Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G., & de Bot, K. (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary education in the Netherlands: Students' language proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 12*(1), 75–93.

Badertscher, H., & Bieri, T. (2009). *Wissenserwerb im Content and Language Integrated Learning: Empirische Befunde und Interpretationen*. Bern/Stuttgart/Wien: Haupt.

Bonnet, A. (2004). *Chemie im bilingualen Unterricht. Kompetenzerwerb durch Interaktion*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Breidbach, S., & Viebrock, B. (2012). CLIL in Germany: Results from recent research in a contested field of education. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1*(4), 5–16.

Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Cammarata, L., & Tedick, D. (2012). Balancing content and language in instruction: The experience of immersion teachers. *The Modern Language Journal, 96*(2), 251–269.

Cenoz, J. (2015). Content-based instruction and content and language integrated learning: The same or different? *Language. Culture and Curriculum, 28*(1), 8–24.

Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical Analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(3), 243–262.

Coyle, D. (1999). Theory and planning for effective classrooms: Supporting students in content and language integrated learning contexts. In J. Masih (Ed.), *Learning through a foreign language* (pp. 46–62). London: CILT.

Coyle, D. (2007). Content and language integrated learning: Toward a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10*(5), 543–562.

Coyle, D. (2008). CLIL – A pedagogical approach from the European perspective. In N. van Deusen-Scholl & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, 2nd edition, Volume 4: Second and foreign language education* (pp. 97–111). New York: Springer.

Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2014). Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university settings. *Applied Linguistics*. doi:10.1093/applin/amu034.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 182–204.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). A construct of cognitive discourse functions for conceptualising content-language integration in CLIL and multilingual education. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 1–38.

Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). Content and language integrated learning: A research agenda. *Language Teaching, 46*(4), 545–559.

Dalton-Puffer, C., Faistauer, R., & Vetter, E. (2011). A country in focus. Research on language teaching and learning in Austria (2004–2009). *Language Teaching, 44*(2), 181–211.

DESI-Konsortium (Ed.). (2008). *Unterricht und Kompetenzerwerb in Deutsch und Englisch. Ergebnisse der DESI-Studie*. Beltz: Weinheim.

Di Martino, E., & Di Sabato, B. (2012). CLIL implementation in Italian schools: Can long-serving teachers be retrained effectively? The Italian protagonists' voice. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning, 5*(2), 73–105.

European Commission. (1995). *White paper on education and training. Teaching and learning: Towards the learning society.* http://europa.eu/documents/comm/white_papers/pdf/com95_590_en.pdf

Eurydice. (2006). *Content and language integrated learning at school in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice European Unit. http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/all_publications_en.php

Evnitskaya, N., & Morton, T. (2011). Knowledge construction, meaning-making and interaction in CLIL science classroom communities of practice. *Language and Education, 25*(2), 109–127.

Fortanez-Gómez, I. (2013). *CLIL in higher education. Towards a multilingual language policy.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Fruhauf, G., Coyle, D., & Christ, I. (1996). *Teaching content in a foreign language*. Alkmaar: European Platform for Dutch Education.

Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). The power of beliefs: Lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education, 16*(3), 267–284.

Jakonen, T. (2014). *Knowing matters: How students address lack of knowledge in bilingual classroom interaction*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 235. University of Jyväskylä.

Jäppinen, A.-K. (2005). Cognitional development of mathematics and science in the Finnish mainstream education in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) – Teaching through a foreign language. *Language and Education, 19*(2), 148–169.

Järvinen, H.-M. (1999). *Acquisition of English in content and language integrated learning at elementary level in the Finnish comprehensive school*. Humaniora, Series B, number 232. University of Turku.

Lasagabaster, D. (2013). The use of the L1 in CLIL classes: The teachers' perspective. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning, 6*(2), 1–21.

Lasagabaster, D., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (Eds.). (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: More differences than similarities. *English Language Teachers Journal, 64*(4), 367–375.

Leung, C. (2005). Convivial communication: Recontextualizing communicative competence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(2), 119–144.

Leung, C., & Morton, T. (2016). Language competence, learning and pedagogy in CLIL: Deepening and broadening integration. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and bilingual education* (pp. 235–248). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lim Falk, M. (2008). *Svenska i engelskspråkig skolmiljö. Ämnesrelaterat språkbruk i två gymnasieklasser.* [Swedish in an English-language School Environment. Subject-based Language use in two upper secondary classes]. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Studies in Scandinavian Philology.

Llinares, A. (2015). Integration in CLIL: A proposal to inform research and successful pedagogy. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 28*(1), 58–73.

Llinares, A., & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal, 42*(2), 181–194.

Llinares, A., & Morton, T. (2017). *Applied linguistics perspectives on CLIL*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Llinares, A., & Whittaker, R. (2010). Writing and speaking in the history class: A comparative analysis of CLIL and first language contexts. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 125–144). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lorenzo, F. (2013). Genre-based curricula: Multilingual academic literacy in content and language integrated learning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(3), 375–388.

Marsh, D. (Ed.) (2002). *CLIL/EMILE – The European dimension. Actions, trends and foresight potential*. European Commission Report, Public Services Contract DG EAC 36 01 Lot 3.

Marsh, D., & Langé, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Implementing content and language integrated learning*. Jyväskylä: ER-paino & Jyväskylän Yliopistopaino.

Massler, U., Stotz, D., & Queisser, C. (2014). Assessment instruments for primary CLIL: The conceptualisation and evaluation of test tasks. *Language Learning Journal, 42*(2), 137–150.

Meyer, O., Coyle, C., Halbach, A., Schuck, K., & Ting, T. (2015). A pluriliteracies approach to content and language integrated learning – Mapping learner progressions in knowledge construction and meaning-making. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 28*(1), 41–57.

Moore, P., & Nikula, T. (2016). Translanguaging in CLIL. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and bilingual education* (pp. 211–234). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Nikula, T. (2005). English as an object and tool of study in classrooms: Interactional effects and pragmatic implications. *Linguistics and Education, 16*(1), 27–58.

Nikula, T., & Järvinen, H-M. (2013). Vieraskielinen opetus Suomessa ('CLIL in Finland'). In L. Tainio & H. Harju-Luukkanen (Eds.), *Kaksikielinen koulu- tulevaisuuden monikielinen Suomi* ('Bilingual school – the multilingual Finland of the future') (pp. 143–167). Helsinki: Suomen Kasvatustieteellinen Seura.

Nikula, T., & Mård-Miettinen, K. (2014). Language learning in immersion and CLIL classrooms. In J.-O. Östman and J. Verschueren (Eds.) *Handbook of pragmatics*, 18. 2014 Installment. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nikula, T., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Llinares, A. (2013). CLIL classroom discourse: Research from Europe. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 1*(1), 70–100.

Nikula, T., Dafouz, E., Moore, P., & Smit, U. (Eds.). (2016). *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and bilingual education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2011). Which language competencies benefit from CLIL? An insight into applied linguistics research. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, M. Sierra, & J. M. Gallardo del Puerto (Eds.), *Content and foreign language integrated learning: Contributions to multilingualism in European contexts* (pp. 129–154). Bern: Peter Lang.

Sahlberg, P. (2007). Education policies for raising student learning: The Finnish approach. *Journal of Education Policy, 22*(2), 147–171.

Smit, U., & Dafouz, E. (Eds.). (2012). *Integrating content and language in higher education: Gaining insights into English-medium instruction at European universities* (AILA review 25). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (1997). *The content-based classroom. Perspectives on integrating language and content*. New York: Longman.

Sylvén, L. K. (2013). CLIL in Sweden – Why does it not work? A metaperspective on CLIL across contexts in Europe. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(3), 301–320.

Sylvén, L. K., & Thompson, A. S. (2015). Language learning motivation and CLIL: Is there a connection? *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 3*(1), 28–50.

Whittaker, R., Llinares, A., & McCabe, A. (2011). Written discourse development in CLIL at secondary school. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(3), 343–362.

Second Language Learning in a Study Abroad Context

Celeste Kinginger

Contents

Introduction 126
Early Developments 126
Major Contributions 128
Work in Progress 132
Problems and Difficulties 133
Future Directions 133
Cross-References 134
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 134
References 134

Abstract

This chapter provides a broad overview of research on language learning in study abroad contexts. The historical origins of this research are examined, revealing that in this domain as elsewhere in the literature on applied linguistics and language education, there is a long-term tension between documentation of outcomes and qualitative scrutiny of learning processes. Current research efforts are varied in focus and include: (1) studies of outcomes defined in terms of holistic constructs such as proficiency, fluency, or skills; (2) scrutiny of outcomes defined as components of communicative competence (i.e., linguistic, actional, discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic abilities); and (3) ethnographic and other qualitative work exploring the nature of the study abroad experience as a context for language learning. The limitations of the contemporary research base, in both scope and methodology, are outlined and directions for future investigations are suggested.

C. Kinginger (✉)
Department of Applied Linguistics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Philadelphia, PA, USA
e-mail: cxk37@psu.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_11

Keywords
Study abroad • Communicative competence • Proficiency • Fluency

Introduction

Study abroad has traditionally enjoyed a reputation as a highly productive context for language learning. As Dekeyser (2010) has noted, for students this reputation is often accompanied by popular notions about study abroad as a magical formula making possible an effortless process of "easy learning" (p. 89). Among language educators and program designers, study abroad can be interpreted as a stage in students' careers during which their language abilities are consolidated and refined, rendering further curricular attention to language unnecessary (Polio and Zyzik 2009). Among researchers, depending on their preferred theoretical framework, study abroad may be cast as an environment offering unlimited access to high quality linguistic input, or as a rich setting for language socialization in which students receive expert guidance in nurturing a second language identity. In short, study abroad is a phenomenon steeped in both professional and lay folklore (Coleman 1997).

The overarching aim of research on language learning in study abroad is to uncover, in myriad ways, the truth about this phenomenon. Do student in fact return from their sojourns in "L2 land" (Coleman 2013) having significantly enhanced their language abilities? If so, which aspects of language competence develop most readily in these contexts? If not, why? How often are students actually attending to the input surrounding them, and to what extent are they truly engaged in activities and interactions fostering language learning? How do students position themselves within host communities, and in what ways are they typically received by their hosts?

Early Developments

Early research in this area may be broadly classified into two categories: studies documenting outcomes and studies examining processes taking place within study abroad settings. Three of the earliest publications still routinely cited illustrate this dual focus. A landmark classic of the outcomes-based research is Carroll's (1967) "Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college." Funded by the United States' National Defense Education Act of 1958, the study's goal was to document the range of proficiency developed in university programs, along with factors associated with variation in performance. A total of 2784 college seniors majoring in French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish were tested for aptitude and for proficiency in the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They also responded to a questionnaire on language learning history. The study's findings indicated a median attainment considered low

at the time (2+, or "Advanced High" proficiency on the Foreign Service Institute scale), a weak correlation between aptitude and language development, and a strong association of skill level and study abroad. Carroll thus argued that study abroad is a "potent variable," that any amount of time abroad appeared to have a beneficial effect, and that students remaining in classroom settings "do not seem to be able to get very far in their foreign language study" (p. 137).

The process focus is illustrated in a pair of classic diary studies carried out in the late 1970s (Schumann and Schumann 1977; Schumann 1980). These authors took up the cause of interpretive research, arguing for inclusion of a subjective dimension to reveal otherwise unobservable phenomena such as learner beliefs and motives. However, the ultimate goal of the project was to complete Schumann's Acculturation Model (1976) establishing causal links between language development and social or psychological factors. To recall, Schumann had argued that language learning is determined in the first instance by solidarity or social distance between groups (e.g., relative status, size and cohesiveness, attitudes or integration patterns). Psychological factors such as self-esteem, anxiety, or motivation come into play in the event that the social factors do not provide a satisfactory explanation. The authors set out to demonstrate that language learners display idiosyncratic "personal variables" (Schumann and Schumann 1977, p. 247) based on subjective appraisals of learning opportunities. The 1977 paper, based on both authors' personal diaries of learning Arabic in Tunisia, and Farsi in Iran, did indeed reveal the importance of individual preferences and dispositions in language learning abroad. Francine Schumann found that she could not comply with the strictures of an Arabic classroom governed by a strong interpretation of the audio-lingual method, while John Schumann experienced anxiety during transitions and preferred learning strategies not encouraged in the classroom. In a subsequent publication, F. Schumann (1980) offered a more socially situated analysis of her difficulties as an Anglophone female learner in Iran, where her opportunities to interact in Farsi were limited both by her desirability as a source of knowledge about English and by her status as a woman, for whom a good many settings for learning were "off bounds" (p. 55).

Taken together, these three studies exemplify the benefits and challenges involved in attempts to document the results and to comprehend the processes of language learning in study abroad settings. In testing nearly a quarter of all language majors in the United States (24%), Carroll generated potentially quite reliable and generalizable results. However, the scale of the study also means that much of the messy variability and most "personal variables" were excluded from consideration. The Schumanns delved deeply into the nature of the study abroad experience, arguing that any causal model must account for unique learning pathways. F. Schumann also pointed out the significance of personal identity in generating or restricting learning opportunities. However, their work represents only the experience of two individuals who happen to be highly sophisticated in the domain of language education, in comparison to the average college-aged student. Following Carroll and the Schumanns, the profession inherited both their methodological tools and the tensions between outcomes-oriented and process-oriented research characteristic of second language research more generally.

Major Contributions

Research on language learning abroad has expanded considerably in the past several decades, particularly since the Freed (1995a) publication of Freed's *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*, the first full volume dedicated to this topic (Kinginger 2009). Outcomes-oriented researchers have relied on an array of holistic constructs, such as proficiency or fluency. Over time, this research focused increasingly on particular skills, such as reading and listening, or components of communicative ability, including linguistic, discourse, pragmatic, sociocultural, and strategic competence. Consistent findings of significant individual differences in achievement eventually convinced many researchers that these differences are somehow amplified during sojourns abroad as opposed to classroom learning (Huebner 1995). This observation, in turn, inspired various attempts to develop hybrid studies or to correlate achievement scores with quantitative measures of participation in settings believed to foster language development. Alongside the evolution of this tradition, there has also been considerable investment in qualitative research. Ethnographies and studies of language socialization scrutinize the characteristics of interactions between language learners and their hosts, taking into account the role of real or imagined identities in shaping the study abroad experience.

The construct of proficiency has been defined as "an individual's general competence in a second language, independent of any particular curriculum or course of study" (Omaggio 1986, p. 9). Attractive to study abroad researchers, this construct informs numerous studies. Among the best known of these is the European Language Proficiency Survey (Coleman 1996) involving, among others, 18,825 British foreign language students whose language ability was assessed using a written test of reduced redundancy, the C-Test. Coleman's findings echoed those of Carroll (1967) in demonstrating a significant correlation between test scores and time spent abroad. In the United States, meanwhile, the default definition of proficiency has been provided by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages through the Oral Proficiency Guidelines and Interview (OPI), the first standardized procedure for assessing speaking ability across contexts. The principle aim of an ongoing study organized by the American Council on the Teaching of Russian is to identify factors predicting gains in proficiency by Americans in Russian, although the researchers have also collected qualitative data in the form of learner diaries. The study was first reported in the mid-1990s, with data from 658 participants (Brecht et al. 1995). Major predictors identified included experience in learning other languages, command of reading and grammar skills, and gender, with men significantly outperforming women. Polanyi's (1995) narrative analysis of gender-related stories in the learner diaries revealed that men recounted being received as competent conversationalists well before this was actually the case, whereas women-related incidents interpreted as sexual harassment. Polanyi further suggested that the OPI itself may not have been gender-neutral, in particular when role-play tasks, such as proposing a toast, involved speech acts which were not, at the time, normally performed by women. A subsequent publication reporting findings for 1881

participants (Davidson 2010) replicated the earlier findings on reading comprehension and control of grammatical structure while also establishing a link between preprogram proficiency and gain scores. By 2010, gender was no longer a significant predictor; as a proposed explanation, the author cites both gradual changes in Russian society and the organization's program of training in self-management and strategy selection, with special attention to female students.

Another holistic construct that has attracted the attention of study abroad researchers is fluency. While this is the term "most frequently evoked in discussions of the linguistic benefits of study abroad" (Freed 1995b, p. 123), the profession has struggled to arrive at a widely accepted technical definition to inform research. One of the most precise definitions was advanced in 2004 by Freed, Segalowitz, and Dewey, in a study comparing the outcomes of classroom learning, study abroad, and domestic immersion programs for 28 American learners of French. Data consisted of two one-minute segments of speech extracted from pre- and post-OPIs as well as data indicating time-on-task through a questionnaire, the Language Contact Profile. Fluency was operationalized in two categories: (1) general measures (total words, duration of speaking time, and length of the longest run) and (2) hesitation and temporal phenomena (speech rate, hesitation, pauses, mean length of speech run without dysfluencies, repetitions, or repairs). Results indicated that the classroom group's performance did not change from pre- to posttest, that the domestic immersion group registered significant gains for five of the variables, and that the study abroad group made only modest gains. Information gleaned from the Language Contact Profile indicated that the domestic immersion students had spent significantly more time engaged in French-mediated activity, especially writing, whereas the study abroad students had spent more time in English than in French outside the classroom for all activities except listening.

The SALA project (Study Abroad and Language Acquisition) (Pérez-Vidal 2014) is another significant contribution to the outcomes-oriented literature with a primary focus on skill acquisition. This project focuses on Catalan-Spanish bilingual students learning English throughout their degree program in Translation and Interpreting, including a compulsory 3-month (or longer) stay abroad. This study is distinguished by its longitudinal design; rather than relying on the problematic involvement of control groups (Rees and Klapper 2008), the researchers collected data from three cohorts at four time points over a period of 30 months: the beginning and end of their first year of formal instruction, upon return from study abroad, and after the final year of instruction. While also focusing on changes in motivation, beliefs, and intercultural awareness, the team selected an array of collection instruments to measure competence in the four skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening as well as overall lexico-grammatical ability, and phonological production and perception. Results indicate substantial improvement after study abroad in all areas save phonological production and perception, which are better served by classroom learning, as well as longer-term retention of these benefits as measured in the delayed posttest.

The literature on language learning in study abroad also includes studies examining various aspects of communicative competence: linguistic, pragmatic,

sociolinguistic, interactive, and strategic abilities. Linguistic competence includes the ability to use the formal grammatical, lexical, or phonological features of a language. The development of grammatical competence has been somewhat controversial in the study abroad literature, with some early researchers (e.g., Walsh 1994) claiming that a sojourn abroad yields "fluent ungrammaticality" (p. 52). Collentine (2004) compared overall grammatical accuracy and acquisition of unique lexical items in OPIs of US-based study abroad versus classroom learners of Spanish at the intermediate level, with results indicating that classroom learning is superior in this domain. When attempting to study the use of monitoring, based on declarative knowledge of grammar, by students of Spanish of the same level and origin, DeKeyser (2010) found that the students did not in fact possess the relevant knowledge. On the other hand, Howard (2005) worked with more advanced Irish learners of French and applied a more nuanced approach, limiting his analysis to details of the aspectual system. In this case, students with experience abroad developed superior ability to mark habituality and progressivity using the imperfect, in comparison with their counterparts at home. Research on the development of phonological skills has yielded similarly mixed results, with some studies (e.g., Mora 2008) showing that only classroom instruction at home can improve students' perceptual abilities and performance, and others (e.g., O'Brien 2004), proving that study abroad increases the extent to which students perceive phonological features and pronounce their new language in native-like ways. Researchers focusing on the learner's lexicon have demonstrated significantly greater rates of vocabulary growth abroad as opposed to at home (Milton and Meara 1995) and also that the organization of the lexicon becomes significantly more native-like following a sojourn abroad (Ife et al. 2000).

Pragmatic competence is the ability to perform speech acts such as requesting, apologizing, or complimenting. Numerous researchers have addressed this topic in studies of speech act production using Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs) to compare learner language use with baseline data from native speakers. Barron (2003), for example, took up this approach to show that Irish learners of German moved toward the native norm for requests, offers, and refusals in several ways, for example, by decreasing the use of routines transferred from English (e.g., *Ich wundere mich* [I wonder]. An exemplary study in this area is Shardakova (2005) on apologies in Russian. In addition to recruiting five groups of participants to perform apologies in a DCT (advanced and intermediate learners with and without study abroad in Russia, and native speakers), the researcher asked all parties to evaluate the gravity of the relevant offense. Results indicate that only advanced proficiency and exposure to Russian culture allowed students to "see things from the point of view of a Russian" (p. 445) and then to opt- or not-to perform in a native-like manner. More recently, research on pragmatics has begun to emphasize interactional competence, akin to discourse competence, or the ability to create and interpret cohesive and coherent texts, including conversation. An interesting project in this domain is Diao (2011) on the development turn-taking initiative in Chinese. Diao followed one learner from his classroom experience though a semester-long sojourn in China, through informal conversations conducted at

regular intervals either face-to-face or via Skype. Prior to his sojourn abroad, the learner's ability to control conversational turn-taking was limited to frequent comprehension checks, and he relied mainly on others to nominate him to speak, while in China, however, he became involved in extended conversations with his Mandarin-speaking roommate and with strangers outside the classroom. As a result, he gradually began to display initiative in conversation, first in allocating turns to other speakers, then in self-nomination to talk, and finally in contributing extended and complete turns.

Research on sociocultural competence has focused on the extent to which learners abroad develop awareness of, and the ability to manipulate features of register, or linguistically marked levels of formality. The most prominent work in this area has been carried out by a team of researchers working with Irish learners of French, Regan et al. (2009). For these scholars, the use of certain variable features of French can be interpreted as signaling integration into Francophone communities. For example, the particle *ne*, presented in textbooks as integral to the expression of negation, is today actually present in spoken French only in formal contexts. Study abroad participants demonstrated significant shifts in their use of this and other variable forms in the direction of native-like use.

A final, notable outcome of study abroad is a degree of autonomy in the process of communication, that is, strategic competence, or the ability to overcome momentary difficulties independently. In Lafford's (2004) examination of OPIs involving US-based students of Spanish having spent a semester either at home or in Spain, the study abroad group used significantly fewer communication strategies. The author attributed this result to changed expectations: the study abroad veterans had developed greater autonomy than had the classroom learners due to their experience of struggle for self-expression in the absence of pedagogical motives on the part of their interlocutors.

Alongside the outcomes-oriented research, there exist a considerable number of qualitative studies examining the nature of the study abroad experience. These investigations demonstrate that the quality of study abroad as a context for language learning depends upon a complex interplay between the manner in which students are received by their host communities and the extent to which the students themselves envision a multilingual future and position themselves as language learners. (For a more extensive review, see "▶ Language Socialization in Study Abroad Contexts"). The extreme variability of all related conditions is illustrated in the case studies outlined by Kinginger (2008) American students in a semester-long sojourn in France. "Ailis," for example, claimed strong language learning motivation, but interpreted her sojourn in France as a one-time opportunity for a European Grand Tour, spending each weekend visiting museums and monuments with a group of fellow Anglophones, and seeing a decrease in her score on the study's test of general academic proficiency (*Test de Français International*). "Bill," on the other hand, was hosted by a family taking an interest in his language development during regular ritual meals and developed a broad social network both on campus and through his internship; by the end of his time abroad, he had outperformed most of the cohort on assessments of both academic proficiency and awareness of register.

Work in Progress

There are three notable, if diverse, new directions emerging in research on language learning in study abroad contexts. These have to do with advances in the field's understanding of social interaction and integration, of adult language learning of pragmatics, and of the nature of language itself. An important trend in the outcomes-oriented literature is refinement and development of the definition of language contact. Contemporary researchers have proposed that amount of contact per se may not necessarily be the most meaningful variable and have instead begun to carry out studies of students' language engagement and social integration while abroad. A leading initiative in this area is the LANGSNAP project at the University of Southampton, where a team of researchers has developed two instruments to examine the experience of the year abroad in France, Spain, or Mexico for 56 British students: a Language Engagement Questionnaire to document student's participation in typical study abroad activities, including use of social media; and a Social Networks Questionnaire. Initial findings for students of French (McManus et al. 2014) show that the contemporary year abroad, for these students, is a multilingual and multicultural experience involving face-to-face and virtual relationships, rapid integration into local international groups, and maintenance of social networks from home, although a substantial minority also developed local social relationships.

In the area of pragmatics, a promising new approach is the development of concept-based approaches. Traditional teaching of pragmatics involves textbook presentations of forms along with simplified rules of thumb for their use, anticipating that experience of language use with expert speakers will lead to enhanced understanding of their social meaning, a process which is haphazard at best. In essence, concept-based instruction reverses this process by beginning with the presentation of fully developed scientific concepts such as identity, indexicality, and speaker intention, then explicitly assisting students' performance as they learn to interpret and use the forms in order to express their own desired social identity within contexts of solidarity, social distance or hierarchy. Van Compernolle (2014) elaborated a concept-based approach to the teaching of sociolinguistic variants in French, such as the *tu*/*vous* second-person address form system, or the presence or absence of the *ne* particle in negation. This approach was then implemented in the study abroad context by Henery (2014), where it was shown to significantly enhance the depth and systematicity of students' pragmatic awareness.

A third area of innovation arises from the development of corpus-based approaches to the analysis of language, and particularly the discovery that a significant portion of the expert user's repertoire consists of formulaic sequences, or semi-fixed lexical phrases known as "chunks" (Boers and Lindstromberg 2009, p. 1). Formulaic language is believed to be acquired as such, rather than through learning of lexical or grammatical features as independent units. More importantly, the notion of formulaicity poses serious challenges to previous definitions of fluency that ignore the content of speech in favor of measures such as rate of enunciation or hesitation frequency. Fernandez (2013) has shown that a sojourn abroad helps student to

develop their repertoire of formulaic general extenders in Spanish (e.g., *o cosas como así* [or things like that]) which in turn enhances their interactive competence.

Problems and Difficulties

As a research base, the literature on language learning in study abroad displays many limitations in scope and design. In terms of scope, most obvious is the fact that the majority of research has been carried out with middle-class Anglophone learners studying commonly taught languages. In terms of understanding language, field has struggled to overcome conservative academic views and to take up usage- or corpus-based models that better reflect the authentic living language and varied registers that students discover when they go abroad. In research involving standardized tests, such as the OPI, it is unclear that the measured abilities in fact correspond in every case to those that students have developed in study abroad settings. Many domains of language competence are under-represented; for example, there are few studies of developing foreign language literacy, despite the emphasis on *study* that many programs announce. Qualitative studies focus mainly on the homestay, with little attention to other contexts, such as classrooms and service encounters. In terms of research design, with the exception of several larger-scale, well-supported investigations, many projects display problems of scale, involving small convenience samples and, occasionally, inflated claims of significance in reporting findings (Rees and Klapper 2008). Qualitative studies tend to emphasize the perspective of students only, excluding those of host community members. Finally, as Coleman (2013) has noted, researchers have been slow to acknowledge the force of history and changes in the basic nature of study abroad in an age of globalized economic, social, and cultural networks.

Future Directions

It follows from the above observations that there are many potential future directions for research in this area. Among these are continued exploration of social network analysis, of concept-based approaches to the learning of pragmatics as well as other aspects of language, and of insights from corpus linguistics. In addition, expansion of the diversity of research foci is much to be desired. This expansion should include greater diversity of the populations, languages, and destinations represented in the literature as well as exploration of communicative settings, such as classrooms, and aspects of language ability, such as literacy, as yet poorly understood. Beyond concept-based teaching, there is a need for research on the effectiveness of other forms of pedagogical intervention and on the design of curricula within study abroad programs for the enhancement of language learning. Above all, and on behalf of students who truly envision a multilingual future, there is a need to bridge the chasm that divides outcomes- versus process-oriented investigations and to design studies

focusing on language learning in combination with an interest in participants as "whole persons" (Coleman 2013).

Cross-References

- ▶ Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition
- ▶ Sociocultural Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Patricia Duff: Language Socialization and Family Dinnertime Discourse. In Volume: Language Socialization

Celeste Kinginger: Language Socialization in Study Abroad. In Volume: Language Socialization

References

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2009). *Maximizing a lexical approach to instructed second language acquisition*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brecht, R., Davidson, D., & Ginsburg, R. (1995). Predictors of foreign language gain during study abroad. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 37–66). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Coleman, J. (1996). *Studying languages: A survey of British and European students*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Coleman, J.A. (1997). Residence abroad within language study. *Language Teaching, 30*, 1–2.

Coleman, J. (2013). Researching whole persons and whole lives. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and cultural aspects of language learning in study abroad* (pp. 17–44). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Collentine, J. (2004). The effects of learning contexts on morpho-syntactic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(2), 227–248.

Davidson, D. (2010). Study abroad: When, how long, and with what results? New data from the Russian front. *Foreign Language Annals, 43*(1), 6–26.

Dekeyser, R. (2010). Monitoring processes in Spanish as a second language during a study abroad program. *Foreign Language Annals, 43*(1), 80–92.

Diao, W. (2011). Study abroad, participation, and turn-taking: A case study. In G. Granena (Ed.), *Selected proceedings of the 2010 Second Language Research Forum* (pp. 1–17). Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Fernandez, J. (2013). A corpus-based study of vague language use by learners of Spanish in a study abroad context. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and cultural aspects of language learning in study abroad* (pp. 299–331). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Freed, B. (Ed.). (1995a). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Freed, B. (1995b). What makes us think that students who study abroad become fluent? In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 123–148). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Freed, B., Segalowitz, N., & Dewey, D. (2004). Contexts of learning and second language fluency in French: Comparing regular classrooms, study abroad, and domestic immersion programs. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(2), 275–301.

Henery, A. (2014). *Interpreting "real" French: The role of expert mediation in learner observations, understandings, and use of pragmatic practices while abroad*. Ph.D. diss, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh.

Howard, M. (2005). On the role of context in the development of learner language: Insights from study abroad research. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics, 147–8*, 1–20.

Huebner, T. (1995). The effects of overseas language programs: Report on a case study of an intensive Japanese program. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 171–193). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ife, A., Vives Boix, G., & Meara, P. (2000). The impact of study abroad on the vocabulary development of different proficiency groups. *Spanish Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 55–84.

Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *Modern Language Journal, 92*, 1. Monoograph.

Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lafford, B. (2004). The effect of context of learning on the use of communication strategies by learners of Spanish as a second Language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*, 201–226.

McManus, K., Mitchell, R., & Tracy-Ventura, N. (2014). Understanding insertion and integration in a study abroad context: The case of English-speaking sojourners in France. *Revue Française de Linguistique Appliquée, 14*(2), 97–116.

Milton, J., & Meara, P. (1995). How periods abroad affect vocabulary growth in a foreign language. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics, 107*(8), 17–34.

Mora, J. (2008). Learning context effects on the acquisition of a second language phonology. In C. Pérez-Vidal, M. Juan-Garau, & A. Bel (Eds.), *A portrait of the young in the new multilingual Spain* (pp. 241–263). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

O'Brien, M. (2004). Pronunciation matters. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 37*(1), 1–9.

Omaggio, A. (1986). *Teaching language in context: Proficiency-oriented instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Pérez-Vidal, C. (2014). *Language acquisition in study abroad and formal instruction contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Polanyi, L. (1995). Language learning and living abroad: Stories from the field. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 271–291). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Polio, C., & Zyzik, E. (2009). Don Quixote meets ser and estar: Multiple perspectives on language learning in Spanish literature classes. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(4), 550–569.

Rees, J., & Klapper, J. (2008). Issues in the quantitative longitudinal measurement of second language progress in study abroad contexts. In L. Ortega & H. Byrnes (Eds.), *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities* (pp. 89–105). New York: Routledge.

Regan, V., Howard, M., & Lemée, I. (2009). *The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a study abroad context*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Schumann, J. (1976). Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 26*(1), 135–143.

Schumann, F. (1980). Diary of a language learner: A further analysis. In R. Scarcella & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Research in second language acquisition* (pp. 51–57). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Schumann, J., & Schumann, F. (1977). Diary of a language learner: Introspective study of SLA. In H. Brown, C. Yorio, & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL'77* (pp. 241–249). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Shardakova, M. (2005). Intercultural pragmatics in the speech of American L2 learners of Russian: Apologies offered by Americans in Russian. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 2–4*, 423–454.
Van Compernolle, R. A. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and L2 instructional pragmatics*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Walsh, R. (1994). The year abroad – A linguistic challenge. *Teanga, 14*, 48–57.

Second Language Literacy Research and Curriculum Transformation in US Postsecondary Foreign Language Education

Per Urlaub

Contents

Introduction 138
Early Developments 139
Major Contributions 140
Work in Progress 144
Problems and Difficulties 145
Future Directions 146
Cross-References 147
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 147
References 147

Abstract

During the last three decades of the twentieth century, foreign language (FL) curricula at the postsecondary level in the United States focused on oral proficiency and ignored explicit attention to the development of literacy competencies. In recent years, this has changed. In response to the structural shortcomings of the two-tiered undergraduate curriculum and inspired by new scholarship in second language (L2) literacy, a number of researchers have developed curricular approaches that integrate at all levels of instruction communicative language training with the systematic development of literacy competencies. New research results on second language reading as well as an expanded view on literacy has provided for the theoretical foundation for the development of undergraduate foreign language curricular that aim at the integration of language and content learning.

This chapter traces developments in second language literacy research and describes their impact of postsecondary FL curricula. The first part of the chapter

P. Urlaub (✉)
University of Texas, Austin, TX, USA
e-mail: urlaub@austin.utexas.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_12

describes an early phase when second language (L2) reading and writing was mostly inspired by first language (L1) research. During this phase, reading and writing were frequently investigated as isolated competences. Developments in content-based language instruction during this period provided an important catalyst for the development of literacy-based FL curricula. The second part of this chapter will concentrate on more recent developments. More holistic views of literacy that integrate reading and writing processes have emerged as common paradigms. Moreover, many literacy researchers in the twenty-first century are investigating learner interactions with a broad variety of discourses beyond traditional print media, including multimedia and digital forms of communication. The chapter outlines these research trends, sketches their theoretical underpinnings, describes implications for postsecondary FL curricula, and elaborates on the role of professional organizations in supporting the proliferation of literacy-based FL curricular in the United States. I will conclude by pointing out challenges and suggest future research directions.

Keywords
Reading • Writing • Literacy • Curriculum

Introduction

Traditionally, literacy is defined as the ability to read and write. As such, the development of literacy skills – and in particular reading – has been the central objective of foreign language instruction for centuries during the era of the grammar-translation method (GTM). However, in the second half of the twentieth century, the traditional emphasis on second language literacy has been gradually replaced with curricula that privileged oral communication. The audio-lingual method (ALM) and communicative language teaching (CLT) largely ignored the explicit development of literacy competences in the foreign language.

Shortcomings of foreign language (FL) curricula that overemphasized the development of oral proficiency have been identified by the profession since the early 1990s. A main target of this critique was the so-called two-tiered curriculum in US higher education that strictly separated language training in the lower level of the undergraduate curriculum from cultural content, often in the form of literature, at the more advanced stages. Introductory communicative language courses with little attention to cultural content in the form of authentic texts insufficiently prepared and inspired beginning language learners for intermediate and advanced courses. In response to the structural shortcomings of the two-tiered undergraduate curriculum, a number of researchers suggested course offerings that integrate at all levels of instruction communicative language training with the systematic development of literacy competencies.

This chapter will describe developments in second language literacy research, sketch their theoretical underpinnings, outline implications for postsecondary FL curricula, and elaborate on the role of professional organizations in supporting the

proliferation of literacy-based FL curricular in the United States. I will conclude by pointing out challenges and suggest future research directions.

Early Developments

Reading research emerged in the beginning of the last century. The field was initially exclusively devoted to L1 reading. Throughout most of the twentieth century, reading instruction in the context of foreign language instruction remained theoretically, methodologically, and pedagogically based on first language reading research. Huey's (1908) monograph *The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading* is generally considered the beginning of reading research. This publication inspired much of the reading research and pedagogies in the first half of the twentieth century. Research from this area focused on basic reading instruction and reading deficiencies. No sustaining attempts were made to theorize the reading process of adult proficient readers.

At North American universities of the 1950s and 1960s, research activities emerged that addressed basic questions beyond reading difficulties and beginning instruction by investigating the reading process of proficient readers. By the early 1970s, two opposing models of the reading process crystallized: Gough's (1972) bottom-up view and Goodman's (1967) top-down understanding. The chasm that resulted from these two views had a profound impact on first language reading instruction and curriculum. Although this split was partly reconciled with interactive-compensatory models of the reading process (Stanovich 1980), top-down views of reading were initially more appealing for L2 reading researchers and curriculum developers. Theoretically grounded in schema theory, cognitive psychologists started to investigate comprehension in the late 1970s (Anderson 1984; Beers 1987). Comprehension-oriented L1 reading models (Rumelhart 1977) had a direct impact on FL instruction and the collegiate FL curriculum (Swaffar and Woodruff 1978). Further, this focus on text comprehension stimulated more interest in investigating the roles of reading strategies (Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983), which led to a sustaining interest in reading comprehension strategy instruction (Pressley 2005). Nevertheless, second language reading research remained derivative of first language reading research, because no generally accepted models of the second language reading process existed. This must be attributed to the predominant view that first language reading abilities fully transfer into the second language. The transfer hypothesis to second language reading was only relativized in the 1990s, which led to a much clearer understanding of the L2 reading process and will be discussed in the main section of this chapter.

Even to a larger degree than L2 reading research, the bulk of the scholarship in the area of L2 writing was inspired by work originally developed in L1 contexts, in particular in the field of composition studies. Because cognitive psychologists showed less interest in writing than in reading and comprehension, fewer efforts were invested in developing theoretical models of the writing process. Instead, the bulk of the scholarship was devoted to identify and implement best practices for

writing instruction. A critical paradigm shift occurred as scholars interested in L1 writing shifted their attention from texts to writers and thus started to focus more on writing processes and less on writing products. As a result, process-oriented theories and pedagogies of writing emerged. Systematic research revealed that expert writers are goal oriented and based on a recursive process that integrates composition strategies that relate to prewriting, drafting, monitoring, revising, editing, and publishing (Murray 1972; Flower and Hayes 1981; Hairston 1982; Bereiter and Scardamalia 1987). Second language writing research has only emerged as a field in the 1970s and "has been shaped by the interdisciplinary relationship between composition studies and second language studies" (Matsuda 2003, p. 15). Process-oriented views to the writing process have inspired second language researchers in their attempts to frame the L2 writing (Zamel 1976). However, the fact that there is no generally accepted theory of L2 writing has to this day prevented the development of research strands that are independent of L1 writing research. William's monograph *Teaching Writing in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms* (2004) demonstrates how closely L2 writing research and pedagogies are aligned with research and practice in the L1 writing community.

Early attempts to develop literacy-centered collegiate foreign language curricula are not necessarily based on reading research alone; they can also be attributed to initial developments that led to content-based language instruction (see, e.g., King et al. 1975). Student achievement in content-rich language learning relied on the learner's ability to critically interact with ideas encoded into authentic texts. At the same time, such meaningful interactions between learners and ideas via texts have the potential to refine literacy competences. Students *read to learn* and *learned to read* with the help of content-rich materials. Focusing on the relation between reading and content, Swaffar, Arens, and Byrnes' monograph *Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning* (1991) regards the learner's critical interaction within meaningful target language discourse as the central contributor to language acquisition. Based on this insight, they present an early alternative to the two-tiered undergraduate curriculum and describe a reading-centered integrated curriculum that integrates language and content through literacy throughout the 4-year undergraduate curriculum.

Major Contributions

Towards the end of the twentieth century, researchers gained more clarity about the L2 reading process, in particular the role of transfer. At the same time, notions of literacy started to change. Instead of separating reading and writing, researchers began to develop integrative views that situate the phenomenon of literacy as a cultural practice within a social context embedded within broader theoretical frameworks that promote a holistic understanding of literacy. The traditional view of literacy that isolated reading and writing implies that literacy was questioned because it was felt to reduce literacy "to straightforward acts of information transfer" (Kern 2003, p. 44). Moreover, contemporary views of literacy have become broader

and extend beyond the written text and consider interactions with a variety of media, including multimedia content and digital forms of communication. Both a more accurate understanding of L2 reading and a broader and more holistic view of literacy practices have had a significant impact on curricular structures of collegiate FL education.

In the 1990s, the understanding that L1 reading abilities transferred fully into L2 reading was debunked. Based on a meta-analysis of existing research as well as their own data, Bernhardt and Kamil (1995) demonstrated that L1 reading skills only contributed to a minor extent to second language reading ability. In subsequent research, Bernhardt (2000, 2005, 2011) showed that only 20% of second language reading can be directly attributed to first language reading ability. An additional 30% is attributable to linguistic proficiency, in particular vocabulary knowledge, in the target language. This empirically substantiated model of the second language reading process has not only helped to establish second language reading research as a field independent from first language reading research, it has also informed a curricular reform of the German language programs at Stanford University (Bernhardt and Berman 1999). This research has inspired the development of curricula that systematically integrate language and reading instruction at all levels of the undergraduate curriculum. Bernhardt's (2011) assessment of learning outcomes in the German program at Stanford demonstrates the benefits of this curricular approach. Background knowledge not only provides beginning learners with the opportunity to generate "intra-German perspectives" on cultural materials, it also provides effective scaffolding for reading and discussing culturally and linguistically increasingly complex materials in the target language in intermediate and advanced stages of the curriculum.

Besides a much better understanding of the L2 reading process, a more holistic view of literacy that integrates reading and writing has informed curriculum developers in collegiate FL programs. Already since the 1970s, L1 literacy researchers have observed co-occurrences between reading performance and writing performance. Based on these observations, Tierney and Pearson (1983) concluded reading and writing are "similar processes of meaning making. Both are acts of composing" (p. 568). Both reading and writing involve lexical and syntactical knowledge, as well as reasoning, critical thinking, and analytic ability, the effective integration of background knowledge, genre familiarity, self-monitoring, and the effective use of strategies. Given these parallels, reading and writing in L1 contexts are increasingly taught through integrative pedagogies (Olson 2003). Research specifically focusing on L2 reading-writing connections has branched off in the early 1990s with the publication of the volume *Reading in the Composition Classroom: Second Language Perspectives* (Carson and Leki 1993) that focused on both cognitive and social perspectives of L2 literacy. Subsequent work by Ferris and Hedgcock (1998) concentrated on advanced L2 literacy, in particular academic reading and writing skills in the second language. A collection of essays edited by Belcher and Hirvela (2001) introduced perspectives that challenge the notion of textual ownership and explore developments as a result of technological innovations. This volume included an extensive review of the literature on reading-writing connections in L1 and L2

contexts (Grabe 2001). Hirvela's (2004) monograph *Connecting Reading and Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction* describes how teaching methods informed by reader-response theory can link reading and writing. In addition to summarizing key components of reader-response theory, the book presents concrete scenarios which act as examples of how reader-response theory could guide L2 literacy instruction as well as ESL and foreign language curricula.

Inspired by the renewed interest in the ideas of Vygotsky (1978, 1980), sociocultural perspectives have strongly influenced educational linguists and had significant impact on how researchers conceptualized literacy since the late 1980s. The New London Group, an international team of researchers including Courtney Cazden, Bill Cope, James Gee, Mary Kalantzis, Gunther Kress, and Allan Luke, stimulated a wide range of research activities that focused on so-called multiliteracies, multimodality, and new literacies. In their programmatic essay *A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures* (1996), the New London Group proposed a broader view of literacy that is theoretically grounded in sociocultural theory and socio-semiotics in order to respond to changing sociopolitical realities in the wake of globalization and increased geographic mobility. By framing literacy as a socially motivated act and by considering multimodal forms of communication beyond traditional print media, the authors challenged educational institutions to respond to the realities of globalization by not only offering curricula that acknowledge a broad spectrum of literacy practices and multimodal forms of communication but also by implementing a pedagogy that allows learners to critically interrogate texts and intentionality through the discovery of form-meaning connections. This pedagogy, referred to as *meaning design*, is realized by the reinterpretation of *available designs* (linguistic, cultural, and social resources) through a transformative process called *designing*. "*Designing* is a process of accessing, applying, and recycling *Available Designs* in fresh ways to create meaning from texts" (Paesani et al. 2016, p. 24). The result of this circular process is a product, the r*edesigned*, which subsequently will join the recipient's repertoire of *available designs*. Four integrated instructional techniques organize this process: situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformed practice.

Besides a significant number of article-length publications in second language studies that are theoretically based on the multiliteracies framework inspired and developed by members of the New London Group, two monographs stand out: (1) Richard Kern's book *Literacy and Language Teaching* (2000) had a sustained impact on the field. Kern demonstrates how principles associated with the pedagogy proposed by the New London Group can be extended and applied to a large number of instructional and curricular challenges in FL education. The result is a model that helps the integration of reading, writing, speaking, and critical thinking through a variety of media at all levels of language study. It includes considerations that relate to digital technologies, curriculum development, assessment of learning outcomes, and teacher development. Practically, the entire body of subsequent publications on literacy and foreign language education relies to various degrees on this monograph. (2) Paesani et al.'s (2016) monograph *A Multiliteracies Framework for Collegiate Foreign Language Teaching* shares its theoretical base with Kern (2000), but besides

considering the growing number of curricular trends that emerged in the 15 years between these two monographs, their book describes a larger number of concrete scenarios, where a multiliteracies framework transforms foreign language instruction and programs. After providing a robust introduction into the theoretical foundations of multiliteracies and multimodality, the monograph focuses on program development, assessment, grammar and vocabulary instruction, oral language use, reading, writing, visual literacy, and emerging digital literacy practices associated with interactive social media.

The concepts of discourse and acculturation are central mechanisms of the learning process in Kramsch's (2009) social semiotic view of language learning. Symbolic competence blends language and content and permits learners to participate in the "traffic of meaning through reflection, translation, and awareness of the power of language in discourse" (Kramsch 2012, p. 19). The idea of symbolic competence had a significant impact on program structures of collegiate language programs at large, partly because it informed to a large degree by the MLA report, which will be discussed in more detail below (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages 2007).

Related to sociocultural views of language and discourse, the construct of genre has proved to be effective as a heuristic to systematically integrate content and form in collegiate language instruction. The concept of genre is theoretically grounded in systemic-functional linguistics. This field regards language not as a fixed set of rules, but as a flexible resource for meaning making that offers users a range of options to realize communicative events (Halliday 1993). In contrast to literary scholars who use the term genre to refer to types of literary texts, in this context, genre encompasses a broader variety of written and oral texts that "include any staged, goal-oriented, socially situated communicative event." (Maxim 2014, p. 82). Genre-based approaches to literacy instruction demonstrate to learners that comprehension and production depend on attention to communicative purpose and register (Martin 2009). Moreover, genre is also an effective tool to facilitate curricular selection and sequencing processes (Coffin 2006; Christie and Derewianka 2008). The concept of genre – in particular the three major micro-genres (recording, explaining, arguing) identified by Coffin (2006) in the context of secondary history education – has assisted applied linguists in their efforts to select and sequence texts and tasks in collegiate FL instruction and to integrate form and content at all stages of the curriculum (Byrnes and Sprang 2004; Byrnes et al. 2010; Maxim 2009, 2014; Crane 2006; Ryshina-Pankova 2013). The German departments at Georgetown University and Emory University represent not only productive research clusters but also sites of experimentation and successful implementations of genre-based FL curricula.

Swaffar and Arens' (2005) monograph *Remapping the Foreign Language Curriculum: An Approach through Multiple Literacies* is far more than an extension of the curricular changes that Swaffar et al. (1991) outlined. Informed by recent research on literacy, genre, and discourse described above as well as a broad spectrum of insights from critical and literary theory, this book synthesizes a detailed model of curricular transformation in collegiate FL departments. Swaffar and Arens

(2005) strike the balance between literacy- and content-based models by suggesting a curriculum that helps language learners to develop multiple literacies in the second language, with a goal pointing beyond language and content enabling them to understand the implications of texts and other media, not just their forms and contexts. Developed with the learner's need for critical literacy competencies in a variety of genre in mind, this learner-centered curriculum emphasizes "a sequence of learning rather than a sequence of material" (p. 187). At the heart of this endeavor rests the methodology of the *précis* that helps learners to discover multiple layers of communicative implications through an investigation of textual elements, discourse structures, and genre.

Work in Progress

Professional organizations have a significant impact on the dissemination of ideas that relate to literacy-based foreign language curricula. Over the last 15 years, the *American Association of University Supervisors and Coordinators* (AAUSC) has served as a venue for the articulation of innovative curricular thinking in collegiate foreign language education. The annual volumes published by the AAUSC have addressed curricular issues such as the role of literature in collegiate FL instruction (Scott and Tucker 2002), advanced FL instruction (Byrnes and Maxim 2004), program articulation (Barrette and Paesani 2005), and the role of critical and intercultural theory (Levine and Phipps 2012). These volumes contain contributions analyzing instructional and curricular innovations that are not only sensitive to the particular context of collegiate FL departments but also theoretically aligned with many of the above-sketched views on literacy, genre, and discourse. Consequently, these volumes have contributed significantly to the profession's efforts to integrate language and content through literacy in all levels of the undergraduate program and to overcome the traditional two-tiered curriculum.

In recent years, the *Modern Language Association of America* (MLA) has assumed again a more active role in shaping scholarly and professional conversations in regard to the FL curriculum. After having been for the previous 40 years almost exclusively concerned with literary scholarship and cultural studies, in 2007, the MLA issued a widely read report that addressed the crisis in US collegiate foreign language education (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages 2007). The organization urged their members, most of them scholars of literary and cultural studies, to participate in a radical transformation of their undergraduate programs by developing and implementing curricular structures that integrate language study and cultural content at all levels of the undergraduate program. The MLA report called for a "more coherent curriculum in which language, culture, and literature are taught as a continuous whole" (p. 3). This call articulated a programmatic principle opposing the two-tiered curriculum that separated language instruction from content, the template for course offerings that had been the dominant curricular paradigm in collegiate modern languages departments throughout the second half of the twentieth century. The MLA report also advocated for a rethinking

regarding the goals of collegiate foreign language education. Instead of targeting linguistic skills exclusively, foreign language curricula "should be structured to produce a specific outcome: educate speakers who have deep translingual and transcultural competence", which enables multilingual subjects to "operate between languages" (MLA 2007, pp. 3–4). Kramsch (2012) explains that such an outcome can be achieved not just by infusing language classes with cultural content but through content-based curricula that foster the development of an awareness of language in discourse. In conjunction with changing institutional needs and external political and economic pressures, the MLA report lent credence to pre-existing professional voices – some of which are documented above – that had urged the need to develop curricular structures that pay attention to L2 literacy in FL departments in the United States.

Problems and Difficulties

Bernhardt's (2000, 2005, 2011) empirically substantiated model of L2 reading has not only established a theoretically robust foundation for an array of research activities in the second language reading research, it has also inspired curricular modification in collegiate FL programs. Unfortunately, we do not have such a solid foundation regarding the L2 writing process. Not enough research on the transfer of L1 writing competencies has been published that would allow a systematic meta-analysis necessary for an L2 writing model that quantifies the role of transfer. As a result of this lack, L2 writing research and pedagogies remain largely derivative of L1 writing research and pedagogies.

In general, the overall effectiveness of literacy-oriented FL curricula has not been sufficiently assessed through robust research designs using quantitative measurements of learning outcomes and control groups. If publications include quantitative data, the findings frequently relate to learner and teacher perceptions. Few publications offer objective insights into language and literacy gains of learners and compare these with outcomes in more traditional FL curricula.

Although the number of research publications that focus on reading and writing in languages that feature logographic writing systems and consonantal alphabets has increased in the previous decade, the vast majority of the research on L2 literacy with curricular implications is still focusing on language pairings of so-called commonly taught languages that share a large number of cognates and structural similarities. This issue is further complicated by the fact that the limited number of research contributions that relate to L2 literacy in languages with logographic writing systems or consonantal alphabets tend to focus on word- and sentence-level decoding and encoding skills and are usually not embedded within a holistic literacy framework.

Lastly, despite the undeniable impact of the research on L2 literacy on postsecondary education, curricular changes are often local interventions. The relative independence of American academic institutions from governmental oversight allows a high degree of curricular experimentation at the level of individual programs. However, this absence of strict regulation creates an innovative climate in the

first place while preventing the nationwide adoption of the best practices identified in individual programs. Further, as literacy-based language curricula are emerging as a paradigm in postsecondary FL language education, curricula anchored in literacy are still rare at the elementary and secondary levels, where FL education is more stringently regulated by districts, states, and federal policy. The American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) National Standards, most recently updated under the new title *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (The National Standards Collaborative Board 2015), has since their initial publication in 2006 served many states in developing FL educational policy, but "the five Cs" only insufficiently reflect contemporary notions of literacy. This cannot solely be attributed to the organization's traditional bias towards oral communicative competence but also to the fact that – as mentioned above – the empirical evidence for the effectiveness of literacy-based FL curricula is thin.

Future Directions

In order to gain deeper insights into literacy-based approaches to FL instruction in and beyond postsecondary education, the profession should devote energies into the following three areas:

Empirical Evidence for the Effectiveness of Literacy-Based FL Curricula. To this day, there are no empirical studies that compare learning outcomes in literacy-based FL curricula to those achieved by learners in control groups taught through conventional curricula. In order to encourage professional organizations to promote literacy-based FL curricula, empirical evidence of the effectiveness of such programs must be established. This is admittedly a challenge, because it requires methodological finesse to quantitatively capture learning gains in literacy-based FL curricula. Important work that relates to outcome assessment in literacy-based language instruction is currently compiled in a volume by Norris et al. (2016). More work that defines outcomes, established methods, and provides evidence in support of literacy-based language curricula is highly desirable.

L2 Literacy Research Beyond Western Languages. L2 literacy is facilitated to a significant degree by transfer of L1 competences. This process is facilitated, if languages share a large number of cognates, grammatical features, and alphabetical principles. It is therefore problematic that the bulk of the L2 literacy research that lead into curricular innovations has been conducted in the contexts of language programs that focus on the learning of western languages. Future research must therefore focus on non-orthographic languages and language pairing that share few cognates.

The Role of ACTFL. Professional organizations have a critical role in advocacy efforts that support the development towards literacy-based curricula. The 2007 MLA Report's recommendations have been laudable and had a significant impact on programs in postsecondary education, but the organization has no influence on educational policy. In contrast, ACTFL has the leverage to impact FL education at all levels in the United States. The ACTFL National Standards are widely used in K-12

and postsecondary education to develop and calibrate curricula. Despite the fact that "the five Cs" can be interpreted as a framework to organize literacy-based language instruction (Arens 2010), at this point the ACTFL National Standards do not explicitly endorse literacy-based FL curricula throughout. However, ACTFL's newly established Language and Literacy Collaboration Center (The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages 2015) aims at developing and implementing strategies to developing language learner's literacy skills. This is a promising move, but more empirical research and effective advocacy will be required to convince stakeholders at all levels of the profession to focus on second language literacy in postsecondary FL education.

Cross-References

► Sociocultural Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Brian V. Street: New Literacies, New Times: Developments in Literacy Studies. In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

Greg Kessler: Second Language Writing, New Media, and Co-construction Peda gogies. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

James Gee: The Unity of Language, Literacy, Learning, and Digital Media. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

References

Anderson, R. C. (1984). Role of the reader's schema in comprehension, learning, and memory. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), *Learning to read in American schools* (pp. 243–257). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Arens, K. (2010). Genres and the standards: Teaching the 5 Cs through texts. *German Quarterly, 81*(1), 35–48.

Barrette, C., & Paesani, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Language program articulation: Developing a theoretical foundation*. Boston: Heinle.

Beers, T. (1987). Schema-theoretic models of reading: Humanizing the machine. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22*(3), 369–377.

Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. R. (Eds.). (2001). *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Bernhardt, E. B. (2000). Second language reading as a case study for reading scholarship in the twentieth century. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 793–811). Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Bernhardt, E. B. (2005). Progress and procrastination in second language reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*, 133–150.

Bernhardt, E. B. (2011). *Understanding advanced second-language reading*. New York: Routledge.

Bernhardt, E. B., & Berman, R. A. (1999). From German 1 to German studies 001: A chronicle of curricular reform. *Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 32*(1), 22–31.
Bernhardt, E. B., & Kamil, M. L. (1995). Interpreting relationships between L1 and L2 reading: Consolidating the linguistic threshold and the linguistic interdependence hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics, 16*(1), 15–34.
Byrnes, H., & Maxim, H. H. (2004). *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs*. Boston: Heinle.
Byrnes, H., & Sprang, K. (2004). Fostering advanced L2 literacy: A genre-based, cognitive approach. In H. Byrnes & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 47–85). Boston: Heinle.
Byrnes, H., Maxim, H. H., Norris, J. (2010). Realizing advanced foreign language writing development in collegiate education: Curricular design, pedagogy, assessment. *Monograph Series, Modern Language Journal,* 94(Issue Supplement s1).
Carson, J., & Leki, I. (Eds.). (1993). *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives*. Boston: Heinle.
Christie, F., & Derewianka, B. (2008). *School discourse: Learning to write across the years of schooling*. London: Continuum.
Coffin, C. (2006). *Historical discourse: The language of time, cause, and evaluation*. London: Continuum.
Crane, C. (2006). Modeling a genre-based foreign language curriculum: Staging advanced L2 learning. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 227–245). London: Continuum.
Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, & practice*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365–387.
Goodman, K. S. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist, 6*, 126–135.
Gough, P. G. (1972). One second of reading. In J. F. Kavanagh & I. G. Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by ear and by eye* (pp. 331–358). Cambridge: MIT Press.
Grabe, W. (2001). Reading-writing relations: Theoretical perspectives and instructional practices. In D. Belcher & A. R. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 15–47). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(1), 76–88.
Halliday, M. A. (1993). Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education, 5*(2), 93–116.
Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Huey, E. B. (1908). *The psychology and pedagogy of reading* (5th ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kern, R. (2003). Literacy as a new organizing principle for foreign language education. In P. Patrikis (Ed.), *Reading between the lines: Perspectives on foreign language literacy* (pp. 40–59). New Haven: Yale University Press.
King, J., Holley, F., & Weber, B. (1975). A new reading. In G. Jarvis (Ed.), *Perspective: A new freedom. ACTFL review of foreign language education* (Vol. 7, pp. 169–217). Skokie: National Textbook Company.
Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kramsch, C. (2012). Theorizing translingual/transcultural competence. In G. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 15–31). Boston: Heinle Cengage.

Levine, G., & Phipps, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy. AAUSC Issues in language program direction, 2010*. Boston: Heinle Cengage.

Martin, J. R. (2009). Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. *Linguistics and Education, 20*(1), 10–21.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 15–34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maxim, H. H. (2009). Developing formal language abilities along a genre-based continuum. In J. Watzinger-Tharp & S. Katz (Eds.), *Conceptions of L2 grammar: Theoretical approaches and their application in the L2 classroom* (pp. 172–188). Boston: Heinle.

Maxim, H. H. (2014). Curricular integration and faculty development: Teaching language-based content across the foreign language curriculum. In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming postsecondary foreign language teaching in the United States* (pp. 79–101). Dordrecht: Springer.

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. http://www.mla.org/pdf/forlang_news_pdf.pdf. Accessed 1 Feb 2015.

Murray, D. (1972). Teach writing as a process not product. *The Leaflet, 71*(3), 11–14.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60–92.

Norris, J., Davis, J., & Watanabe, Y. (Eds.). (2016). *Student learning outcomes assessment in college foreign language programs*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Olson, C. B. (2003). *The reading/writing connection: Strategies for teaching and learning in the secondary classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Paesani, K., Allen, H. W., & Dupuy, B. (2016). *A multiliteracies framework for collegiate foreign language teaching*. Boston: Pearson.

Pressley, M. (2005). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching*. New York: Guilford.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1977). Toward an interactive model of reading. In S. Dornic (Ed.), *Attention and performance IV.* New York: Academic.

Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2013). Connecting languaging and knowing through genre: Exemplifying the link in a curricular progression. In J. Plews & B. Schmenk (Eds.), *Traditions and transitions: German curricula*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Scott, V., & Tucker, H. (Eds.). (2002). *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues*. Boston: Heinle.

Stanovich, K. E. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly, 16*(1), 32–71.

Swaffar, J., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the foreign language curriculum: An approach through multiple literacies*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.

Swaffar, J., & Woodruff, M. (1978). Language for comprehension: Focus on reading – A report on the University of Texas German program. *Modern Language Journal, 62*(1/2), 27–32.

Swaffar, J., Arens, K., & Byrnes, H. (1991). *Reading for meaning: An integrated approach to language learning*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

The American Council for The Teaching of Foreign Language. (2015). *Language and literacy collaboration center.* http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development/languages-and-literacy. Accessed 1 Feb 2015.

The National Standards Collaborative Board. (2015). *World-readiness standards for learning languages: Fourth edition* (W-RSLL). http://www.actfl.org/publications/all/world-readiness-standards-learning-languages. Accessed 1 Feb 2015.

Tierney, R. J., & Pearson, P. D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts, 60*(5), 568–580.

Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 10*(1), 67–76.

Electronic Portfolios in Foreign Language Learning

Mary Toulouse and Michelle Geoffrion-Vinci

Contents

Early Developments 152
Major Contributors 153
Work in Progress 159
Problems and Difficulties 161
Future Directions 164
Cross-References 164
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 165
References 165

Abstract

This chapter presents the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of electronic portfolios for language learning. A means of archiving, documenting, and evaluating the development of student knowledge over time, the e-portfolio has only recently been recognized as a powerfully effective tool in language study and the development of communicative competence and cultural literacy. This chapter situates the language e-portfolio in the historical and geopolitical context in which it has taken shape in Europe and the USA over the past 20 years. It describes key players past and present in e-portfolio development, critical national and international political and educational initiatives that influenced the growth of e-portfolio usage and evolution, and a number of major initiatives in electronic portfolio usage in Europe and the USA from kindergarten to university, including the European Language Portfolio, LinguaFolio, and LaFolio. Additionally, the entry examines related assessment practices and rubrics used to evaluate student learning as manifest in e-portfolios. Finally, it discusses the kinds of structural, administrative, and financial support necessary

M. Toulouse (✉) • M. Geoffrion-Vinci (✉)
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Lafayette College, Easton, PA, USA
e-mail: toulousm@lafayette.edu; geoffrim@lafayette.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*,
Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_13

to make e-portfolio usage "sticky" or long-lasting in foreign language teaching and learning at all levels of instruction.

Keywords
Communicative competence • Evidence • authentic communicative tasks • coherence • standards • accountability • formative assessment • connected learning • integrated e-portfolio • reflection • VALUE rubrics • Milestones • electronic credentials

Early Developments

The last 20 years have seen abundant growth in research and development in electronic portfolio methodologies, technologies, and praxis across a variety of disciplines, from English to engineering studies (Banta 2003; Cambridge et al. 2001; Cambridge et al. 2009; Garrett 2009, pp. 719–740; Jafari and Kaufman 2006; Yancey 2001, pp. 15–30). Nationally and internationally, primary and secondary schools as well as colleges and universities, both public and private, have been adopting e-portfolios as a means of archiving, documenting, and evaluating the development of student knowledge over time (National Council of State Supervisors for Languages n.d.).

Although traditionally associated with the visual arts, the portfolio was repurposed and popularized in the 1990s as a universal assessment tool that serves as a formative alternative to the multiple-choice tests and other structured format evaluations traditionally used at the time. It was intended for general education use, not specifically foreign language instruction. These predigital portfolios were paper-based and unwieldy, thus preventing easy implementation. They did, however, establish what would become the goals of e-portfolio usage and served as models for this next-generation instrument, namely:

> A portfolio is a purposeful collection of student work that exhibits the student's efforts, progress, and achievements in one or more areas. The collection must include student participation in selecting contents, the criteria for selection, the criteria for judging merit, and evidence of student reflection. (Paulson et al. 1991, pp. 60–63)

As the electronic portfolio has increased in use, a wide variety of commercially available e-portfolio systems have sprung up in order to accommodate the growing need for instrumentation (Digication e-Portfolios n.d.; Interfolio – Dossier, Credentials and Letter of Recommendation n.d.; Brightspace|D2L ePortfolio n.d.; Open School n.d.; Chalk and Wire n.d.). Additionally, the e-portfolio itself is the main focus of two professional organizations, namely, the Association for Authentic, Experiential and Evidence-Based Learning (AAEEBL) (Association for Authentic, Experiential and Evidence-Based Learning (AAEEBL) – Home for the World E-Portfolio Community 2011) and the Inter/National Coalition for Electronic Portfolio Research (Inter/National Coalition for Electronic Portfolio Research 2010),

both of which examine from diverse angles the implications and impact of this apparatus on learning.

While they have been used to chart skill development in a growing number of disciplines in the aforementioned 20 years, it has only been far more recently that e-portfolios have gained a foothold in the USA in the area of non-English language studies (Cummins and Davesne 2009, pp. 848–867; National Council of State Supervisors for Languages 2014). Prior to the mid-2000s, e-portfolio usage in this discipline was eclipsed by more traditional teaching and assessment methods (Ricardo-Osorio 2008, pp. 590–610).

Communicative competence and cultural literacy, the overarching goals of language learning, are well suited for the e-portfolio framework. Indeed, performance-based communicative output as outlined by the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (ACTFL 1999) lends itself readily to this form of assessment. Second-language acquisition in a standards-based curriculum means learning how to use language to accomplish authentic communicative tasks, to gain and to demonstrate understanding of the cultures that speak the language of study, to use this language to acquire knowledge in and of other disciplines, to better understand one's own language, and to engage directly with linguistic and cultural systems that share our collective economic, social, and geographical landscape (ACTFL 1999). These goals are interconnected and call for a curriculum that is similarly integrated, with learning activities that extend well beyond the memorization of vocabulary and discrete grammar points. Such activities must be based on real life or authentic contexts and content, and the degree to which students can negotiate meaning in such settings can only be effectively measured across a chronological continuum by something more than the traditional achievement test.[1] Given its holistic and longitudinal attributes, the e-portfolio has the potential to be the vehicle by which to accomplish this.

Major Contributors

It is useful to consider e-portfolio development within the context of recent historical events in Western history. The signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1993 ratified the newly formed European Union (EU) and brought together 26 culturally and linguistically diverse countries, 22 of which abolished internal border controls by issuing common visas, thus encouraging the free circulation of trade, goods, money, and people. At the time, with more than 250 languages, 24 of which were official idioms in member states, the need arose for a means to standardize the learning, teaching, and certification of language use for all European stakeholders, i.e., learners,

[1]Portions of this entry are reprinted with permission from Geoffrion-Vinci et al. (2013) "Of proficiency, prochievement, and (e)Portfolios: A blueprint for deep language-learning and assessment." *ADFL Bulletin*, 42(2): 36–60.

educators, employers, and assessing agencies, with an important focus on serving the new, unified labor market.

It is in this political framework that the European Language Portfolio (ELP), perhaps the earliest model of the language portfolio, was first proposed at the Rüschlikon Symposium in 1991 along with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The ELP was conceived as the tool to promote, disseminate, and implement the primary goals of the CEFR, i.e., respect for linguistic and cultural diversity, or plurilingualism, in the newly formed Union. (See also "► The Common European Framework of Reference" by Monica Barni.) Their joint charge was – and still is today – to provide transparency and coherence for the teaching, learning, and assessment of all European languages (Little et al. 2015).

Development and exploration of the implementation of the ELP continued under the auspices of the Council of Europe, a centralizing, advisory, and policy-making group for the EU. In 1997, at the closing of the Council of Europe's April conference on the topic of "Language Learning for European Citizenship," participants agreed to support a series of pilot ELP projects in 15 Council of Europe member states and three International Non-Governmental Agencies (INGOs) such as the American National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages (NCSSFL). In 2000, a European Union Council Resolution by the ministers of education of all member states of the Council of Europe formally recommended using the CEFR to validate language proficiency and also approved a mandate to draft and accredit new versions of the ELPs in the different member nations. The year 2001 was designated as the "Year of Languages," and the first ELP was officially launched (Little et al. 2015).

In terms of its design, the ELP was and continues to be made up of three primary components: the Language Passport, the Language Biography, and the Dossier. The Language Passport, working in tandem with the *Europass: Opening doors to learning and jobs*, was sponsored by the Council of Europe, the European Commission's Directorate General of Education and Culture, and the European Center for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP). The overarching goals of this part of the ELP were "to help [European] citizens communicate their skills and qualifications" (European Center for the Development of Vocational Training 2014) in language competency on the job market as well as in the common area of educational cooperation as established by the 1999 Treaty of Bologna.

In terms of functionality, the Language Passport profiles the user's language skills and provides detailed lists of (1) the user's personal experiences with one or several languages, (2) written self-assessments, (3) summaries of formal learning beginning in preschool and continuing through higher education as well as training schools, (4) official certifications that document communicative proficiency, and (5) the user's relevant linguistic and intercultural experiences. Self-assessments and certifications are based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), a series of rubrics designated in 2001 by the Council of Europe to evaluate understanding, speaking, and writing; proficiency is represented on graduated scale of novice (A1, A2), intermediate (B1, B2), and advanced/native speaker levels (C1, C2) (Council of Europe et al. 2001).

The ELP's second component, the Language Biography, is a descriptive presentation by the learner of (1) pertinent personal information; (2) personal objectives for language use; (3) how she/he uses the language(s) at work, at home, at school, or in leisure activities; and (4) how she/he uses language(s) to "mediate between people" (Council of Europe et al. 2001).

The third component, or Dossier, is a document that illustrates and provides evidence of achievements noted in the Language Passport and Biography. It can provide a formative assessment of learner's linguistic ability and development of the same or serve as a summative assessment, attesting to the learner's level of proficiency, which, since validated by the CEFR, is standardized across the larger European employment market and may be used to show qualifications for a particular job (Council of Europe et al. 2001).

LinguaFolio is the North American adaptation of the European Language Portfolio, and it, too, is worth situating historically. Indeed, its genesis occurred when a delegation of American educators participated in the 2002 Transatlantic Dialogue in Düsseldorf, Germany, on the development of the ELP. Members of the delegation returned to the USA with the goal of popularizing and building on the concept, renamed LinguaFolio (LF). Whereas the ELP had been the product of a change in European geopolitical structure and marketplace, LinguaFolio was conceived as a preparatory measure for the twenty-first century and a new era in American education. Toward that end, two changes were in the wind: the development of national standards for language learning and a push for accountability in schools.

The first of these changes began to take shape in 1993 as part of the "America 2000" education initiative. For this national project, the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) received federal funding to develop standards for foreign language education in grades K-12. By the early 2000s, ACTFL had twice revised its recommended *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* and developed new proficiency guidelines for rating student achievement. Under the *Standards*, five content areas were identified as important to the development of curriculum:

- **C**ommunication through interpretation, interpersonal interactions, and presentations using language
- Understanding of other **c**ultures
- **C**omparisons and contrasts between cultures
- **C**onnections with other disciplines
- Participation in different **c**ommunities

Published in 1999 after years of deliberation, the ACTFL standards have been described as "an unprecedented consensus among educators, business leaders, government, and the community on the definition and role of foreign language instruction in American education" (ACTFL 1999). In terms of the proficiency guidelines for rating achievement, the emphasis shifted from what students know about a language, i.e., grammar and vocabulary, to what they can do with a language,

in other words, listen, read, write, speak, and interact in authentic contexts (ACTFL 1999; Tedick 2015). (See also "► The Role of the National Standards in Second/Foreign Language Education" by Sally Magnan, this volume.)

Secondly, in 2001, as part of the national educational agenda and new heightened interest in accountability, the Congress passed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), after which the use of standardized testing dramatically increased in all American schools that received public funding and in all subject areas, including those, like foreign languages, for which testing was not mandated. (See also "► Assessing English Language Proficiency in the United States" by Luis E. Poza and Guadeloupe Valdes) The LinguaFolio concept, as a formative assessment of communicative proficiency in foreign languages, not only met the new ACTFL standards but also addressed the important accountability issues facing educational institutions at the time (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages n.d.).

Given all of the above, it should be noted that the role of the US Federal government in education is limited by the Constitution; even though national standards may be put forth, according to the Tenth Amendment, education is normally the purview of the state and local governments. Therefore, contrary to its European counterpart, the language portfolio in the USA is not overseen by a centralizing organization such as the European Council. Rather, oversight of this instrument and its related goals and outcomes is the responsibility of individual state education agencies with world languages task forces. However, to date, not all US states have opted to participate in this process. The first iterations of the portfolio were piloted in the states of Nebraska and Virginia. The 2002 Düsseldorf group included Faye Rollings-Carter, a member of NCSSFL and former associate director of foreign languages at the State of Virginia Department of Education. Considered by many a "pioneer" of the language portfolio movement in the USA, Rollings-Carter continued to promote LinguaFolio in the state of Virginia, where it eventually became the base for a five-state consortium version, and then went on to advocate its use nationally as well (LinguaFolio® 2014).

Both the Nebraska and Virginia beta versions were based on (1) the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, (2) the CEFR, and (3) their respective state task force language standards. Like the European Language Portfolio, these student portfolios consisted of three sections: (1) the Biography or Language Journey, (2) the Language Passport, and (3) the Dossier of Evidence. The original versions were paper-based portfolios and appropriate for a kindergarten through high school population. Implementation in the curriculum in both states was encouraged through professional teacher training workshops. Tests were developed to serve as a baseline so that students could compare this assessment of their work with that of their teachers or a third-party evaluator. Some of these tests were public, like the European Dialang online test (Lancaster University 2015), or commercial, like the American STAMP test (Standards-based Assessment and Measurement of Proficiency n.d.). Students were also encouraged to share their e-portfolios with counselors and college admissions offices.

As grassroots use of e-portfolio increased at the state level, the LF became a national goal for professional organizations affiliated with language learning. In collaboration with the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) and the National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL), the Center for Applied Language Studies (CASLS), a national foreign language resource center located at the University of Oregon, undertook the task of developing a beta version of LinguaFolio, which, with newly developed Internet capability, would be available electronically for generalized use and customization by all state education departments, schools, and centers, private or public. Important additional support for the LF online came from the National Security Agency, executive agent for the STARTALK program (STARTALK n.d.; Center for Applied Language Studies n.d.), a Presidential Initiative that funds summer programs in critical languages, such as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Persian, Turkish, Swahili, and Urdu. Students in these programs are required to document their work in the new LinguaFolio®.

The LinguaFolio®, trademarked in 2011, and LinguaFolio Junior portfolios became available for a per capita fee from LinguaFolio online at the University of Oregon in 2014. Moreover, an intensive support network has been created for new users as well as those institutions wishing to customize the LinguaFolio template. In addition, the NCSSFL provides a resource entitled Building Your Own LinguaFolio® on their website that allows registered users to download all documents to build electronic or paper versions of LinguaFolio® (LinguaFolio® 2015). The State of Nebraska offers a series of corollary video resources for goal setting and reflection (World Language Education n.d.). The Global Can-Do Benchmarks, an American framework of reference for proficiency standards, is available, thanks to a cooperative effort between ACTFL and the NCSSFL Can-Do statements (NCSSFL 2014). Additionally, NCSSFL and the state of North Carolina Public Department of Public Instruction working in collaboration with Faye Rollings-Carter have set up teacher training modules (What is LinguaFolio? n.d.).

The NCSSFL, arguably the primary advocate of the LinguaFolio initiative, sees the goals of this product as far-reaching:

> The vision of LinguaFolio® is to allow seamless progress in language learning as individuals move from one level to another, from one program to another, and even as they cease to participate in formal language instruction, but continue active language learning independently. The goal is to empower each individual learner to take responsibility for his or her language learning and be able to continue to develop proficiency independently and autonomously once the formal sequence of language instruction has ended. (LinguaFolio® 2014)

The LinguaFolio online is not considered a test, but rather a formative assessment tool with an emphasis on student agency that empowers learners to take charge of their learning of languages over their lifetimes. As an online tool, it is portable and allows students to archive evidence that "prove" their communicative abilities and experiences to themselves and others. It is an instrument used in schools to encourage students to document their personal reflections and intercultural experiences, thereby scaffolding the language learning experience and the learner's cultural

understanding. It is geared for use by a national audience with thousands of students (Center for Applied Language Studies n.d.).

Like the ELP, the LinguaFolio (LF) online product in its current form is a highly structured instrument composed of three sections and an accompanying passport that summarizes the sections:

1. The Biography is a record in which learners list and categorize their experiences with language and culture, e.g., in formal language classes or during informal travel experiences.
2. The Can-Dos, similar to those of the ELP, are self-assessment checklists of positive statements that identify language knowledge, skills, strategies for learning, cultural understanding, and proficiency levels. Considered the "heart" of LinguaFolio, these rubrics visually assess student's abilities across the five modes and sub-modes of communicative competence (formerly termed "skills"): interpretive listening, interpretive reading, interpersonal presentational speaking, and presentational writing. Based on the ACTFL and NCSSFL standards, the metrics are different from the CEFR in that they consist of 11 benchmarks: novice low, medium, and high; intermediate low, medium, and high; advanced low, medium, and high; superior; and distinguished. Thanks to an innovative computer program, students dynamically check off personal goals for each statement, electronically track their progress on a regular basis, and can provide proof of their ability by uploading supporting evidence, e.g., YouTube video of their work, audio files, and texts. A section for feedback from reviewers, both that of peers and instructors, is included in the portfolio.
3. The interculturality module, which could be compared to the ELP's category where the language speaker "mediates between people," provides a listing of student reflections on their interactions with the target culture.
4. Language Passport is an overview of the individual's biography, language journey, and progress on the Can-Do statements. It includes external test scores, awards, and achievements.
5. A Task Section is available to accommodate needed extra tasks in the learning of non-Western languages, an important option for STARTALK users (Center for Applied Language Studies n.d.).

Some concluding observations:

1. Over the last decade, the LinguaFolio with its accompanying "Can-Do" statements has gained in recognition in the USA as an exciting new vehicle to promote national standards and an alternative to traditional assessments; both ACTFL and NCSSFL, the two preeminent American language learning organizations, have endorsed its use. Importantly, by the mid-2010s, a number of state departments of education (Wisconsin, North Carolina, Oklahoma) with world language standards – not all do – and some local school districts (e.g., Newark) are currently promoting the product; but, without a Federal government mandate, usage remains random, given that adoption is the purview of individual institutions

and, in some cases, even individual instructors. As a result of Congress's recent repeal of the No Child Left Behind Act (2015), that essential push for adoption across the states, similar to that of the European Union, seems unlikely to continue.

2. In terms of accessibility, the transfer from a paper portfolio to an electronic format has had a significant impact on the accessibility and utility of this tool, in particular the Can-Do statements. However, given current financial priorities and struggles of both public and private school districts, the conversion from a free instrument, as was the case during the beta test, to a fee-per-student, commercial product will undoubtedly have negative consequences. It is unclear as to how this will impact the long-term sustainability of the product: when a K-12 institution initiates and pays for the original portfolio, who will be responsible for the portfolio's longer-term maintenance once the student user leaves the school? Moreover, who, in fact, owns the portfolio and its intellectual content?
3. To ensure future adaptation and viability, the LinguaFolio would benefit from expanding its ecosystem to include more consumers and users. In its current state of development, the individual student's LinguaFolio is nested within the prescribed foreign language program, and even class, of a sponsoring school or institution. Although users are encouraged to showcase it as a credential for college admission, the lifespan of the portfolio is often limited to the period of time of the student's formal education at the K-12 secondary institution. In order to gain more traction, it would, for example, behoove language educators to lobby for inclusion of LinguaFolio as a document within the universal application to college, thus encouraging broader support across the educational community.

Work in Progress

At the collegiate level, research and development of electronic portfolios have also been a topic of great interest in language departments and centers across the country (Rice, Cornell University, Virginia Commonwealth University, the Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research (CALPER)). Representative of this interest, the Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures at Lafayette College began the development of LaFolio in the mid-2000s. The LaFolio model, like many of the e-portfolio initiatives, found its origins in the ELP during early information sessions offered by the National Capital Language Center (NCLRC) (NCLRC 2015). However, whereas the primary focus of LinguaFolio was on C for communication from the standards' five Cs with a secondary emphasis on culture, the initial LaFolio goals were broader, designed specifically with the goal of "developing a digital learning record that could (sic) be used to document the achievements of specified learning outcomes . . . in every single one of the content standards of the five Cs" or content areas (Geoffrion-Vinci et al. 2013, p.39). The focus was and continues to be on connected learning.

Although well grounded by the ELP in its roots as a language e-portfolio, LaFolio also found inspiration in the digital general education portfolio movement of the

2000s, in particular through participation in a conference organized by the New York Times Education Division and hosted at LaGuardia Community College, a leader of one of the national e-portfolio cohorts (ePortfolio at LaGuardia Community College n.d.). American colleges and universities were facing a variety of challenges. Pedagogically, the focus was shifting from grades to student outcomes and to finding new and inclusive ways to evaluate student work. Rather than basing assessment solely on traditional methods, i.e., exams or papers, the e-portfolio showcases evidence of student achievements, skills, and attitudes. Moreover, in an environment where "everything is part of the curriculum" as it is in today's colleges (Berret 2014, p. A29), the e-portfolio offers a cohesive document that comprehensively recounts the typical learner's educational journey. As such, the LaFolio model extends its scope beyond that of a simple language portfolio, like that of an ELP or a LinguaFolio; this model is designed as an integrated e-portfolio instrument that not only charts skill development in communicative competence and cultural literacy but also includes the documentation of cocurricular engagement in multiple communities, connections through interdisciplinary studies, and comparisons through personal statements on their language learning and multicultural insights (Geoffrion-Vinci et al. 2013, pp. 36–60). Indeed, LaFolio's users at Lafayette include majors in such notably diverse disciplines as international affairs, neuroscience, biology, the arts and engineering, as well as student-athletes and student-citizens (see also "► Using Portfolios for Assessment/Alternative Assessment" by Janna Fox).

A second concern in the 2000s is the escalating cost of a college education. A number of commercial software e-portfolio packages are available; they seem, however, to have a cookie-cutter presentation that serves a mass audience well, but is not easily customizable. Constructed with *WordPress*, a free, open-source blog, and website creation tool (McCollin 2013), the underlying structure of the LaFolio model is flexible in its format but still serves as a blueprint that facilitates the telling by each individual student of his or her own "personal story," thus transferring ownership of the portfolio from the educational institution to the student as a way of encouraging long-term use. Importantly, as a WordPress file, LaFolio and all its contents can be easily exported and moved by its student-author to his or her own hosting space on the Internet as they continue to tell that post-graduation story.

Whereas the format of LinguaFolio, as a national tool with a secondary education target population of users in the thousands, is by necessity based on lists, a college-style portfolio can be grounded in the individual institution, be more personalized, and encourage more qualitative and descriptive input. LaFolio, for example, has five primary, but modifiable content areas in which the student-authors freely upload different types of information using text, colorful graphics, and media:

1. The "Profile," or welcome page for a summary of the user's skills as well as professional information such as a résumé.
2. "Awards and Distinctions" for documentation of awards or credentials that indicate ratings in external testing, badges earned, and campus leadership certificates.
3. "Courses" for descriptions, comparisons, and reflections on evidence of learning, ranging from core courses to electives. More than just an archive of disconnected

links, evidence may include projects for a course. In many cases, the "course" is, in fact, a nested portfolio within the student's larger, personal portfolio; set up as a blog, this mini-portfolio serves as a staging ground for learning across a semester. This feature is difficult to achieve in a commercial product.

4. The "Experiences" tab encourages students to connect their studies abroad, internships, and/or off-campus learning activities by annotating them with videos and picture galleries. A unique feature of the flexible model portfolio is that journals from other blogs may also be incorporated.
5. The "Personal Statement," for the user's general reflection on her/his overall development, skill set, and future goals.

> Importantly, for each of the above content areas, students work with faculty advisors and participate in an e-portfolio preparation method commonly known as "Collect, Select, and Reflect." (LaFolio n.d.) That is, in consultation with their professors, student learners collect all evidence that demonstrates skill development, select the most relevant and/or exemplary artifacts within that evidence, and reflect in writing on precisely how said artifacts demonstrate what they know and what they can do in a given learning domain. (Burke et al. 1994)

Problems and Difficulties

There are three major challenges to the twenty-first century portfolio movement that should be considered: early adoption, sustainability, and the eternal quest for new and improved assessment tools.

The primary challenge to portfolio implementation is to convince educators to first explore and perhaps eventually adopt new technologies and pedagogical initiatives, thus changing the current teaching and learning landscape. Indeed, entropy, as a law of nature, is normal and inherent in any system, even in an educational community whose main goal is primarily benevolent, i.e., that of providing a quality learning environment for its students. This challenge as it applies to twenty-first century portfolio initiatives is compounded by the residual stigma of past failures. As recently as the 1990s, educators and their respective institutions, seeking alternative assessment methods, invested heavily in the implementation of predigital portfolios, but met with little success; the instrument was shelved, perceived as simply too hard to implement; the all-important strong community of users never developed.

Unfortunately, the cyber revolution was only starting just as the old portfolio initiative beginning to fail. The Internet and the World Wide Web did not become available until the early 1990s. It would take another decade to develop the innovative technologies, i.e., digital images, video, and audio files (the new bread and butter of twenty-first century language learning), the electronic transfer and sharing of files, online server storage, as well as Web software programs like WordPress and Majara that would facilitate portfolio distribution and transform the archiving of artifacts (predominately paper) and networking, capabilities that were previously too cumbersome to use or did not exist. Understandably, even with these exciting new technologies, the successful beta versions of the e-portfolio have proceeded slowly,

testing and developing models that would encourage wary educators to once again reconsider, reevaluate, and reinvest their time and resources in the new electronic portfolios.

Indeed time has been a factor in fulfilling the formula for portfolio implementation: development of the appropriate tools, establishing good practices, and the creation of an ecosystem of contributors and consumers. At the international and national levels of early adoption, it has taken the ELP and LinguaFolio almost 10–15 years to transition from their original paper formats and developed the infrastructure and subsequent buy-in of the digital version of the portfolio by a community of uses. In the decade following the launch of the language e-portfolio initiative in Europe, there are now over 118 ELPs that have been validated with an estimate of over 584,000 learners using e-portfolios (Stoicheva et al. 2015; Little et al. 2015). As an institutional example, beta testing on early versions of LaFolio began in 2006, supported by only a small coalition of the willing. With 1266 language portfolios currently in the chute, it is only now (2016) starting to being actively tested as a requirement for Spanish and German majors at the departmental level; moreover, an expansion of the language portfolio is in the works: the College's Academic Planning Committee at Lafayette College, LaFolio's host institution, has just authorized future exploration and development of campus-wide, integrated e-portfolios.

The second challenge lies in how to segue from early adoption to long-term sustainability. Early findings indicate that "the electronic portfolio is both a highly effective vehicle for increased deep learning in language and a measurement of communicative competence and cultural literacy that pushes far more traditional, unidimensional methods of teaching, learning, and assessment." (Geoffrion-Vinci et al. 2013, p. 46) Likewise, continued implementation and development of the LinguaFolio in the USA seem to point toward positive results in both methodology and practice. Impact studies carried out on the ELP report that it is an innovative and practical tool; yet, its sustainability is still a concern (Stoicheva et al. 2015; Little et al. 2015).

The question remains as to whether the language e-portfolio venture is what Ali Jafari would describe as "sticky," in other words, an instrument, which over time "works and will be adopted by users" (Jafari 2004, p. 38). As the concept matures, plans must be made to increase its functionality and scaffold the all-important buy-in from stakeholders, ranging from individual learners at all levels of their studies to their instructors, from educational programs to their institutions, and, finally, the marketplace and beyond.

The third challenge to portfolio adoption is of a pedagogical nature. Much of the interest generated in e-portfolios is because it is considered an alternative assessment tool. With the major archiving and networking problems resolved, thanks to the technology revolution and the digitation of student work, the overarching question remains as to how this tool can be easily and effectively used by educators to evaluate students' linguistic and cultural competence. LinguaFolio online has addressed this problem with an optional section for external review by instructors or peers. However, the primary review mechanism, albeit popular, is limited to an indirect assessment method, relying on self-efficacy or Can-Do statements. Self-efficacy research is supported by the well-known, social cognitive theories of the

psychologist Albert Bandura (Mills et al. 2007) that were first popularized in the 1960s. The underlying principle is, nevertheless, controversial: it posits that learners' impressions of how much or how well they are learning directly correlate with reality. In other words, i.e., if you think you can do something, you can.

On the other hand, the use of direct learning assessments for portfolios, as distinct from assessments that target users' impressions of their learning, has not yet been completely vetted. Fortunately, language educators have at their disposal a series of well-developed and validated methods for evaluating their students' progress, thanks to the aforementioned Common European Framework of Reference and the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* as well as the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Language's Oral and Written Proficiency Guidelines. In fact, a wealth of rubrics for all language abilities and modes of communication are currently being developed and shared by teachers across the world, thanks to new Internet technologies and social media. At the micro- or classroom level, individual portfolio artifacts that students select from their classwork have already been assessed, and such assessments are typically based on a grading rubric designed or selected by the instructor. Such rubrics can and indeed should also be included in the e-portfolio.

The evaluation of e-portfolios that are implemented at the micro-/class level exclusively is the purview of the instructor. At the macro-level of e-portfolio methodology, however, the protocols and practices have yet to be fully explored; it is necessary to develop (1) new rubrics, (2) determine who specifically evaluates a student e-portfolio, (3) to know by what process the e-portfolios are evaluated, and (4) to know how achievement is to be recognized.

The challenge is exciting: electronic portfolio use affords a digital space and a unique opportunity to evaluate skill development on a broader horizon that represents a learner's holistic evolution over time and across a wider array of domains including but not limited to critical thinking, technical literacy, creativity, and citizenship. Fortuitously, the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) has constructed a battery of rubrics designed to measure growth in these areas and more besides (Programs | VALUE | VALUE Rubrics n.d.). These rubrics, better known as the VALUE rubrics (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) (Programs | VALUE | VALUE Rubrics n.d.), reflect those manifest in the CEFR and ACTFL guidelines but also move the teaching of foreign languages out of its Tower of Babel and set up interdisciplinary, transcurricular milestones that are readily customizable to fit the needs of any program and/or e-portfolio. Repurposed as electronic credentials, such rubrics can be easily identifiable and be put in place at the macro- and even the microlevels, hyperlinked or otherwise incorporated directly onto the e-portfolio for easy accessibility and referencing by learners, teacher/evaluators, and the greater social network, if so desired. But, importantly, as noted by the Alliance for Excellent Education (2013), such electronic credentials "play an integral role by supporting recognition of a skill or competency level and allowing learners to create custom pathways" – pathways that integrate all five Cs in ways that could not otherwise be imagined given the traditional, compartmentalized departmental structures common in most of today's educational institutions infrastructures.

Future Directions

As we imagine the future language portfolio as part of a global ecosystem, there will be necessary changes in its role and form, to wit:

- The language e-portfolio will need to find its place in a variety of communities and be integrated into the professional and personal story of the user. To do this, it may no longer exist as a language portfolio, but rather as an interdisciplinary, trans-curricular tool in which five Cs language learning plays an important role. We have already seen the beginning of this important trend in the ELP and LaFolio.
- Public and private funding will need to continue to provide teacher training and support for curriculum changes designed to meet the challenges of providing evidence of a communicative approach to learning.
- The tool will need to take on a form – perhaps even a "family" of forms (Little et al. 2015) – that are user-friendly, will increasingly facilitate author independence, and are readily available to all, importantly, at little or no cost.
- New assessment tools will need to be vetted and validated and current tools refined. The future e-portfolio will interconnect with social networking spaces so as to create a dialogue with students and employers about its importance.

The ELP, LinguaFolio, and LaFolio have served as important models of early twenty-first century electronic portfolios and merit further research and development. Indeed, the advantages of exploring future e-portfolio seem clear, especially if the difficulties in adoption and sustainability are addressed. With the advent and continuous infusion of new and varied technologies, computer-mediated activities have already become common currency in many language classrooms at both the K-12 and collegiate levels across the USA and elsewhere. As such and paired with related, standards-based rubrics to assess students' learning, these can easily be incorporated into an electronic portfolio for broader understanding of what we are teaching our students. The digital framework of the portfolio aptly showcases twenty-first century artifacts that demonstrate language learning outcomes in new ways and in a variety of types, from the traditional composition to student-produced movies to blogs representative of work in any of the five Cs. With continued training and support from both the public and private sectors, programs at many institutions could integrate electronic portfolios at both the course and program levels with little difficulty, thus providing students and faculty with an important and exciting innovation in the teaching and learning of foreign languages.

Cross-References

► The Role of the National Standards in Second/Foreign Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Monica Barni: The Common European Framework of Reference. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment

Janna Fox: Using Portfolios for Assessment/Alternative Assessment. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment

References

ACTFL. *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century.* (1999). Lawrence: Allen Press.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2013). Expanding education and workforce opportunities through digital badges. Retrieved from http://all4ed.org/reports-factsheets/expanding-education-and-workforce-opportunities-through-digital-badges/

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (n.d.). Testing for proficiency. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3348

Association for Authentic, Experiential and Evidence-Based Learning (AAEEBL). (2011). Home for the world e-portfolio community. Retrieved from http://www.aaeebl.org/

Banta, T. W. (2003). *Portfolio assessment: Uses, cases, scoring, and impact* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berret, D. (2014). Now everything is part of the curriculum. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, LSX*(11), A29.

Brightspace|D2L ePortfolio. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.brightspace.com/products/eportfolio/

Burke, K., Fogarty, R., & Belgrad, S. (1994). *The mindful school: The portfolio connection. K-College*. Arlington Heights: IRI/Skylight Training and Publishing.

Cambridge, B. L., Kahn, S., Tompkins, D. P., & Yancey, K. B. (Eds.). (2001). *Electronic portfolios: Emerging practices in student, faculty, and institutional learning*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Cambridge, D., Cambridge, B. L., & Yancey, K. (Eds.). (2009). *Electronic portfolios 2.0 emergent research on implementation and impact*. Sterling: Stylus (Va.).

Center for Applied Language Studies. (n.d.). About LinguaFolio online. https://linguafolio.uoregon.edu/home/about

Chalk, & Wire. (n.d.) Assessment for learning. Retrieved from http://chalkandwire.com/

Council of Europe, Council for Cultural Co-operation, Education Committee, & Modern Languages Division (Strasbourg). (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge.

Cummins, P. W., & Davesne, C. (2009). Using electronic portfolios for second language assessment. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(s1), 848–867.

Digication e-portfolios. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.digication.com/

European Center for the Development of Vocational Training. (2014). Europass: Opening doors to learning and working in Europe. Retrieved from https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/home

Garrett, N. (2009). Computer-assisted language learning trends and issues revisited: Integrating innovation. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(s1), 719–740.

Geoffrion-Vinci, M., Lamb-Faffelberger, M., & Toulouse, M. (2013). Electronic portfolios: A blueprint for deep language learning and assessment. *ADFL Bulletin, 42*(2), 36–60.

Inter/National Coalition for Electronic Portfolio Research. (2010). Retrieved from http://ncepr.org/index.html

Interfolio – dossier, credentials and letter of recommendation service. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.interfolio.com/

Jafari, A. (2004). *The "sticky" ePortfolio system: Tackling challenges & identifying attributes* (pp. 38–48). Boulder: EDUCAUSE.

Jafari, A., & Kaufman, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of research on ePortfolios*. Hershey: Idea Group Publishing.

LaFolio. (n.d.). The lafayette college e-portfolio and badge initiative. Retrieved from http://lafolio.lafayette.edu/

LaGuardia community College/CUNY. E-portfolio. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.eportfolio.lagcc.cuny.edu/

Lancaster University. (2015). DIALANG. Retrieved from http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/researchenterprise/dialang/about.htm

Little, D., Goullier, F., & Hughes, G. (2015). The European language portfolio: The story so far (1991–2011). Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/elp/elp-reg/history_elp/Story_so_far_EN.asp#TopOfPage

McCollin, R. (2013). *Wordpress [electronic resource] pushing the limits/rachel McCollin* (1st ed.). Chichester/West Sussex: Wiley.

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2007). Self-efficacy of college intermediate French students: Relation to achievement and motivation. *Language Learning, 57*(3), 417–442. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00421.x.

National Council of Supervisors for Languages. (n.d.). LinguaFolio®. Retrieved from http://www.ncssfl.org/LinguaFolio/index.php?linguafolio_index

Openschool. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.openschooleportfolio.com/

Paulson, F. L., Paulson, P. R., & Meyer, C. A. (1991). What makes a portfolio a portfolio? *Educational Leadership, 48*(5), 60–63.

Programs | VALUE | VALUE rubrics. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index_p.cfm?CFID=27479586&CFTOKEN=56048426

Ricardo-Osorio, J. G. (2008). A study of foreign language learning outcomes assessment in U.S. undergraduate education. *Foreign Language Annals, 41*(4), 590–610. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03319.x.

Standards-Based Assessment & Measurement of Proficiency (STAMP) (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.stamptest.net/stamp0708/stamptest/

STARTALK|National Foreign Language Center. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.nflc.umd.edu/projects/language/startalk#.VL6ELCeolOg

Stoicheva, M., Hughes, G., & Speitz, H. (2015). The European language portfolio: An impact study. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/elp/elp-reg/Source/History/Impact_study_EN.pdf

Tedick, D. (2015). Proficiency-oriented language instruction and assessment: Standards, philosophies, and considerations for assessment. Retrieved from http://www.carla.umn.edu/articulation/polia_standards.html

What is LinguaFolio? (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.learnnc.org/lp/editions/linguafolio/1.0

World Language Education|NDE. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.education.ne.gov/FORLG/LinguaFolio/NebraskaLinguaFolioWorkshopOnline.htm

Yancey, K. B. (2001). Digitized student portfolios. In B. L. Cambridge (Ed.), *Electronic portfolios: Emerging practices in student, faculty, and institutional learning* (pp. 15–30). Sterling: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Foreign Language Education in the Context of Institutional Globalization

Chantelle Warner

Contents

Introduction 168
Early Developments 168
Major Contributions 170
Languages Across the Curriculum 170
Study Abroad 171
Work in Progress 172
Problems and Difficulties 174
Future Directions 175
Cross-References 177
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 177
References 177

Abstract

In the past few decades, globalization has found a secure place in educational discourses. While its impact and extent are subject to dispute among social scientists and critical theorists, globalization is a clear driving concept in policy decisions and institutional missions, which has a significant impact on foreign language pedagogy and research. The following article discusses some of the major curricular and scholarly contributions in this area over the past few decades, including the (Cultures and) Languages Across the Curriculum (CLAC) movement, the study-abroad practices, the recent interest in global communication technologies, and the new literacy practices. Key issues facing foreign language education at globalized institutions are also taken into consideration, in particular those that arise in the tensions between globalization understood as the intensified connectivity between localities and perspectives that see

C. Warner (✉)
Department of German Studies, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA
e-mail: warnerc@email.arizona.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_14

globalization as a primarily Western-led linguistic and cultural imperialism. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the more recent work in the field, in which languages and language pedagogies are conceptualized as essentially manifold, and a brief consideration of what this trend toward pluralization has for the position of foreign language programs in institutional internationalization efforts and responses to globalization.

Keywords
Globalization • Internationalization • Foreign language education • Multilingualism • Higher education

Introduction

Whether its history is traced back across a few decades or several centuries and whether its effects are understood as imperializing or hybridizing, it is clear that "globalization" is now a key term in contemporary education theory and policy in general and in foreign language education specifically. One of the most cited and most concise definitions comes from sociologist Anthony Giddens, who defines globalization as "the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa" (Giddens 1990, p. 64). As Block and Cameron (2002, p. 1) note, the term seems to perform itself, maintaining a certain crosslinguistic stability with cognates in languages as diverse as Japanese, Spanish, and German and direct translations in other languages such as French and Chinese. The impact of globalization on foreign language education is, however, less direct, and it has been the subject of debate and scrutiny among language educators, applied linguists, higher education scholars, and policy makers over the past few decades.

Early Developments

In discussions of institutional effects, "globalization" is often distinguished from "internationalization." While the latter describes the relationships between nation-states, the former is understood as flowing across national boundaries, even making them superfluous as sites of power, cultural capital, and human activity. At the same time, higher education scholars Jane Knight and Hans de Wit have argued that globalization affects different countries in different ways due to each nation's "individual history, traditions, culture and priorities" (Knight and de Wit 1997, p. 6). Globalization is perhaps best located on a continuum with the more national or local and internationalization understood as a more proximal and typically proactive response to the supranational effects of globalization.

The effects of globalization are also a contested topic. Some scholars see the "intensification of worldwide social relations" described by Giddens (1990, p. 64) as

the potential for greater connectivity across cultures; others perceive it as a homogenizing force, resulting from transnational flows of capital – both economic and cultural. Others still emphasize the inequalities that are brought about or at least heightened by globalization, i.e., the differential relationships between the "globalizers" and the "globalized." Whether viewed as a positive or negative phenomenon or even as something in between, an institutional effect of globalization is the perceived need for what has been described as "global competence" or "global-mindedness." Defined broadly as an appreciation for the diversity of cultures and perspectives and an understanding of the interdependence between peoples and societies (see Gacel-Ávila 2005, p. 123), global competence seems at times almost synonymous with intercultural competence (Deardorff 2006, p. 247), although it is notably culturally and nationally unspecific. For this reason, it is often left unclear what role language might play in the development of globally minded students.

In many ways, these effects of globalization find ready parallels in the commonly cited rationales for internationalization in higher education. As described by Hans de Wit (2002), these are economic, political, academic, and sociocultural. Economic rationales are tied both to potential career advantages which can lead to greater earnings for students and to income which can be generated for the institution (e.g., from international students' tuition and satellite campuses abroad). Political rationales for internationalization emphasize national security and foreign policy concerns. Academic rationales are closely connected to the aforementioned educational objectives of global-mindedness, as well as associated notions of critical thinking and intercultural competence. Finally, sociocultural rationales for internationalizing curricula focus on the ability to communicate across diverse cultures.

Ryuko Kubota (2009, p. 613) has noted that academic and sociocultural rationales most clearly relate to foreign language learning. And yet, economic and political motivations often prevail in university mission statements and government policy statements (Kubota 2009, p. 613; Warner 2011, pp. 2–3; see also Heller 2002 on the commodification of languages). There are also notable differences between academic fields. For example, Melanie Agnew's (2012) qualitative study of faculty perceptions of internationalization indicates that scholars in the so-called "hard–pure" disciplines are more likely to emphasize the universality of their inquiry and to accept English as a lingua franca, whereas the "soft–applied" and "soft–pure" fields were more likely to value local cultural contexts and the languages spoken there.

Early developments in institutional globalization shape the space within which foreign language teaching and learning take place, as curriculum designers attempt to seek a careful balance between the political and economic rationales and the academic and sociocultural rationales. The following sections discuss two of the most long-standing efforts to address institutional globalization in foreign language education: (Cultures and) Languages Across the Curriculum and study-abroad and work-abroad programs. These two pedagogical trends and their accompanying bodies of scholarly research have developed in parallel with the rise of globalization discourses in education and thus are both major contributors as well as exemplary

illustrations of how foreign language education has coevolved with institutional paradigms over the past few decades.

Major Contributions

Languages Across the Curriculum

One of the earliest responses to globalization in foreign language education, Languages Across the Curriculum, dates back to the late 1980s and 1990s, around the same time that internationalization entered into mainstream discourses on curriculum development. Languages Across the Curriculum (LAC), in European contexts sometimes dubbed Modern Languages Across the Curriculum, is a movement to integrate the learning of foreign languages with other kinds of coursework. A key model for early LAC programs was the Writing Across the Curriculum or WAC movement in the early 1980s, which similarly attempted to extend composition instruction beyond the language and literature departments. LAC also builds heavily on two other interrelated approaches to language pedagogy, which were popularized in the 1980s and 1990s – content-based language instruction (CBLT) and communicative language teaching (CLT) – which similarly emphasize the development of linguistic abilities through meaningful and authentic language use. Since the mid-1990s, the LAC movement (especially in the USA) has to a large extent evolved to align itself more explicitly with institutional objectives of global competence and the wider cultural turn in language pedagogy, a shift that is often signified through the slightly modified nomer CLAC, Cultures and Languages Across the Curriculum. (C)LAC supporters cite evidence that the integration of language learning and content fosters motivation and promotes active learning, but one of the main stated rationales for LAC is also the potential for establishing more clearly the academic and professional relevance of foreign languages on university campuses (Grenfell 2002; Straight 1998).

In a special topic discussion on internationalization and foreign language education, which appeared in the "Perspectives section" of the *Modern Language Journal* in 2009, Carol Klee noted that in spite of the shared principles described above, the primary objectives of (C)LAC vary widely. "Global literacy" is cited on the CLAC Consortium web site as central to the movement, and similar formulations appear in mission statements of some of the leading LAC programs. The balance between language and content learning varies across programs, with some programs placing language and culture as primary educational objectives and others treating them as an enrichment of disciplinary knowledge (see Klee 2009, p. 619). It can also be argued that (C)LAC principles are inherent in language for specific purposes (LSP) courses such as German for business and Chinese for engineering, which similarly put language in the service of disciplinary knowledge construction, rather than the inverse (which is characteristic of content-based language instruction). Notably, the disciplines involved are typically those which provide clear economic rationales for

institutional internationalization (e.g., engineering and business), although LAC proponents promote academic and sociocultural motivations for the model as well.

Early LAC efforts within the USA were supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), the Center for International Education, and the Department of Education as well as private organizations such as the American Council on Education, which has led to model programs on several campuses, several of which are still in existence. Although the interest in LAC seemed to wane in the mid-1990s, Klee, writing in 2009, sees a resurgence in interest after the event of September 11, which provided a political rationale for internationalization, with the ensuing public perceptions that the USA suffers from a "language crisis" (MLA 2007) – a perspective which is perhaps supported by the decreasing enrollments in collegiate foreign language programs (see Goldberg et al. 2015).

Study Abroad

Although study-abroad programs extend beyond and even predate mainstream institutional discussions of globalization, they were perfectly poised to respond to the pressures of institutional internationalization. Study abroad has been the focus of governmental initiatives to expand Americans' global literacy, such as the 2006 resolution of the US Senate to a Year of Study Abroad. Increased mobility is a hallmark of globalization, and study abroad has been rationalized as not only an academic advantage for "world-minded" learners but also as an economic advantage in the global marketplace.

There is some research evidence that supports the assertion that students' global awareness and cultural sensitivity are enhanced through study abroad. For example, a study by Carlson and Widaman (1988) compared US college students who spent a junior year abroad at European institutions and those who remained on their home campus. Based on questionnaire data, the scholars concluded that the study-abroad group exhibited increased cultural cosmopolitanism and cross-cultural interests, such as international political concern. In an ethnographic study of 23 study-abroad students, McCabe (1994) found that participants' perceptions moved along several continua of complexity, for example, from viewing people as all the same to viewing them as the same and different. Based on these perspectival shifts, McCabe concluded that students may return from study abroad with a greater global awareness.

A number of more recent studies build upon the work of these scholars to better understand what conditions contribute to desired outcomes of global-mindedness and cross-cultural awareness. Drawing from pre- and post-departure surveys, Kitsantas (2004) found that goal-setting seemed to be the single greatest predictor for the development of global understanding and ability to function in multicultural settings, which she interprets as an indication that training programs designed to enhance and support students' goals for their time abroad ought to be an integral part of the study-abroad experience. These findings support claims from the field that

desired outcomes of cultural awareness and global-mindedness do not necessarily arise simply because someone lives abroad. Kinginger (2008) has demonstrated, through her work, the central role that identity, e.g., gender, race, and ethnicity, plays in shaping students' experiences abroad. These findings call into question the uniformity of study-abroad experiences and learning outcomes.

In addition to these caveats, the findings related to study abroad and language learning are often contradictory. Kinginger's (2008) research suggests that individual differences in linguistic proficiency and language awareness gains are closely related to other aspects of students' study-abroad experience and in particular their dispositions toward their host community. In some ways, the shifts in the field of study abroad seem to echo the movement from intercultural to global competence discussed earlier in this chapter; with an ever-greater emphasis on global-mindedness has come a decreased focus on language learning. A growing number of programs, especially in fields of business, engineering, pharmacy, and political science, offer study-abroad programs in non-English-speaking countries with no or only limited language instruction. These trends evidence an oft-cited paradox that in using the discourse of globalization to sell study abroad, programs seemingly negate the linguistic and intercultural benefits they purport to provide. With more abstractly defined academic goals of "global-mindedness," programs and institutions are likely to deprioritize language learning even as they continue to support study-abroad opportunities.

Work in Progress

Over the last 10–15 years, a number of scholars have begun to question the extent to which educational objectives for foreign language teaching as they had been conceptualized in the previous decades remain relevant in the age of globalization, in particular, the presumption that communicative competence is the sine qua non learning objective of foreign language education. To quote Kramsch and Whiteside's description of complex interactions in globalized settings, language users today must increasingly "mediate complex encounters among interlocutors with different language capacities and cultural imaginations, who have different social and political memories, and who don't necessarily share a common understanding of the social reality they are living in" (Kramsch and Whiteside 2008, p. 646). Kramsch and Whiteside posit that current social realities call upon abilities that go beyond standard definitions of communicative competence as the ability to use utterances appropriately and require more a symbolic competence – an ability "to play with various linguistic codes and with the various spatial and temporal resonances of these codes" (2008, p. 664). Symbolic competence is conceptually closely related to the kind of "translingual and transcultural" competence that the much-cited 2007 MLA report described as the central objective of foreign language learning. Students are ideally "educated to function as informed and capable interlocutors with educated native speakers in the target language. They are also trained to reflect on the world and themselves through the lens of another language and culture" (MLA 2007, n.p.).

But Kramsch and Whiteside's symbolic competence more deliberately highlights the multiplicity, the unevenness, and the indeterminacy of interaction.

These alternatives to communicative competence are designed to move beyond the "global ideology of 'effective communication'" (Block and Cameron 2002, p. 8) which governs the teaching of spoken language in both first and second language learning contexts and which is associated with a particular US American speech style whatever the actual linguistic code in question. One danger of framing communication in this way is that language pedagogy itself becomes part of the standardizing tendency of globalization. Concepts such as "communication," "task," and the "negotiation for meaning," which originate in the US-dominated SLA research, form the basis for pedagogical approaches, which are presumed to have universal applicability.

The inherent multiplicity of linguistic practice is also a central concept in discussions of what is sometimes called multiliteracies or new literacies (see also "► New Literacies, New Times: Developments in Literacy Studies," by Brian V. Street). The most seminal publication in this area comes from the New London Group (NLG), a collective of Anglophone scholars, whose piece "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures" called for a reconceptualization of literacy in education in order to address the "linguistic differences and cultural differences" that have "become central to the pragmatics of our working, civic, and private lives" (1996, p. 64). In short, "[w]hen the proximity of cultural and linguistic diversity is one of the key facts of our time, the very nature of language learning has changed" (1996, p. 64). The key claim is that the social conditions of globalization compel educators to broaden their understanding of literacy and literacy teaching to include a multiplicity of discourses, forms, modes, and media. Within foreign language education, these imperatives have been realized in two main areas: in multiliteracies curricula and the implementation of digital communication tools (see also "► Second Language Literacy Research and Curriculum Transformation in US Postsecondary Foreign Language Education" by Per Urlaub, this volume; "► Identity, Language Learning and Critical Pedagogies in Digital Times" by Bonny Norton).

To quote Richard Kern whose book *Literacy in Language Teaching* (2000) was one of the first to systematically conceptualize multiliteracies pedagogies in foreign language contexts, second language literacy is understood as "the use of socially-, historically-, and culturally-situated practices of creating and interpreting meaning through texts," which "entails at least a tacit awareness of the relationships between textual conventions and their contexts of use and, ideally, the ability to reflect critically on those relationships" (Kern 2000, p. 16). One of the predominant curricular models for multiliteracies in foreign language education draws from work in systemic functional linguistics and genre theory in order to conceptualize language as a meaning-making system. Emblematic for such curricular models is the work of Heidi Byrnes and her colleagues in the German Department at Georgetown University (Byrnes 2005). By redefining interdisciplinary and intercultural connections in terms of the genres, i.e., forms of knowledge construction in and through language, this approach maintains the centrality of language in global competence.

A booming field of work on digital literacies and foreign language education examines the implications and potential implementations of digital communication technologies. The "global conversations" that occur through digitally mediated communication and in online social spaces are a particular focal point of these discussions. Much of the research explores how a variety of digital literacy practices from social media sites to digital gaming to collaborative composition tools can foster second language development and cross-language awareness across distant localities. An example of a more critical perspective can be found in Kramsch and Thorne (2002) study of a tandem email exchange between language students in France and in the USA. According to Kramsch and Thorne's analysis, the French and the American students exhibited different genre conventions in their exchanges – the French students favoring an academic print literacy style and the Americans a more informal, conversational tone. The authors read this as a clash "between two local genres engaged in global confrontation" (99) and use moments of tension in this exchange in order to demonstrate the paradox of global communication; the very ease of connectivity, which the technology affords, also gives rise to presumed commonalities (global youth culture, global speech styles) that are exposed and ruptured in actual moments of communication and which, in this case, prohibit the more meaningful intercultural exchange envisioned by many educators. Similar to the multiliteracies pedagogies, the implied solution seems to be to attune learners to the multiplicity of discourses and speech styles, which are realized in and through different linguistic codes (see also "► Multilingual Resources in Classroom Interaction: Portuguese and African Languages in Bilingual Education Programs" by Feliciano Chimbutane; "► Ecologies of new literacies: Implications for education" by Karin Tusting).

Problems and Difficulties

One of the greatest problems facing foreign language education in the face of institutional globalization is rooted in the paradox that the discourses of globalization at times seem in opposition to the particularities of discourses, cultures, and ways of speaking that foreign language education prizes. As Byrnes states, "there is considerable irony in the fact that the task of internationalizing the curriculum in terms of FL departments' unique educational contribution frequently presents itself to them under alien, if not to say, alienating circumstances and furthermore, does so within an environment that is deeply marked by the status of English as the 'go-to' international language that both supersedes and potentially even distorts the presence and role of other languages" (2009, p. 608). This irony has also been described by a number of other scholars, who have similarly argued that globalization negatively impacts the teaching and learning of languages other than English (e.g., Phillipson 1992). The acceptance of English as a lingua franca is supported by economic rationales related to the global marketplace; however, as language rights scholars have pointed out, if English-only were the obvious rational move, Latinos in the

USA would have given up Spanish, the Québécois would have surrendered French, and citizens of postcolonial African countries would have abandoned their local languages. Current research on multilingualism and multiliteracies, such as the scholarship cited in the previous section, also indicates that the arguments for problematizing the global accessibility of English are many, but these perspectives continue to be overshadowed in institutions of higher education, which, under increasing pressure to privatize their funding models, find English to be a convenient commodity (see also "▶ Language Education and Multilingualism" by Adrian Blackledge).

Even among educational leaders and policy makers who recognize the value of learning languages other than English, the field of foreign language education is often viewed as esoteric or inadequate for the perceived needs of today's learners. William Brustein, vice provost for global strategies and international affairs at Ohio State University, has been outspoken about the need to look beyond foreign language and humanities departments. In an essay titled "The Global Campus: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education in North America" (2007, p. 390), Brustein acknowledges that foreign language proficiency is a necessary and important aspect of global competence, but argues that faculty in language and literature departments rarely have an interest or enough knowledge to teach foreign languages in such a way that they would be relevant to students outside of their own disciplines. For these reasons, he argues, responsibility for language teaching should "be placed under a campuswide entity to ensure a more flexible approach and to allocate resources in a more effective way" (390). In a study of college faculty perceptions about foreign language, Carol Wilkerson (2006) describes similar statements from the faculty and administrators across her campus in rural Tennessee. Although most of the participants believed that students should be required to know a second language, a number of the faculty also believed that college was too late to learn a second language and several had advised students against enrolling in a language class. One of Wilkerson's most striking findings was that there was often correlation between negative experiences with learning languages, for example, in high school classes, and negative perceptions of the efficacy of studying languages in higher education. Likewise, faculty with previous positive experiences seemed more likely to support the teaching of foreign languages. Given that these perceptions, positive and negative, are passed on the students and advisees and therefore have direct ramification for enrollments and attitudes, Wilkerson's study seems to stress the importance of early outreach in K-12 educational institutions, where these early beliefs often become sedimented.

Future Directions

While there seems to be a consensus among foreign language educators that globalization has changed the conditions under which foreign languages are learned, taught, and used, exactly what this means for programs and pedagogies at

educational institutions is an ongoing discussion. In light of the difficulties described in the previous section, one key objective for scholars and practitioners in foreign language education will be to communicate the value of learning additional languages, in particular less commonly taught and less readily commodifiable languages. The task of advocating for foreign language learning in this historical moment of institutional globalization is plagued by a number of difficult questions, posed by the scholars, discussed and summarized here. How can scholarly recognitions of the fact that linguistic conventions and codes have become destabilized and diversified in globalization be reconciled with institutional imperatives to prepare students for global economic realities and national political interests? What role can foreign languages play in institutional fiscal priorities, which prioritize the recruitment of international students, who generate revenue, and the exportation of English-language teaching? What role ought language awareness and the learning of specific languages play in the kind global-mindedness privileged in institutional missions and how can these educational objectives be convincingly articulated to colleagues, administrators, and policy makers?

If foreign language education is engaged in "semiotic struggle[s] to control definition of reality" (Hasan 2003 , p. 437) of global competence, communication, and language use, then the first front might be within the language classroom. Applied linguists such as Kumaravadivelu (2007) and Canagarajah (2005) have argued that the one-way flow of pedagogical knowledge from Western nations – for example, the global spread of communicative language teaching – can be counteracted through a "globalization from below," local oppositions to central discourses. Globalization, in the context of education, is thus not only postcolonial and postmodern, but, these scholars argue, importantly postmethod. Pluralizing the norms of foreign language education is also a means of legitimating local knowledge, identities, and roles, which are obfuscated in homogenizing (largely economic) discourses of globalization. Foreign language educators are just beginning to explore how pluralizing methods might also foster greater awareness of language as a local practice and what this means for the kind of global competence desired by institutions (see also "► Critical Applied Linguistics and Education" by Alastair Pennycook).

Writing from a UK perspective, Andrea Dlaska (2013) offers another partial solution to some of these issues that plague foreign language education. Dlaska describes the outward-looking gaze of most institutional responses to globalization, which look past the internationalizing potential and plurality found in their own classrooms. University foreign language classrooms, Dlaska argues, were teaching "international groups in learner-centred settings long before higher education as a whole discovered the importance of introducing an international dimension to its learning and teaching agenda" (261). In addition to pioneering study abroad, language departments inadvertently introduced what has been dubbed "Internationalisation at Home" (261), teaching additional languages to international students alongside their domestic peers. In the multilingual space of the foreign language classroom where students from multiple disciplines and backgrounds meet, the advantages of native speaker status can be productively

decentered and the dynamic nature of cultures and identities foregrounded. In this way, Dlaska argues, foreign language education becomes a microcosm of students' future lives in a globalized world.

Cross-References

► Globalization and Language Education in Japan

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Christina Higgins: Language Education and Globalization. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Viniti Vaish: Biliteracy and Globalization. In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

Joseph Sung-Yul Park: Researching Globalization of English. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

References

Agnew, M. (2012). Strategic planning: An examination of the role of disciplines in sustaining internationalization of the University. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2), 183–202.

Block, D., & Cameron, D. (2002). Introduction. In *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 1–10). London/New York: Taylor and Francis.

Brustein, W. I. (2007). The global campus: Challenges and opportunities for higher education in North America. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3–4), 382–391.

Byrnes, H. (2005). Literacy as a framework for advanced language acquisition. *ADFL Bulletin, 37*(1), 85–110.

Byrnes, H. (2009). The role of foreign language departments in internationalizing the curriculum. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(4), 607–609.

Canagarajah, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Carlson, J. S., & Widaman, K. F. (1988). The effects of study abroad during college on attitudes toward other cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12*, 1–17.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Deardorff, D. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(3), 241–266.

Dlaska, A. (2013). The role of foreign language programmes in internationalising learning and teaching in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(3), 260–271.

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education, Summer 2005, 9*(2), 121–136.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Goldberg, D., Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2015). Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2013. The modern language association.

Retrieved from https://www.mla.org/content/download/31180/1452509/2013_enrollment_survey.pdf
Grenfell, M. (2002). *Modern languages across the curriculum*. London: Routledge.
Hasan, R. (2003). Globalization, literacy, and ideology. *World Englishes, 22*(4), 433–448.
Heller, M. (2002). Globalization and the commodification of bilingualism in Canada. In D. Block & C. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 47–64). London/New York: Taylor and Francis.
Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *The Modern Language Journal Monograph, 1*, 1.
Kitsantas, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college students' goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Student Journal, 38*(3), 441–452.
Klee, C. (2009). Internationalization and foreign languages: The resurgence of interest in languages across the curriculum. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(4), 618–621.
Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1997). Internationalisation of higher education: A conceptual framework. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalisation of higher education in Asian Pacific Countries* (pp. 5–18). Amsterdam: EAIE/OECD.
Kramsch, C., & Thorne, S. (2002). Foreign language learning as global communicative practice. In D. Block & C. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 83–100). London/New York: Taylor and Francis.
Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(4), 645–671.
Kubota, R. (2009). Internationalization of universities: Paradoxes and responsibilities. *The Modern Language Journal, 93*, 612–618.
Kumaravadivelu, B. (2007). *Cultural globalization and language education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
McCabe, L. T. (1994). The development of a global perspective during participation in semester at sea: A comparative global education program. *Educational Review, 46*(3), 275–286.
MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. Retrieved from http://www.mla.org/flreport
New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60–92.
Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Straight, S. (1998). Languages across the curriculum. *ERIC Clearinghouse on languages and linguistics*. Washington, DC. http://www.ericdigests.org/1999-3/languages.htm
Warner, C. (2011). Rethinking the role of language study in internationalizing higher education. *L2 Journal, 3*(1), 1–21.
Wilkerson, C. (2006). College faculty perceptions about foreign language. *Foreign Language Annals, 39*(2), 310–319.

The Role of the National Standards in Second/Foreign Language Education

Sally Sieloff Magnan

Contents

Early Developments 180
Major Contributions 184
National Buy-In 184
Teacher Professional Development 185
Instructional Refocusing 185
Work in Progress 187
Reaching Teachers PK-16 187
Connecting Standards with Literacy 188
Developing Standards in LCTLs 188
Problems and Difficulties 188
Implementation 188
The Standards' Constructs 190
Future Directions 192
Cross-References 193
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 193
References 193

Abstract

The World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages, previously known as the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, puts forth what foreign language learners should know and be able to do. The document presents five domains as goals for language learning (known as the 5Cs): Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. Each goal area is articulated by content standards, 11 in all. Developed first in 1996 by language educators from

S.S. Magnan (✉)
Department of French and Italian, University of Wisconsin, Madison, College of Letters and Science, Madison, WI, USA
e-mail: ssmagnan@wisc.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_16

several professional organizations, the Standards have built national consensus about these goals for teaching languages through the PK-16 levels in the United States. Indeed, the Standards have been aligned with other major documents relating to US education, including the Common Core Standards and twenty-first-century skills. Through now four editions, the Standards document has had a major impact on how instructors are prepared and how languages are taught, more at the elementary and secondary than at the university levels. The Standards have also been influential in the development of instructional materials for both commonly taught and less commonly taught languages. Still, there remain concerns about (a) an overemphasis on Communication and Cultures in instruction, (b) a tendency to consider the goal areas individually instead of focusing on their interrelationship, (c) a narrowness in the Standards' constructs especially in the portrayal of culture, (d) the nonspecification of needed fluency associated with the goals, and (e) the limited number of related assessment tools being developed.

Keywords

5Cs • Assessment • Common Core • Comparisons • Communication • Communicative language teaching • Communities • Connections • Cultures • Literacy • Proficiency • Standards • Testing • Twenty-first-century skills

Early Developments

The World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (2014) are previously known as the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*: *Preparing for the 21st Century* (1996, 1999, 2006). This document is typically seen as a guide for curriculum, unit, and lesson design and for accountability at the local and state levels. It depicts five interlocking concepts, each one representing a domain of knowledge associated with language and expression:

Communication: Communicate effectively in more than one language in order to function in a variety of situations and for multiple purposes.
Cultures: Interact with cultural competence and understanding.
Connections: Connect with other disciplines and acquire information and diverse perspectives in order to use the language to function in academic and career-related situations.
Comparisons: Develop insight into the nature of language and culture in order to interact with cultural competence.
Communities: Communicate and interact with cultural competence in order to participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world.

Taking the first letter of each interrelated concept, the Standards are known as the 5Cs of language learning. They are depicted in a logo stressing their interrelationship.



Each of these five domain areas is elucidated by content standards, 11 in all. With the 2013 refreshing, the document became known as the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (see Appendix in next page).

Reflecting best practices at the time of their creation, the Standards call forth notions of communicative language teaching. As "situated documents" (Byrnes 2012, p. 20), their usage reflects evolving notions of language learning and changing situations in schools and colleges. This document, created by groups of language teaching professionals, including the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and several language-specific organizations (AATs), represents the largest effort to date to set goals for language learning across PK-16 instructional levels or, in the words of the Standards, to establish *what students should know and be able to do as a result of foreign language study.* All states (more than 40) that have foreign language learning standards have created or revised them in line with these national standards. The Standards are used as a basis for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards for teacher preparation programs, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) *Model Standards for Licensing Beginning Foreign Language Teachers* (2002), and the ACTFL/NCATE *Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* (2002). In addition, ACTFL has crafted an alignment document to show how the language Standards connect with the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy (Anchor Standards) (ACTFL 2012). Recently, how Communication is framed in the Standards (as compromised of three modes of communication rather than the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing) has influenced the latest version of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.

It is important to remember that the United States has never had a national language education policy or a top-down curriculum that specifies learning goals. Phillips (2007) suggested that the Standards provide a "de facto definition of foreign language education" (p. 268) for the country. Indeed, the Standards were created under the influence of the 1994 Goals 2000 Act and instrumentalized through the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB 2001). World languages were not initially included in Goals 2000, which served as a wake-up call to the profession (Tucker 2000). ACTFL and the Joint National Committee for Languages (JNCL) responded vigorously to this omission and languages became the seventh and final discipline. Languages never became an assessed discipline as part of NCLB, however, which provided substantial challenges to the Standards' implementation. Nonetheless, the Standards were diffused quickly to PK-12 teachers, who readily embraced their principles.

A survey 3 years after their creation found that 50% of PK-12 language teachers were already aware of the Standards (Wood 1999). By 2010, that percentage had increased to 83% of teachers who aligned their curriculum around the Standards (Rhodes and Pufahl 2010).



WORLD-READINESS STANDARDS FOR LEARNING LANGUAGES

GOAL AREAS	STANDARDS		
COMMUNICATION Communicate effectively in more than one language in order to function in a variety of situations and for multiple purposes	**Interpersonal Communication:** Learners interact and negotiate meaning in spoken, signed, or written conversations to share information, reactions, feelings, and opinions.	**Interpretive Communication:** Learners understand, interpret, and analyze what is heard, read, or viewed on a variety of topics.	**Presentational Communication:** Learners present information, concepts, and ideas to inform, explain, persuade, and narrate on a variety of topics using appropriate media and adapting to various audiences of listeners, readers, or viewers.
CULTURES Interact with cultural competence and understanding	**Relating Cultural Practices to Perspectives:** Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the cultures studied.	**Relating Cultural Products to Perspectives:** Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between the products and perspectives of the cultures studied.	
CONNECTIONS Connect with other disciplines and acquire information and diverse perspectives in order to use the language to function in academic and career-related situations	**Making Connections:** Learners build, reinforce, and expand their knowledge of other disciplines while using the language to develop critical thinking and to solve problems creatively.	**Acquiring Information and Diverse Perspectives:** Learners access and evaluate information and diverse perspectives that are available through the language and its cultures.	
COMPARISONS Develop insight into the nature of language and culture in order to interact with cultural competence	**Language Comparisons:** Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and their own.	**Cultural Comparisons:** Learners use the language to investigate, explain, and reflect on the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own.	
COMMUNITIES Communicate and interact with cultural competence in order to participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world	**School and Global Communities:** Learners use the language both within and beyond the classroom to interact and collaborate in their community and the globalized world.	**Lifelong Learning:** Learners set goals and reflect on their progress in using languages for enjoyment, enrichment, and advancement.	



WORLD-READINESS STANDARDS FOR LEARNING LANGUAGES

The five "C" goal areas (Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities) stress the application of learning a language beyond the instructional setting. The goal is to prepare learners to apply the skills and understandings measured by the Standards, to bring a global competence to their future careers and experiences.

The National Standards for Learning Languages have been revised based on what language educators have learned from more than 15 years of implementing the Standards. The guiding principle was to clarify what language learners would do to demonstrate progress on each Standard.

These revised Standards include language to reflect the current educational landscape, including:
- Common Core State Standards
- College and Career Readiness
- 21st century skills

These Standards are equally applicable to:
- learners at all levels, from pre-kindergarten through postsecondary levels
- native speakers and heritage speakers, including ESL students
- American Sign Language
- Classical Languages (Latin and Greek)

The 2011 report, *A Decade of Foreign Language Standards: Impact, Influence, and Future Directions,* provided evidence of and support for the following concepts which influenced these revisions:
- The National Standards are influencing language learning from elementary, through secondary, to postsecondary levels.
- The integrated nature of the five "C" goal areas has been accepted by the profession.
- Educators asked for more description of what language learners should know and be able to do in the goal areas of Connections and Communities.
- Over 40 states have used the five "C" goal areas to create state standards for learning languages (identifiable even if configured in slightly different ways).
- Some state documents are beginning to describe cultural outcomes in terms of processes of observation and experience.
- Many local curricula are also aligned with the five "C" goal areas and the details of the 11 standards.

Based on this consensus from all levels of language educators, **the five goal areas and the 11 standards have been maintained**. The World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages clarify and better illustrate each goal area and standard in order to guide implementation and influence assessment, curriculum, and instruction.

Responses to the online feedback survey gave overwhelming support to the proposed revisions:
- **93.4%** of respondents said the "refreshed" Standards describe **appropriate** (39.1%) or **very appropriate expectations** (54.3%) for language learners.
- **94.9%** of respondents said the "refreshed" Standards provide **equally clear** (10.9%), **somewhat clearer** (26.8%), or **much clearer direction** (57.2%) for language educators and learners.

In response to additional suggestions from the feedback and comments received, specific descriptions of performance at each level (Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, and Superior), sample indicators of progress, and sample learning scenarios will be the next areas addressed in this revision process.

All documents may be accessed at: www.actfl.org/publications/all/national-standards-foreign-language-education.

Although the Standards are expressly intended for PK-16 levels, they have had much less influence in higher education than at the secondary level. It is perhaps their origin through the Goals 2000 Act – which targeted PK-12 education – that led many postsecondary teachers and scholars to question their applicability to their teaching

missions (e.g., H. Allen 2009; Byrnes 2002). The Modern Language Association (MLA), the largest professional organization of postsecondary language teachers, endorsed the Standards (Welles 1998), but the 2007 publication of that organization's *Foreign Languages and Higher Education*: *New Structures for a Changed World* did not mention the Standards. In 2011, the ACTFL Decade of Standards Project (ACTFL 2011a, b) surveyed 2,134 language educators, of whom one-third reported working in pedagogically related areas of higher education. This survey revealed a strong awareness of the Standards and reliance on them for curriculum planning and teaching.

Since their publication, the Standards have undergone minor revisions in three subsequent editions to make them more overtly relevant to less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) and to postsecondary education. The original edition (1996) set forth the five C domains and the 11 content standards that composed them, a rationale for their designation, performance standards, and sample progress indicators. The second edition (1999) added program models for higher education and applications beyond the CTLs (French, German, Spanish) to include five LCTLs (Chinese, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, and Russian), as well as Classical Languages. The third edition (2006) included minor revisions and standards for Arabic. Subsequently, standards have been developed for numerous other LCTLs. In 2013, the Standards were refreshed to reflect language in state standards for English language arts and a focus on literacy, to update technology, to remove the word *foreign* in the document and its title, and to change the sample progress indicators set for grades 4, 8, and 12 to sample progress indicators for novice, intermediate, and advanced range of learners with examples for learners in elementary grades, middle school and high school, and postsecondary education. This refreshing also removed the 1–5 numbering of the five interrelated domains to discourage users from assigning a priority or instructional sequence to them. The most recent fourth edition (2014), renamed the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages*, is based on this refreshing.

Major Contributions

On the PK-12 level, the Standards had an immediate and far-reaching impact. They have led to a high level of consensus building, as witnessed by the national buy-in from educators, their extensive use for professional development, and much instructional refocusing in textbooks and pedagogical materials. On the postsecondary level, their impact is less, where they have influenced mainly teacher educators and lower-level language instructors (see Magnan et al. 2014 for review and discussion).

National Buy-In

The national buy-in is arguably the greatest contribution of the Standards. Soon after the document's dissemination, states began refocusing or creating their state standards in line with the national ones. This large buy-in from the states furthered the

bottom-up manner in which the Standards were created and disseminated. Because higher education lacks such state-level or other regulatory influence, it is easy to understand why the Standards had less immediate impact on the postsecondary level.

As early as 1999, Phillips argued that, for the PK-12 levels, the Standards were already changing teaching approaches, bringing classrooms more in line with communicative language teaching. By the third edition of the Standards, that document claimed they had "galvanized" the field and "defined the agenda for the next decade – and beyond" (Standards 2006, p. 15). The 2012 alignment of the foreign language Standards with the Common Core State Standards for English Language Learning and with the twenty-first-century skills furthered their widespread acceptance and highlighted the value of foreign language study. Similarly, the association of the Standards with organizations and programs for teacher licensing has broadened their national acceptance and facilitated their implementation.

Teacher Professional Development

Indeed, the Standards have spearheaded teacher professional development efforts since their creation. The 2011 ACTFL Decades of Standards Survey (ACTFL 2011b) revealed that 95% of professional development efforts considered the Standards and that 74% of teachers experiencing these workshops, seminars, or programs had implemented new pedagogies or changed their instructional practices to align more with the Standards. Many of these programs were offered by Language Resource Centers (LRCs) or National Foreign Language Resource Centers (NFLRCs), with all 11 centers reporting having offered professional development built on the Standards. Although these percentages are encouragingly high, it was also revealed that only 50% of the teachers responding to the survey had received such professional development opportunities.

The survey further showed that most professional development focused on the Communication and Cultures domain areas, especially the three modes of the Communication standard. It is thus not surprising that a considerable amount of pedagogical innovation attributed to the Standards relates to these areas.

Instructional Refocusing

With a renewed focus on communication, the Standards reinforced and expanded communicative language teaching and, buttressed by acknowledgment of the central role of culture, reinforced teaching language in the context and the interdisciplinarity of language teaching (Watzinger Thorp 2014). Instruction promoted by the Standards included (a) making learners the center of instruction, (b) viewing language through communicative modes, and (c) merging communication and cultural content.

Making learners the center of instruction. Perhaps the greatest message to teachers from the Standards is that they focus more on what their students are learning than on what they are teaching. This refocusing helped shift the teacher's

role from provider of knowledge to guide, organizer, and facilitator (Bragger and Rice 1999). It also gave learners greater responsibility for their own learning (Glisan 1999). As the years passed, this shift increased the proportion of communicative activities which, following the Standards, were shaped around the three modes of Communication – interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational. It also fostered the integration of cultural notions in activities – with emphasis on the products, practices, and perspectives called forth in the Cultures standards – and, especially when looking toward the Communities standards, encouraged the use of technology. These changes can be seen as consistent with the recommendations of the twenty-first-century skills map (Partnership for Twenty-First-Century Skills, 2011), which advocate a Standards-based curriculum. Concomitant with this shift toward a more learner-centered classroom, the profession experienced a fundamental change in the discourse dynamics of the classroom (Thomas 2012).

Viewing language through communicative modes. In line with the emphasis on Communication, the Standards have encouraged teachers to think about language in terms of the three communicative modes rather than the four skills, which, according to Swaffar and Arens (2005), convey a dated separation of verbal and mental capabilities aligned with audio-lingual methods. Learning activities, and even testing built on the Standards, center on the interrelationship between understanding and communicating, whether the medium is oral or written. In higher education, Allen (2009) saw a related effect when she credited the Standards as making educators "grapple with notions of spiraling content considering the role of context in various forms of communication" (p. 48).

Merging communication and cultural content. As the profession focused teaching around the three modes of Communication, it integrated culture more centrally in lessons through authentic texts and authentic-like activities and tasks. The Standards thus helped the profession integrate cultural study as part of learning language. The Comparisons and especially the Connections standards are called into play here: texts became recognized as embodiments of culture (Kern 2008), and, ideally, culture became the locus of learning.

Increasingly in recent years, however, educators (e.g., Byrnes 2002) have cautioned that the Cultures standards in their limited view of practices, products, and perspectives do not take on the thorny definition of culture and have not led the profession beyond an additive to a truly integrative view of culture. A more integrative view of culture in language teaching is now associated with a literacy-based approach to language teaching, which takes the profession beyond communicative language teaching to a renewed focus on texts, the embodiment of cultural content in communication. In literacy-based approaches, the use of authentic texts centers on questioning these texts, the interaction of readers/listeners to them, and the voice and underlying message of the text's author, all of which are culture bound. This view of texts perhaps reflects better the transcultural and translingual competence described in the 2007 MLA report (MLA 2007), a document that drew slightly more attention

from postsecondary educators than did the Standards, which tend to be associated more with communicative competence.

As would be expected, textbooks and learning materials on the PK-12 and collegiate levels have been broadened to reflect the Standards. Materials now systematically include all three modes instead of a nearly exclusive emphasis on the interpersonal one (Knight 2000; Lally 1998). Many of these new materials, especially in the LCTLs, have been developed and disseminated by NFLRCs and LRCs. Given the paucity of pedagogical resources in many LCTLs, the influence of the Standards in these languages has been enhanced through these materials.

In summary, major contributions of the Standards are pedagogical, as intended. More important, however, than the impact on individual classrooms is the consensus built in the profession around what learners should know and be able to do and about how to talk about these learning goals. Articulating goals for foreign language learning in terms of the goals used across other disciplines has helped situate the study of languages more securely in the greater school curriculum and on the national education stage. It has also opened doors for work in articulation across levels from primary through higher education.

Work in Progress

With the Decades of Standards survey (ACTFL 2011a, b) and publication of the fourth edition (2014), the Standards have just undergone an intensive examination and update. As discussed, this update has been enhanced by the alignment of the Standards with major documents in teacher preparation and student literacy. Current projects are building on these updates to expand the reach of the Standards to more teachers in more languages and to make known the central role that foreign language learning should hold in education.

Reaching Teachers PK-16

It is now commonplace to include the Standards in professional development for PK-12 teachers. The NFLRCs, LRCs, and ACTFL are particularly active in offering workshops, seminars, and sessions (in person and virtually) to help teachers enhance their units of instruction in line with the five C goals. Increasingly, all five areas and their integration are highlighted, with the previously neglected Communities often treated through service learning, virtual connections, or study abroad. Published research increasingly demonstrates the success and advantages of these programs, especially on the postsecondary level where the majority of them occur. An ultimate hope is that professional development of instructors across levels will strengthen the articulation of K-16 and, at the college level, reduce the divide between language courses in basic programs and upper-level literature and culture courses.

Connecting Standards with Literacy

Increasingly, we see the Standards linked to national efforts in other disciplines, especially for K-12 to programs about literacy as depicted in the Common Core State Standards and for the postsecondary level, with literacy-based instruction focusing on texts, their cultural underpinnings, and learners' negotiation through them. This alignment of the Standards with literacy both strengthens the Standards and presents a major challenge to them. Do the Standards fit a literacy-based curriculum, with its emphasis on multiple interpretations and meanings? Do they embrace a nuanced enough view of culture and even communication, to align well with current thinking in these areas (Byrnes 2012)? Sandrock (personal communication, December 7, 2014) emphasizes how the 2013 refreshing of the Standards, especially through its verbs, directly links with the national conversation around literacy and twenty-first-century skills. The question remains whether these changes, as important as they are, suffice to address more fundamental shortcomings of the document. As individual instructors and students work with more C goal areas, they are gently probing these critical questions.

Developing Standards in LCTLs

In higher education, the Standards are gaining a foothold through the LCTLs. It should be remembered that LCTL organizations were involved with the Standards from the original 1996 version, even though the great majority of teachers working on the project came from French, German, and Spanish. Taking into account both CTLs and LCTLs, there are now language-specific standards for ASL such as Arabic, Chinese, Classical Languages, French, German, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Russian, Scandinavian Languages, and Spanish. Language-specific standards are currently in the works for Yoruba, Swahili, Akan, and Modern Greek. Updates are now based on the 2013 refreshed World-Readiness Standards. Given that LCTLs are most frequently taught at the college level, this expansion in LCTLs should help bring the Standards more centrally into postsecondary instruction.

Problems and Difficulties

Although widely accepted, at least on the PK-12 level, the Standards face several challenges that have plagued them from their creation. These problems and difficulties come in two areas: how the Standards are implemented and issues with the Standards' constructs.

Implementation

Especially in two respects, the profession has hesitated to implement the Standards as they were intended. First, the logo, as well as the Standards' rhetoric, attests that

the five goal domains (5Cs) are interrelated and should be treated as such in the curriculum. Second, given that the Standards emerged as a result of a national testing movement, the lack of national consensus on an assessment instrument for them is striking and troublesome to their implementation.

Interrelationship of the five goal domains. Although the five domains of the Standards, as interrelated constructs, are meant to coexist and thus be taught, simultaneously, the profession has prioritized the Communication and Cultures standards in instruction. This perceived hierarchy among the 5Cs is loosely reflected in the distribution of publication topics in the ACTFL Standards database. It may also be falsely suggested by a focus on the three modes of the Communication standards, with a nod to the products, practices, and perspectives of the Cultures standards, in the 1998 and 2012 Performance Descriptors. Even the former numbering system – 1 Communication, 2 Cultures, 3 Connections, 4 Comparisons, 5 Communities – suggests these priorities. On the postsecondary level, studies (for a review, see Troyan 2012) indicate how instructors have favored these two standards, with the increasing appeal of the Communities standard through service learning, computer-mediated courses, and study abroad (e.g., Allen and Dupuy 2012; Glisan 2012; Leeman 2011). This lack of attention to the inherent interrelationship of the Standards would be exasperated if some states were to choose certain standards – namely, Communication and Cultures – as "power standards."

An instructional prioritization of Communication and Cultures might be understood as relating to the practices of teachers under a communicative approach in which the three modes (interpersonal, interpretive, presentation) and cultural lessons have been stressed for decades. A counterpoint to this explanation is that Connections and Comparisons may be relatively new ideas to teachers who consider them outside the realm of basic language courses. In fact, in the ACTFL survey, some teachers reported that Communities lies outside instruction, considering it a goal domain that applied after some mastery in others was acquired.

In contrast, first-year and second-year college learners of both LCTLs and CTLs (Magnan et al. 2014) had the strongest learning goals and expectations for achieving them in the Communities areas, which has been the most neglected goal of teachers (ACTFL 2011a, b). These students also sought and expected to achieve goals in the interpersonal and interpretive modes of the Communication area.

The prioritization also appears in subtle ways. For example, the ACTFL magazine, *Language Educator*, ran a six-part series on the Standards (Cutshall 2012a, b, c, d, e, f): an introduction and then one issue for each goal area, in the order of their numbering from Communication to Communities. To be fair, it is important to note that the introduction and the prose of these articles stressed the necessary interrelationship of the five domains, as did the discussion in each of the articles, and yet, their separation was highly evident in the presentation.

It is clear that the profession is battling this problem. It is important that the numbering system – which was actually never intended as priorities but was used to follow the Goals 2000 model – was eliminated in the 2013 refreshing, leaving only the logo depicting the interrelationship among the goal areas. Increasingly,

professional development and publications stress the interrelationship, and research often reports on multiple domains instead of just one.

Reconceptualization of assessment. As instruction relies increasingly on the Standards, it would seem fitting that testing reflects this focus. Indeed, because assessment has a significant impact on what is taught and what is learned (Shohamy 2001), the lack of systematic assessment is often a curricular impediment. Thus, even though languages are not among the areas tested under the NCLB Act, appropriate assessment remains critical for informing learners and teachers about how well the Standards help students reach learning goals. It is important then that, as Sandrock (personal communication, December 7, 2014) pointed out, the most prominent testing instruments used in language study today (STAMP, AP, IB) are quite well aligned with the Standards.

In addition, tools have been developed specifically for the Standards. The initial form of assessment developed for the Standards focused on Communication: Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA) features interaction of the three modes of that single goal area (Adair-Hauck et al. 2006). Troyan (2012) warned that the Standards can be erroneously reduced to the Communication goal area through the restricted focus of the IPA rubric, and yet the IPA emphasizes a connected content for assessing Communication, tapping the other four C domain areas.

More recently, ACTFL developed the ACTFL Assessment of Performance Toward Proficiency in Languages (AAPPL), another performance-based assessment across the interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational modes as defined by the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* (ACTFL 2014). In this tool, students perform a series of tasks, including virtual video chats, creating wikis, writing journal entries, sending email messages, creating podcasts, and making posters. Hammer and Swaffar (2012) offered rubrics built on the Standards' relationship between language and culture, which they see as building on a pedagogy that would respond to both the Standards and to the MLA call for translingual and transcultural competence. These rubrics offer promise, but, unfortunately, none of them have been thoroughly developed or implemented on a large scale. It is clear that today's challenge revolves around how to connect Communication with the other four C domains in a practical assessment instrument.

The Standards' Constructs

Contributing to hesitancy about implementing the Standards is the concern about their constructs. Critics have questioned the portrayal of culture, the absence of pragmatic competence, an inappropriate nativeness, and a nonspecification of fluency.

Portrayal of culture. As early as 1999, Lange alerted the profession that restricting cultural notions to one Cultures goal area misconstrues the interconnectedness of culture and language in society (cf. Kramsch 1993; Swaffar and Arens 2005). Since then, scholars have pointed out that cultural notions reside also in the

Connections 3.2 (Byrd et al. 2011; Oskoz 2009; Shrum and Glisan 2009), Comparisons 4.1 (Arens 2009), Comparisons 4.2 (Byrd et al. 2011), and Communities 5.1 and 5.2 (Arens 2009). Lange (1999, 2003) suggested that culture actually permeates all goal areas, which is clearly the intention of the Standards especially in its latest version with multiple references to cultural competence. Beyond where culture is situated, critics worry that the portrayal of culture is overly limited to superficial notions and that the complex interplay of culture and language fails to be captured (for further discussion, see Magnan et al. 2014).

Absence of pragmatic competence. Specifically, there is concern that culture is narrowly portrayed as knowledge (Lange 1999). Cultural knowledge can be static, whereas intercultural competence is dynamic. Looking particularly at the Communication standards, where culture is not specifically mentioned, Dykstra (2009) argued for more extended and specific inclusion of pragmatics, including the choices learners make when faced with sociocultural constraints and the effects these choices have on their interactions, critical awareness, and understanding. Although in the document's discussion of communicative competence the Standards include six indicators about developing pragmatic awareness, Dysktra argued that pragmatic notions must be specified in the content standards themselves because it is through pragmatic goals that the Standards could come to include transforming the self into another, multilingual self.

Charge of nativism. Related to the portrayal of culture is concern over the expression *their own* in the Comparisons standards. In these content standards, learners are asked to compare the language they are learning with their own language and culture, both in the singular. Jernigan and Moore (1997) and Kubota (2004) argued that heritage speakers do not have a single native language or culture; rather they likely construct their identities as multiple, a perception that is supported by the learners in Magnan et al. (2014). Charging the Standards with nativism, these scholars questioned whether multilingual and multicultural speakers could see themselves in the Standards. They also worried that essentializing cultural notions polarizes cultures of the Other and the Self, making the Other truly foreign and giving the Self an erroneously homogenized view of American culture. In response to this charge, professional development is focusing on giving learners multiple lenses through which to look at cultural phenomena and on addressing the complexity of identity issues especially in multilingual communities.

Nonspecification of fluency. While there is concern that culture is not adequately portrayed, the concern over fluency is that it is expressly missing in the first three editions of the Standards. The fourth edition of the Standards addresses the fluency through Can-Do Statements embedded in the Communication standard and by redefining grade levels with proficiency levels (novice, intermediate, advanced learners), each with sample progress indicators in all five C domains.

Perhaps this lack is not troublesome because fluency is part of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines, which are becoming increasingly related to the Standards. It should be remembered that the college learners in Magnan et al. (2014) identified fluency as a major learning goal for themselves independent of the Standards. If these learners are typical, fluency would appear inherently related to the Standards'

goals. Increased, explicit attention to fluency could make the Standards more attractive to learners and instructors at all levels.

These problems and difficulties with the Standards contribute to a fear, particularly at the postsecondary level, that putting forth the Standards as primary goals for student learning could result in a troublesome instructional change from a humanistic to a utilitarian orientation, leading to a restrictive curriculum. Of course, developers of the Standards would argue that such a fear is not justified; in fact, instruction toward the interrelationship of the five C domains implies broadening the curriculum, not restricting it.

Future Directions

In addition to addressing the concerns elaborated above, the profession must develop more language-specific standards and consider how the Standards relate to higher education, particularly to the upper-level language, culture, and especially literature courses. So far, research on the Standards relates mostly to language courses, service learning courses, or experience abroad. Time has shown that the Standards are an intellectually charged document. A greater range of minds needs to engage with them as they move forward.

In particular, the learners themselves should give feedback on the Standards as their personal goals for them and on their expectations for meeting these goals, either as part of instruction or as part of their life experiences. The research by Magnan et al. (2012, 2014) stands out in this regard, demonstrating that college learners do have goals that align with the Standards and expect to meet many of them. From this study, it would appear that the Standards might help students identify and articulate their goals and their progress toward them. The profession needs to hear from students with diverse profiles at all instructional levels, including heritage learners, students who study or have learned multiple languages, and students with different experiences at home and outside the United States.

If the Standards could be used for self-assessment, the profession could learn from efforts with the European Common Framework of Reference, which guides both teachers for curriculum and learners for self-motivation and self-assessment. Might the Proficiency Guidelines and the Standards even be combined in some way to include the Standards goals with fluency, modeling after how this combination occurs in the European framework? The NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Statements, describing proficiency targets, are a step in this direction.

With continued revision of the Standards, and especially as they are reviewed in terms of other documents, the profession needs an open mind to the constructs themselves. In what ways are the five domains overlapping? Does each domain present a coherent concept? For example, is there coherence in the three modes of the Communication standard? What relationships do scholars, teachers, and students see? Where should culture reside in the Standards and how can it be more thoroughly

portrayed? What is missing from the Standards that may contribute to intercultural or, according to the vision of the MLA report, translingual and transcultural competence?

Of course, to move forward in measuring competence, appropriate assessment tools must be developed. As that happens, the profession should be wary of a Pygmalion effect of setting aspirations for learners only as high as those their teachers envisage or can measure (Rosenthal and Jacobson 1992). Teacher professional development should tackle this issue head-on, seeing it through the lens of interaction within the five goal domains. Professional development, which, of course, should continue at all levels, must be more successful in reaching college faculty in order for the Standards to achieve the objective of articulating PK-16 instruction.

There is little doubt that the Standards have galvanized the profession and created a newfound unity of purpose within foreign language education and a stronger relationship between language and other disciplines. Considering it has now been 18 years since the Standards' creation, there has been surprisingly little change in them, either in the concepts on which they are framed or in the language used to convey them. Perhaps it is this stability that anchors their impact on the profession. Professional energy remains forward looking for their expansion into other languages through language-specific standards and for their continued impact on the field.

Cross-References

- ► Foreign Language Learning in K-12 Classrooms in the USA
- ► Second Language Literacy Research and Curriculum Transformation in US Postsecondary Foreign Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Brian V. Street: New Literacies, New Times: Developments in Literacy Studies. In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

Janna Fox: Using Portfolios for Assessment/Alternative Assessment. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment

References

ACTFL (2012). *Alignment of the national standards of language learning with the common core state standards*. Alexandria: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (actfl.org).

ACTFL (2014). *World-readiness standards for learning languages*. Actfl.org.

ACTFL Task Force on Decade of Standards Project. (2011a). *A decade of foreign language standards: Influence, impact, and future directions*. October. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Alexandria (actfl.org).

ACTFL Task Force on Decade of Standards Project. (2011b). *A decade of foreign language standards: Influence, impact, and future directions. Survey results.* April. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Alexandria (actfl.org).

Adair-Hauck, B., Glisan, E., Koda, K., Swender, E., & Sandrock, P. (2006). The Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA): Connecting assessment to instruction and learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 39*, 359–382.

Allen, H. (2009). In search of relevance: The Standards and the undergraduate foreign language curriculum. In V. Scot (Ed.), *Principles and practices of the Standards in college foreign language education* (pp. 38–52). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Allen, H., & Dupuy, B. (2012). Evolving notions of literacy-based foreign language teaching: A qualitative study of graduate student instructors. In H. Allen & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 171–191). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Arens, K. (2009). Teaching culture. The standards as an optic on curriculum development. In V. Scott (Ed.), *Principles and practices of the standards in college foreign language education* (pp. 160–180). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Bragger, J., & Rice, D. (1999). The implications of the standards for higher education. *ADFL Bulletin, 31*, 70.

Byrd, D., Hlas, A., Watzke, J., & Valencia, M. (2011). An examination of culture knowledge: A study of L2 teachers' and teacher educators' beliefs and practices. *Foreign Language Annals, 44*, 4–39.

Byrnes, H. (2002). Language and culture: Shall the twain ever meet in foreign language departments. *ADFL Bulletin, 33*(2), 25–32.

Byrnes, H. (2012). Of frameworks and the goals of collegiate foreign language education: critical reflections. *Applied Linguistics Review, 3*, 1–24.

Cutshall, S. (2012a). More than a decade of Standards: A look at how far we've come. *Language Educator, 7*(1), 42–47.

Cutshall, S. (2012b). More than a decade of Standards: Integrating "Communication" in your language instruction. *Language Educator, 7*(2), 34–37.

Cutshall, S. (2012c). More than a decade of Standards: Integrating "Cultures" in your language instruction. *Language Educator, 7*(3), 32–35.

Cutshall, S. (2012d). More than a decade of Standards: Integrating "Connections" in your language instruction. *Language Educator, 7*(4), 32–38.

Cutshall, S. (2012e). More than a decade of Standards: Integrating "Comparisons" in your language instruction. *Language Educator, 7*(5), 32–37.

Cutshall, S. (2012f). More than a decade of Standards: Integrating "Communities" in your language instruction. Language Educator, 7(6), 32–37.

Dykstra, L. (2009). Reconceptualizing the goals for foreign language leaning: The role of pragmatics instruction. In V. Scott (Ed.), *Principles and practices of the standards in college Foreign Language education* (pp. 86–105). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Glisan, E. (1999). The impact of *standards* on higher education: For more than just the sake of "continuity". *ADFL Bulletin, 31*(1), 75–78.

Glisan, E. (2012). National standards: Research into practice. *Language Teaching, 45*, 515–526.

Hammer, J., & Swaffar, J. (2012). Assessing strategic cultural competence: Holistic approaches to student learning through media. *Modern Language Journal, 96*, 209–233.

Jernigan, C., & Moore, Z. (1997). Teaching culture: A study in the Portuguese classroom implication for the national standards. *Hispania, 80*, 829–841.

Kern, R. (2008). Making connections through texts in language teaching. *Language Teaching, 41*, 367–387.

Knight, S. (2000). Standards-specific speculation: K-12 or K-16. *ADFL Bulletin, 31*(2), 69–72.

Kramsch, C. (1993). Foreign languages in a global age. *ADFL Bulletin, 25*(1), 5–12.

Kubota, R. (2004). The politics of cultural difference in second language education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal, 1*, 21–39.

Lally, C. (1998). Back to the future: A look at present textbooks and past recommendation. *Foreign Language Annals, 31*, 307–314.

Lange, D. (1999). Planning for and using the new culture standards. In J. Phillips & R. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language standards: Linking research, theories, and practice* (pp. 57–135). Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company.

Lange, D. (2003). The implications of the new culture standards and theoretical frameworks for curriculum, assessment, instruction, and research. In D. L. Lange & R. M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Perspectives on culture in second language learning* (pp. 337–354). Greenwich: Information Age.

Leeman, J. (2011). Standards, commodification, and critical service learning in minority language communities. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, 300–303.

Magnan, S., Murphy, D., Sahakyan, N., & Kim, S. (2012). Student goals, expectations, and the standards for foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 3*, 170–192.

Magnan S., Murphy, D., & Sahakyan, N. (2014). Goals of collegiate learners and the standards for foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(Suppl).

MLA (Modern Language Association) Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign language and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession, 2007*, 234–245.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107–110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).

Oskoz, A. (2009). Using online forums to integrate the standards. In V. Scott (Ed.), *Principles and practices of the standards in college foreign language education* (pp. 106–125). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Phillips, J. (1999). Introduction: Standards for world languages – On a firm foundation. In J. Phillips & R. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language standards: Linking research, theories, and practices* (pp. 1–14). Lincolnwood: National Textbook.

Phillips, J. (2007). Foreign language education: Whose definition? *Modern Language Journal, 91*, 266–268.

Rhodes, N., & Pufahl, I. (2010). *Foreign language teaching in U.S. schools: Results of a national survey – Executive summary.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1992). *Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development*. New York: Irvington Publishers.

Shohamy, E. (2001). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. New York: Longman.

Shrum, J., & Glisan, E. (2009). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (4th ed.). Boston: Heinle.

Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1996, 1999, 2006).

Swaffar, J., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the foreign language curriculum*. New York: MLA.

Thomas, J. (2012). Classroom discourse in foreign language classrooms: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(S1), S8–S27.

Troyan, F. (2012). Standards for foreign language learning: Defining the constructs and researching learner outcomes. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(S1), 118–140.

Tucker, H. (2000). The place of the personal: The changing face of foreign language literature in a standards-based curriculum. *ADFL Bulletin, 31*(2), 53–58.

Watzinger Thorp, J. (2014). Are global, international, and foreign language studies connected? In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming foreign language education in the United States* (pp. 123–142). New York: Springer.

Welles, E. (1998). Standards for foreign language learning: Implications and perceptions. *ACTFL Newsletter, 11*, 7–9.

Wood, P. (1999). Who is using the national foreign language standards? *Foreign Language Annals, 32*, 435–440.

Network-Based Language Teaching

Richard Kern, Paige Ware, and Mark Warschauer

Contents

Introduction 198
Early Developments 199
Major Contributions 200
SLA-Grounded Research 200
Sociocognitive and Sociocultural Approaches 201
Work in Progress 202
Nonclassroom Contexts 202
Multimodality 203
Problems and Difficulties 204
Future Directions 205
Conclusion 206
Cross-References 206
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 207
References 207

Abstract

Whereas early studies in network-based language teaching (NBLT) tended to test the technology to see what effects it might have on language use, later studies gradually shifted toward testing theories of second language acquisition within the context of computer-mediated communication. This chapter describes two

R. Kern (✉)
French Department, UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA
e-mail: rkern@berkeley.edu

P. Ware (✉)
School of Education, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX, USA
e-mail: pware@smu.edu

M. Warschauer (✉)
School of Education, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA
e-mail: markw@uci.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_30

trends in research on NBLT: one that emphasizes interactionist SLA models and another informed by sociocultural and sociocognitive theories. Most interactionist SLA studies fall into one of three categories: negotiation of meaning studies, transfer studies, or feedback studies. Socioculturally oriented research, on the other hand, has tended to emphasize two main areas: genre differentiation and culture learning in networked classrooms. However, the goals, content, and structure of NBLT are changing rapidly. In contrast to the primarily task- and product-oriented online interactions that characterized early research in NBLT, recent work examines online learning in two new areas: nonclassroom contexts (in which learners' uses of digital technologies are often more varied and more sophisticated than those they encounter at school) and multimodality (the exploration of semiotic modes beyond text in blogs, wikis, podcasting, mobile phones, bimodal chat rooms, and videoconferencing). As NBLT expands its focus to include cultural, communicative, and social aspects of online teaching and learning, a number of problematic areas arise, such as differences in medium, style, and levels of engagement, technocentrism, and methodological and ethical issues. After describing how researchers are grappling with these issues, the chapter concludes with some thoughts about future directions in NBLT research.

Keywords
Technology • Computer-mediated communication • Second language acquisition • Culture • Multimodality

Introduction

Over the past 25 years, computer networks have introduced unprecedented opportunities for language learners to access and publish texts and multimedia materials and to communicate in new ways within and beyond the classroom. Whereas computer-assisted language learning (CALL) refers broadly to a wide range of applications (e.g., tutorials, drills, simulations, instructional games, tests, concordancers, etc.), network-based language teaching (NBLT) refers specifically to the pedagogical use of computers connected in either local or global networks, allowing one-to-one, one-to-many, and many-to-many communication. NBLT research explores what happens when learners are brought together with texts, media, and other speakers of the language in computer-mediated contexts of interaction.

NBLT arose at the confluence of both technological and educational changes. In the 1980s and 1990s, networking technologies and infrastructure developed with dramatic rapidity in many industrialized countries, making low-cost connections possible. At the same time, educational theory and practice were increasingly influenced by social constructivism, which emphasized the social and cultural

construction of knowledge, the importance of collaboration among individuals and groups, and a learner- and problem-based approach to pedagogy.

Early Developments

Although computer networks have been used for interpersonal communication since the 1960s, it was not until the 1980s that they began to serve language teaching. One of the first pedagogical uses of local area networks was to teach writing to deaf students via synchronous conferencing at Gallaudet University. The University of Texas at Austin was another early adopter institution, where synchronous conferencing was incorporated into English literature and writing courses as well as foreign language teaching (in Portuguese, German, and French). These early studies (for reviews, see Ortega 1997 and Warschauer 1997) pointed to a number of potential benefits of synchronous conferencing compared to face-to-face class discussions: (a) increased and more democratically distributed student participation; (b) more time to develop and refine comments, possibly leading to greater precision and sophistication of expression; (c) encouragement of a collaborative spirit among students; (d) enhanced motivation for language practice and, in particular, greater involvement of students who rarely participated in oral discussions; (e) reduction of anxiety related to oral communication in a foreign language; and (f) positive effects on students' writing ability and perhaps speaking ability as well.

There soon followed a number of studies that systematically compared the dynamics of synchronous conferencing with face-to-face classroom interaction (reviewed in Ortega 1997 and Warschauer 1997). These studies confirmed the expected benefits of synchronous conferencing, with the exception of its effects on general writing and speaking abilities – an area that has been taken up more recently (see "Major Contributions" below). They also revealed an overall greater level of sophistication of students' language use (in terms of the range of morphosyntactic features and discourse functions). However, synchronous conferencing was also found to introduce a number of unsettling changes. For example, Kern (1995) noted that teacher control over class discussions was compromised, that the rapid pace of written discussion sometimes taxed students' comprehension abilities, and that although participation was more equitably distributed than in normal classroom discussion, the coherence and continuity of discussions often suffered. Kern concluded that effectiveness had to be evaluated in relation to instructional goals. Synchronous conferencing fostered free expression, student responsiveness, and the voicing of multiple perspectives on issues, but it did not improve grammar or reinforce standard discourse norms.

Noticeable in early NBLT studies was a tendency to test the technology to see what effects it might have on language use. In the next section, we will see a gradual shift toward testing theories of second language acquisition (SLA) within the context of computer-mediated communication.

Major Contributions

Two general trends characterize the bulk of current research on NBLT. The first emphasizes SLA theory and interactionist models of learning. Data analysis typically consists of quantitative counts of the occurrence of morphological, lexical, and syntactical features in online discourse.

The second trend, described by Kern and Warschauer (2000) in the introduction to their key collection of research articles on NBLT, is informed by sociocultural and sociocognitive theories and draws on a mixture of quantitative, qualitative, ethnographic, and discourse analytic methods. At issue here is not only quantifying language development but also understanding how learners interpret and construct meaning online across culturally situated contexts.

Although the primary research emphasis of each trend differs, the studies typically share a focus on discourse written by post-secondary foreign language learners in asynchronous and synchronous environments.

SLA-Grounded Research

Most studies grounded in SLA theories of networked classroom instruction fall into one of three categories: (i) negotiation of meaning studies that examine the effectiveness of different forums of online interaction in promoting negotiation of meaning, noticing, and comprehensible output, (ii) transfer studies that explore the degree to which language use online transfers to language proficiency more generally, and (iii) feedback studies that explore how instructors, students, and distally located peers can provide form-focused feedback.

Promoting negotiation of meaning. A major benefit for SLA-based research is the ease of collecting interactional data online, which instructors can use to facilitate students' metalinguistic reflection and researchers can use for analysis. Research in this area has focused primarily on exploring synchronous interaction and has examined which tasks facilitate negotiation of meaning. Findings show that real-time interaction can improve grammatical competence and metalinguistic awareness, with particular benefits resulting from decision tasks and goal-oriented tasks (for a review, see Kern et al. 2004). Further, in both MOOs and online chatting, students make repeated requests for explicit linguistic feedback and use a variety of strategies to develop their proficiency.

Transfer studies. Implicit in this line of research is the expectation that the linguistic and metalinguistic awareness developed online will transfer to other domains of language learning. Using rigorous quasi-experimental methods to examine the question of transfer into oral proficiency, Payne and Whitney (2002) provide evidence that the intermediate-level Spanish learners in the synchronous chat group outperformed the face-to-face control group on a pretest/posttest oral proficiency measure. In another quasi-experimental study, Abrams (2003) considers language in a third-semester German course but found no statistically significant differences in terms of lexical richness and diversity or syntactic complexity. Mendelson (2014)

takes a qualitative, ecological approach that connects specific cases of transfer to the instructional contexts in which they occurred. He found that in one case, transfer between chatting and speaking was related to the formation of interpersonal bonds that led to increased opportunities and willingness to speak the target language offline. In another case, chat was used to rehearse speech acts and express opinions online before uttering them in class.

Feedback studies. Early research examined feedback on the genre of classroom essays and showed that students tend to provide corrective feedback at the local level of grammar, syntax, or word choice, rather than at the ideational or organization level (for a review, see Ware and Warschauer 2006). More recently, research on form-focused feedback in blogs has shown that distally located peers support one another in developing metalinguistic knowledge of lexical and morphosyntactic errors (Lee 2011). Students who write together in wikis, however, tend not to provide feedback on form unless instructors explicitly and strategically require such feedback (Arnold et al. 2012).

To summarize, much of the research grounded in SLA theory and in cross-modality transfer builds off the premise that language itself remains a relatively stable target, and the overarching goals, outcomes, and processes of language learning are generally considered similar whether conducted in physical or virtual space.

Sociocognitive and Sociocultural Approaches

Researchers who question the assumed stability and neutrality of linguistic forms and functions in virtual discourse have turned their focus to two main areas: genre differentiation and culture learning in networked classrooms.

Genre differentiation. Online communication is not a single uniform genre, but rather a range of genres generated situationally for different media (e.g., blogs, e-mail, instant messaging, wikis, online forums, MOOs, chat groups) and according to the particular needs and purposes of participants. For example, synchronous online language is typically characterized by the fragmentary nature of conversation flow, the multiplicity of discussion threads, the difficulty of back-channeling to clarify one's message, the lack of paralinguistic and contextual cues, and the tendency to emphasize phatic communication. Asynchronous modes such as threaded discussion, however, tend to be less fragmentary, more informationally dense and complete, and focused on a single discussion topic. Variability in both technology and purpose leads to a range of online language that can resemble hybrid forms of standard and nonstandard language. Herring (2001) maintains that the fragmented, nonstandard language found in some online interactions is not the result of errors, but rather the result of deliberate choices by users to save typing time or to be creative with language. Warner's (2004) work on language play corroborates this view by showing how learners of German created hybrid language forms with code-mixing in their synchronous chat sessions. From a critical pedagogical perspective, however, such tendencies in online discourse create tensions for teachers' intent on

assisting their students in developing, if not proficiency in standard forms of language, at least the ability to discern among standard, nonstandard, and hybrid uses (for recent work in this area, see Gebhard et al. 2011; Hanna and de Nooy 2009; Pasfield-Neofitou 2011; Thorne et al. 2009).

Culture in NBLT. A significant shift in NBLT in the last 10 years is the growing emphasis on cultural aspects of language learning. In part the result of theoretical trends toward sociocultural and social constructivist frameworks, and in part an outgrowth of the increasing popularity of online collaborative partnerships, many researchers are turning to a broader conception of language learning that insists on its inextricable cultural layering. Often referred to as telecollaboration, these international partnerships link language learners in online discussions to promote language use and intercultural learning. Within the key pedagogical and discourse analytical work on culture and NBLT (for an extended analysis, see Kern et al. 2004), the most significant trends have been the move from monolithic to multidimensional presentations of culture (Furstenberg and Levet 2014; Lam 2009); the interrogation of what "intercultural" really means (Lamy and Goodfellow 2010); potential linguistic, technical, and educational hegemonies (Helm et al. 2012); and the potential for communication breakdown (O'Dowd and Ritter 2006; Ware 2005).

Work in Progress

New studies investigating the viability of technology-integrated teaching for supporting second language acquisition and intercultural learning continue to appear each month at a rate that shows little sign of slowing. The goals, content, and structure of NBLT are changing rapidly. Traditional definitions of language learning, as measured by demonstrated proficiency and control of the target language, no longer suffice as the primary knowledge base for teachers in online contexts (see discussion in Ware and Kramsch 2005). In contrast to the primarily task- and product-oriented, classroom-controlled online interactions that characterized early research in NBLT, recent work examines online learning in two new areas: nonclassroom contexts and multimodality.

Nonclassroom Contexts

Young people today learn digitally mediated modes of expression largely *outside* of school, and those out of school uses of digital technologies are often more varied and more sophisticated than those they encounter at school (Jenkins et al. 2009). Ethnographic work has provided a unique lens on the kinds of language practices that shape linguistic socialization outside of the traditional classroom. Lam's (2000, 2004) extensive research on Chinese-American adolescents documents how students develop textual identities and hybrid language forms through their participation in multilingual online communities. Such studies of how learners' identities mediate

(and are mediated by) their language practices *outside* of educational contexts offer an important perspective for classroom teachers. In Thorne's (2003) study of the "cultures of use" of online learning, for example, he notes the generational shift in college-level students' preference for conversing via instant messaging outside of class and their professors' requirement that they communicate over e-mail for in-class work, resulting in a potentially derailing mismatch of tools and purposes. Research by Black (2008) documents the experiences of adolescent English language learners on *fan-fiction* writing sites and the ways learners on these sites construct their identities as writers who solicit and make use of peer feedback. By exploring the affiliations, preferences, and practices of learners in their chosen environments, researchers can provide powerful insights into how we might change the shape of classroom-based teaching.

Unlike the nonclassroom communities Lam documented, which typically form around common interests without an explicit focus on language, tandem partnerships form online for the explicit purpose of improving proficiency in standard forms of the target language. These bilingual partnerships, grounded in two basic principles of learner autonomy and reciprocity, are goal directed toward improving traditional markers of language proficiency such as syntactic complexity, lexical precision, and morphosyntactic accuracy. A number of studies (e.g., Bower and Kawaguchi 2011; Kötter 2003) have integrated the tandem model of learner autonomy and reciprocity, mostly used in voluntary contexts, into classroom-based environments.

Multimodality

The environments of technology-mediated teaching and learning are changing to keep apace with innovations in technology tools. A major shift in recent years has been toward the expansion of semiotic modes beyond text. Increasingly, researchers are exploring the flexibility and interactivity of multimodal venues for communication. Thorne and Payne (2005) provide a detailed inventory of cutting-edge research in communication media such as blogs, wikis, podcasting, personal digital assistants, and cell phones. They emphasize the importance of these personalized, portable multimedia tools, not merely for fostering learners' linguistic proficiency in a conventional sense but also for challenging them to use the technologies as a springboard for thinking deeply and engaging with content in the ways promoted in classroom language instruction.

Multimodal learning also includes bimodal chat rooms (Blake 2005) and multimedia authoring tools (Nelson 2006). Blake (2005) examines a bimodal (oral and written) chat room, in which learners studying Spanish as part of a distance learning course can write and speak to one another and their professor. Although he reports on a case study of only a single learner, his analysis indicates that such bimodal CMC classrooms offer important new venues for student participation and negotiation of meaning. Nelson takes a different approach to multimodality in his examination of post-secondary ESL writing students who, in addition to writing traditional print-based essays, authored multimodal projects. His analysis shifts the focus away from

usual concerns of fluency and accuracy in foreign languages and suggests that instructors attend more broadly to students' developing awareness of language as just one aspect of a larger system of semiotics. Malinowski (2014) explores the convergence of embodied, on-screen, and mentally envisioned spaces in videoconferencing, underlining the importance their interaction in multimodal communication.

Problems and Difficulties

As NBLT expands its early focus on linguistic features to include cultural, communicative, and social aspects of online teaching and learning, a number of problematic areas arise. Differences in medium (Thorne 2003), linguistic style (Belz 2003), and levels of engagement (Ware 2005) complicate online language learning.

In order to grapple with these issues, researchers have adopted a number of theoretical perspectives. Reeder et al. (2004), for example, take an intercultural perspective on online communication and suggest that significant cultural gaps and differences in *cyberculture values* strongly impact the success or failure of online communication. Ess (2005) takes a postcolonial position and argues that because current CMC technologies favor Westernized values and communicative preferences, researchers need to work toward "middle grounds" (p. 162) that better connect global trends with local traditions. Warschauer (2003) has pushed for a more integrated, nuanced conception of electronic literacy. He elaborates the plural construct of *electronic literacies*, including computer literacy, information literacy, multimedia literacy, and computer-mediated literacy, to investigate the relationship between the sociocultural contexts of networked classrooms and the particular ways that literacy is valued and practiced by teachers, learners, and members of the larger society.

Another issue has to do with technocentrism, which can draw us toward testing the technology to the point where we risk becoming stagnated in terms of developing better theories of online language use. Related to technocentrism is the concern that technology-mediated language learning is becoming more and more commercialized, that is, packaged into convenient software programs and marketed to mass audiences. If the technology is attractive, it will tend to woo customers, regardless of the quality of its content or empirical base. In this regard, educators need to become critical consumers, just as their students need to evaluate online sources critically.

Finally, a number of methodological and ethical issues arise as well. Due to the short-term duration of most NBLT studies, a great deal more longitudinal research is needed to examine the effects of NBLT across time. Tracking language learning through year-long or multi-year studies helps mitigate, for example, concerns about how the novelty of technology might affect learner outcomes. Furthermore, longitudinal studies provide a more adequate basis for understanding how language learning might transfer across skill areas, as researchers are better poised to track students across multiple contexts of use.

Ethically, a key methodological issue has to do with subjects' informed consent to participate in research (and the real difficulty of maintaining student privacy in the virtual world). It is easy to collect data on the Internet without subjects' knowledge or consent, and because boundaries between what is private and public are often unclear, it is essential that researchers follow procedures for obtaining informed consent of subjects. Other ethical issues involve copyright/intellectual property issues, which are especially thorny in multimodality projects in which students download images, sounds, text, and video off the Internet. This is of course also tied to issues of plagiarism that tend to coincide with the easy access of technology-mediated learning.

Future Directions

As the field of NBLT develops in the coming years, research is needed that continues many of the strands discussed above. In addition, we anticipate that research will grow in a number of other areas.

First, more work is needed that explores multimodal learning contexts. Image and voice are becoming integral parts of how we interact and represent ourselves online, and digital media have quickly become readily available to wide audiences of users, teachers, and students. Of key interest for teachers will be discovering novel ways of integrating multiple modes of learning into the language classroom as they meet a broadening array of pedagogical foci that include linguistic development, intercultural learning, and identity issues.

A second area of future research will likely be directed toward more critical explorations of how culture functions in NBLT, both at the classroom and individual levels. Terms such as intercultural understanding and cultural identity will need to be more fully developed so that researchers can generate nuanced understandings of key concepts that underlie notions of competence, representation, and identification. To do this, theories will require strong interdisciplinary lenses, and methodologies will benefit from the work of collaborative research teams.

Third, expanded research will be needed on the relationships among and across learners, instructors, activities, partnerships, contexts, and frameworks. Lamy and Goodfellow (2010) describe this approach as taking place across various levels: the microlevel of the classroom, the meso-level of the school and institution, and the macro-level of the larger national and societal discourse frames. Crucial to any research on classroom-based NBLT will be attention to multiple layers that impact the changing footing of classroom learning.

Fourth, we anticipate that researchers will focus on curricular integration and assessment, particularly as NBLT moves into K-12 education, where high-stakes testing marries technology innovation to the development of measurable outcomes. O'Dowd (2010) has synthesized a number of issues needing further exploration that relate to the assessment of online interaction and intercultural learning, while Towndrow et al. (2013) have outlined the many complexities associated with bringing multimodal learning into the challenges of classroom assessment.

Finally, because more learning resources of all kinds have become available via the Internet rather than as stand-alone applications, the distinctions between CALL and NBLT have increasingly faded. New forms of research will be required to investigate the learning processes and outcomes that occur when traditional CALL activities are carried out in networked environments and combined with computer-mediated communication, intercultural learning, and identity development.

Conclusion

Over the past 25 years, a rich body of research has been conducted on NBLT. The accelerating diffusion of digital media and wireless networks, together with the increased naturalization of computer-mediated communication, promises that NBLT will remain a critical area for teaching and research. We note, for example, that the first generation of *digital natives* who have grown up using the Internet and view it as an entirely ordinary environment of interaction is now entering higher education. What's more, the Internet itself has changed dramatically in recent years, with the rapid spread of participatory tools and sites facilitating social networking, interactive game playing, collaborative writing and editing, and multimodal production. These tools provide opportunities for students to read, write, communicate, and construct knowledge in a second or foreign language in ways that are both new and unexplored.

While the potential role of NBLT is thus greater than ever before, research has also shown that sound pedagogy and not computers or networks per se is what really counts in NBLT. Future success will thus require teachers' continued attention to the close integration of project goals, activity/task design, and technology interface within often complex logistical realities. Teachers also need to know how NBLT can constrain as well as enhance their students' language use and know when it is better *not* to computerize a particular activity. The growing complexity of decisions involved in NBLT highlights the importance of technology integration in both preservice and in-service teacher education.

Finally, given the rapid evolution of technologies and the fluidity of communicative environments, flexibility will be a prime requirement for teachers and researchers as they continue to explore language teaching and learning in new networked contexts. By adopting the same habits of mind that we seek to inspire in our students – autonomous learning, inventive thinking, and critical perspectives on the intersection of language, technology, and culture – teachers and researchers can help ensure that the impressive potential of network-based teaching to transform language learning is achieved.

Cross-References

- ▶ Applied linguistic theory and second/foreign language education
- ▶ The Professional Development of Foreign Language Instructors in Postsecondary Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Kevin M. Leander: Literacy and Internet Technologies. In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

Lawrence Williams: Sociolinguistic Insights into Digital Communication. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

Marta Gonzales-Lloret: Technology and Task Based Language Teaching. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

Ilana Snyder: Research Approaches to the Study of Literacy, Technology and Learning. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Jennifer Rowsell: Researching Multimodality in Language and Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Karin Tusting: Ecologies of New Literacies: Implications for Education. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

Sirpa Leppänen: Multilingualism and Multimodality in Language Use and Literacies in Digital Environments. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

Mirjam Hauck, Malgorzata Kurek: Digital Literacies and Teacher Preparation. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

References

Abrams, Z. I. (2003). The effect of synchronous and asynchronous CMC on oral performance in German. *Modern Language Journal, 87*(2), 157–167.

Arnold, N., Ducate, L., & Kost, C. (2012). Collaboration or cooperation? Analyzing group dynamics and revision processes in wikis. *CALICO Journal, 29*(3), 431–448.

Belz, J. A. (2003). Linguistic perspectives on the development of intercultural competence in telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology, 7*(2), 68–99.

Black, R. W. (2008). *Adolescents and online fan fiction*. New York: Peter Lang.

Blake, R. (2005). Bimodal CMC: The glue of language learning at a distance. *CALICO Journal, 22*(3), 497–511.

Bower, J., & Kawaguchi, S. (2011). Negotiation of meaning and corrective feedback in Japanese/English eTandem. *Language Learning & Technology, 15*(1), 41–71.

Ess, C. (2005). Moral imperatives for life in an intercultural global village. In R. J. Cavalier (Ed.), *The impact of the internet on our moral lives* (pp. 161–193). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Furstenberg, G., & Levet, S. (2014). *Cultura*: From then to now: Its origins, key features, and how it has evolved. Reflections on the past and musings on the future. In D. Chun (Ed.), *Cultura-inspired intercultural exchanges: Focus on Asian and Pacific languages* (pp. 1–31). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Gebhard, M., Shin, D.-S., & Seger, W. (2011). Blogging and emergent L2 literacy development in an urban elementary school: A functional perspective. *CALICO Journal, 28*(2), 278–307.

Hanna, B. E., & de Nooy, J. (2009). *Learning language and culture via public internet discussion forums*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Helm, F., Guth, S., & Farrah, M. (2012). Promoting dialogue or hegemonic practice? Power issues in telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology, 16*(2), 103–127.

Herring, S. C. (2001). Computer-mediated discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 612–634). Malden: Blackwell.

Jenkins, H., Purushotma, R., Weigel, M., Clinton, K., & Robison, A. J. (2009). Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century. In *The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation reports on digital media and learning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kern, R. (1995). Restructuring classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects on quantity and quality of language production. *Modern Language Journal, 79*(4), 457–476.

Kern, R., & Warschauer, M. (2000). Theory and practice of network-based language teaching. In M. Warschauer & R. Kern (Eds.), *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice* (pp. 1–19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kern, R., Ware, P. D., & Warschauer, M. (2004). Crossing frontiers: New directions in online pedagogy and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 243–260.

Kötter, M. (2003). Negotiation of meaning and codeswitching in online tandems. *Language Learning & Technology, 7*(2), 145–172.

Lam, W. S. E. (2000). L2 literacy and the design of the self: A case study of a teenager writing on the Internet. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(3), 457–482.

Lam, W. S. E. (2004). Second language socialization in a bilingual chat room: Global and local considerations. *Language Learning & Technology, 8*(3), 44–65.

Lam, W. S. E. (2009). Multiliteracies on instant messaging in negotiating local, translocal, and transnational affiliations: A case of an adolescent immigrant. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(4), 377–397.

Lamy, M.-N., & Goodfellow, R. (2010). Telecollaboration 2.0: A critical appraisal. In F. Helm & S. Guth (Eds.), *Telecollaboration 2.0 for language and intercultural learning* (pp. 107–138). Bern: Peter Lang.

Lee, L. (2011). Focus on form through peer feedback in a Spanish-American telecollaborative exchange. *Language Awareness, 20*(4), 343–357.

Malinowski, D. (2014). Drawing bodies and spaces in telecollaboration: a view of research potential in synaesthesia and multimodality, from the outside. *Pedagogies, 9*(1), 63–85.

Mendelson, A. (2014). *Write to speak revisited: An ecological investigation of transfer between chatting and speaking in foreign languages*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Nelson, M. E. (2006). Mode, meaning and synaesthesia in multimedia L2 writing. *Language Learning & Technology, 10*(2), 56–76.

O'Dowd, R. (2010). Issues in the assessment of online interaction and exchange. In S. Guth & F. Helm (Eds.), *Telecollaboration 2.0: Language, literacies and intercultural learning in the 21st century* (pp. 337–360). Bern: Peter Lang.

O'Dowd, R., & Ritter, M. (2006). Understanding and working with "failed communication" in telecollaborative exchanges. *CALICO Journal, 23*(3), 623–642.

Ortega, L. (1997). Processes and outcomes in networked classroom interaction: Defining the research agenda for L2 CACD. *Language Learning & Technology, 1*(1), 82–93.

Pasfield-Neofitou, S. (2011). Online domains of language use: Second language learners' experiences of virtual community and foreignness. *Language Learning & Technology, 15*(2), 92–108.

Payne, J. S., & Whitney, P. J. (2002). Developing L2 oral proficiency through synchronous CMC: Output, working memory, and interlanguage development. *CALICO Journal, 20*(1), 7–32.

Reeder, K., Macfadyen, L. P., Roche, J., & Chase, M. (2004). Negotiating cultures in cyberspace: Participation patterns and problematics. *Language Learning & Technology, 8*(2), 88–105.

Thorne, S. L. (2003). Artifacts and cultures-of-use in intercultural communication. *Language Learning & Technology, 7*(2), 38–67.

Thorne, S. L., & Payne, J. S. (2005). Evolutionary trajectories, Internet-mediated expression, and language education. *CALICO Journal, 22*(3), 371–397.

Thorne, S. L., Black, R. W., & Sykes, J. M. (2009). Second language use, socialization, and learning in internet interest communities and online gaming. *Modern Language Journal, 93*, 802–821.

Towndrow, P. A., Nelson, M. E., & Yusuf, W. F. B. M. (2013). Squaring literacy assessment with multimodal design: An analytic case for semiotic awareness. *Journal of Literacy Research, 45*(4), 327–355.

Ware, P. D. (2005). "Missed" communication in online communication: Tensions in a German-American telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology, 9*(2), 64–89.

Ware, P. D., & Kramsch, C. (2005). Toward an intercultural stance: Teaching German and English through telecollaboration. *Modern Language Journal, 89*(2), 190–205.

Ware, P., & Warschauer, M. (2006). Electronic feedback and second language writing. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 105–122). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Warner, C. N. (2004). It's just a game, right? Types of play in foreign language CMC. *Language Learning & Technology, 8*(2), 69–87.

Warschauer, M. (1997). Computer-mediated collaborative learning: Theory and practice. *Modern Language Journal, 81*(4), 470–481.

Warschauer, M. (2003). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Part III

International Perspectives on Second and Foreign Language Education

Learning and Teaching Endangered Indigenous Languages

Leanne Hinton

Contents

Introduction 214
Early Developments 214
Major Contributions 215
Problems and Difficulties 219
Future Directions: What Constitutes "Success?" 221
Cross-References 222
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 222
References 223

Abstract

As global economics, cultures, and languages become more pervasive, the smaller populations find themselves losing their own languages, livelihoods, and cultural practices. But there is a large and growing counterforce movement of language revitalization. Much of this movement has been focused on teaching children their heritage language in schools. Bilingual education and immersion schooling are discussed. However, the middle generations – professional-age and parent-age adults – do not speak their heritage tongues either, and it is therefore essential to have a strong adult education program in order to train language teachers for the schools and parents to reinforce the language at home. The Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program has been designed to close this age gap.

Keywords

Bilingual education • Endangered languages • Immersion schools • Language change • Master-Apprentice program

L. Hinton (✉)
Linguistics Department, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA
e-mail: lhinton@berkeley.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_18

Introduction

The vast majority of the languages of the world are spoken by small numbers of people.[1] These are the indigenous and minority languages in nations that do not support them – and over the last several hundred years, their speakers have been under increasing pressure from the forces of colonialism, industrialization, and globalization to shift to a majority language. Typically, education, jobs, mass media, and literary materials are in the majority language, making it difficult for anyone who does not command the majority language to thrive. And in learning the majority language, the minority language is often abandoned. Thus, we have a world full of endangered languages – languages going out of use, no longer being learned at home by children, and languages which seem to be disappearing from the face of the earth.

However, the small languages of the world still have great value to their speakers and to the descendants of speakers. The language may symbolize and even embody traditional values, religion and culture, rich oral literature, history, and a sense of rooted identity (Fishman 1985). The wish for increased autonomy of indigenous groups trapped in a nation established by conquest or colonization also adds to the symbolic value of the languages. Since the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, minority and indigenous groups have been increasingly active in reclaiming their rights to their own cultures and languages. Therefore, in much of the world, we see that language decline is accompanied by the counterforce of grassroots attempts to reverse language shift. These efforts are followed with interest and support by many people outside the indigenous communities as well, since there is a growing sense that language diversity and the knowledge systems that accompany the languages are important to posterity in general. It is felt that each language is the carrier of a unique environmental understanding, philosophy, and oral literature whose loss diminishes humanity's intellectual wealth. Thus, the survival and revitalization of indigenous languages is supported by occasional reports in the press, by linguists lending their expertise, by foundations interested in indigenous welfare, and sometimes even by governments willing to shift away from the older language eradication policies to support indigenous language survival.

Early Developments

An early major contribution to the theory and methodology of language revitalization was Joshua Fishman's work, especially Fishman (1991). Hinton and Hale (2001) and Grenoble and Whaley (2006) were the first volumes after that to cover the various facets of language revitalization in some detail.

[1]Nettle and Romaine (2000), calculating from data on the *Ethnologue*, state that 90% of the languages of the world are spoken by only 10% of the people, collectively.

The USA is one of the countries where indigenous languages are the most deeply endangered, and much literature focuses on American Indian language endangerment and revitalization. According to the Ethnologue:

> the number of individual languages listed for United States is 227. Of these, 215 are living and 12 are extinct. Of the living languages, 4 are institutional, 7 are developing, 2 are vigorous, 61 are in trouble, and 141 are dying. (https://www.ethnologue.com/country/US, accessed January 19, 2015)

In 1992, Krauss wrote that only 20 languages have a sizable number of families where children are still learning the language at home (Krauss et al. 1992). Two decades later, even those 20 languages are on the cusp of "tipping" to English as the primary language of communication (see Dorian 1986 on "tip"). This decline of indigenous languages is the result of a 500-year history of contact and discrimination. Starting from the first European settlers, there was a long period of conquest, warfare, and genocide. The twentieth century saw a period of forced assimilation through boarding schools, where use of indigenous languages was a punishable offense. Finally, in current times, work, school, television, and sheer force of numbers of English speakers are making the indigenous languages disappear faster than ever. Incomplete language learning also plays a role in shift, as older relatives begin to criticize young people for not speaking correctly, thus making the young speakers decide to avoid criticism by abandoning the language altogether. The end result of all these factors is often precipitous, for example, Navajo, which has the most speakers of any American Indian language in the USA, is experiencing a very rapid decline. The Navajo community of Fort Defiance is a case in point: whereas in 1971 95% of the children in Fort Defiance were arriving at Kindergarten speaking Navajo, 15 years later less than a third of the children had even passive knowledge of Navajo (Arviso and Holm 2001). Recent reports say that throughout the reservation in the last few years, almost no children are coming to school knowing Navajo (James McKenzie, personal communication, October 21, 2014).

Major Contributions

Bilingual Education. But from the 1960s on, American Indians and Alaska Natives have tried to combat language loss with increasing energy. The first wave of resistance to language loss was through bilingual education, set up by the federal government (mainly with immigrants in mind) in 1968 through the Bilingual Education Act and mandated by the Lau Remedies of 1975. Many American Indian communities established bilingual education programs in their schools, which resulted in a blossoming of new orthographies, reading materials, and written genres for languages that had never before had a tradition of literacy. It also brought the indigenous languages back into the same educational system that had once forbidden and reviled them and, in the process, gave children and their parents a new sense that their languages were respectable.

However, bilingual education did not reverse language shift. Families continued to shift away from the use of their languages at home, and the language was rarely used outside the classroom. The government was ambivalent about the value of bilingual education, and it became a politicized issue. Government funding and training for bilingual education was always spotty, never sufficient. The administration's shift away from bilingual education was made clear when a few years ago the Office of Bilingual Education was renamed the "Office of English Language Acquisition" (Crawford 2002). Over the decades, bilingual education has declined in American Indian communities; even many of the best programs have lost their funding by now, in large part because many communities who once had children dominant in the indigenous language coming to school no longer have a viable population of child speakers. This is not to say that no American Indian bilingual education exists anymore; there are still excellent programs in some Native American communities. But the impetus for language survival in most communities has shifted to more intensive means.

Immersion Schools. Some of the larger communities have successfully implemented a much more intensive kind of program: immersion schooling, where most or all instruction takes place in the indigenous languages. The oldest of these is the Akwesasne Freedom School of the Mohawks. The largest is the Punana Leo system of schools in Hawaii, and the Ojibwes, Blackfeet, Navajos, and others have all worked to develop such schools. The results are very promising – children emerge from the school system both well educated and fluent in their heritage tongues. For example, Hawaii now has a young generation of thousands of fluent speakers as a result of their large and successful system of Hawaiian-medium schools going all the way from preschool through high school (plus Hawaiian Studies majors at the University of Hawaii campuses which have excellent Hawaiian language instruction). A growing number of Hawaiians exposed to the immersion schools have made Hawaiian the language of their home (Wilson and Kamanā 2013).

Immersion schooling is a tremendously exciting strategy for language survival, but it is also very difficult to implement, demanding great financial and human resources and an ability to fight bureaucratic and political hurdles. Such government policies as "No Child Left Behind" and state initiatives such as Arizona's proposition 203 that have outlawed teaching in any language except English are pitted against tribal efforts to run their own schooling according to their own needs and goals. Smaller groups have very little in the way of the resources needed to run immersion schools. In California, for example, most of the languages now have only a few elderly speakers, way past retirement age, and none of whom have a teaching credential.[2] There is a "missing generation" of speakers – those generations who are

[2]One of the proactive measures developed by California Indians and passed by the state legislature is the Eminence Credential for American Indian Languages, to be issued by the state to candidates who have demonstrated eminence in that tribal language based on an assessment developed and administered by that federally recognized Indian tribe. This allows a speaker of the language to teach the language in public school classrooms (California AB 244, 2009).

of professional and parenting age, who would, if they knew the heritage language, be able to transmit it to the children. Furthermore, many of the tribes are so small that there may not be a critical mass of children to teach. In many cases there is not even a physical community – the children are scattered in different public schools. In a state like Hawaii, where there is only one indigenous language, funding and educational and political assistance can be focused on it (e.g., Hawaiian is now one of the two official languages of the state). In a place like California, where there are 50 living indigenous languages, state and university assistance is scattered, funding is scarce, and with so few people who could possibly teach in an immersion school, burnout is a major issue. While a few immersion classes have sprouted in California, most of them have been small and short-lived (but see Future Directions).

The Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program. How, then, can any headway be made in reversing language shift in a place like California? This question was asked in 1992 at a gathering of California Indians at what has now become a biennial language revitalization conference attended by 250 or more Native Californians. At that first conference, a committee was formed, called the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival (AICLS), now a nonprofit organization with an all-native board (and this author as an advisory member). AICLS has developed a number of programs to enhance and support language survival. The best known of these programs is the Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program (MAP). The goal of MAP is to build new speakers in the missing generations described above, through informal immersion techniques in natural settings. The Master-Apprentice model focuses on the development of communicative competence; it borrows from various other models such as Total Physical Response (see Asher 1996) and Situational Learning (Holm et al. 2003) and also teaches the apprentice to utilize monolingual elicitation techniques as developed by linguistic fieldworkers (e.g., Everett 2001).

Teams consisting of a speaker of a California language and a younger member of the community who wishes to learn the language apply to AICLS, who provides them with training, mentoring, and a small stipend. They are trained at weekend workshops in how to leave English behind and speak only in the target language, using gestures, actions, pictures, and props to make themselves understood. Since even the speakers of these moribund languages have generally lost the habit of using their language long ago in real communicative situations, one of the major tasks is to help them regain the habits of communicating in their native tongue. This task falls primarily to the apprentice. At the weekend workshops, one of the first things the apprentice is assigned to learn is how to ask basic questions in the target language. The apprentice learns to ask such things as "What is this/that?," "What are you (am I, is she/he) doing?," and "How do you say X in our language?" Apprentices also learn reminders like "Please speak to me in our language," or "Please say that in our language," and helpful phrases for beginning learners like "Say that again."

People without training in language teaching tend to think that one teaches word lists first and that it is necessary to write the words down. In MAP we do not encourage writing, in part because most California languages do not have standardized writing systems and people tend to use a "folk orthography" that they

themselves cannot decipher later. Furthermore, the point of the Master-Apprentice program is to help people become conversationally proficient, and it is very clear that conversational proficiency only comes through oral and aural practice. We remind people of how children learn their first language and try to get the teams to behave in some ways like parents and children in the first-language learning situation. We encourage the introduction of vocabulary and sentences in communicative contexts where the meaning is made clear not through translation but through visual and contextual cues. At training sessions, we emphasize sequences where a word might be introduced in sentential contexts (e.g., "This is my nose. That's your nose." (with appropriate gestures)) and reinforced through commands "Touch your nose" and questions "Is that your nose?," etc.

We teach the teams to work together in real-life situations – drinking coffee together, making and eating meals, going on drives, looking at family picture albums, etc. We tell the master that she/he can get the apprentice to do housework, chop wood, cook a meal, wash laundry, or paint the house – so long as communication in the target language is taking place during it. The teams may also be involved in traditional activities such as making regalia or baskets, which become very natural situations in which communication in the target language can take place.

Activities that are less usual in adult daily life are also encouraged. We sometimes develop kits for the teams that include games, puppets, and children's books without words, for the teams to play with together to vary their language-learning activities. There is also a published manual that can guide the teams through the language transmission process (Hinton et al. 2002).

After the first training session, the teams go to their respective home communities and begin work. They are paid a small stipend for every 30 hours the team puts in together. The apprentice writes a report of the sessions and what activities they did together and send it in to the AICLS administrator before the checks are cut. Each team is also assigned a mentor, usually a member of the board or a previous apprentice, who calls them twice a month and helps the team solve problems they are coming up against. The mentor also suggests new activities and exercises the team can do. At least once a year, the mentor visits the team at their homesite and observes them in their sessions. Quarterly reports about team progress are sent to AICLS by the mentors.

At every training, the apprentices' knowledge of the language is assessed by a set of simple tests. First, the team is asked to converse together about any topic for a few minutes, and then the apprentice is given a complex picture of some sort – often a painting with a California Indian theme or a page from a picture book – and asked to talk about it. The assessors do not themselves generally know the language, and what is primarily listened for is the degree of fluency that is being exhibited by the apprentice – how long they can talk, whether they are using connected speech or just simple vocabulary items, whether they have to stop and search for words frequently, or can they speak fluidly and confidently. The assessment is filmed and posted for the board members to comment on and discuss ways to help the teams progress. After the first training, teams are challenged in various ways at subsequent workshops: apprentices are asked to give short talks in their language (longer talks as

time goes on) or tell stories; teams are asked to prepare skits or puppet shows during the workshop; and activities are assigned such as picking a topic out of a hat that the apprentice must then develop a brief talk on.

AICLS also familiarizes the Master-Apprentice teams with other programs that can be of use to them in language learning. One program of special interest is Stephen Greymorning's picture-based Accelerated Second Language Acquisition method (ASLA), which he originated for his own Arapaho language, but now gives workshops to many other American Indian language programs. Another is the game-based "Where are your keys?" method, which has become popular in American Indian language revitalization programs (http://www.whereareyourkeys.org/).

The apprentice is generally of professional or child-bearing age and is selected in large part on their demonstrated commitment not only to learn the language but also to transmit it to others – either to their own relatives or through the teaching of classes. In some communities the Master-Apprentice model is being used specifically to train teachers for school language programs (whether these are immersion programs or the less-ambitious language classes in an otherwise English-medium school). In California, apprentices are trained to use some of the same techniques for teaching that they use for learning – use no English; focus on real-life communicative situations rather than on isolated word lists; make sure there are lots of repetition and review, but in different contexts so that students are not bored and are learning new language at the same time; and use entertaining games and activities in the teaching process. Some of the apprentices have become skilled language teachers, and many are teaching their languages now to classes or to their own children (Hinton 2013).

The Master-Apprentice program has gained popularity around North America: AICLS has done trainings in such places as Oklahoma, Washington, Alaska, British Columbia, Ontario, and Nova Scotia and given invited presentations or workshops at indigenous conferences around North America and as far away as Japan, Finland, and Australia. The Master-Apprentice program is now being used in Sweden (Olthuis et al. 2013); and Australia is now doing training for Master-Apprentice programs of aboriginal languages. In California, AICLS has trained over 100 teams since 1992, in at least 30 different languages.

Problems and Difficulties

The Master-Apprentice program has a number of flaws, one being a lack of structure to the learning process. Considerable imagination is needed by the teams to create the needed structure for progress. Not all teams are successful in transmitting conversational proficiency to the learner; much depends on the ability of master and apprentice to spend sufficient time together (10–20 h per week) and to have faith in and be willing to employ the principles of immersion. But if those two requirements are fulfilled, after a 3-year program together, the apprentice generally emerges with a high degree of conversational proficiency. Another problem is what happens after the 3 years that AICLS can give the teams support, especially if there is no local

language program that the apprentice can be part of. Larger tribes around the nation have their own Master-Apprentice programs that feed directly into school programs. In the small language communities of California, apprentices with or without their language masters sometimes begin programs themselves, running language camps, teaching community classes, or starting to use their language at home with their children.

Language Change. What is sometimes seen as a problem in language revitalization is language change. There are two major ways in which any language revitalization program produces major changes in the language. One is in the development of new vocabulary, and the other is in the changes resulting from second-language learning in an environment where another language – in our case, English – is dominant.

The Master-Apprentice model is usually employed in a situation where even the speakers have not used the language for everyday communication for many years. Daily life nowadays is filled with objects and events that have never been talked about before in the endangered indigenous language. Teams can go to a grocery store or look at a city street and see a multitude of things for which no words exist in the target language. If English is not going to be used, strategies for developing new vocabulary must be used. Of course, borrowing English vocabulary is a possibility, but since English is the encroaching language that language revitalization programs are defending against, there is a strong desire to develop native vocabulary instead.[3] While in large programs such as the Hawaiian immersion schools it is essential to have a centralized authority to ratify new vocabulary (since otherwise each classroom would end up with different words for the same things!), in the small Master-Apprentice programs, a given team may be the only people using the language and find themselves having to develop vocabulary on their own. This is often a very entertaining activity which can bring a lot of humor into the situation, and by learning from the speaker traditional means of developing vocabulary through such processes as descriptive phrases and metaphors, the learner becomes well educated in aspects of the grammar and semantics of the target language.

Second-language learning in adulthood and for anyone beyond the "critical age" will rarely result in speakers that can speak identically to a native speaker. The learners are likely to speak with an accent and will probably exhibit a good deal of calquing and grammatical influence from English. Furthermore, it takes a very committed and skilled person to become truly fluent in an endangered language, since it is virtually never heard outside of the learning environment itself. Thus, the learner's language may be relatively limited and pidginized. Unlike the case with world languages, the learners of endangered languages represent the only hope for future survival and transmission of the language, meaning that whatever the learner knows is what will be passed on. If the learner's language has an accent or different grammatical structuring from the last native speakers, it is the learner's form of the

[3]For scientific vocabulary, the Hawaiians have chosen to borrow "international scientific vocabulary" and to "Hawaiianize" the pronunciation, rather than making completely new words.

language that will be transmitted. Thus, going through the bottleneck of second-language learning is likely to result in major changes for the endangered languages. This fact is problematic for people trying to save their languages, and there is a good deal of debate over how much value there is in an imperfect language competency. At one extreme are some elders who stultify younger people by saying "If you can't speak our language right, don't speak it at all!" On the other side of the debate are some of the second-language learners who value true communication in their heritage language over perfection. We must not think that language revitalization will save all of a language in its full traditional form. Languages always change, of course, but endangered languages are changing in particular, extreme ways. While extreme change is probably inevitable, it is important for second-language learners of endangered languages to understand that so long as there are speakers or linguistic records to learn from, they have a lifetime of learning ahead of them. Language change is inevitable, but learners can hope to learn genres of speech, idioms, manners of speaking, and grammatical systems that are full and rich and not merely calques of English.

Future Directions: What Constitutes "Success?"

When might we say that language revitalization is "successful?" We could look to Hebrew as an extreme example of success: a whole nation now uses Hebrew as its language of daily communication, whereas for close to 2000 years, it survived primarily in written form and as a language of religious study. Most endangered languages cannot hope for that kind of final outcome (though who knows what might happen 2000 years from now?).

For languages indigenous to the USA, Hawaiian is the only one that has much hope of becoming a language of daily communication between a large number of people – it was the national language of independent Hawaii until its forcible annexation to the USA, and it is the only indigenous language of the state and is now an official language of the state, and people of all races have some sense of identity with the language, so that many nonnative people wish to learn it. Due to the effective school programs, Hawaiian is already a language of daily communication among many people, and it is likely that this will increase. However, English will probably never lose dominance in Hawaii.

Unlike Hebrew and Hawaiian, most endangered languages belong to very small minority populations and are endemic to small locales. "Success" must be measured in other terms. We must look for smaller, stepwise goals. For example, Daryl Baldwin, who learned his language (Miami ~ Myaamia) proficiently from written records (since there were no native speakers left at all), made it the language of his family, raising four children who are all active speakers. Baldwin is a leader of language revitalization in his community but thinks in terms of an intergenerational 50-year plan. For now, language camps and usage at home by a small group of advocates represent the first major steps toward success. But Baldwin says that not much more can happen for language growth until community-based education and

social development within specific geographical areas can occur. Nor is language fluency among youth Baldwin's main goal at this early stage; instead he sees the revitalization of a sense of Miami identity and community as the immediate goal. There must be a communal and cultural context for a group of people to share a language, and although language is central to identity, reclaiming a language from a sleeping state requires a great deal of resources and community development if the language is going to have the kind of support needed for its collective use. Right now, language cannot be the only goal, but increasing use and eventual fluency can be an outcome of other goals, he believes. He is now the founder and director of the Myaamia Center at Miami University in Ohio (myaamiacenter.org), where students from the Miami tribe are exposed to tribal history, language, and culture and develop that sense of identity and community that Baldwin seeks for them.

Smaller tribes, many of them not even federally recognized, may not ever have the options that Baldwin foresees for Myaamia. Each person and each community may see success in such small events as someone learning to introduce himself in his heritage tongue. These smaller successes may be part of a longer-term set of goals for language revitalization, but as a whole, language activists cannot see where the next generations will take the process – they can only say "this language will not die on my watch."

In 2014, two California tribal immersion schools opened. The Tolowa tribe in Northern California opened an immersion preschool, and a Washoe immersion school opened in Gardnerville, Nevada (the Washoe tribe straddles the California-Nevada border). This is the result of many small steps spanning three generations – an older generation of native speakers that were willing to share their language with ambitious young adults – who then inspired children in their families and communities to learn their language; and those children went on to college to get teaching credentials and a strong background in language education. It is that third generation that was able to open promising immersion schools. Each step has had perceived failures and successes, and there are many more steps along the way. Each step is an act of language reclamation, and each of these acts constitutes success in language revitalization.

Cross-References

► Sociolinguistics and Language Education
► Teacher Training in Bilingual Education in Peru

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Bernard Spolsky: Investigating Language Education Policy. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
Leena Huss: Researching Language Loss and Revitalization. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Teresa McCarty: Ethnography of Language Policy. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas: Linguistic Human Rights in Education. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

Arviso, M., & Holm, W. (2001). Tséhootsooídi Olta'gi Diné Bizaad Bíhoo'aah: A Navajo immersion program at Fort Defiance, Arizona. In Hinton, L., & Hale, K. (Eds.), *The Green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 203–215). San Diego: Academic.

Asher, J. (1996). Learning another language through actions, 5th edn. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.

Crawford, J. (2002). Obituary: The Bilingual Ed Act, 1968 to 2002. *Rethinking schools. Special collection on bilingual education, 2002.* Retrieved from http://www.rethinkingschools.org/special_reports/bilingual/Bil164.shtml

Dorian, N. C. (1986). Abrupt transmission failure in obsolescing languages: How sudden the "tip" to the dominant language communities and families. In V. Nikiforidu, M. Van Clay, M. Niepokuj, & D. Feder (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 72–83). Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Everett, D. (2001). Monolingual field research. In P. Newman & M. Ratliffe (Eds.), *Linguistic fieldwork* (pp. 166–188). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fishman, J. (1985). *The rise and the fall of the ethnic revival*. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing language shif: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multi-lingual Matters.

Grenoble, L., & Whaley, L. (2006). *Saving languages: An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hinton, L. (Ed.). (2013). *Bringing our languages home: Language revitalization for families*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.

Hinton, L., & Hale, K. (Eds.) (2001). *The green book of language revitalization in practice.* San Diego: Academic. (Reprinted by Brill Press, 2013).

Hinton, L., Vera, M., & Steele, N. (2002). *How to keep your language alive: A commonsense approach to one-on-one language learning*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.

Holm, W., Silentman, I., & Wallace, L. (2003). Situational Navajo: A school-based, verb-centered way of teaching Navajo. In J. Reyhner, O. Trujillo, R. Carrasco, & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Nurturing native languages* (pp. 25–52). Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Nettle, D., & Romaine, S. (2000). *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olthuis, M.-L., Kivelä, S., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2013). *Revitalising indigenous languages: How to recreate a lost generation* (Series linguistic diversity and language rights). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

The Ethnologue. Retrieved from www.ethnologue.org

Wilson, W., & Kamanā, K. (2013). E PaePae Hou 'Ia Ka Pōhaku: Reset the stones of the Hawaiian house platform. In L. Hinton (Ed.), *Bringing our languages home: Language revitalization for families* (pp. 101–117). Berkeley: Heyday Books.

Community Language Learning in Australia

Suzanne Fernandez and Margaret Gearon

Contents

Introduction 226
Early Developments 227
Major Contributions 228
Work in Progress 231
Problems and Difficulties 232
Curriculum and Assessment 232
Higher Education Programs 233
Status of Languages 233
Demography and Delivery 233
Future Directions 233
Cross-References 234
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 234
References 234

Abstract

This chapter explores the nature and role of community languages and their maintenance in after-hours educational settings. The relationship between government language policies, especially in regard to bilingual education, and support for community languages schools is traced from the late nineteenth century until the most recent Australian Curriculum framework (2014). From

S. Fernandez (✉)
Wesley College Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: Suzanne.fernandez@wesleycollege.net

M. Gearon (✉)
Faculty of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: margaretgearon@gmail.com

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_19

the early 1980s, greater recognition was given to ethnic schools and they began to receive funding from both federal and state governments. This saw an expansion of this sector in response to demand from a range of linguistic and community groups. Although there have been few studies of teaching and learning in these schools, those which do exist present evidence of a high level of commitment on the part of parents and teachers. Despite the Australian community being highly multilingual and promoting multiculturalism, there remains a "monolingual mindset" which poses challenges for those who believe strongly in the value of raising bilingual children through the maintenance of home languages and cultures.

Keywords
Community languages • Language maintenance • Immigrant languages • Language planning

Introduction

The term "community languages" was coined in the mid-1970s to denote languages other than English used in the Australian community. This is to stress that these are not really "foreign" languages. The term does not usually include indigenous languages as their communities wish to emphasize their uniqueness and special status. Within education, community languages have often been subsumed under the term "languages" which is one of eight learning areas of the new Australian Curriculum to be implemented in stages from 2014.

School education is under the jurisdiction of the six states and two territories, all of which have different languages education policies. There are three types of institutions which give instruction in community languages to school-aged children:

1. Primary and secondary day schools
2. Schools of Languages which are part of the state education department in some states and offer instruction on Saturdays in languages not available to the students at their regular school
3. After-hours ethnic or community languages schools

We can distinguish between state schools, Catholic schools, and independent schools. The latter are largely affiliated with Protestant denominations, but there are also some run by other Christian and non-Christian religious and parent education bodies. Some such schools have links with a particular language to whose teaching they give special weight – Arabic in Islamic, Coptic and Maronite schools, Hebrew in Jewish schools, Modern Greek in Greek Orthodox schools, and to some extent German in Lutheran schools. Nongovernment schools charge fees. Across the Australian population, 65% of the student population is enrolled in state schools, 14% in nongovernment schools, and 21% in Catholic schools. Some of the languages taught in universities and adult education programs are spoken in the

community, although there are now a number of community languages which are no longer taught in these institutions (e.g., Macedonian, Serbian, Croatian, Polish).

Early Developments

Bilingual education was not uncommon in some of the British colonies which predated the federated nation of Australia (1901) – mostly German-English primary schools in rural areas settled by Germans, but also a few German-English secondary schools in urban areas, some French-English girls' secondary schools in Melbourne, and, as early as the mid-nineteenth century, some Gaelic-English primary schools. Originally intended for children from the respective language background, some attracted pupils from English-speaking backgrounds, and in the case of the French schools, they were in the majority (Clyne 2005, p. 2). Bilingual schools fell victim to the homogenization tendencies of the education acts of the 1870s and 1880s or to wartime legislation outlawing instruction through the medium of community languages (Clyne 1991, p. 13). Restrictions on bilingual education continued until well after World War II, by which time Australia had embarked on a large-scale immigration scheme bringing unskilled labor from Europe. The expectation was that immigrants would acquire English and rapidly abandon their first language.

In the 1950s and 1960s, languages were generally not taught in primary schools, and the main "foreign language" taught in secondary schools was French, not the language of a large immigrant group. Where a community language was offered, usually German, but sometimes Russian or Italian, such programs were clearly intended for those without a home background in the language, and there were subtle means of discriminating against such students in matriculation examinations in some languages (Clyne 2005, pp. 118–119).

By the mid-1960s, some interest began to be shown in offering "migrant languages" in the mainstream school curriculum as a resource for language maintenance purposes and to promote balanced bilingualism, as can be gauged from a discussion in the modern language teachers' journal *Babe*l (Clyne 1964; McCormick 1964). Some states were soon to extend the range of languages taught in government schools. This had already happened in many nongovernment schools. In 1972, the new Victorian Universities and Schools Examination Board changed the regulations for a language to be a matriculation subject so that languages other than the common ones such as French and Latin could be offered. Similar developments then took place in South Australia and New South Wales. In Victoria, German, Italian, and Dutch, which were significant community languages, had been introduced much earlier as "foreign languages", to be joined by Modern Greek, and in the 1970s, the introduction of Lithuanian and Latvian paved the way for a large number of community languages to become examination subjects, firstly in Victoria and then in some other states.

The range of languages available at universities was generally wider than that available in secondary schools. French and German were taught in virtually all universities, and some offered Italian, Greek, Indonesian, Russian, and, to a lesser

extent, Dutch, Swedish, Chinese, and Japanese. Asian languages were not spoken much in Australia at that time due to racially based immigration restrictions. Languages were taught as intellectual exercises for cultural enrichment (Pauwels 2007).

However, 1972 was to mark the beginning of a new era – with the election of a reformist Labor government, the rapid change from assimilation to multiculturalism as the dominant policy and the dismantling of the White Australia policy, which had already been weakened by the previous government. This would have profound effects on language education policy and its delivery.

Major Contributions

The above changes were promoted by national and international political factors and also by the demands of ethnic communities and the growing critique by academics about the Australian government's monolingual focus. Smolicz (1971), for instance, argued that the Australian school setting was acting as an assimilation agency and, indeed, continues to do so into the twenty-first century. The late 1970s and early 1980s saw the advent of migrant education conferences and lobbies in a number of state capital cities, which received considerable input from academics in relevant fields, produced sets of demands which included the teaching of community languages in primary and secondary schools. Ethnic schools started to receive funding from Australian federal and state governments. Descriptive studies of Greek, German, and Japanese ethnic schools were undertaken, e.g., Tsounis (1974), Arvanitis (2000), Gindidis (2013), Monheit (1975), and Miyoshi (1994), respectively.

Rado (1977) and others argued for bilingual education, which was introduced in a number of state schools in Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney in the mid-1970s. In Victoria, bilingual education saw a resurgence in the late 1990s and early 2000s with the State government supporting the expansion of partial immersion programs in government primary schools and with the introduction of some forms of bilingual education in newly established Islamic schools teaching Arabic and Turkish.

From the mid-1970s, a coalition of language interest groups including linguists, language teachers, and ethnic communities and their organizations began to lobby for a national policy on languages. Ozolins (1993) shows how the mobilization of professional language organizations and ethnic communities on issues of language policy set the stage for a greater push for community languages teaching. As stated/explained previously, the Australian federal government's decision to commission a parliamentary committee to inquire into the need for a national languages policy was due in part to these community languages' lobbies. The guiding principles of this policy included the development and maintenance of both community and indigenous languages. In the 1980s, the major community languages which mainstream schools supported were Italian (especially in the Catholic School system) and Greek,

Turkish, and "Serbo-Croatian" where there were substantial numbers of speakers in particular districts. In Victoria, for example, community language programs which were introduced as partial immersion ones in primary schools included German at Bayswater South PS, Macedonian and Greek at Lalor North PS, and Vietnamese and Chinese at Richmond West PS.

The National Policy on Languages (Lo Bianco 1987) established the complementarity of English and the other languages used in Australia and provided social justice and cultural and economic arguments for multilingualism in Australia. It secured federal funding for innovations in language maintenance as well as second-language acquisition programs in all states and territories and established a multi-center National Languages Institute, which was based on areas of research strength in applied linguistics at universities. Among collaborative projects was the production of a set of nine volumes entitled *Unlocking Australia's Language Potential* (1993) which examined the potential of each of nine key languages. Among other things, these considered the community use of the language and issues in the teaching of the language in schools and universities. Other research projects included Rubino (2004) who examined approaches to catering for background and non-background learners of Italian in first-year university courses, emphasizing the need for flexibility in both curriculum and assessment to maximize the potential of both groups of students and a study of the language of first- to third-generation bilinguals in German, Italian, and Chinese programs which produced a taxonomy of language acquisition experiences among children studying a particular language at secondary school (Clyne et al. 1997). Issues from this study were taken up by a collaborative project between the University of Melbourne and the Victorian State and Catholic school systems which examined the role of secondary schools in the maintenance and sharing of community languages (Clyne et al. 2004b). This project also generated a study of the learning of a community language, Greek or Spanish, as a third language (Clyne et al. 2004a) which showed that these L3 learners, because of their bilingual metalinguistic awareness, were more effective and persistent learners than those who did not have such a background. These L3 learners were constantly comparing their languages and using one as a resource to learn another. In addition, learning a third language supported their attitude to home language maintenance and gave them a more general interest in languages.

The National Languages Policy was subsequently replaced by the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (Dawkins 1991) which prioritized fourteen languages, some of which did have significant communities in Australia, and from which each state and territory could choose eight priority languages for special federal funding. All eight states and territories included Italian and Mandarin among their priority languages, six Modern Greek, four Vietnamese, and three Spanish, slightly reducing the teaching of other community languages such as Macedonian, Turkish, and Maltese in mainstream schools. The Rudd Report (1994), further increasing the emphasis on languages for trade and de-emphasizing sociocultural issues, resulted in a large-scale concentration on four Asian languages – Mandarin, Indonesian, Japanese, and Korean – in a well-funded program which lasted for 10 years but did not

really contribute to the expansion of the teaching of these languages nor to that of other significant community languages such as Vietnamese.

In an important overview of Australian language policy, Lo Bianco (2001) shows how governments since the early 1990s have distanced community involvement from policy, preferring a "managed" top-down policy, marginalizing and disrupting professional networks of language advocates and the interests of community language groups (see also Scarino and Papademetre 2001; Lo Bianco 2001, "▶ Language Policy and Education in Australia").

Between 2003 and 2006, Erebus International, on behalf of Community Languages Australia, an umbrella body which unites the state-based Ethnic Schools Associations under a single organizational and administrative banner, carried out extensive consultations with community languages groups and Ethnic Schools Associations across Australia. The goal was to improve national coordination and communication between all those involved in community languages education and to conduct research and establish a quality assurance model linked to state and territory accreditation processes for schools in this sector (Wyatt and Carbines 2008, p. 6). The work undertaken in this project also supported the role of community languages schools, recognized in the National Statement and Plan for Languages Education in Australia 2005–2008, as important providers of languages education, especially since mainstream schools and universities could not provide a range of languages which learners wanted to study (MCEETYA 2005, p. 7).

Bradshaw and Truckenbrodt (2003) investigated attitudes to the teaching of Greek among stakeholders (teachers, parents, students, management) at a Melbourne Greek independent day school. They demonstrated the diversity of opinions between the Greek consular staff, the school staff and parents on Greek linguistic norms, the status of students (L1 or L2), teaching methods, and student's motivation, despite an overarching commitment to the teaching of Greek. Papers from an American-Australian symposium on heritage/community language education held in Melbourne, Australia, made recommendations for future research into national and ethnic identities, policy and teacher education in community languages schools, and the preparation of learner profiles and pathways for community languages learners (Hornberger 2005, pp. 104–106). A study undertaken by Cardona, Noble, and Di Biase (2008) of community languages schools in New South Wales examines the attendance by first-, second-, and third-generation students, referring to the value of the schools for the maintenance of home languages and cultures plus their role in contributing to linguistic, cultural, and identity issues. The paper concludes with a large number of recommendations for future directions and research into the role and purpose of community languages schools, their relationship to mainstream school languages programs, and the need for their teachers to be accorded better training and access to professional pathways (Cardona et al. 2008, pp. 64–66). Other research studies which have examined teachers in community languages schools in terms of their skills, beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions include Cruickshank and Morgan (2012), Gindidis (2013), and Gearon (2015). All three studies present positive teacher attitudes to the role of community languages schools. The latter two studies reveal that teachers' own prior language learning experiences from their home

country influence the way in which they believe their language should be taught. However, they recognized that there were differences between their L1 learning experiences and the L2 learning context in which they were now teaching.

A project instigated at Monash University by Michael Clyne connected secondary school learners of three community languages – Chinese, German, and Spanish – who were in their final 2 years of language study, to older background speakers of each language in a series of intergenerational and intercultural encounters. The conversations between each pair were recorded and the ways in which the younger and older person negotiated their respective roles and use of language were examined. The study showed that the opportunities provided by these encounters improved not only the students' language competence but also gave them a greater understanding and respect for the older members of the speech community (Cordella and Huang 2015, p. 110).

Work in Progress

Much of the research in progress continues to focus on finding ways of improving community language learning for students at all levels, but some projects have also investigated which languages the community will need for aged care and medical services for the aging immigrant populations of the 1950s to 1980s (Bradshaw 2009). Others are focusing on service provisions for more recently arrived populations who have proficiency in many languages and who do not necessarily have any one dominant and/or common language (Borland and Mphande 2009).

There are some recent studies which examine the issues of language maintenance. Hlavac (2015) is studying the features and use of language by first-, second-, and third-generation speakers of Macedonian, Croatian, Chaldean/Assyrian, and Arabic and also their use of language varieties and code-switching practices. Musgrave and Hajek (2015) are interested in the issues and challenges facing recently arrived migrant and refugee communities, in particular, the Sudanese.

In Victoria, there has been an expansion in the number of community languages schools due to an increased demand for languages such as Mandarin and an attempt to meet the needs of recent migrant and refugee communities from Africa with the establishment of a community language school for speakers of Dinka and some other Sudanese languages. There are also a number of Arabic schools catering for children from Afghanistan and the Horn of Africa. In New South Wales, Cruickshank is examining community languages teachers' skills, perceptions, and attitudes, and Lu is complementing this study with one which looks at mainland Chinese teachers' beliefs and how these influence their classroom practices. Yet another project which aims at making teachers and teaching in community languages schools more professional and more similar to languages and culture teaching in mainstream schools is the introduction of a Certificate IV in Community Languages Teaching in Victoria. The production and registration of this certificate resulted from a Victorian Government project undertaken by Monash University's Faculty of Education languages educators who developed units specifically targeted at teaching in community

languages schools and covering the languages curriculum components taught in mainstream schools as well as bilingual language teaching pedagogies. In line with the recent interest in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) pedagogies to promote bilingualism, Gindidis is offering a CLIL stream at a Greek Community Language school in Melbourne.

Problems and Difficulties

Since the 1950s, Australia has developed as a highly multilingual and multicultural country where many migrant groups strive to maintain their language and culture through family use, in social networks with speakers from the same language, and by sending their children and grandchildren to community language school programs. The dominant use of English and the pervasiveness of what Clyne (2005) termed "a monolingual mindset," together with a lack of resources for small languages and those of newer migrant groups, have resulted in many challenges to the maintenance of language and cultural practices. For those languages not having established written forms, the need to develop literacy has meant that a consensus about an orthographic system has had to be established, and for some languages, for example, those from South Sudan, this has been difficult.

Curriculum and Assessment

In terms of curriculum documents and assessment practices, there are four issues which impact on teachers and students in community languages schools. Firstly, the Australian Curriculum framework for languages while recognizing the role played by community languages schools is only preparing curriculum documents for languages such as Greek, Spanish, Turkish, and Vietnamese taught in mainstream schools. Thus far, no provision is being made for more than 40 community languages currently taught in after-hours schools. Secondly, for languages such as Arabic, Australian governments and school systems have failed to recognize their pluricentricity. Thirdly, the arrival of recent migrants with an L1 background in Chinese and Modern Greek in particular has resulted in Australian-born students of these languages feeling disadvantaged and discouraged by having to compete with these L1 speakers in the examinations at the end of secondary schooling. Fourthly, the lack of numbers enrolled in certain languages such as Latvian and Dutch has resulted in their suspension from the Collaborative Curriculum and Assessment Framework for Languages (CCAFL), discouraging those children whose families have struggled to maintain the language from continuing their studies. This lack of recognition of the multifaceted nature of different types of background and levels of proficiency in a number of community languages adds to the difficulties faced by community languages schools and their parents, students, and teachers.

Higher Education Programs

As mentioned in Clyne and Fernandez (2008, p. 177), universities have been unable to maintain some language programs, in particular those used by migrant groups in the community. The very small number of students interested in community languages has seen their teaching in higher education restricted to Arabic, Chinese (Mandarin), Korean, Hindi, and Vietnamese with the latter two languages offered in only two or three institutions. Some universities have developed collaborative teaching arrangements (e.g., The Brisbane Hub; University of Adelaide, University of South Australia and Flinders University), while others have introduced cross-institutional enrolments for Diploma of Language courses. In spite of the 2011 census data showing a broader range of languages within the top ten used in the states and territories, this is not reflected in university language programs.

Status of Languages

Despite continuing to be one of the eight key learning areas in the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting framework, learning of languages still tends to be considered as less important than other curriculum areas (Lo Bianco 2009). However, some states, such as Victoria, accord a high priority to language teaching and learning with the introduction of a 10-year plan to ensure that all students will have access to another language from the first year of primary school to the final year of compulsory secondary schooling (Vision for Languages Education 2011). The same document also emphasizes the importance of maintaining home languages and encourages parents to develop their children's bilingual skills in both numeracy and literacy.

Demography and Delivery

It remains the case that the languages offered in mainstream school programs do not reflect Australia's language demography, especially since the arrival of more refugees and migrants from the Horn of Africa, South Sudan, and Burma. Although this varies across the states and territories, apart from Italian, the most widely spoken community languages are not generally taught in mainstream schools. This is particularly the case for Arabic, Greek, Spanish, Tamil, Turkish, and Vietnamese, all of which rely on after-hours community languages schools for delivering programs to background speakers and others wishing to learn these languages.

Future Directions

Although multilingualism and multiculturalism in Australia are a reality, the future of community languages learning depends on the attitude of the whole of Australian society, including those monolinguals who do not value the learning of additional

languages. Their future viability is also dependent on political support, as the survival of existing schools and the opening of new ones to provide education for recently arrived migrant groups rely on financial support from both the federal and state and territory governments. Community Languages Australia continues to lobby all governments and all major political parties to ensure that those children from non-English-speaking backgrounds who wish to maintain their language (both for oracy and literacy) are able to do so through regular attendance at well-resourced and well-run community languages schools. The survival of the after-hours community languages schools depends on the recognition and valuing of Australia's form of multiculturalism and multilingualism, not just by individuals and ethnic communities but also by decision-makers at all levels of government and the Australian population as a whole.

Cross-References

► CLIL: A European Approach to Bilingual Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Joseph Lo Bianco: Bilingual Education in Australia. In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

Trevor H. Cairney: Community Literacy Practices and Education: Australia. In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

Joseph Lo Bianco: Language Policy and Education in Australia. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

Arvanitis, E. (2000). *Greek Ethnic Schools in Transition: Policy and Practice in Australia in the Late 1990s*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, RMIT University, Melbourne.

Borland, H., & Mphande, C. H. B. (2009). Linguistic diversity and language service provision: Emerging African language communities in Victoria. In H. Chen & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Making a difference: Challenges for applied linguistics* (pp. 341–358). Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Bradshaw, J. (2009). Changing demographic profiles and language support needs of community language speakers. In H. Chen & K. Cruickshank (Eds.), *Making a difference: Challenges for applied linguistics* (pp. 328–340). Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Bradshaw, J., & Truckenbrodt, A. (2003). Divergent orientations to Greek and its teaching in an Australian school. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 6*, 439–457.

Cardona, B., Noble, & Di Biase, B. (2008). Community languages matter! Challenges and opportunities facing the community languages program in New South Wales. Report funded by The NSW Community Languages Schools Program, The NSW Federation of Community

Languages, and the University of Western Sydney, University of Western Sydney Print Services, Sydney.
Clyne, M. (1964). Migrant languages in schools. *Babel, 27*, 11–13.
Clyne, M. (1991). *Community languages: The Australian experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's language potential*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
Clyne, M., Fernandez, S., Chen, I., & Summo-O'Connell, R. (1997). *Background speakers*. Canberra: Language Australia.
Clyne, M., Isaakidis, T., & Rossi Hunt, C. (2004a). Learning a community language as a third language. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 1*, 33–52.
Clyne, M., Isaakidis, T., Rossi Hunt, C., & Liem, I. (2004b). Developing and sharing community language resources through secondary school programmes. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*, 255–278.
Clyne, M., & Fernandez, S. (2008). Community language learning in Australia. In: N. Van Deusen-Scholl & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd Edition, Volume 4: Second and Foreign Language Education* (169–181). New York: Springer.
Cordella, M., & Huang, H. (2015). L1 and L2 Chinese, German and Spanish Speakers in Action: Stancetaking in Intergenerational and Intercultural Encounters. In J. Hajek & Y. Slaughter (Eds.), *Challenging the monolingual mindset* (pp. 97–112). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Cruickshank, K., & Morgan, L. (2012). Community languages: Teacher skills, perceptions and attitudes. Refereed paper presented at AARE conference.
Dawkins, J. (1991). *Australia's language: The Australian language and literacy policy*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
Gearon, M. (2015). Understanding the role of professional development and influences on teacher practice: An Australian case study of Community Languages teachers. In J. Hajek & Y. Slaughter (Eds.), *Challenging the monolingual mindset* (pp. 199–212). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Gindidis, M. (2013). Australian community languages teachers: A phenomenological study: Invisible to visible unpublished doctoral thesis, Monash University, Melbourne.
Hlavac, J. (2015). Language maintenance and sociolinguistic continuity among two groups of first-generation speakers: Macedonians from aegean macedonia and the republic of macedonia. In J. Hajek & Y. Slaughter (Eds.), *Challenging the monolingual mindset* (pp. 131–148). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Hornberger, N. (2005). Introduction: Heritage/community language education: US and Australian perspectives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8*(2–3), 101–108.
Kipp, S. (2008). The language ecology of Australia's community languages. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 9, pp. 2962–2976). New York: Springer.
Lo Bianco, J. (1987). *National policy on languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
Lo Bianco, J. (2001). From policy to anti-policy: How fear of language rights took policy making out of community hands. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 13–44). Canberra: Language Australia.
Lo Bianco, J. (2009). (with Yvette Slaughter). Second languages and Australian schooling. AER (Vol. 54). Melbourne: ACER.
McCormick, C. (1964). Italian and assimilation. *Babel, 26*, 2.4.
MCEETYA (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs). (2005). *National statement for languages education in Australian schools, national plan for languages education in Australian schools 2005–2008*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.
Miyoshi, S. (1994). Efforts of ethnic supplementary schools for community language maintenance in Australia – With special reference to the Melbourne International School of Japanese. Tokyo Denki University, Engineering Department Research Report, No 13.

Monheit, D. (1975). *The role of the German ethnic school in maintaining the German language in Melbourne.* Unpublished BA Honours thesis, Monash University, Melbourne.

Musgrave, S., & Hajek, J. (2015). Linguistic diversity and early language maintenance efforts in a recent migrant community in Australia: Sudanese languages, their speakers and the challenge of engagement. In J. Hajek & Y. Slaughter (Eds.), *Challenging the monolingual mindset* (pp. 113–130). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia: Australian Second Language Learning Programme. (1993). *Unlocking Australia's language potential: Profiles of 9 key languages in Australia*. Deakin: A.C.T., National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia.

Ozolins, U. (1993). *The politics of language in Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pauwels, A. (2007). Maintaining a language other than English through higher education in Australia. In A. Pauwels, J. Winter, & J. Lo Bianco (Eds.), *Maintaining minority languages in transnational contexts* (pp. 107–123). London: Palgrave.

Rado, M. (1977). Bilingual education. In L. Claydon, T. Knight, & M. Rado (Eds.), *Curriculum and culture* (pp. 178–182). Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Rubino, A. (2004). *Teaching mixed-ability groups at tertiary level: The case of Italian* (Vol. 2(1)). Adelaide: Flinders University Languages Group Online Review.

Rudd, K. (1994). *Asian languages and Australia's economic future*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Scarino, A., & Papademetre, L. (2001). Ideologies, languages, policies: Australia's ambivalent relationship with learning to communicate in 'other' languages. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 305–324). Canberra: Language Australia.

Smolicz, J. (1971). Is the Australian school an assimilationist agency? *Education News, 13*, 4.

Tsounis, M. (1974). *Greek ethnic schools in Australia*. Canberra: Department of Demography, Australian National University.

Wyatt, T., & Carbines, B. (2008). *Community languages schools quality assurance framework. Implementation guidelines for schools*. Gladesville: Erebus International.

Second/Foreign Language Learning in South Africa

Nkonko M. Kamwangamalu

Contents

Introduction 238
Early Developments in Second/Foreign Language Learning in SA 238
Major Contributions 239
The New Language Policy 241
Work in Progress: "Incremental Introduction of African Languages in South African Schools" 242
Problems and Difficulties 244
Future Directions 246
Cross-References 247
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 247
References 248

Abstract

This chapter is an updated version of a chapter of the same title published in the 2008 edition of *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. In particular, the chapter reviews new language policy initiatives designed to promote use of indigenous African languages alongside English in education in South Africa, considers the challenges that efforts to implement these new policies are likely to face especially against the legacy of apartheid Bantu education policies on the one hand and of the hegemony of English on the other, and suggests an alternative approach involving inclusion of economic variables in language policymaking if the intent is to succeed.

N.M. Kamwangamalu (✉)
Department of English, Howard University, College of Arts and Sciences, Washington, DC, USA
e-mail: nkamwangamalu@howard.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_20

Keywords
Apartheid • Mother-tongue education • Multilingualism • South Africa • Language policy • Outcomes-based education • Curriculum 2005 • Bantu Education Act

Introduction

South Africa is known to the rest of the world mostly because of its now defunct, divide-and-rule apartheid system, on the basis of which the country was ruled from 1948 to 1994 and whose legacy continues to haunt the country's educational system. In order to better appreciate the discussion of issues in second/foreign language learning in the post-apartheid state, one must understand South Africa's colonial history against which the issues themselves have evolved. This history will be discussed in the section on major contributions to second/foreign language in South Africa, with a focus on the country's past and current language policy. The next section reviews pedagogical issues in second/foreign language learning in South Africa against the background of the sociopolitical changes, especially the end of apartheid, that have taken place in the country since 1994. The subsequent section looks at work in progress, especially the "Incremental introduction of African languages in South African schools," successor to Curriculum 2005/Outcomes-Based-Education (OBE), discussed in the 2008 version of this paper. This will be followed by a brief discussion of some of the obstacles facing the implementation of the new language policy initiatives. The last section suggests an alternative approach, inclusion of economic variables in language-in-education policymaking in South Africa, to provide equitable education to all.

Early Developments in Second/Foreign Language Learning in SA

South African schools at all levels including primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions fall into two language-based categories, much as they were during the apartheid era: there are English-medium schools on the one hand and Afrikaans-medium schools on the other. In regard to the English-medium schools, in the apartheid era, non-English-speaking background students were required to learn English as a second language (L2). However, and as already pointed out, in South Africa, the distinction between "English as a first (L1) and/or second (L2) language" has been called into question. For instance, Young (1988, p. 8) associates terms such as L1 and L2 with apartheid and argues that they should be discarded because they imply that Blacks are not able to assimilate western language and culture. Policy makers have voiced a similar view, i.e., that the term *second language* implies a "deficit view of language competence" (ANC 1992, p. 2) and that "the aim of a fully bilingual education system is rather to achieve a single level of language proficiency by the end of compulsory schooling" (Barkhuizen and

Gough 1996, p. 459). In 1993 a Core Syllabus Committee for English was set up to look into this issue. The Committee noted that the use of the terms *English* as a *first* and/or s*econd language* is complicated by the fact that most second-language learners, even those in rural areas for whom English can be described as a foreign language, use English as their medium of instruction. Therefore, the Committee proposed that

> . . .these terms [English-first and English-Second Language] be replaced with the term *English*. Nevertheless, the principle of equity demands some acceptable and brief way of acknowledging the verifiable differences . . . between mother-tongue and non-mother-tongue learners of English. For this purpose then, it is proposed that a growing international practice of referring to all learners for whom English is not their mother-tongue as *bilingual* learners of English, be adopted. (Murray and van der Mescht 1996, p. 258)

Since then, there seems to be a trend (as yet to be documented) for everyone in English-medium schools, irrespective of home language, invariably to learn English as L1 and Afrikaans or an African language as L2. In Afrikaans-medium schools, everyone learns Afrikaans as L1 and at least one other language, in practice most commonly English, as L2. Unlike in English-medium schools, in Afrikaans-medium schools, there seems to be no need to distinguish between Afrikaans as L1 and/or as L2 since these schools are attended mostly by native speakers of Afrikaans.

In predominantly black schools, especially those located in rural areas, African languages continue to be used as the medium of instruction for the first 4 years of primary school, much as they were in the apartheid era. However, recent trends in language education suggest that, in these schools, even where no qualified English teachers are available, English is increasingly being used, in whatever form, as the medium of instruction from grade one onward (**See Also** "▶ Codeswitching in the Classroom: Research Paradigms and Approaches" by Angel M.Y. Lin). A number of questions arise as a result: if the distinction between English as L1 and/or L2 is not maintained, how does one prevent the emergence of a society in which, as Peirce (1992, p. 6) warns, power is concentrated in a minority of speakers of standard English? Should the country reintroduce first-language (or mother tongue) education despite its close association with apartheid, or should it promote English-medium education despite its elitist nature and the high failure and dropout rates, especially among black learners (**See Also** "▶ Critical Ethnography" by Deborah Palmer; "▶ Ethnography of Language Policy" by Teresa McCarty). Future language-in-education policies must address these issues if attempts to implement multilingualism in education in South Africa are to succeed.

Major Contributions

As pointed out earlier, issues in second/foreign language in South Africa cannot be discussed in a vacuum, for they are interwoven with the country's sociopolitical history and with its language-in-education policies in particular. This section offers a

brief review of these policies and their colonial history. The colonial history of South Africa indicates that the country was first colonized by the Dutch, who ruled South Africa from 1652 to 1795. During the century and a half of the Dutch occupation of the country, only knowledge of Dutch, hence *Dutchification*, served as a catalyst for access to education and employment in the civil service. The *Dutchification* of South Africa or what was then called the Cape colony came to an end in 1795 when the territory fell under British control. With the territory now in their hands, the British authorities introduced the policy of *Anglicization*, which sought to replace Dutch with English in all spheres of public life including the educational system (Davenport 1991, p. 40). Like Dutchification, *Anglicization* required knowledge of English for access to education and to whatever resources were available in the colony. As the language of power and official language in the colony, English had to be learnt as a second/foreign language by all including the Africans and the Dutch. The policy of *Anglicization* lasted until 1948 when the Dutch, who by now identified themselves as Afrikaners, took the reign of the government. They, in turn, replaced *Anglicization* with *Afrikanerization*, a policy which saw the Afrikaans language, an offspring of Dutch, increase its power dramatically and take center stage in the administration of the state:

> . . .All government-controlled institutions, the state administration, the radio and television, the education sector, the defense force and semi-state institutions gradually [became] almost wholly Afrikaans. The [white] Afrikaans-population was in total control. (Webb and Kriel 2000, p. 22)

Knowledge of Afrikaans became a requirement for entry into the civil service, much as was that of Dutch and English in the eras of *Dutchification* and *Anglicization*, respectively. In an effort to further *afrikanerize* the South African society, in 1953, the apartheid government adopted a controversial language policy commonly known as the **Bantu Education Act**. Briefly, the policy sought (a) to promote Afrikaans and reduce the influence of English in black schools, (b) to impose in these schools the use of both Afrikaans and English on an equal basis as media of instruction, and (c) to extend mother-tongue education in African languages from grade 4 to grade 8 (e.g., Cluver 1992; Kamwangamalu 1997, p. 237) (for an elaborate discussion of other motives of the Bantu Education Act, see Kamwangamalu 2001, pp. 390–395). This legislation had serious implications for languages of learning and teaching in black schools. In line with this policy of Bantu Education, black children had to receive education through three languages, Afrikaans, English, and the mother tongue, while for their white, colored (people of mixed race), and Indian counterparts, education was dispensed exclusively in Afrikaans or in English, depending on whether one was Afrikaans or English speaking. The black pupils resisted mother-tongue education, as promoted by the Bantu Education Act, because they recognized it for what it was: one of the strategies used by the apartheid government to deny the Blacks access to English and hence to higher education and thus restrict their social and economic mobility (Kamwangamalu 1997, p. 243). The black pupils' resistance to the Bantu Education

Act, and the apartheid government's determination to impose it, led to the bloody Soweto uprising of 16 June 1976, in which several pupils lost their lives (Alexander 1989). The aftermath of the Soweto uprisings saw Afrikaans emerge, in the minds of black South Africans, as the language of oppression, and English as the language of advancement and of liberation against apartheid. As for the indigenous African languages, they became identified as inferior and unsuitable for use in the educational system. In other words, the Soweto uprisings reinforced black people's hatred toward Afrikaans; they boosted the status of an already powerful language, English, over both Afrikaans and African languages in black schools and in black communities at large and led the black South Africans to equate education in their own languages with inferior education. It is against this background that one must understand issues in second/foreign language learning and the development of the new language policy, to which I turn below, in the post-apartheid state.

The New Language Policy

When apartheid ended in 1994 and against the background of past language policies, the new government wasted no time in introducing a new language policy. The policy gives official recognition to eleven languages including English and Afrikaans, previously the only two official languages of the state, and nine African languages, among them Ndebele, Pedi, Sotho, Swati, Tsonga, Tswana, Xhosa, Zulu, and Venda. The key objective of the new language policy has been, understandably, to redress the imbalances of the past by promoting the use of previously marginalized languages that is the indigenous African languages, in higher domains such as the media, education, the government and administration, etc. In 1997, the Minister of Education announced a *language-in-education policy* whose objectives are listed as follows:

> (a) to promote additive multilingualism, that is, to maintain home language(s) while providing access to and the effective acquisition of additional language(s);
> (b) to promote and develop all the official languages;
> (c) to counter disadvantages resulting from different kinds of mismatches between home languages and languages of learning and teaching;
> (d) to develop programs for the redress of previously disadvantaged languages.
> (Department of Education, *Government Gazette* no. 18546, December 19, 1997)

One of the main objectives of the new multilingual language policy has been to promote the status of the nine official African languages against the backdrop of past discriminatory language policies. Accordingly, the new Constitution states that "...recognizing the historically diminished use and status of the indigenous languages of our people, the state must take practical and positive measures to elevate the status and advance the use of these languages" (The Constitution, 1996, Chapter 1, section 6 (2)). The Constitution also makes provision for the

establishment of a Pan South African Language Board (PANSALB) with the responsibility to, inter alia, ". . .promote and create conditions for the development and use of these (African) and other languages" (The Constitution, 1996, Chapter 1, section 6 (5a)).

The question that needs to be raised at this juncture and which is at the core of this paper is this: to what extent have the recent political changes in South Africa, especially the country's new language-in-education policy, affected second/foreign language learning schools and universities? Recent studies (Webb 2002; Kamwangamalu 2000) indicate that not much has changed in terms of language practice in education. In other words, the status quo prevails: English and Afrikaans remain the chief media of learning in English-medium and Afrikaans-medium schools, respectively, much as they were in the apartheid era. If anything has changed at all in terms of the language practices, it is that English has gained more territory and political clout than Afrikaans in virtually all of the country's institutions including education. English has become the only language in which the majority of South African parents want their children educated: English is the language of business, commerce, and international trade; it is the language of education, government and administration, international communication, diplomacy, and science and technology; and it is seen not only as the language of power, prestige, and status but also as an open sesame (Samuels 1995) by means of which one can acquire unlimited vertical social mobility. It is therefore not surprising that except for historically Afrikaans-medium schools, the majority of schools in South Africa are English medium. The demand for English-medium education, and not for education through the medium of other official languages, has to be understood against the background of the socioeconomic power and international status of English on the one hand and of the legacy of the Bantu education Act on the other. Besides, in South Africa there seems to be no demand for multilingual skills for sociocultural, academic, and administrative purposes. Consequently, as Verhoef (1998) remarks, for African pupils there is no alternative to English-medium education. In a study of language attitudes in black schools in the North West Province, Verhoef (1998) found that constitutional demands for multilingualism are at odds with black pupils' demand for English as the sole language of learning and teaching. The demand for English is exacerbated by the fact that the pupils are only too well aware of the power of English to ask for education in any other language and of the fact that their own languages have no economic cachet either locally or internationally. In the section that follows, I discuss the new pedagogical framework, namely, outcomes-based education that South Africa has adopted to redress past inequities in education.

Work in Progress: "Incremental Introduction of African Languages in South African Schools"

When South Africa became a democracy in 1994, it adopted a new language policy giving official recognition to eleven languages including English and Afrikaans, previously the only two official languages of the then apartheid state, and nine

African languages including Ndebele, Pedi, Sotho, Swati, Tsonga, Tswana, Venda, Xhosa, and Zulu, all of them newcomers to the official language scene in South Africa. The country's constitution calls for parity of esteem among, and equity in the use of, the official languages (The Constitution, 1996, Section 3(2)). In an earlier version of this chapter, I have described one language policy initiative, outcomes-based education (OBE) curriculum 2005, aimed at addressing the issue of parity of esteem and equity in language practices in education, in particular. One of the key characteristics of Curriculum 2005/OBE is the acknowledgment of, and support for, the learners' use of their primary languages for acquiring knowledge Gultig et al. (1998). Research reports indicate, however, that implementation of Curriculum 2005 was fraught with problems: teachers experienced difficulty in interpreting and translating the (Curriculum 2005) program guidelines into the classroom; the program was poorly financed to achieve its objectives; it was rushed and had little training and resources (Motaboli 2009) (**See Also** "▶ Investigating Language Education Policy" by Bernard Spolsky). Alternative initiatives have since been undertaken by a number of South African universities to introduce African languages as the medium of instruction for some subjects and as a required subject for all degrees offered at these institutions. The University of Limpopo, for instance, has introduced a Bachelor of Arts Program – the Contemporary English and Multilingual studies degree – where students study in both English and Northern Sotho, one of South Africa's official languages (**See Also** "▶ Codeswitching in the Classroom: Research Paradigms and Approaches" by Angel M.Y. Lin). The program, which has been running since 2010, has not been evaluated yet to determine its success or failure. A similar initiative has been undertaken by the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN). There, isiZulu, South Africa's most widely spoken indigenous language and a lingua franca in the Province of KwaZulu-Natal where UKZN is located is said to have become a compulsory subject for undergraduate students (Rudwick and Permegiani 2013). In particular, the UKZN's language policy states that "All students registering for undergraduate degrees at UKZN from 2014 will, unless they get an exemption, be required to pass or obtain a credit for a prescribed Zulu module before they can graduate." Put differently, the policy makes isiZulu language classes compulsory for all first-year students. The aims of this policy are "to achieve for Zulu the institutional and academic status of English"; to provide "facilities to enable the use of Zulu as a language of learning, instruction and administration"; and "to foster research in language planning and development" (Rudwick and Permegiani 2013, p. 93). The authors point to some developments at UKZN indicating that the institution is serious about elevating the social status of isiZulu. Among the developments are the digitalization and availability, on the university's website, of the "Basic Zulu" course to all UKZN staff members, availability of on-campus Zulu-English bilingual services (e.g., telephone, student counseling services), use and posting of Zulu-English bilingual signs on campus, etc. The policy is not intended to replace English but rather to elevate isiZulu to the status of an academic language and language of instruction and research as well as of general communication at UKZN and in South Africa as a whole (Nkosi 2014). As a result of this policy, students in the School of Education at UKZN, for example, are

claimed "to be able to conduct their research projects in the medium of isiZulu" (2014, p. 249). Masoke-Kadenge and Kadenge (2013) report on efforts to introduce African languages as the medium of instruction including a language policy proposal to use seSotho as the medium of instruction alongside English at Wits University in Johannesburg, and isiXhosa alongside English at the University of Cape Town and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in Port Elizabeth.

The move to introduce isiZulu in education at UKZN is paralleled by similar efforts by the Department of Basic Education (DBE) (2013), when it stated that "all primary and secondary schools will introduce an African language in their curriculum." The policy, dubbed "The Incremental Introduction of African Languages in South African Schools," spells out the original goal of South Africa's multilingual language policy, namely, additive bilingualism involving the use of African languages in education alongside English, and explains the rationale for doing so. In this regard, Heugh (2013) notes that the motivation for using African languages in the educational system derives from UNESCO-commissioned 20-country study of mother-tongue education in sub-Saharan Africa. That study determined that students' academic performance improves significantly when they learn through the medium of a familiar, indigenous language rather than through a transplanted foreign language. It is too soon to assess the efficacy of all the aforementioned language policy initiatives and how they will be received by various stakeholders (Heugh 2013, p. 231). The need to introduce African languages as the medium of instruction in the educational systems in South Africa cannot be emphasized any further. Studies into students' literacy levels in South Africa indicate that "the curriculum and ESL learning conditions are inadequate to facilitate transition to English medium by Grade 4; those privileged under the previous government, English and Afrikaans speakers, continue to be privileged under the new system" (Heugh 2013, p. 224). Along these lines, in a study of 75,000 students in the Western Cape, Heugh et al. (2007), cited in Heugh (2013, p. 228), found that "the majority of students across all language backgrounds were unable to read or write beyond the most minimal basic level by Grade 8," [and so] "were unlikely to be able to proceed into higher education."

Problems and Difficulties

In addition to the problems discussed in an earlier version of this paper (e.g., see Webb 2002, pp. 56–57), efforts to implement the new policy initiatives mentioned in the previous section are likely to face serious challenges. There is the challenge of persuading the stakeholders to change their attitude toward and accept African languages as a viable medium of instruction in the schools against the legacy of apartheid education. It was noted earlier that the Department of Basic Education (DBE) has initiated the move to incrementally introduce an African language as the language of learning and teaching (LoLT) alongside English in all primary and secondary schools in the country. It may not be easy at all to implement the proposed policy. For example, in KwaZulu-Natal, just like in the majority of provinces in

South Africa, traditionally the language of learning and teaching has been English. It is not clear how the school curriculum will deviate from this practice and introduce African languages as additional media of instruction. Also, policymakers do not seem to have gauged the stakeholders' perception of or reaction to the new policy initiative. The literature does, however, offer some pointers (Moodley 2010; Nkosi 2014; Rudwick and Permegiani 2013; Webb 2012). In an in-depth study of language practices in education at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Rudwick and Parmegiani point to what they term "the inevitability of English." It is evident from their investigation that "while South African students were in favor of promoting African languages in principle, they would not necessarily choose to be educated in their mother tongue" (p. 101). The following comments by some of the participants in Rudwick and Parmegiani's study are telling (**See Also** "▶ Conversational Analysis Approaches to Language and Education" by Hansun Zhang Waring). They show that the participants have a more favorable attitude toward English than toward their own indigenous language, in this case isiZulu, as the medium of instruction in the schools.

> The circumstances under which our country is right now force us to go with the flow. The flow is English. You can't stop the flow. Even Zulu teachers send their children to Model C schools (i.e., previously whites-only schools). (Rudwick and Permegiani 2013, p. 102)
>
> Where would I be employed with my Zulu degree in the world? Maybe in the government, but I don't know of a single department where I can only speak isiZulu. (2013, p. 102)
>
> Zulu is as important as all other languages, but then, with English being the language that you need to succeed as a person, it's better to learn in English. (2013, p. 99)

Nkosi's (2014) study of students' attitude toward isiZulu as the medium of instruction at the University of KwaZulu-Natal offers a similar reaction against the language:

> With isiZulu you cannot go anywhere because it is spoken mainly within the borders of South Africa. (2014, p. 256)

Masoke-Kadenge and Kadenge (2013) cites Nodoba's (2010), Made's (2010), and Conduah's (2003) studies into students' language preferences for a medium of instruction at the University of Cape Town, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, and Wits University, respectively. Like tertiary institutions in other provinces in South Africa, each of these three universities has adopted language policies aimed at promoting an African language either as a subject of study or as a medium of instruction alongside English: isiXhosa as subject and as medium of instruction at the University of Cape Town and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, respectively, and seSotho as a medium of instruction at Wits University. The findings of the three studies (Nodoba 2010; Made 2010; Conduah 2003) indicate that, all else being equal, students have negative attitudes toward the use of an African language as a medium of instruction. Some attribute the difficulty to promote African languages as media of instruction to the lack of adequate infrastructure (qualified teachers, availability of didactic materials, etc.) (Webb 2012).

Others attribute the difficulty to the legacy of apartheid language policies (Kamwangamalu 2000).

Another difficulty is the historical struggle between English and Afrikaans or, put differently, between "white" speakers of these two languages. Since the end of apartheid in South Africa in 1994, Afrikaans has lost a lot of ground to English. South Africa is increasingly becoming a monolingual country (in English) in its public space (Webb 2012). Previously Afrikaans-medium universities, for example, have been required to reform themselves and have become dual-medium universities, offering courses not only in Afrikaans but also in English to accommodate black students' demand for English-medium education. However, there is no comparable legislation requiring these institutions to offer instruction through the medium of an African language, let alone offer an African language as a required curriculum subject. Webb (2012, p. 205) observes that the University of Johannesburg, a previously single-medium Afrikaans university, has practically become an English-medium university, for 90% of its student population opt for English- rather than for Afrikaans-medium instruction. Du Plessis (2012) makes a similar comment concerning language-in-education preferences at the University of the Free State, also a previously single-medium Afrikaans University. There, 73.6% of the student population prefers English-medium education despite the fact that many of them do not have the required proficiency in English (Webb 2012, p. 204). It is instructive that black students studying at previously whites-only universities have not demanded to be educated through the medium of an African language. Thus, it will be difficult for policymakers to persuade the stakeholders including the student population at these institutions and their parents to accept an African language as a medium of instruction. Any move to encourage use of African languages as instructional media is viewed with suspicion and would be interpreted as a disguised return to the much documented, despised, and controversial apartheid policy of Bantu education, which sought to deny black South African students access to English (Heugh 2013; Kamwangamalu 2000; Webb 2012). Heugh (2013) remarks that urban parents in particular articulate a preference for English-medium education not so much because they reject education through the medium of indigenous languages, but rather because English serves as a proxy for the best-resourced educational opportunities for their children. English-medium schools have best trained teachers and are better resourced than schools that use African languages as the medium of instruction. To underscore this point, Heugh points to the number of graduating teachers for English, Afrikaans, and African languages, noting that in 2009, "87% (1,007) of teachers graduating and qualified to teach foundation phase (Grade R/0–3) were speakers of Afrikaans and English, while only 13% (168) were speakers of African languages" (2013, p. 225).

Future Directions

South Africa's new language policy initiatives are a welcome development to change the status quo, namely, the continuing hegemony of English over the country's other official languages including African languages and Afrikaans. However, legislation

alone is not enough to bring about change in South Africa's language-in-education practices, where English remains the chief medium of instruction. Indeed, the lack of resources and adequate infrastructure impedes the implementation of the new language policy initiatives. In addition, however, the stakeholders' negative attitudes toward the use of African languages as instructional media derive from the fact that, unlike English, academic knowledge of African languages is not profitable, that is, it does not pay off on the formal labor market. For the new policy initiatives to succeed, they must be revised to project African languages as a resource or a cash cow in which their speakers and potential users would have a keen interest to invest. As I have observed elsewhere (Kamwangamalu 2004), for language consumers in South Africa, the question is not so much whether or not indigenous African languages should be used as the medium of instruction in the educational system alongside English, but rather determining what an education through the medium of an African language would do for them in terms of upward social mobility compared with an education through the medium of English. Theoretical developments in language economics (Grin et al. 2010) could inform language-in-education policymaking in post-apartheid South Africa. Language economics is a field of study whose focus is on the theoretical and empirical analyses of the ways in which linguistic and economic variables influence one another. Understanding the interplay between economic and linguistic variables, say Grin et al. (2010, p. 140), is "... relevant to language policy, since this understanding sheds light on why firms require foreign language skills ..." or, in the context of this paper, why there is so much demand for these skills in South Africa's labor market, but virtually no comparable demand for African languages. A language policy initiative that does not lead to tangible economic advantages, such as access to employment opportunities in the labor market, is doomed to failure. As Ager (2001, p. 36) remarks, "without the bottom-up advantages, ... language policy will remain an empty, symbolic gesture, a plaything for the intellectuals." It remains to be seen whether South Africa will consider economic variables in language policymaking or whether symbolic gestures will continue to be a hallmark of its language-in-education policies.

Cross-References

► Applied Linguistic Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education
► Sociolinguistics and Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Lin, A.: Codeswitching in the Classroom: Research Paradigms and Approaches. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
Waring, H.: Conversational Analysis Approaches to Language and Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Palmer, D., Caldas, B.: Critical Ethnography. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

McCarty, T., Liu, L.: Ethnography of Language Policy. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Spolsky, B.: Investigating Language Education Policy. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

References

African National Congress. (1992). *ANC policy guidelines for a democratic South Africa*. Johannesburg: African National Congress.

Ager, D. (2001). *Motivation in language planning and language policy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Alexander, N. (1989). *Language policy and national unity in South Africa/Azania*. Cape Town: Buchu Books.

Barkhuizen, G., & Gough, D. (1996). Language curriculum development in South Africa: What place for English? *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 453–471.

Conduah, A. N. (2003). Introducing an African language for teaching and learning at Wits University. *Nordic Journal of African Studies, 12*(3), 245–264.

Davenport, T. R. H. (1991). *South Africa – A modern history* (4th ed.). London: McMillan.

de V Cluver, A. D. (1992). Language planning models for a post-Apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems & Language Planning, 16*, 104–133.

Department of Basic Education (DBE). (2013). *The incremental introduction of African languages in South African schools. Draft policy*. Pretoria: Department of Basic Education.

Department of Education. (1997). *Government Gazette*. 18546. December 19.

Du Plessis, T. (2012). The role of language policy in linguistic landscape changes in a rural area of the Free State Province of South Africa. *Language Matters, 43*(2), 263–282.

Grin, F., Sfreddo, C., & Vaillancourt, F. (2010). *The economics of the multilingual workplace*. London: Routledge.

Gultig, J., Lubisi, C., Parker, B., & Wedekind, V. (Eds.). (1998). *Understanding outcomes-based education: Teaching and assessment in South Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Heugh, K. (2013). Multilingual education policy in South Africa constrained by theoretical and historical disconnections. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 33*, 215–237.

Heugh, K., Diedericks, G., Prinsloo, C., & Herbst, D. (2007). *Assessment of the language and mathematics skills of grade 8 learners in the Western Cape in 2006*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (1997). Multilingualism and education policy in post-apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems & Language Planning, 21*, 234–253.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2000). A new language policy, old language practices: Status planning for African languages in a multilingual South Africa. *South African Journal of African Languages, 20*(1), 50–60.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2001). The language situation in South Africa. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 2*(4), 361–445. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2004). The language planning/language economics interface and mother-tongue education in post-apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 28*(2), 131–146.

Made, S. J. (2010). *An investigation into implementation of language policy in the Eastern Cape with specific reference to isiXhosa*. PhD thesis. Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth.

Masoke-Kadenge, E., & Kadenge, M. (2013). 'Declaration without implementation': An investigation into the progress made and challenges faced in implementing the Wits language policy. *Language Matters, 44*(3), 33–50.

Moodlely, V. (2010). Bilingualism at the University of KwaZulu-Natal: Staff and students' preferences. *Alternation, 17*(1), 328–354.

Motaboli, T. (2009). *Implementing outcomes-based education curriculum 2005 in South Africa*. Cape Town: Vdm Verlag.

Murray, S., & van der Mescht, H. (1996). Preparing student teachers to teach English first and second language – Problems and challenges. In V. de Klerk (Ed.), *English around the world: Focus on South Africa* (pp. 251–267). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Nkosi, Z. P. (2014). Postgraduate students' experiences and attitudes towards isiZulu s a medium of instruction at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 15*(3), 245–264.

Nodoba, G. T. (2010). *Language preferences and behaviors of selected students and staff in the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Cape Town: A qualitative analysis*. Master's thesis. University of Cape Town.

Peirce, B. N. (1992). English, difference and democracy in South Africa. Extracted from *TESOL Matters* June/July 1992 and reprinted in *SAALA Communique,* 4(2), 6.

Rudwick, S., & Permegiani, S. (2013). Divided loyalties: Zulu vis-à-vis English at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. *Language Matters, 44*(3), 89–107.

Samuels, J. (1995). Multilingualism in the emerging educational dispensation. In *Proceedings of the Southern Africa applied linguistics association* (Vol. 15, pp. 75–84). Cape Town: University of Stellenbosch.

The Republic of South Africa. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. (1996). Pretoria: Government Printer.

Verhoef, M. (1998). In pursuit of multilingualism in South Africa. In N. M. Kamwangamalu (Ed.), *Aspects of Multilingualism in post-apartheid South Africa: A special issue of Multilingua* (2–3rd ed., Vol. 17, pp. 181–196). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Webb, V. (2002). English as a second language in South Africa's tertiary institutions: A case study at the University of Pretoria. In N. M. Kamwangamalu (Ed.), *English in South Africa* (A special issue of *World Englishes* 1st ed., Vol. 21, pp. 49–61). Oxford: Blackwell.

Webb, V. (2012). Managing multilingualism in higher education in post-1994 South Africa. *Language Matters, 43*(2), 202–220.

Webb, V., & Kriel, M. (2000). Afrikaans and Afrikaner nationalism. In N. M. Kamwangamalu (Ed.), *Language and ethnicity in the New South Africa. A special issue of the international journal of the sociology of language* (Vol. 144, pp. 19–51). Berlin: Mouton.

Young, D. (1988). English for what for whom and when? *Language Projects Review, 3*(2), 8.

Innovative Second and Foreign Language Education in the Middle East and North Africa

Mahmoud A. Al-Khatib

Contents

Introduction 252
Early Developments 253
Major Contributions 254
Work in Progress 257
Problems and Difficulties 259
Future Directions 260
Cross-References 261
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 261
References 262

Abstract

Just like the case in many parts of the world, second language education has been accorded much importance in the Middle East and North Africa. This chapter is intended to serve two main purposes: (1) to survey progress and problems in the development of second language education in the Middle East and North Africa and (2) to look at some of the policies and theoretical constructs pertaining to second language education in a selected number of countries. We consider here a representative number of cases covering a wide geographical area of the region. We selected Jordan, Tunisia, Turkey, and Iran as representatives of the Middle East and North Africa due to the fact that what is taking place at present in these countries illustrates themes and topics which characterize the latest developments in the fields of language teaching and language planning. The chapter is structured in five parts. The first part provides a historical background of second

M.A. Al-Khatib (✉)
Faculty of Science and Arts, Department of English Language and Linguistics, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan
e-mail: mahmoud@just.edu.jo

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_22

language education in the region. The second part focuses on policy efforts directed towards improving the quality of second language education. The third part sketches the major progress that has been made. The fourth part identifies several thorny issues in second language education that deserve serious attention from policymakers. The last part speaks of the future directions in light of the materialization of new methods, approaches, and media for second language education. It has been observed that the driving force behind the implementation of many foreign languages in the education systems is not simply a desire to prepare students for a global economy but also a result of multiple social and political factors.

Keywords
L2 education • The Middle East • North Africa • Language planning • Language acquisition

Introduction

This chapter is a thorough investigation of second language education in the Middle East and North Africa. It carefully examines the educational systems in different parts of the region and attempts to highlight the fundamental background literature in second language education. Specifically, the areal focus of this work is on the Middle East and North Africa, by which I refer to the vast area spanning the Levant, the Arab Gulf countries, Yemen, and North Africa, in addition to Turkey and Iran.

The Middle East and North Africa form a vast region stretching from the Atlantic Ocean in the West to India and China in the East and the Caucasus and/or Central Asia in the north. At present, the region comprises more than 23 independent countries, the majority of which are Arab states. With the exception of Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Israel where the predominant languages are Turkish, Farsi, Urdu and English and Hebrew, respectively, the overwhelming majority of people in this region use Arabic with different dialects. Almost all these countries have depended, both historically and currently, on the strategic priorities of the power blocks (e.g., The Ottoman Empire, USA, and Europe).

The educational systems in the region vary from country to country. As Akkari (2004, p. 144) puts it "each country's educational past and current experiences are different, but several important similarities exist." He adds that since each country's experiences, culture, and history are different, each country of the region will have to devise its own plan for educational reform. As far as second language education is concerned, it can be traced back to the early decades of the twentieth century, when different parts of the region came under the British and French mandates. It is never an easy task to handle the language situation in every single country of the area; therefore, an attempt will be made in this article to consider the cases of only four representative countries.

Early Developments

The Middle East and North Africa are two regions that are often grouped together because they have many things in common. Historically, the region has attracted the attention of historians since early times because of its significant position. The area is believed to be inhabited by 6.3% of the world's population. The modern history of the region has its origins in the events of the First World War and the postwar settlement (Kedouri 1978; Longrigg 1978). With the exception of Iran, Turkey, and Israel, the area is inhabited by the Arabs who are of Semitic origin and who use Arabic as their native tongue. People inhabiting the Arab countries can be seen as a diglossic speech community, where two varieties of the same language are used side by side; colloquial Arabic which exists as the vernacular varieties of the major Arab-speaking countries, and classical Arabic, the language of the Qur'an, which provides a common standard written form for all vernacular variants, and a common medium for affairs of state, religion, and education throughout the Arabic-speaking countries (Al-Khatib 2006).

The political, social, and economic developments which took place early in the Middle East and North Africa have left their effect on second language education extensively. 100 years ago, most Arabs were part of the Ottoman Empire, a large multiethnic state based in Istanbul. The Ottoman era in the history of Arabia and many other countries of the Middle East lasted from 1517 to 1918. European powers actively encouraged nationalities within the Ottoman Empire to revolt throughout the 1800s. With British encouragement, a group of Arab people revolted against the Turks and sided with the British. From 1914 to 1918, the Arabs began to attack the Ottoman forces throughout the Arab world. Because of the Arab Revolt, the British were able to easily conquer some countries of the region from the Ottoman Empire. This prepared the way for a new era of reshaping the sociolinguistic situation and language education policies of the region. So, one may claim that the Turkish occupation of the area and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire had a significant role in shaping the sociolinguistic history and language education policies of the region in foregrounding the ideological dynamics between Arabic and English/French.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the whole of North Africa, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco became in the grip of the French colonization. France's harsh occupation in these countries was a reflection of its conception of that region as an extension of itself. Algeria is a case in point where French became the official language of the country and Arabic was forbidden to be used there. Even after independence 1950s and 1960s, countries in the Moroccan region continued to use French as a tool of modernization and development (Battenburg 1997). At present, however, the case has been changed, the French language is now replaced by Arabic in all public schools, and indigenous history and culture are excluded from the curricula. Arabization continues its spread into society at large. Moreover, a competition between English and French in these countries began to take place in a later stage. Several early developments concerning English language teaching in Tunisia were to influence the growing competition between English and French in later years (for more information on this issue see Battenburg 1997).

In the context of Jordan, Palestine, Iraq, Egypt, and Sudan, the case is rather different. English language teaching in these countries can be traced back to the 1920s when they came under the British mandate. All evidence suggests that English was gaining prominence in all aspects of the people's life. A few decades later (i.e., from the 1950s onward), most of these countries became the main supplier of skillful manpower (i.e., teachers, engineers, doctors) to the Arab oil-producing countries which witnessed major, rapid developments that affected all aspects of life, including language education in general and teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) in particular.

In Israel, the language situation is notable for its distinctive complexity (see also: Bernard Spolsky: Investigating Language Education Policy (Volume 10)). The Israeli population is a linguistically and culturally diverse community. Three main languages – Hebrew, Arabic, and English – are spoken in the country. Although, according to the Israeli law, the official languages of the country are Hebrew and Arabic, English is also spoken by a large percentage of the population. English has a semiofficial status and is used mainly for foreign communication exchange. It is also mandatory as a second language in schools and universities. Since the early 1990s, due to the massive immigration to Israel from the former Soviet Union, Russian became also a widely spoken language in Israel. Additionally, many other languages like Yiddish, Ladino, French, Romanian, polish, and so on are known by large sectors of the Israeli population (cf. Spolsky 1996).

Major Contributions

We consider here a representative number of cases covering a wide geographical area of the region. We selected Jordan, Tunisia, Turkey, and Iran as representatives of the Middle East and North Africa due to the fact that what is taking place at present in these countries illustrates themes and topics which characterize the latest developments in the fields of language teaching and language planning.

Just like in many other countries in the region, in Jordan all students who finish the public secondary school education must have had at least 8 years of instruction in English as a school subject. This was the case until 2000 when a new curriculum for the basic stages of education was developed. This new curriculum introduced various reforms with respect to the teaching of English as a second language. Among these is the introduction of teaching English as a school subject to the first four grades. As part of the Ministry's scheme for improving English at elementary-school level, it was first tried in a representative number of Government elementary schools. After successful completion of the first phase, the period of instruction in English as a school subject has become 12 instead of 8 years. Thus, with the introduction of the new reforms, English has become compulsory in all elementary, preparatory, and secondary Jordanian private and public schooling. Certain objectives for each stage were drawn up for each linguistic skill: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. A number of private schools have very exacting standards

where all other subjects are taught in English, though some of them are less restrictive about the type of material being taught or the background of their teaching staff. Also, almost all university-level classes are given in English.

French, on the other hand, remains elective in many schools, mainly in the private sector. Even though it remains an elite language in the country, it does enjoy the same amount of prestige and popularity as English. German also is an increasingly popular language among the elite and the educated; it has been most likely introduced on a large scale after the introduction of the German-Jordanian University in 2005. As far as the objectives of the philosophy of education are concerned, they remain the same: they are still to be both educational and instrumental, enabling students to acquire a level of competence which allow them to pursue their education or to use English as a medium of communication with the outside world (cf. Abu-Absi (1997, p. 199).

Tunisia is a typical francophone country where French is predominant and used as a second language. Although it is the smallest country in the region, it can be seen as the commercial, financial, and cultural center as well as the most educationally advanced country in that particular region. All evidence suggests that English is gaining prominence in both academic and business circles. This was first noted by Battenburg (1997) who points out that along with the progress in Arabization today English is emerging as another linguistic option. After examining two periods in postprotectorate Tunisia, the introduction of English (1956–1980) and spread of English (1980–present), he points out that "recent developments in Tunisia in English language policy and planning suggests that the decline in French linguistic influence may be accompanied by a future decrease in French political and economic status." In another report in which Battenburg (2006) speaks of his experience as a university professor in Tunisian universities, he contends that his students' English language proficiency level is impressive, despite the fact that English is their fourth language after Tunisian Arabic, classical Arabic, and French. He adds that in spite of the fact that Tunisian has a level of linguistic homogeneity probably not found anywhere else in the world (an estimated 99% speak Tunisian Arabic), Tunisians have a remarkable ability to learn other languages. This predisposition for language acquisition, according to Battenburg, has been aided by two related factors: first, Tunisians have had a history of invasions and contact with neighboring countries due to its geographical position; and second, as a small country with limited natural resources, Tunisians are obliged to communicate with speakers of other languages particularly for purposes of trade and tourism.

However, among the main challenges encountered by the process of Anglicizing the country, he remarked that just like many of the other developing countries in the region, textbooks as well as other equipment are in short supply in Tunisia. English Departments there are divided into three programs: Literature, linguistics, and civilization. The challenge in Tunisian English departments is to offer university degrees in English within Arab country using a French educational system (Battenburg 2006).

In Turkey, which can be seen as a land bridge connecting Europe to Asia, the situation is not that different from other countries in the region, as it has been

described by many authors and official resources (e.g., Brown 2003; Kose et al. 2002; Tercanlioglu 2004; Köksal and Şahin 2012; Dinçer et al. 2010). English, the most common foreign language, is taught in public schools from 4th grade onward through to the end of high school. All students entering university are supposed to have had at least 9 years of instruction in English as a school subject. However, in public schools, much of that instruction has been by teachers who speak English as a second language themselves. For many students, English is not used outside the classroom, so they have little to practice their second language skills. However, the case in private schooling is different. The increasing prosperous Turkish middle classes are more eager than ever to learn English. Dozens of private secondary schools and a few universities use English as the language of instruction. Kose et al. (2002, p. 1) note:

> There is an ever-increasing demand for English teaching and learning activities in Turkey, with the implementation of new eight-year compulsory primary education in 1998. Eight-Yearly Development Plan (1999–2006) estimates the English teacher need of Turkey as approximately 60,000. In order to meet this demand Turkish Ministry of National Education (MNE) and Eskisehir Anadolu University signed a protocol in February 2000. Anadolu University is authorized to initiate a four-year Distance English Teacher Education program.

In Iran, the case is completely different from all other countries in the region, as foreign language education has been much affected by both the political and social developments which took place in the country during the last four decades. Farhady et al. (2010, p. 10) argue that "deciding on a language to be taught as a foreign language in a country is not a matter of pure academic choice but a matter of government policy often motivated by political, social, economic, and educational factors." Iran has been found to be more conservative toward foreign language education. One of the main reasons for this is politicization of the language issue after the Islamic Revolution and the fear that English language represents a threat to the Persian language and Islamic culture (see also Khubchandani 2008). Farhady et al. (2010) summarize existing foreign and second language education in Iran as follows:

> The educational policy makers formulated a plan to promote learning and teaching of five foreign other languages (i.e. other than English) including German, French, Italian, Spanish, and Russian. Following this amendment, the national curriculum committee prepared textbooks for all these languages to be used at schools. However, due to insufficient number of teachers and a low number of applicants for these languages, English has been the most dominant foreign language taught at the high schools.

They add that "with many ups and downs, however, at present teaching English in public schools is stabilized." An interesting point is that, according to them, while teaching English was almost banned early after the revolution, it has been given the same number of credit units as other main subject matter areas such as biology and chemistry.

Work in Progress

The literature of foreign language education in various countries of the region has, in recent years, been filled to overflowing with examples of highly critical self-examinations and with proposed solutions to the problems which these analyses have identified (see, for example, Hasan 2006; Bataineh and Zghoul 2006; Battenburg 2006; Fay 2006; Zughoul 2003; Kose et al. 2002; Al-Khatib 2005; Kiany et al. 2011; Rababah 2003; Talebinezhad and Aliakbari 2001; Spaven and Murphy 2000; Mahmoud 2000; Al-Issa 2007; Farhady et al. 2010; Shishavan 2010; Mahboudi and Javdani 2012, among others). Some of the areas which have received special attention in the current research include: educational policy, language transference and interlanguage development, material preparation, teacher training, pedagogical approaches, and language attitudes.

In the context of Jordan, two collections of papers covering a wide range of issues relating to EFL teaching and bilingualism were edited by Al-Khatib (2000, 2006). These provide the first serious attempts to tackle bilingual education and EFL learning from an Arab point of view and introduce to the outside reader new literature on foreign language teaching across varied settings of the region. Several studies were conducted in the region on second language pedagogy (see also Kirk Hazen: Variationist Approaches to Language and Education (Volume 1)). Bataineh and Zghoul (2006) examine the critical thinking skills of 50 students enrolled at the Master's TEFL program at Yarmouk University, Jordan. They use the Cornell Critical Thinking Test, Level Z to test the students' use, or lack thereof, of the critical thinking skills of deduction, semantics, credibility, induction, definition, assumption, and identification. They observed that the respondents performed poorly on the test and noted the effect of gender, age, and grade point average. Hasan's (2006) Article on "Analyzing Bilingual Classroom Discourse" presents an analysis and discussion of spoken discourse in the EFL classroom at Damascus University. The study looks at the mechanism of classroom interaction; e.g., the use of questions, initiations, repetitions, and expansions. The results show that classroom language is artificial and this can be exemplified by the teachers' simplified input, their use of display questions that restrict students' responses, and their number of initiations.

In educational policy, Zughoul (2003) traces the effect of globalization on second language education. He outlines some of the impacts the language of globalization has had on different societies/cultures and the kind of reactions this language has generated among various cultures. The author reached the conclusion that despite the hegemonic and imperialistic nature of English (as the language of globalization), it is still badly needed in the Arab World for the purposes of communicating with the outside world, education, acquisition of technology, and development at large. He adds that teaching English as a language of globalization necessitates changes in the older approaches and calls for making changes in the curriculum to respond to the needs of the learner and society. Similar observations were also made in the context of Iran when Dahmardeh (2009) noted that the worldwide growing interest in English stresses the need for a new approach to English language teaching.

As regards material preparation, Spaven and Murphy (2000) conducted a study in the context of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) on teaching information skills in English as a second language. In order to develop suitable curriculum for their students, they have had to re-examine their views on librarianship and on lifelong learning. Based on the findings of their study, the authors concluded that teaching information skills in a second language need not be onerous if we bring the enthusiasm they have for their profession to their customers. The English Translation program in Iranian Universities was also the subject of another study carried out by Razmjou (2001). The purpose of this study is to develop some guidelines to modify the present curriculum for a BA in English Translation in Iranian universities. Based on the results of the study, guidelines are suggested for skill development and content improvement for a translation curriculum.

A significant amount of work on language transference and interlanguage development has also been carried out in different parts of the Middle East and North Africa. One important investigation was carried out by Mahmoud (2000) who tackled the problem of language transfer among Arabic-speaking students learning EFL. The author highlights the problem of using two main varieties of Arabic in each Arab country by Arab students and attempts to find answer to the question of which variety of Arabic students transfer from. He discovered that there is no significant difference between the means of the number of clauses produced in both cases and suggested that further research is still needed to determine which variety Arab students tend to transfer from in their writing. Some of these works have also tackled this issue from a translation point of view. In an article describing the English Language Program (LTP) as implemented in Israeli high schools, Kozminsky et al. (1998) found that the LTP students improved the meta-language skills related to translation and also gained five extra percentage points in the regular English matriculation exams at the end of grade 12, compared to the non-LTP controls. Administrative, pedagogical, and conceptual problems in implementing the program are discussed in detail in the article. Similarly, in another study of the difficulties encountered by EFL students in the UAE in translating Arabic "fa" into English, Saeed and Fareh (2006) examined several types of tests in order to identify the salient functions that this marker has into Arabic discourse. The difficulties that Arab EFL learners encounter in translating this marker into English were identified and rank ordered in terms of difficulty.

In an article on "Moods and Myths about speaking British English In Turkey," Fay (2006) attempts to draw attention to the predominance of British English in the ESL community in Turkey and then look at some of the perceptions of teachers and students involved with this choice. Based on the findings of his study, a number of significant suggestions are made in order to apply the analysis results to curriculum and syllabus design in general and within the specific context of the Turkish second language education programs.

In an attempt to address the attitudes of the Iranian high school and university learners towards the way culture is addressed in ELT (English language teaching) in the context of Iran, Mahboudi and Javdani (2012) concluded that all students had an overall negative attitude towards the way culture is addressed in ELT in Iran. They

also suggest that to be able to select, accept, or reject ideas, concepts, and pressures, especially those emanating from other and dominant cultures, people have to be equipped with a good knowledge of their own culture and history.

Problems and Difficulties

Not all languages have benefited equally from the efforts and resources invested in foreign/second language learning in the region. English and – to a lesser extent – French have received the most attention and support to date at the level of both formal and nonformal education. Teaching English in particular is gaining importance at an accelerated rate in the region, not only because the language has been regarded as a valuable resource for the people's modernization drive, but because it has a great impact on all aspects of their daily life. Therefore, in what follows we confine ourselves to discussing the problems/difficulties encountered by teaching these two languages, though the teaching of other languages like German, Spanish, and Italian may experience the same problems.

Since the 1970s, English language education in several countries of the Middle East and North Africa has been declared by many to be in crisis. This crisis is characterized by high rates of failure, low student proficiency in English, and in some cases low rates of student retention. Many researchers attribute these problems to various reasons: the impact of "the Arab Spring" on education in general and second language education in particular (Al Rabai 2014), the linguistic and cultural gaps between home and school (Al-Khatib 2005; Rababah 2003; Atay and Ece 2009), shortage of teaching staff (Kose et al. 2002, p. 1), shortage of textbooks (Abd El Rahman 2006), inefficiency of language programs or in some cases resistance to innovative teaching methods in public schools and universities (Battaineh and Zghoul 2006; Abd El Rahman 2006; Akkari 2004), and cultural and socio-political factors (Kiany et al. 2011; Farhady et al. 2010). It appears from the literature that most of these countries have a lot of problems and difficulties in common.

Careful examination of the literature shows that the problems and difficulties facing foreign and second language education in the region can be summarized as follows:

- Inadequate national education policy/strategy
- Limited financial resources or – in some countries – financial resources which are not commensurate with the basic requirements for second language education programs.
- Insufficient moral or financial support from the government and collaboration from the private sector to develop new training programs for the teachers.
- Lack of experience/expertise and limited technical capacity of local staff.
- Difficulties in recruiting or keeping qualified instructors; high turn-over of experts and well-trained teachers.
- Decreasing number of highly qualified teachers (experts) because of the lack of research/training institutions in some countries.

- Nonapplication or incorrect application of the principles of new theoretical frameworks.
- Poor education systems and a lack of educational and vocational alternatives for millions of students who fled their countries to the neighboring boarders after the recent protests that spread across the region.

The role of "The Arab Spring" (i.e., protests that spread across the region in early 2011) cannot be underestimated. In some countries, its impact on education in general and second language education in particular has been profound. Even though the results varied from country to country, providing an important look into the unique set of concerns confronting each, its effect can clearly be noticed on second language education and research in terms of type, quantity, and quality. This was clearly manifested in Al Rabai's (2014) words, who assumed that "the teaching of English as a Second or a Foreign language may witness a tremendous decline in Arab countries where fundamental regimes may take control as a consequence of what has been termed as Arab Spring 'chaos'".

However, due to the diversity of the region, the problems and difficulties facing second language education differ from country to country. While many challenges remain in the development of successful language teaching programs for the region, such problems merit more attention and energy on the part of program developers with regard to the type of material (textbooks) to be used by the students. Textbooks can be made more rigorous or relevant by incorporating real-life material. Jordan's current school textbooks for English language teaching are a case in point, as they have drawn on the results of linguistic and pedagogic research and are a great improvement over the English language textbooks of the past. Petra's series of textbooks which are used in Jordanian public schooling – published by Longman Group Limited in cooperation with the Ministry of Education in Jordan – are one example of such linguistic and cultural adaptation.

Future Directions

Having now considered the history and development of second language education over the past few decades, we have seen that the process entails a wealth of problems and difficulties, and the nature of language teaching itself is still in need of more specific attention. It has been observed that until very recently, the focus of second language education has been on the nature of language acquisition and language learning. No remarkable effort has yet been made to carry out systematic empirical research into the way teachers actually go about doing this work in real-life situations and the effect of such situations on second language teaching practice. To appreciate how meanings are encoded in words, learners need to take a look at the actual sociocultural contexts in which these words are used. For improving the quality of second language teaching in the region, more effort, therefore, still needs to be applied to moving future research forward in the direction of using sociocultural theory as its framework.

Similarly, the development of study materials for communication education in the area should receive a high priority in policy formation and planning. At a wider scale, education authorities can carry out language education programs by incorporating intercultural communication learning as one of the core components of the curriculum. Thus, future work on second language education should raise the awareness of policy makers and the public at large of this issue. In other words, researchers must strive to instill a deep awareness of the importance of studying the language in relation to its sociocultural background.

Insofar as the learners themselves are concerned, it has been noticed that EFL learners face a great number of problems in learning all language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The pedagogical implications cited in the great majority of previous work indicate how serious the problem is and that this situation requires a solution. One important solution is that instead of merely arguing that learners are in need of more practice in the various language skills, future research has to come up with a practical set of suggestions and recommendations on *how* students could build their language skills, and through *what* means.

Furthermore, with the emergence of multiple electronic modalities of communication such as e-mails, voice mail, SMS, among others, language is expected to be one of the many aspects of life affected by the new technological developments taking place around the world (see, for example, Ingrid de Saint-Georges: Researching Media, Multilingualism and Education (Volume 1)). Intercultural communication at present relies increasingly on e-mail, which is predominantly an English language medium. The language of electronically mediated communication is still a neglected research area. Therefore, future research on EFL and ESP is needed and must be directed toward the most effective ways in which the language can be taught to students using English for diverse scientific purposes. Among these is the use of English for electronically mediated communication.

Cross-References

► Sociolinguistics and Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Bernard Spolsky: Investigating Language Education Policy. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Ingrid de Saint-Georges: Researching Media, Multilingualism and Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Kirk Hazen: Variationist Approaches to Language and Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

References

Abd El Rahman, A. (2006) Arab World. In K. Nordenstreng & M. Traber (Eds.), Promotion of educational materials for communication studies: Report of phase I of UNESCO/IPDC interregional project by IAMCR/AIERI. Retrieved from http://www.uta.fi/cmt/textbooks/arab.html

Abu-Absi, S. (1997). Innovative second language education in The Middle East and North Africa. In G. Tucker & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Vol. 4, Second language education* (pp. 197–205). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Akkari, A. (2004). Education in the Middle East and North Africa: The current situation and future challenges. *International Education Journal, 5*(2), 144–153. Retrieved from http://ehlt.flinders.edu.au/education/iej/articles/v5n2/Akkari/paper.pdf#search

Al Rabai, A. (2014). Teaching English in the Arab world: A future in turmoil. *Education, 4*(5), 126–133.

Al-Issa, A. (2007). The implications of implementing a flexible syllabus for ESL policy in the Sultanate of Oman. *RELC Journal, 38*, 199–215.

Al-Khatib, M. (2000). An introduction: The Arab world: Language and cultural issues. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 13*(2), 121–125.

Al-Khatib, M. (2005). English in the workplace: An analysis of the communication needs of tourism and banking personnel. *Asian EFL Journal,* 7 (1st Edition) 174–194.

Al-Khatib, M. (2006). Aspects of bilingualism in the Arab world: An introduction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(1), 1–6.

Atay, D., & Ece, A. (2009). Multiple identities as reflected in English-language education: The Turkish perspective. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 8*(1), 21–34.

Bataineh, R., & Zghoul, L. (2006). Jordanian TEFL graduate students' use of critical thinking skills (as measured by the Cornell Critical Thinking Test, Level Z). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(1), 33–50.

Battenburg, J. (1997). English versus French: Language rivalry in Tunisia. *World Englishes, 16*(2), 281–290.

Battenburg, J. (2006). English language teaching in Tunisia. 5–12. Retrieved from http://cla.calpoly.edu/~jbattenb/world/tunisia.html

Brown, H. (2003). A bilingual education program in Turkey. *Second Language Learning and Teaching, 1*(2). Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/2871898/A_bilingual_education_program_in_Turkey

Dahmardeh, M. (2009). *English language teaching in Iran and communicative language teaching.* PhD thesis, University of Warwick.

Dinçer, A., Takkaç, M., & Akalın, S. (2010). An evaluation on English language education process in Turkey from the viewpoints of university preparatory school students. In *2nd international symposium on sustainable development, June 89, 2010 Sarajevo*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED536847.pdf

Farhady, H., Hezaveh, F, & Hedayati, H. (2010). Reflections on foreign language education in Iran. *TESL-EJ, The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language, 4*, 1–18. March 2010. Retrieved from http://www.teslej.org/wordpress/issues/volume13/ej52/ej52a1

Fay, D. (2006). Moods and myths about speaking British English in Turkey: The predominance of British English in Turkey's ESL System.

Hasan, A. (2006). Analyzing bilingual classroom discourse. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(1), 7–18.

Kedouri, E. (1978). *England and the Middle East: The destruction of the Ottoman Empire, 1914–1921*. London: Harvester Press.

Khubchandani, L. (2008). Language policy and education in the Indian subcontinent. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 393–404). New York: Springer.

Kiany, G., Mirhosseini, S., & Navidinia, H. (2011). Foreign language education policies in Iran: Pivotal macro considerations. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 53*(222), 49–70.

Köksal, D., & Şahin, C. (2012). Macro-level foreign language education policy of Turkey: A content analysis of national education councils. *International Association of Research in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics, ELT Research Journal, 1*(3), 149–158.

Kose, G., Canturk, B., & Ulsever, S. (2002). Distance English Language Teaching (DELT) program: A new model for Turkey. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE), 3*(1), 1–4. Retrieved from http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/tojde5/articles/bahar_txt.htm

Kozminsky, E., Weizman, E., & Horowitz, H. (1998). Teaching translation in Israeli high schools. *Meta XLIII* (1), 1–14. Retrieved from http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1998/v43/n1/003349ar.html

Longrigg, S. (1978). *The Middle East: A social geography*. London: Gerald Duckworth.

Mahboudi, H., & Javdani, F. (2012). The teaching of English in Iran: The place of culture. *Journal of Language and Culture, 3*(5), 87–95.

Mahmoud, A. (2000). Modern standard Arabic vs. non-standard Arabic: Where Arab students of EFL do transfer from? *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 13*(2), 126–136.

Rababah, G. (2003). Communication problems facing Arab learners of English: A personal perspective. *TEFL Web Journal, 2*(1), 15–30.

Razmjou, L. (2001). Developing guidelines for a new curriculum for the English translation for The BA program in Iranian universities. *Translation Journal, 6*(2), 1–14.

Saeed, A., & Fareh, S. (2006). Difficulties encountered by bilingual Arab learners in translating Arabic 'fa' into English. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(1), 19–32.

Shishavan, B. (2010). The relationship between Iranian English language teachers' and learners' gender and their perceptions of an effective English language teacher. *English Language Teaching, 3*(3), 3–10.

Spaven, C., & Murphy, A. (2000). Parlez-vous Technologie? Teaching information skills in a second language. *INSPEL, 34–3*(4), 179–186. Retrieved from http://www.ifla.org/VII/d2/inspel/00-3spcl.pdf

Spolsky, B. (1996). Multilingualism in Israel. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 17*, 1–10.

Talebinezhad, M., & Aliakbari, M. (2001). Basic assumptions in teaching English as an international language. *The Internet TESL Journal, VII*(7), 1–15. Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Talebinezhad-EIL.html

Tercanlioglu, L. (2004). Perceptions on school-based English teacher education: A qualitative study. *The Qualitative Report, 9*(4), 673–705. http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR9-4/tercanlioglu.pdf#search.

Zughoul, M. (2003). Globalization and EFL/ESL pedagogy in the Arab world. *Journal of Language and Learning, 1*(2), 1–29. Retrieved from http://www.shakespeare.uk.net/journal/jllearn/1_2/zughoul.html

Innovative Second and Foreign Language Education in Southeast Asia

Eduardo Lage-Otero

Contents

Introduction 266
Early Developments 266
Major Contributions 269
Language Policy in Singapore 269
Work in Progress 273
Regional Language Policies 273
Malaysia 274
Indonesia 276
Vietnam 278
Problems and Difficulties 279
Future Directions 280
Cross-References 281
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 282
References 282

Abstract

This chapter focuses on recent developments in the field of second and foreign language education in Southeast Asia, with particular focus on Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Vietnam. The nations in this region contain a rich diversity of cultures, languages, and dialects that governments need to reconcile with unifying national projects, the desire to develop their economies, and the need to function in regional and world organizations. The use of English in education has been particularly contentious as some of the countries are former British colonies and English is inevitably associated with political and cultural shifts away from mother tongues and more traditional value systems. At the same time, for many of these governments – Singapore is a case in point – English is viewed as

E. Lage-Otero (✉)
Humanities (Spanish), Saga College, Yale-NUS College, Singapore, Singapore
e-mail: Eduardo.LageOtero@yale-nus.edu.sg

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_23

essential for development and as a lingua franca for their workers to compete in the global knowledge economy. Of particular significance is the recent push to establish partnerships with Western higher education institutions, with the goal of attracting foreign talent, adopting new pedagogical practices, and injecting dynamism in the local educational landscape. These moves are not without critics, but they reaffirm the push to internationalize education and prepare local workforces for the changes happening in labor markets. This chapter presents some of the effects these policy changes and reform projects have on language preference and use, and how the notion of a clearly delineated language fails to represent the individuals' lived experiences in Southeast Asia.

Keywords
Development • Education • English • Government • Instruction • International • Language • Schools • Teaching

Introduction

Southeast Asia, with an area of around 4.3 million square kilometers, is a dynamic region that includes Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar (Burma), the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste, and Vietnam. Although it is home to close to 600 million people, it is also one of the most sparsely settled areas in Asia (Jones 2013). Economic development has been uneven across the region, but some of the wealthiest countries in the world (Brunei and Singapore) are located there. Singapore, in particular, has amassed so much wealth that its decisions can significantly impact its ASEAN partners (Chew 2014). Overall, the region is enjoying a period of relative political stability, particularly in the cases of Singapore, Indonesia, and Malaysia (Kassim 2005). The cultural and linguistic diversity of the region harkens back to its rich precolonial history, and its lack of regional cohesiveness – primarily when it comes to politics – points to the power dynamics of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when the Dutch, British, French, and Spanish ruled over most countries in this part of the world. Nonetheless, the fast rate of development in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has affected all these countries in similar ways: rapid industrialization, massive migration to cities, improvements in agriculture, and the formation of "mega-urban regions" (Barker et al. 2014). The region has continued to experience significant economic growth in spite of the financial crisis of 2008, which had a more significant and lasting impact on Western economies than in Asia.

Early Developments

Founded in 1967 by Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has brought together the countries in the region to form a powerful trading block that conducts ongoing

negotiations with the USA on a range of issues.[1] From the start, ASEAN adopted English as its official language (Sercombe and Tupas 2014), but in 2009 it enshrined this role in its charter (Kirkpatrick 2014a, b). Over the past decade, English has further established its role as the predominant second or foreign language in the region (Chan et al. 2011). However, the period has also seen the rise of Chinese (Mandarin) as the most significant language of study, both as a foreign and second language. The Chinese economic prowess and the acknowledged influence of this country in the South China Sea and beyond are important factors in generating student interest (Yang 2015). Nonetheless, interest in other foreign languages continues to be strong, with Japanese, German, and French, showing healthy enrollment numbers at the upper secondary and tertiary level (Chan et al. 2011). This is partly due to economic ties as well as historical influences in this part of the world.

Besides Chinese, there are other Asian languages that are becoming increasingly prominent and of interest to students, namely, Arabic, Hindu/Urdu, and Japanese; and in the case of Chinese and Japanese, their governments have put significant resources behind their promotion abroad following established models in the west such as the creation of cultural institutions with offices around the world.[2]

Since Pakir's analysis (2008) of the state of the field of second language acquisition in Southeast Asia in the 1990s and early 2000s, there has been an increased emphasis on professional development and quality of instruction among language professionals (Chan et al. 2011) although much work remains in these areas at the primary and secondary level. At the tertiary level, better-trained instructors have resulted in improved student satisfaction, student retention, and an increase in enrollment. At the same time, these initiatives have strained budgets and resulted in an increase in part-time language instructors who teach a large number of sections but with little time or incentive to innovate or pay close attention to individual students (Chan et al. 2011). This is a major concern at a time when interest in language learning continues to grow in line with the rise of globalization. Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and online instruction have the potential to mitigate this problem. In the case of MOOCs, these courses can provide easy access to language instruction to large numbers of students. As their pedagogical design and level of interactivity improves, they may be a practical substitute for some language levels. Online instruction, whether synchronous or asynchronous, can also facilitate pooling resources across institutions to offer language courses that may otherwise not be feasible.

In the balance between central and peripheral languages (Singh 2013), learners in Southeast Asia find themselves grappling with the desire to master English as the language of globalization with the acknowledgment of a complex web of political and economic relations that push and pull at local identities and regional powers. Language instructors have to balance these issues in the classroom and negotiate

[1]For more details on these negotiations, please see http://www.asean.org/storage/2016/01/4Jan/Overview-of-ASEAN-US-Dialogue-Relations-(4-Jan-2016).pdf.

[2]See, for example, the Confucius Institute (http://www.chinesecio.com/).

pedagogical choices with geopolitical forces (Marlina 2014). Kirkpatrick (2014c), for example, refers to a new mother-tongue policy enacted by the government of the Philippines "whereby twelve languages of the Philippines can be used, where appropriate, as languages of instruction from Primary 1 to Primary 3" (p. 435). This represents a dramatic shift from the existing policy that named Filipino and English as the only languages of instruction. The author calls for more research to understand how successful these policies are and how they affect instruction.

The countries in Southeast Asia have now experienced several decades of postcolonial self-rule, and this has resulted in more assertive governments at home and abroad. What may have seemed like yielding to colonial rules by maintaining the erstwhile official language, as in the case of Cambodia and Vietnam with French, it is now perceived as a sign of engaging with the world and becoming a full member at the international table (Rappa and Wee 2006). Vietnam, for example, has embarked on a radical transformation of its higher education system via its Higher Education Reform Agenda (HERA). The goal is to achieve comprehensive changes by 2020 on a range of critical areas (Harman et al. 2010): higher enrollments, lower teacher-student ratios, improved quality of instruction, increased financing of research and teaching, internationalization of the curriculum, and greater agency to the various institutions, to name a few.

This approach is not without critics who consider the globalization of English and its predominant role in education as a new form of colonization and big business for English-speaking countries (Kaplan 2001). In this respect, the establishment of educational partnerships with Western institutions of higher learning is an example of the desire to blend eastern and Western traditions and establish themselves as cultural and educational destinations in their own right. One of the main goals of this program is "that of improving the international competitiveness of the country's professional labour force" (Harman et al. 2010, p. 51).

The transformation of this region from a manufacturing hub during the second half of the twentieth century into a center of business, banking, and finance has resulted in renewed interest in education. In the case of Singapore, its recent changes to banking secrecy and property taxes are in direct response to the global economic downturn and the government view that Singapore needs to remain competitive in the face of China's rapid growth. This has lead to a massive increase in the number of low-skill and high-skill workers, the former with substantially greater social and political restrictions than the latter (Lim 2010). The combination of these government policies and strategies has resulted in significant population growth due to foreign workers moving to Singapore and either becoming permanent residents or taking up citizenship.

Since 1997, the Singapore government has reached beyond its immediate neighbors to attract foreign students at all levels with the promise of offering world-class education that combines Asian ideas with Western practices (Lim 2010). The number of international students has more than doubled to close to 150,000 students, many of them from China and India. In 2013, for example, Yale-NUS College[3]

[3]See http://www.yale-nus.edu.sg/.

opened its doors as the first liberal arts college in Asia, funded solely by the Singapore government (Lewis 2013). The result of a partnership between the National University of Singapore (NUS) and Yale University, it reinforced the establishment of Singapore, and Southeast Asia more broadly, as a world partner in education and a regional education hub. Yale University followed in the footsteps of other institutions like INSEAD, Johns Hopkins University, or Duke University, which had already established partnerships in Singapore.

One of the main barriers to educational innovation in Singapore is the ingrained test-driven culture that has its origins in Confucian traditions (Chong 2002). This poses a severe constrain on innovation as prescribed by official syllabi and the adoption of instructional models such as communicative language teaching in the classroom (Rubdy 2010). Tan (2006) argues that "intense inter-school competition over the past decade has worked as a powerful centralizing influence on all schools, and has worked against the promotion of diversity and innovation" (p. 68). Paradoxically, this concern is shared by the government, which has recognized the importance of creativity and critical thinking in the knowledge economy while at the same time acknowledging the low performance in these areas among Singaporean youth.

Major Contributions

Language Policy in Singapore

Singapore is the epitome of a globalized world (Muhd and Aljunied 2014), with a dynamic economy and one of the highest standards of living in the world[4] ("Singapore: Overview," 2011). It has one national language (Malay), four official languages (English, Malay, Mandarin, and Tamil), and three mother tongues (Malay, Mandarin, and Tamil). Its linguistic diversity, however, is much broader than this when we take into account local dialects (e.g., Hokkien) and other languages spoken by its ethnic minorities (e.g., Hindi and Gujarati). As a young nation without any natural resources, the government acknowledged the vital role of English as the language of commerce and trade but more importantly as the key to economic development. It promoted English as an interethnic lingua franca and as the mode of instruction in education. The goal was to create a bilingual population as a way to develop a sense of identity among its population with one of the mother tongues as the link to family and tradition while English would be the language of the workplace (Wee 2014). Students were thus required to study their respective mother tongues (Mandarin, Tamil, or Malay, as per their father's ethnic background) as a second language in school.

In a nod to the new realities in Singapore at the beginning of the twenty-first century, where mixed-race marriages are common (Sim 2013), the government has

[4]See http://www.mercer.com/newsroom/2014-quality-of-living-survey.html.

recently announced greater flexibility for parents to record the race of a child in mixed-race marriages. For example, a couple can record their child as "Indian," "Chinese," "Indian-Chinese," or "Chinese-Indian." In the case of the "double-barreled" race option, the first race will be used to assign a student to a mother-tongue language class (ICA 2010). This limited introduction of choice into the issue of ethnicity and language points to the transformations that Singapore is undergoing in the late modern or consumer society (Stroud and Wee 2012). In addition, as the initial goal of students becoming fully bilingual proved too ambitious, the government realized the need to introduce more flexibility in the school system via the streaming of students into different language tracks (Simpson 2007).

Irrespective of these policies, the new generation of Singaporeans, although they may speak one of the other languages or dialects at home, they consider English (Standard Singaporean English), or the local version known as Singlish (Colloquial Singaporean English), their primary language (Pakir 2000; Rubdy 2001; Stroud and Wee 2012). Although English has dominated the educational landscape as the main mode of instruction, there has been ongoing emphasis to promote the teaching and learning of mother tongues in an effort to "keep the people anchored and focused amidst the changes around them" (Lee Kuan Yew, *The Straits Times*, 24 November 1979, quoted in Rubdy 2001, p. 342) and to mitigate the shift to English at home. In spite of this shift to English, the General Household Survey of 2005 showed strong use of Mandarin at home among the Chinese population (Goh 2013). However, the use of Malay and Tamil is largely declining, even within its ethnic communities (Lim 2010).

The Singaporean government has strived to foster "English knowing bilingualism" (Pakir 1993) among Singaporeans, that is, being able to speak English plus one mother tongue. Since 1979 it has pushed to make Mandarin the most studied second language in schools in an effort to bridge the various dialects spoken on the island. Mandarin and the values it imbues may also counterbalance the influence (perceived or real) of liberal Western values conveyed by English language and culture. These values are placed in juxtaposition to the traditional Asian ethos, usually understood as Confucian ethics, that the government cherishes (Rubdy 2001). As one of the official mother tongues, the government presented Mandarin as a unifying force among the various ethnically Chinese Singaporeans. This appeal to the common heritage and sentimental value of the language has been expanded more recently to include the more instrumental value of Mandarin, "in order to take advantage of China's growing economy" and its increasing might on the world stage (Stroud and Wee 2012). However, as Goh indicates, Mandarin occupies that privileged role "with a certain bad faith from the point of view of occluding communities of dialect-speakers who must thus occupy the position of being 'un-Chinese' in their practice of dialects" (2013, p. 133).

In the case of English and as a countermovement to the widespread acceptance of Singlish among most Singaporeans, the government launched the *Speak Good English* campaign in the early 2000s. The stated goal was to promote Standard English and to highlight the competitive advantage in speaking Standard English over rivals in the region. This campaign has attracted a fair amount of criticism (Bruthiaux 2010), finding its motivation misplaced and its goals uncertain.

Rubdy (2001) describes the Ministry of Education (2014) efforts to strengthen English instruction in the schools by boosting teacher training for 8000 teachers. In spite of multiple efforts at improving curriculum and syllabus design and implementation, the results have been mixed (Rubdy 2010). Nonetheless, these efforts combined with the push to make the teaching of Mandarin the default second language at the primary and secondary level point to the government interest in maintaining and strengthening its competitive advantage over its neighbors. The desire to be a global city-state that can partake in the information economy has informed government language policies when it comes to English as well as Mandarin. In the case of Mandarin, the government has acknowledged the diminishing number of Mandarin speakers among students and has launched a Chinese Bicultural Studies Program[5] to target the elite students who can cope proficiently with both languages (Lim et al. 2010).

When it comes to pedagogical practices, "despite the government's ambitious educational reforms that aim at implementing a student-centred approach, the discursive practices in Singapore classrooms remain strongly teacher-centred" (Curdt-Christiansen and Silver 2011). This runs counter to the intended goals of educational reforms, where promoting negotiation of meaning and construction of knowledge is key (ibidem). And yet, the Singapore Ministry of Education (MoE) has devoted significant resources to create a world-class education system (as with the case of Yale-NUS College) and to prepare its workforce for the challenges of an information economy. In 2009, the budget for education totaled US $5.2 billion (Muhd and Aljunied 2014). These substantial efforts aim to transform the educational landscape in quantitative and qualitative ways, moving beyond knowledge acquisition into critical thinking and independent learners. To this end, Singapore has gone from one to four major universities, established several partnerships with Western institutions of higher learning, and recently opened a 4-year, residential, liberal arts college – Yale-NUS College – with a very innovative common curriculum.

Among practitioners and in response to government initiatives to create more choice for students, there is a push to integrate the so-called workforce skills into the curriculum (Huang and Teo Sor Noi 2011). The Integrated Programme (IP) that started in 2004, spanning upper secondary and junior college and thus bypassing the General Certificate of Education "Ordinary" Level examinations, was one of these models. The IP model, in addition to allowing some schools to offer the International Baccalaureate program, appears to have achieved the goal of improving learning outcomes and students' preparation for the workforce, although the idea of competition and ranking schools as a way to boost performance is highly contested (Tan 2006).

Among those schools at the tertiary level, polytechnics are at the forefront of students' preparation for the workforce. The Ngee Ann Polytechnic, for example, designed its language curriculum with a holistic approach that promotes language

[5]See http://www.moe.gov.sg/education/scholarships/moe-preu/special-assistance-plan/secondary/.

learning in context (Ng et al. 2011). In their efforts to make language learning a student-centered affair, the school has incorporated technology in a variety of ways to improve pronunciation, foster conversation among students, assist with vocabulary building skills, and engage with authentic websites that can lead to real-world experiences with the languages, e.g., booking tickets, purchasing objects, or making reservations at a hotel.

Lim (2010) discusses the current linguistic situation of Singapore in terms of the impact migratory and economic forces are having on the country. With respect to the study of English in Singapore, there is considerable research interest in the notion of glocalization as a functional term to address the tension between the global projection of English and the local variants around the world (Alsagoff 2010). In this respect, "for Singaporeans, the global and the local are counterpoised, and it is in the negotiations of identity between the global and the local that result in speakers varying their use of English to reflect such concerns." (p. 115). Alsagoff highlights the need to add nuance to the discussion on Singlish and to study issues of style-switching as speakers negotiate different contexts. This, in addition, calls into question the notion of a stable and unified form of Singlish, and even the shift in some Singaporeans to consider Singlish their mother tongue (Stroud and Wee 2012).

In this respect, Blommaert notes the importance of distinguishing "between 'linguistic communities' and 'speech communities,' where the former are groups professing adherence to the normatively constructed, ideological articulated 'standard' language ('we speak English') and the latter are groups characterized by the actual use of specific speech forms" (2006, p. 243). These groups are distinct and indicative of the hegemony of particular languages.

In the classroom context, Pakir argues that "in terms of role modelling, teachers may want to exhibit their remarkable mastery or competence of the language, while at the same time, not denying their students a glimpse of their use of English for solidarity, familiarity and intimate purposes" (2010a, p. 274). Furthermore, as Stroud and Wee (2012) note, "in a rapidly globalizing world of highly mobile individuals, the ability to effectively deploy varied linguistic systems in order to achieve particular interactional goals is a valuable skill" (p. 15). English, however, has been the official language of instruction since the mid-1980s and thus takes on a special status among the population (Wee 2014).

This modernist view of languages as clearly defined and delimited systems leads to their treatment "as an unproblematic and easily identifiable construct, one that serves as an intrinsic expression of a community or individual identity" (Stroud and Wee 2012, p. 27). This view is highly contested as Singapore continues to grapple with ways to maintain parity among the various mother tongues while parents and students understand the relative value of each language and even argue for other languages to be offered, such as Hindi and Punjabi (Stroud and Wee 2012). In the classroom, "teachers need to be able to create the conditions that can support learners in performing and negotiating subjectivities and voices, and how these performances can be deployed as aids in learning the language" (p. 179). Stroud and Wee argue that a new approach toward multilingualism is needed in Singapore at this point. The authors argue for the deconstruction of the notion of mother tongue "from one that is

tied to specific ethnic identities to one that is more reflective of an individual's lived experiences" (p. 215).

Besides the study of English and their mother tongue, Singaporean students in primary and secondary education can study a third language. This option is available to the top 10% of students who take the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE[6]). The validity of the mother-tongue policy is highly contested as Singaporean society continues to change in the first decades of this century (Stroud and Wee 2012). The notion of choice and what an individual considers to be his or her mother tongue have become more central, resulting in likely changes to the official language policy. For those students studying a third language, eight languages are available: Mandarin, Malay, Bahasa Indonesia, Arabic, French, German, Japanese, and Spanish (Ministry of Education 2014). The most common choices are French, German, and Japanese. To these, three regional languages are gaining strength: Mandarin, Malay/Indonesian, and Arabic (Lim 2010).

Work in Progress

Regional Language Policies

Singapore is a fascinating example of the ethnic and linguistic diversity and complexity of this region where language policy is closely tied to nation-building processes (Sercombe and Tupas 2014). The attempts to foster the use of mother tongues over national languages within some Southeast Asian countries, however, are seen "by state institutions as contributing to a nation's disintegration, thus posing a threat to national unity and identity" (p. 10). These languages usually represent ethnic minorities that are perceived as being against a national project and are commonly associated with an earlier stage of development. And yet, "ASEAN is currently moving towards closer language integration in some respects, building on the role of English as a regional lingua franca; and the trend of privileging English looks set to continue" (p. 12). This need for a lingua franca is in line with the main aims and purposes of ASEAN as originally conceived (Kirkpatrick 2010), such as to expand regional growth, collaboration, mutual assistance, training, and research. Although English originally served an institutional function for negotiations and diplomacy, it was also perceived as the language of progress and modernity. As regional economies expand and the need for a skilled and flexible workforce increases, the role of English has steadily grown.

Sercombe and Tupas argue that ASEAN's emphasis on English is ill-advised as the role of English is not equal across the region and "English remains the language of the educated and the elite, not people in general" (p. 12). In the case of Malaysia, it did not adopt English as its official language both to privilege Bahasa Malay and due to its colonial associations (Wee 2014). Singapore, on the other hand, adopted

[6]See https://www.seab.gov.sg/pages/nationalExaminations/PSLE/general_information.asp.

English early on as a way to differentiate itself from Malaysia and to attract foreign investment. Singapore also serves as headquarters for the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) Regional Language Centre (RELC).[7] This educational project dates back to 1968 and has evolved into an engine for collaboration and interregional cooperation on language education. Its journal publishes a variety of research in the area of second and foreign language learning and teaching and is a source of reference in the region. In the case of Indonesia, it has seen rapid growth since the late 1990s but the adoption of English as the language of trade and globalization by powerful segments of society has created anxiety within the country as it threatens to displace the national language, Bahasa Indonesia (Wee et al. 2013). Vietnam serves as an example of the influence of liberal economic policies on linguistic trends within the country while the government tries to strike a balance between promoting English while supporting and encouraging the use of local languages.

The following section presents a brief overview of these three ASEAN countries (Malaysia, Indonesia, and Vietnam) in terms of their language planning, policies, and pedagogy vis-à-vis English. Like Singapore, Malaysia was a former British colony and is now considered part of the outer circle of world Englishes, whereas Indonesia and Vietnam are part of the expanding circle, with English being used in EFL contexts (Kachru 1986; Pakir 2010b). They also have significant differences in population distributions, financial stability, ethnic and religious affiliations, and their approaches toward English education.

Malaysia

Malaysia, with a population of around 28 million people, gained independence from the British in 1957. Since then, "the combination of laissez-faire economics and racial divide-and-rule administrative policies coupled with the entrepreneurial drive of migrants had produced a culturally variegated but politically segregated ethnoscape" (Guan 2013, p. 170). The country experienced significant growth under the leadership of Mahathir Mohamad (1981–2003), who focused on manufacturing, construction, and finance during his tenure (ibidem). This emphasis on development and modernity continues to this day as the country tries to negotiate the contentious waters between modernity and the core principles of Islam, between the Malay Bumiputera (the indigenous population) and the ethnic Chinese and Indian minorities. Within this varied landscape, the concept of what it means to be Malay – practicing Islam, the Malay culture, and speaking Malay – provided the government with a useful notion to bring together different ethnic groups within one nation. By the same token, the Malay language has also served as a unifying force in a linguistically divided nation (David and McLellan 2014),

[7]See http://www.relc.org.sg/.

and its central place as the national language remains unquestionable. In addition, any challenge to this position is punishable by law as codified in the Sedition Act (Talib 2013, p. 146).

The tension between the importance and status of Malay and English dates back to the country's origin and the 1961 Education Act – which established Malay as the sole language of public education – and continues to this day, particularly in the field of education (Don 2014; Gill 2014). Don indicates how "the choice of the medium of instruction in education at different levels is a conscious decision taken by the government according to local conditions and global trends, and has always been a controversial issue" (p. 118). The government decided early on to switch from English to Malay as the medium of instruction in education, a change completed in 1983 (Lin and Man 2009). Thus, Malay has strengthened its role thanks to its central position in the education system although today "English is widely spoken and taught in primary and secondary school" (Gill 2014, p. 2). In the early 1990s and then again in 2002, the government of Mahathir Mohamad decided to make English the language of instruction in math and science (Simpson 2007, p. 356). In response to this situation, the Centre for Academic Advancement at the Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia developed a strategic plan that while still promoting Malay, "aimed for a 10 year change over, with retraining of staff and a gradual move to English as the medium for science and technology" (Gill 2014, p. 67). However, there were concerns about poor performance by ethnic Malays (Tan and Heng 2006; David and McLellan 2014), particularly in rural areas, and lack of preparedness among the instructors (Gill 2014; Hanewald 2016). In 2009 the government had to reverse their decision to continue with English instruction in math and science after significant unrest and criticism and switch back to Malay by 2012 (Hanewald 2016). Kirkpatrick and Sussex (2012) view this shift as the clash between nationalistic forces aiming to strengthen Malay as the national language and the language of instruction and the pressing need to develop English expertise in key areas like math and science.

The government has tried to strike a balance between upholding Malay as the official national language while strengthening English instruction. It has made it compulsory and available in government-funded and government-supported schools. This situation has resulted in English gaining ground in the capital and other central urban areas as well as in the private sector. Unlike Indonesia, where Dutch ceased to play a role after independence, in Malaysia, the language of its former colonial ruler had practical advantages that were hard to ignore even for the most intransigent nationalists. This is one of the reasons why the influence of English over Malay is inevitable and leads to frequent instances of code-mixing among Bahasa Malay speakers, especially among artists who aim to challenge and push social norms (Talib 2013). Rajadurai (2013) argues that attitudes toward English vary between Malays and non-Malays. While the former view it primarily in nationalistic terms, the latter have come to accept it as part of their multilingual community. This is in contrast to Singapore where English has been presented from the beginning as a neutral language or lingua franca, thus disassociating it from a specific ethnic group (Rappa and Wee 2006).

In the past decades Malaysia has seen tremendous growth in the private education sector to the point that over 40% of the students at the tertiary level were enrolled in private institutions by the late 1990s (Lee 2006). This may be due in part to the quota system in place that allocates seats based on students' ethnicity (Rappa and Wee 2006), but it also stems from the policy reversal that established Malay as the sole language of instruction in all public universities (Gill 2014). To meet increasing demand and offer a wider selection of choices to students who may fall outside of the rigid quota system, Malaysia has also adopted the partnership model with foreign universities (e.g., Nottingham University and Monash University), where instruction is carried out in English and the instructional models tend to be more innovative than local ones. The Malaysian Qualifications Register[8] (MQR) provides a directory of all accredited institutions, yielding official sanction but also supervision over their programs.

These measures are very much needed as the current system generates graduates with poor command of English and unable to find employment (Don 2014). These unemployed graduates are primarily Malay and their low English proficiency prevents them access to many of the jobs in the knowledge economy, an economy that functions largely in English. In addition, there is strong public support for affordable, government-funded schooling options in English at all levels to increase choice and meet the needs of a globalized economy (Gill 2014). The government has included some of these initiatives in its National Education Blueprint 2013–2025 (Hanewald 2016, p. 190), recognizing the importance of English proficiency and the complexity of the educational and political landscape in Malaysia.

Indonesia

Of the approximately 600 million people living in Southeast Asia, around half of them live in this large archipelago. It forms a rich and complex tapestry of languages – over 700 by some accounts (Lewis 2009; Zentz 2015) – with an official policy that supports and encourages the use of local languages (Bertrand 2004; Musgrave 2014) while at the same time promoting a single official language (Bahasa Indonesia) to bind the country together. Since independence in 1945,[9] Bahasa Indonesia (or High Malay) has been the official language and the gateway to education, government jobs, and economic opportunities, although the reality on the ground is the coexistence of several varieties of the official language side by side with other local languages. As Gill indicates, Bahasa Indonesia "fulfills the four functions: cognitive, instrumental, integrative, and cultural" (2014, p. 6). Javanese, the most spoken language by number of speakers and also a far more complex language than Indonesian, continues to do well, although younger speakers are shifting to Bahasa Indonesia as their first choice, probably due to the 1990 government policy to use this language in education from

[8]See http://www.mqa.gov.my/MQR/english/eperutusan.cfm.

[9]Formal independence was achieved in 1949.

cradle to university (Musgrave 2014). According to Simpson (2007), "Bahasa Indonesia has been able to reach its present position as the primary language of national-level and formal activities so effectively not only because this ascendance has not harmed the use of the regional languages but also because Indonesian faced no threat from the continued presence of a colonial language following independence" (p. 334).

After the fall of Suharto in 1998 following the Asian financial crisis and the questioning of the technocratic New Order he had instituted (Amir 2012), Indonesia experienced significant social and economic transformations, resulting in the questioning of existing social norms and practices (Barker and Lindquist 2013). This change in attitudes has paralleled the rapid growth in mobile technology and social media use. With this widespread use of new media, there are concerns about the influence of local languages and dialects, in particular when it comes to vocabulary. Simpson (2007) points out, for example, "where aspects of the Jakartan dialect occur frequently repeated in the speech of television and film stars, these may become part of common, more widely spoken Indonesian and direct its development in the same way that the increased borrowing of Javanese words into the speech of various important public figures might seem to some to threaten its neutral character" (p. 335). The author also notes how the trend continues to be toward bilingualism with the regional language as a mother tongue and Bahasa Indonesia as the national language. This is the case with Mandarin as well where the number of young native speakers of this language is now increasing after a period of decline (Gill 2014, p. 7).

The government has acknowledged that it needs to do more to meet the demand for education within its population and to align educational goals with business and industry needs (Hadisantosa 2010). In the case of English instruction, international schools in Indonesia only became accessible to Indonesians after the change in government and economic crisis in the late 1990s, but the demand for instruction in English has continued to expand. The central government has accepted its appeal and value to large segments of the population, usually the middle and upper class, and has developed a series of international schools at the primary and secondary levels with English as the medium of instruction. One of the main concerns with this trend is its impact on local languages. Hadisantosa notes that many of them have started to disappear. As such, "out of 726 indigenous languages, 10 have vanished" (p. 31), and many students at the international schools have stopped using them altogether in favor of English. The adoption of English in these schools as the medium of instruction from grade 1 contributes to this trend and as Zentz has researched, in spite of institutional restrictions, "forms of English are important parts of the ecologies of local identities and local ways of making meaning" (2015, p. 65).

When it comes to the English curriculum, although it has moved away from an overemphasis on grammar to prioritizing communication and mastery of the language, teaching and assessment practices lag behind and there is a need for more teacher training and giving teachers more agency in the development of the curriculum. There is also a call for adapting curricula to the Indonesian context and not adopting international ones wholesale (Widodo 2016). Looking beyond the national context, Indonesia and Malaysia have collaborated since the 1970s on vocabulary

and spelling issues with the establishment of the Language Council of Brunei-Indonesia-Malaysia or MABBIM[10] to ensure greater understanding across both national languages given their shared Malay history and to facilitate exchanges between both nations (Simpson 2007). Thanks to this collaboration, Malay spellings have been standardized and a large number of vocabulary items added across several field of study. This is particularly important at a time of rapid technological development.

Vietnam

As a socialist republic with a rich history, Vietnam has tried to reconcile modernity with tradition in expected and unexpected ways since the Economic Renovation (*Doi Moi*) and its integration into global markets in the late 1980s (Huong 2010). The emphasis on economic development often runs counter to traditional beliefs and practices that struggle to coexist with it (Harms 2013), but it has certainly contributed to the rapid growth in English instruction (Bui and Nguyen 2016). With a predominantly young population of roughly 87 million people, over 50 ethnic groups, and around 100 languages, there was a need from early on for a common language that could unify such a diverse country. Vietnamese has served this purpose since at least 1945, once Vietnam gained independence from France (Le Ha et al. 2014). Although English has been taught at the secondary and tertiary levels together with French, Russian, and German, the emphasis has remained on Vietnamese as the sole official language and a way to bring the north and south regions of the country together. In spite of this, the government has consistently tried to maintain the country's rich ethnolinguistic heritage, and the "Education Law of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam 2005" makes the state responsible for helping ethnic minorities learn how to read and write their languages (Le Ha et al. 2014, p. 236). Nevertheless, the gains have been modest at best, and the government priority seems to be on fostering the teaching of Vietnamese over minority languages.

English, which had been widely studied in the south during the period of US influence in the late 1950s and 1960s, has also been making inroads in the Vietnamese linguistic landscape due to its role as a global language and a key factor in economic and personal development. The government made it a required subject in 2000 for all students, noting that English would help them become more competitive at a local and global level, give them access to advance technology, contribute to nation-building, and link Vietnam to the world (Bui and Nguyen 2016). In this regard, the government has launched an ambitious US$ 2 billion program to introduce English instruction starting at grade 3 and covering all levels by 2020 (Le Ha et al. 2014). This English 2020 Strategy addresses a range of issues, "quality assurance, curriculum development and design, assessment, teaching qualification standards, and teacher curricula for both English and other subjects to be taught in

[10]See http://www.bt.com.bn/golden-legacy/2012/04/09/celebrating-40-years-mabbim.

English" (Wee et al. 2013, p. 306). There is a clear need for this program as many of the instructors lack the necessary English competency to teach English or teach their subject in English (Bui and Nguyen 2016). As Bui and Nguyen posit, this instructional deficit severely jeopardizes the implementation success of the language policy.

The government is aware of this problem and has invested in regional language centers and provided funds for instructors to take training courses abroad, primarily in the UK and Australia. The issues raised by this strong government push to promote English are significant as materials can lack context awareness to facilitate student learning, magnify class divisions, and negatively impact minority groups, among other issues that can lead to students dropping out (Bui and Nguyen 2016). Some critics have argued that this English-language policy is a direct challenge to the multilingual character of the nation (Huong 2010; McCarty 2011) while undermining the dominant role of Vietnamese in the country. It is also seen as part of a neoliberal agenda that prioritizes capital and material resources over more intangible cultural values (Bui and Nguyen 2016).

Vietnam has also seen robust growth in the number of international private institutions teaching solely in English, and demand for these continues to grow. Huong notes that "with the goals to reform the higher education system, the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) has permitted Vietnamese universities and colleges to implement the Advanced Programs, the goal of which is to transplant curricula from particular American programs into counterpart departments in Vietnam" (p. 107). This is another example of the trend to drive educational innovation by partnering with Western institutions, but issues of adequate teacher training, financing, and adapting instruction and curriculum design to the local context are but a few of the obstacles in the way. Rather than the strong focus on English learning, Bui and Nguyen propose a shift toward bilingual/multilingual education (2016) as a more viable, sound, and human-focused alternative in the Vietnamese context.

Problems and Difficulties

This section will note some of the recent developments in second and foreign language instruction in this region, such as decentralization of the policy-making process, role for technology in language education, and new pedagogies.

Decentralization of education has gained momentum around the world as a way to address local differences within countries, and Southeast Asian governments have also embraced this idea to varying degrees (Bjork 2006b). Singapore, for example, has explored several models with relative success (as in the case of autonomous and independent schools), whereas in the case of Indonesia, the push and pull of the central government has resulted in the slow implementation of decentralized plans for education. Hadisantosa (2010) notes how the Indonesian central government still controls policy and budget decisions. The change to a more decentralized approach may have been made more difficult by the strong alliance of the teachers to the nation-building project. The government, however, has made a long-term

commitment to devolve curriculum and planning authority to the local level (Bjork 2006a). In Singapore, the requirement to pass advanced-level entrance exams to university in English, as well as the student's mother-tongue requirement, has driven many students to study abroad. In response, the government has relaxed such policy to keep students in Singapore and reduce the chances that they will not come back (Simpson 2007). In addition, new initiatives such as Yale-NUS College have shifted to holistic admission methods[11] that look beyond test scores in order to recruit talented students for its program.

Information technology and social media are also playing an increasing role in education. Facebook and Twitter have large numbers of users in Indonesia, Singapore, and the Philippines, with the smartphone becoming the computing platform of choice (Barker et al. 2014). In Malaysia, the use of social media by university students to improve their English has become commonplace, with students perceiving it "as authentic interaction using contextualized language" (Wan et al. 2014, p. 39). In the case of language instructors, both preservice and in-service, social media and the Internet can facilitate sharing of best practices and the sense of belonging to a professional community, something lacking in Vietnam, for example, according to Bui and Nguyen (2016).

In the Singaporean context, the NUS Centre for Language Studies (CLS) has led the way in establishing robust language study options in nine languages and has recently added Spanish to its offerings. The Centre holds a biannual language conference (CLaSIC[12]) that draws experts and professionals from around the world to share experiences and learn about the state of the field. Chan and Chen (2011) argue for the adoption of a constructivist pedagogy that moves away from a teacher-centered, objective method of instruction to a more student-centered and engaging pedagogy. The authors favor the use of computer media to support language learning, highlighting the importance of interactivity in the knowledge creation process. Kubler (2011), however, warns of the need to keep pedagogical goals in mind at all times and the risk for new instructors to spend "far too much time on the development of multimedia materials to the detriment of class preparation for existing classes and individual tutoring of students" (p. 76).

Future Directions

The role of English as a first, second, or foreign language in Southeast Asia is likely to remain central well into the twenty-first century. Wee et al. (2013) list the following challenges as Southeast Asian countries continue to devote significant resources to English-language instruction:

[11]See http://admissions.yale-nus.edu.sg/afford/.

[12]For details on the most recent CLaSIC conference, see http://www.fas.nus.edu.sg/cls/CLaSIC/clasic2016/.

- A need to reconsider how English education is organized vis-à-vis its role as a lingua franca
- Balancing the widespread use of English in the country and around the world with notions of national pride in the official language
- Analyzing and responding to competitive challenges among countries as they perceive the adoption and evolution of English within those countries

Simpson (2007) raises the question "of how the learning of English impacts on the linguistic identity of speakers and whether the increased use of English may perhaps pose a challenge to the success of a national language in binding a population together" (p. 16). In this respect, the Singaporean government has repeatedly expressed concerns about the challenge to traditional Asian values brought about by the widespread use of English "which it sees as necessary for technological advancement of the country and its competition in world markets" (p. 27). This tension is likely to continue.

Murray and Scarino (2014) argue that "languages education needs to be developed on the basis of an understanding of the interplay of all the languages and cultures available in local contexts" (p. 3). As such, policies and instructional approaches need to be adapted to local contexts and the unique idiosyncrasies of each country. In this respect, the back and forth in the efforts to incorporate English as the language of instruction in primary education in the region versus using local languages is indicative of the creative tensions present in this debate (Andy Kirkpatrick 2014c). Using the example of Singapore, Pakir (2014) posits that English has become a glocal language, "one that is internationally oriented but locally appropriate and at the same time, one that could be locally oriented but globally understandable" (p. 52). In other words, English represents the common language for a large portion of the world population, including Southeast Asia. For many of these people, English is their first language; for others, it is a communication tool in their professional life, and they are comfortable switching to their mother tongue at home or in social settings. It serves as the lingua franca on the Internet, for global trade, and in many research and political settings. Thanks to this privileged position, it is located squarely at the intersection of global trends and local contexts. This tension results in very unique responses, locally appropriate but globally understandable, as Pakir indicates. The shift in focus from English as a second or foreign language to "World Englishes" and "English as an International Language" also has significant implications across all educational levels, from teacher-hiring practices to instructional goals (Ali 2014). These issues are ongoing topics of research and should be considered by policy makers and education planners as they grapple with second and foreign language education in Southeast Asia.

Cross-References

► Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in the Asia-Pacific Region
► Foreign Language Education in the Context of Institutional Globalization

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Adrian Blackledge: Language Education and Multilingualism. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Barbara Seidlhofer: English as Lingua Franca and Multilingualism. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

Bernard Spolsky: Investigating Language Education Policy. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Doris Warriner: The Politics of English Language Teaching. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Joseph Sung-Yul Park: Researching Globalization of English. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Kimmo Kosonen: Language Policy and Education in Southeast Asia. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

Ali, F. (2014). Implementing EIL paradigm in ELT classrooms: Voices of experienced and pre-service English language educators in Malaysia. In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students* (pp. 95–109). Cham: Springer.

Alsagoff, L. (2010). Hybridity in ways of speaking: The glocalization of English in Singapore. In L. Lim, A. Pakir, & L. Wee (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Modernity and management* (pp. 109–130). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Amir, S. (2012). *The technological state in Indonesia: The co-constitution of high technology and authoritarian politics* (Vol. 54). Milton Park/Abingdon/New York: Routledge.

Barker, J., & Lindquist, J. (2013). Indonesia. In *Figures of Southeast Asian modernity* (pp. 130–169). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press..

Barker, J., Harms, E., & Lindquist, J. (2014). *Figures of Southeast Asian modernity.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Bertrand, J. (2004). *Nationalism and ethnic conflict in Indonesia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bjork, C. (Ed.). (2006a). *Educational decentralization: Asian experiences and conceptual contributions* (Education in the Asia-Pacific region, Vol. 8). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Bjork, C. (2006b). Transferring authority to local school communities in Indonesia: Ambitious plans, mixed results. In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational decentralization: Asian experiences and conceptual contributions* (pp. 129–147). Dordrecht: Springer.

Blommaert, J. (2006). Language policy and national identity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 238–254). Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Bruthiaux, P. (2010). The Speak Good English movement: A web-user's perspective. In L. Lim, A. Pakir, & L. Wee (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Modernity and management* (pp. 91–108). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Bui, T. T. N., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2016). Standardizing English for educational and socio-economic betterment A critical analysis of English language policy reforms in Vietnam. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 363–388). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Chan, W. M., & Chen, I. R. (2011). Technology in the service of constructivist pedagogy: Network-based applications and knowledge construction. In W. M. Chan, K. N. Chin, & T. Suthiwan (Eds.), Foreign Language Teaching in Asia and Beyond: Current Perspectives and Future Directions (pp. 191–215). Boston, USA: Walter de Gruyter.

Chan, W. M., Chin, K. N., & Suthiwan, T. (Eds.). (2011). *Foreign language teaching in Asia and beyond: Current perspectives and future directions*. Boston: De Gruyter.

Chew, P. G.-L. (2014). From multilingualism to monolingualism: Linguistic management in Singapore. In K. Sung & B. Spolsky (Eds.), *Conditions for English language teaching and learning in Asia* (pp. 1–16). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Chong, T. (2002). Asian values and Confucian ethics: Malay Singaporeans' dilemma. *Journal of Contemporary Asia, 32*(3), 394–406.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Silver, R. (2011). Learning environment: The enactment of educational policies in Singapore. In C. Ward (Ed.), *Language education: An essential for a global economy* (pp. 2–24). RELC. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore.

David, M. K., & McLellan, J. (2014). Political, educational and socioeconomic motivations for language shift in multilingual Malaysia. In P. Sercombe & R. Tupas (Eds.), *Language, education and nation-building: Assimilation and shift in Southeast Asia* (pp. 131–147). Macmillan, New York: Palgrave.

Don, Z. M. (2014). English in Malaysia: An inheritance from the past and the challenge for the future. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspective on languages education in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 117–133). Dordrecht: Springer.

Gill, S. K. (2014). *Language policy challenges in multi-ethnic Malaysia* (Vol. 8). Dordrecht: Springer.

Goh, R. B. H. (2013). Uncertain locale: The dialectics of space and the cultural politics of English in Singapore. In L. Wee, R. B. H. Goh, & L. Lim (Eds.), *The politics of English: South Asia, Southeast Asia and the Asia Pacific* (pp. 125–143). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Guan, Y. S. (2013). Malaysia. In J. Barker, E. Harms, & J. Lindquist (Eds.), *Figures of Southeast Asian modernity* (pp. 170–194). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ha, P. L., Ha, V. H., & Dat, B. (2014). Language policies in modern-day Vietnam: Changes, challenges and complexities. In P. Sercombe & R. Tupas (Eds.), *Language, education and nation-building: Assimilation and shift in Southeast Asia* (pp. 232–244). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hadisantosa, N. (2010). Insights from INDONESIA. In R. Johnston (Ed.), *Learning through English: Policies, challenges and prospects. Insights from East Asia.* British Council (pp. 24–46). Malaysia: British Council.

Hanewald, R. (2016). The impact of English on educational policies and practices in Malaysia. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 181–198). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Harman, G. S., Hayden, M., & Phạm, T. N. (Eds.). (2010). *Reforming higher education in Vietnam: challenges and priorities* (Vol. 29). Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-3694-0.

Harms, E. (2013). Vietnam. In J. Barker, E. Harms, & J. Lindquist (Eds.), *Figures of Southeast Asian modernity* (pp. 46–74). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Huang, T. L., & Teo Sor Noi, C. (2011). Preparing for the 21st century workplace: The English language arts experience in River Valley High School. In C. Ward (Ed.), *Language education: An essential for a global economy* (pp. 46–56). RELC. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Huong, T. T. T. (2010). Insight from Vietnam. In R. Johnston (Ed.), *Learning through English: Policies, challenges and prospects. Insights from East Asia.* British Council (pp. 96–114). Malaysia: British Council.

ICA. (2010). Greater flexibility with implementation of double-barrelled race option from 1 January 2011. *Immigration and Checkpoints Authority.* http://www.ica.gov.sg/news_details.aspx?nid=12443

Jones, G. (2013). *The Population of South-East Asia* (Working Papers No. 196). *Asia Research Institute Working Papers*. Singapore. Retrieved from http://cmsad.um.edu.my/images/psu/doc/Recommended Reading/The population of SE Asia by Gavin Jones.pdf

Kachru, B. B. (1986). The power and politics of English. *World Englishes, 5*(2–3), 121–140. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.1986.tb00720.x.

Kaplan, R. B. (2001). English – The accidental language of science. In U. Ammon (Ed.), *The dominance of English as a language of science* (pp. 3–26). Berlin.: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kassim, Y. R. (2005). *Transition politics in Southeast Asia: Dynamics of leadership change and succession in Indonesia and Malaysia*. New York/Singapore: Marshall Cavendish Academic.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model* (Project Mu.). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2014a). Teaching English in Asia in Non-Anglo cultural contexts: Principles of the "lingua franca approach". In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students* (pp. 23–34).Cham: Springer.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2014b). English in Southeast Asia: Pedagogical and policy implications. *World Englishes*, *33*(4), 426–438. doi:10.1111/weng.12105.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2014c). English as a medium of instruction in East and Southeast Asian Universities. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspective on languages education in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 15–29). Dordrecht: Springer.

Kirkpatrick, A., & Sussex, R. (Eds.). (2012). *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Kubler, C. C. (2011). Promises and perils of educational technology in foreign language curriculum and materials development. In W. M. Chan, K. N. Chin, M. Nagami, & T. Suthiwan (Eds.), *Media in foreign language teaching and learning* (pp. 69–85). Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Lee, M. N. N. (2006). Centralized decentralization in Malaysian education. In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational decentralization: Asian experiences and conceptual contributions* (pp. 149–158). Dordrecht: Springer.

Lewis, M. P. (Ed.). (2009). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Dallas: SIL International.

Lewis, P. (2013). Asia invests in liberal arts: US higher education expands abroad. *Harvard International Review, 35*(1), 36–39.

Lim, L. (2010). Migrants and "mother tongues": Extralinguistic forces in the ecology of English in Singapore. In L. Lim, A. Pakir, & L. Wee (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Modernity and management* (pp. 19–54). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Lim, L., Pakir, A., & Wee, L. (2010). English in Singapore: Policies and prospects. In L. Lim, A. Pakir, & L. Wee (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Modernity and management* (p. 3). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Lin, A., & Man, E. Y. F. (2009). *Bilingual education: Southeast Asian perspectives*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Marlina, R. (2014). English language education the pedagogy of English as an international language. In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students* (pp. 1–19). Cham: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-06127-6.

McCarty, T. L. (Ed.). (2011). *Ethnography and language policy.* New York: Routledge.

Ministry of Education. (2014). *Secondary school education: Shaping the next phase of your child's learning journey.* Singapore.

Muhd, S., & Aljunied, K. (2014). Singapore. In J. Barker, E. Harms, & J. Lindquist (Eds.), *Figures of Southeast Asian modernity* (pp. 195–213). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Murray, N., & Scarino, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspective on languages education in the Asia-Pacific Region* (Vol. 9). Dordrecht: Springer.

Musgrave, S. (2014). Language shift and language maintenance in Indonesia. In P. Sercombe & R. Tupas (Eds.), *Language, education and nation-building: Assimilation and shift in Southeast Asia* (pp. 87–105). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ng, E., Biswas, A., Hirata, Y., Masuhira, K., Muraoka, C., & Woebs, T. (2011). Introducing students to new worlds: Teaching foreign languages in Ngee Ann Polytechnic. In C. Ward (Ed.), *Language education: An essential for a global economy* (pp. 76–90). RELC. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Pakir, A. (1993). Two tongue tied: Bilingualism in Singapore. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 14*(1), 73.

Pakir, A. (2000). Singapore. In W. K. Ho & R. Wong (Eds.), Language policies and language education: The impact in East Asian countries in the next decade (pp. 284–306). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Pakir, A. (2008). Innovative second and foreign language education in Southeast Asia. In N. Van Deusen-Scholl & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), Encyclopedia of Language and Education (2nd ed., Vol. 4, pp. 239–254). New York: Springer Science+Business Media LLC.

Pakir, A. (2010a). English as a lingua franca: Negotiating Singapore's English language education. In L. Lim, A. Pakir, & L. Wee (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Modernity and management* (pp. 261–279). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Pakir, A. (2010b). Current research on Englishes in Southeast Asia. *World Englishes*, *29*(3), 329. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2010.01657.x.

Pakir, A. (2014). Glocal English in Singapore. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies: A relational perspective on languages education in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 49–57). Dordrecht: Springer.

Rajadurai, J. (2013). The think speaking in English isn't good, you know. In L. Wee, R. B. H. Goh, & L. Lim (Eds.), *The politics of English: South Asia, Southeast Asia and the Asia Pacific* (pp. 167–186). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Rappa, A. L., & Wee, L. (2006). *Language policy and modernity in Southeast Asia: Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand*. Springer. Springer, New York: Springer Science+Business Media LLC..

Rubdy, R. (2001). Creative destruction: Singapore's Speak Good English movement. *World Englishes, 20*(3), 341–355. doi:10.1111/1467-971X.00219.

Rubdy, R. (2010). Problematizing the implementation of innovation in English language education in Singapore. In L. Lim, A. Pakir, & L. Wee (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Modernity and management* (pp. 207–233). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Sercombe, P., & Tupas, T. R. (Eds.). (2014). *Language, education and nation-building: Assimilation and shift in Southeast Asia*. New York/Houndmills/Baskingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sim, M. (2013, March 31). Mixed marriages becoming more common in Singapore. *The Straits Times*. Singapore. http://www.straitstimes.com/breaking-news/singapore/story/mixed-marriages-becoming-more-common-singapore-20130331

Simpson, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Language and national identity in Asia*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Singapore: Overview (2011). *USAToday.* http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/marketplace/ibi/singapore.htm

Singh, N. K. (2013). *Multilingual trends in a globalized world: Prospects and challenges*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Stroud, C., & Wee, L. (2012). *Style, identity, and literacy: English in Singapore*. Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters.

Talib, I. S. (2013). The encroachment of English in Malaysian cultural expression. In L. Wee, R. B. H. Goh, & L. Lim (Eds.), *The politics of English: South Asia, Southeast Asia and the Asia Pacific* (pp. 145–165). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Tan, J. (2006). Limited decentralization in the Singapore education system. In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational decentralization* (Vol. 8, pp. 59–70). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-4358-1_5.

Tan, H., & Heng, C. (2006). English for mathematics and science: Current Malaysian language-in-education policies and practices. *Language and Education, 20*(4), 306–321. doi:10.2167/le631.0.

Wan, C., Rahimah, I., & Collet, P. (2014). Perceived learning strategies of Malaysian university students in Web 2. 0-based English as a second language informal learning. *Journal of Language Studies, 14*(1), 29–42.

Wee, L. (2014). The minoritization of languages in Singapore. In P. Sercombe & R. Tupas (Eds.), *Language, education and nation-building: Assimilation and shift in Southeast Asia* (pp. 181–199). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wee, L., Goh, R. B. H., & Lim, L. (2013). *The politics of English: South Asia, Southeast Asia and the Asia Pacific* (Vol. 4). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Widodo, H. P. (2016). Language policy in practice: Reframing the English language curriculum in the Indonesian secondary education sector. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 127–152). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Yang, R. (2015). China's soft power projection in higher education. *International Higher Education, 46*, 24–25.

Zentz, L. R. (2015). The porous borders of language and nation: English in Indonesia. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 39*(1), 50–69. doi:10.1075/lplp.39.1.03zen.

Globalization and Language Education in Japan

Ryuko Kubota

Contents

Introduction 288
Early Developments 289
Major Contributions 290
Language Ideologies as Observed in Globalization and Language Education 291
Foreign Language Education 292
Teaching JSL 294
Problems and Difficulties 296
Future Directions 297
Cross-References 297
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 298
References 298

Abstract

Contemporary discussions on globalization and language education in Japan, which arose in the 1980s, reflect the synergy of internationalization and *nihonjinron*, a discourse that emphasizes the uniqueness of the Japanese. The government in the 1980s promoted the teaching of communication skills in English in order to disseminate Japanese unique perspectives to the world. This ideological framework has reconfigured into a synergy of neoliberalism and nationalism since the 2000s. Reflecting the global trend of prioritizing English language teaching, the Japanese government and business associations have promoted English language teaching to bolster global economic competitiveness. Policies have included employing native English-speaking teachers, offering English at elementary schools, and using commercially available English

R. Kubota (✉)
Language and Literacy Education, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
e-mail: ryuko.kubota@ubc.ca

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_24

proficiency tests. The neoliberal promotion of English is complemented by neoconservative emphasis on national identity. A similar synergy is observed in teaching Japanese as a second language (JSL). Globalization prompted an influx of immigrants, creating demands for teaching JSL in schools for newcomer children, who tend to be assimilated into mainstream society. Teaching JSL also supports the internationalization of higher education, in which many international students are recruited for the ultimate purpose to strengthen the Japanese economy. However, the recent promotion of English-medium programs has created a dilemma for Asian nonnative English-speaking international students, who are positioned as linguistically and racially inferior in English and Japanese. Overall, despite the linguistic, cultural, and racial heterogeneity implied by globalization, language education policies and practices in Japan have been influenced by monolingual, monocultural, and monoethnic ideologies that resist heterogeneous understandings of language and language speakers.

Keywords
Internationalization • Neoliberalism • Nationalism • Native speakers • Early learning of English • Japanese as a second language

Introduction

Globalization, as characterized by borderless flows of people, capital, goods, and information, is not only a contemporary phenomenon relevant to Japan. Human activities across geographic territories have been observed throughout history and have influenced social, cultural, and linguistic shifts. However, what characterizes the nexus between contemporary globalization and language education policies in Japan is a complex web of neoliberalism that influences social, economic, demographic, and ideological structures (Kubota 2011), the perceived global usefulness of English, and the rightwing pursuit of strengthening national identity.

Language education in Japan has multiple facets. It is classified into the teaching of Japanese as a native language or *kokugo* [literally "national language"], Japanese as a second language (JSL), foreign languages, and heritage languages. While *kokugo* is taught to all students in primary and secondary schools, JSL is taught in schools mostly to children of newcomer migrants. Adult newcomers learn JSL usually for survival purposes in community-run programs mostly taught by volunteers. JSL is also taught to international students in post-secondary education. As for foreign languages, English is widely taught to students of all ages, as in other parts of the world, and other languages are taught less widely. A small number of schools offer heritage languages for Korean and Chinese old-comer immigrants or newcomer children (Gottlieb 2012; Kanno 2008; Okano 2012). Languages used by indigenous peoples from Ainu and Ryukyuan backgrounds are also taught and learned in some local communities on a small scale. In nonformal contexts, various languages are taught and learned in diverse ways as intellectual and social activities.

Of these diverse languages taught and learned, English and JSL most clearly illustrate the impact of globalization on language education. It is important to note that although "English" in the primary and secondary school curriculum is only a part of "foreign languages," a "foreign language" is virtually synonymous with English. This chapter addresses issues in teaching foreign languages, especially English, and JSL in Japan.

Early Developments

In the late nineteenth century, Japan replaced an old shogunate system with a constitutional monarchy. Modern Japan actively introduced knowledge, culture, technology, and social systems of the West, while pursuing military, economic, and cultural dominance of the region, which ultimately led Japan to wage the Asia Pacific War. During this era, except between the 1941 Attack on Pearl Harbor and Japan's defeat in 1945, English was a predominant foreign language taught in schools, although other languages of the colonized, such as Mandarin, Korean, and Malay, were also taught in some technical schools (Erikawa 2006). Also during this era, learning Japanese as a colonial language was imposed on people in Korea, Taiwan, Manchukuo (Northeastern China), and other occupied territories. The current teaching of English and JSL carries a legacy of this history.

The subsequent US occupation of Japan, which lasted until 1952, cemented Japan's post-war political, economic, and cultural subordination to the United States. The previous popularity of English language teaching for all ages intensified with the discourse of *kokusaika* [internationalization] in the 1980s. This was the time when Japanese economic success triggered friction with the United States. The *kokusaika* discourse promoted Japan's engagement with Western nations not by assimilation but rather by accommodation which deployed both Westernization and cultural nationalism of *nihonjinron* [theories on the Japanese] (Kobayashi 2011; Kubota 2002; Liddicoat 2007).

The synergy of *kokusaika* and *nihonjinron* is clearly seen in the reports published between 1985 and 1987 by the Ad Hoc Council on Education established in the Cabinet Office. The Council's recommendations and the subsequent revision of the national curriculum emphasized fostering communication skills in English in order to convincingly express the Japanese point of view in Western logic. This international/national ideological synergy has reconfigured since the 2000s as paradoxical juxtaposition of neoliberalism and nationalism (discussed below). The term "communication" appeared for the first time in official documents, such as the Council's reports and the national curriculum, signifying a shift in priority toward practical language skills and a new direction for subsequent recommendations and actual revisions of curriculum and instruction (Torikai 2014).

As the government increasingly promoted English language teaching by drawing on *kokusaika* discourse in the 1990s, intellectuals in Japan began to raise their concerns about linguistic imperialism of English (cf. Phillipson 1992). Extending a previous critique of teaching "English conversation" in Japan as a racist activity

privileging white native English speakers (Lummis 1976), Tsuda (1990), for example, critiqued the glorification of English, English-speaking foreigners, and Western cultures and argued that the Japanese should develop positive cultural and linguistic self-esteem to establish communicative equality. Critics challenged the prevalent belief that speaking English alone would lead to *kokusaika.*

As *kokusaika* became a buzzword, domestic *kokusaika* – increased population of diverse newcomer migrants – was actually occurring during the 1980s bubble economy in Japan. The number of unskilled migrant workers from Asia and South America rose, and in the 1990s, the implementation of new immigration laws allowed foreigners of Japanese descent, mostly from Brazil and Peru (i.e., return migrants whose parents and grandparents had emigrated from Japan since the beginning of the twentieth century) and other foreign trainees, mainly from China, to legally work in Japan. This created a demand for teaching JSL in schools. Although JSL was initially targeted to Japanese returnees and research focused on issues of identity (Kanno 2003), attention shifted to newcomers from foreign backgrounds as well as repatriated children and women stranded in China at the end of the war.

JSL instruction has also taken place in post-secondary institutions. To pursue *kokusaika,* the Japanese government in 1983 launched a plan to host 100,000 international students by the year 2000. The plan paralleled the nationalist impetus of promoting English language teaching; it aimed to gain international recognition of Japan as a nation making intellectual contributions and playing a civilizing role, especially in Asia (Tsukada 2013). Reflecting global trends, efforts to internationalize higher education have intensified more recently.

A significant issue in teaching JSL is the power dynamics of language, culture, and ideology. Just as linguistic imperialism of English has stemmed from British and American colonialism, teaching JSL has carried a colonial legacy of Japanese nationalism. Segawa (2012) reviewed Japanese articles on teaching JSL published since the 1960s and revealed that nationalistic arguments linking Japanese language and Japanese ways of thinking (paralleling the previous colonial strategy for ruling the colonies and occupied territories) reemerged in the 1970s with the rise of *nihonjinron*. As domestic diversity became visible in the 1980s, the focus shifted to the cultural and linguistic integration of JSL learners, in which they were guided to discover cultural differences on their own. Throughout history, essentialist understandings of Japanese culture, language, and ways of thinking have persisted. *Kokusaika* discourse in response to actual and envisioned diversity has in fact strengthened national identity in teaching English and JSL (Kobayashi 2011).

Major Contributions

The term globalization or *gurôbarizêshon* began to appear in the 1990s and has been used in the title of some official documents on education released in the 2010s, although it is sometime conflated with *kokusaika* (Rivers 2010). Globalization

implies a borderless society with a free market economy enhanced by corporate overseas expansion, privatization, and competition, all of which are founded on neoliberalism. As economic competitiveness has become Japan's major mission, language education policies have begun to reflect corporate and government strategic interests. The emphasis on English language teaching has intensified, while linguistic, cultural, and racial heterogeneities in foreign language education have continued to be ignored. In addition, nationalism, which complemented Westernization in the previous *kokusaika* discourse, has been heightened. Language education is situated in the contradictions and complicities of neoliberal globalization and nationalism.

Scholarly works have focused on language education policies, cultural dynamics, and sociolinguistic aspects of language teaching and learning in relation to *kokusaika* and globalization discourses as discussed in the next sections. Some scholars have conceptually analyzed ideologies in language education, while others have conducted qualitative research employing critical discourse analysis, qualitative interviews, or ethnography. Still others have employed quantitative methodologies to investigate the attitudes of Japanese language learners. In the following sections, I will provide an overview of language ideologies that underpin the current trend of language education, followed by an examination of selected topics in two key areas of language education: foreign language and JSL.

Language Ideologies as Observed in Globalization and Language Education

Language ideologies or "beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein 1979, p. 193), which underlie the contemporary language education policies and practices in Japan, inherit those observed in the previous decades. The prevalent discourse about foreign language education is founded on the following conceptual linkage: foreign language = standard (American) English = being global/international = spoken by native speakers = white people (Kubota 2002). This is juxtaposed with the ideology of monolingualism of the nation (Gottlieb 2012) which privileges cultural and linguistic Japaneseness, now explicitly discussed in terms of nationalistic values such as "respect our traditions and culture" and "love the country" as stipulated in the 2006 revision of the Fundamental Law of Education. These ideologies operate in multiple ways: excluding languages, cultures, and people who do not fit the abovementioned equation, shaping homogenizing view of language and language users, ignoring the actual heterogeneity that globalization brings about, neglecting nondominant values, and assimilating the inferior Others into mainstream Japanese society. Thus, despite the implied diversity associated with globalization, anti-heterogeneous views of foreign language and JSL education seem to have intensified.

Foreign Language Education

With regard to foreign language education, English has continued to dominate, reflecting the global trend. Many recommendations about English language teaching have been made by the government and business associations since the 1990s, including emphasizing oral communication, formally making foreign language compulsory in the secondary school curricula and specifying English as the language to be learned, employing native English-speaking teachers (NESTs), and introducing English in the elementary school curriculum. The latter two policies correspond to what Phillipson (1992) critiqued as the "native speaker fallacy" and the "early-start fallacy," respectively. Phillipson's ideological constructs aptly describe the policy trend in Japan. The following discussion will focus on these two topics and the current neoliberal and neoconservative trend in English language teaching.

The politics of NESTs. Providing schools with greater availability of NESTs has constituted an important internationalization agenda in educational initiatives. The Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program was the first government-funded effort to pursue this goal.

The *kokusaika* discourse in the 1980s, in the midst of trade war between Japan and the United States, led the Japanese government to create the JET Program to recruit NESTs from mainly inner circle countries. According to McConnell (2000), this was presented as a "gift" to the United States in the hope that the economic friction would be alleviated. Employing NESTs would also enhance internationalization and strengthen English language teaching as proposed by the Ad Hoc Council on Education and demanded by Japanese business associations. Through an ethnographic study, McConnell (2000) exposed complexities and contradictions of this top-down implantation of diversity in public schools, as observed in Japanese officials' and teachers' anxiety over managing diversity of race, nationality, English accent, and sexuality among the JET participants, as well as their heightened Japanese identity.

Since then, very little research has been conducted to explore whether instruction provided by NESTs has made a positive educational impact, but government and business interests have continued to promote the employment of NESTs for the purpose of generating positive learning outcomes.

The policy of placing NESTs in schools entails a language ideology, which regards inner circle varieties of English as legitimate and white Americans as only legitimate English teachers. For instance, Matsuda (2003) found through a survey and interviews that Japanese high school students tended to associate English mainly with American English and American people. Yamada (2015) revealed that English textbooks for lower secondary schools tended to portray the United States most frequently of all nations and that illustrations of people with fair skin predominated. Rivers and Ross (2013) conducted an experimental study on Japanese university students' attitudes toward racialized groups of English language teachers and revealed that although native speakerness was the strongest desirable attribute, the white race was more desired than the black or Asian race. Idealized NESTs are not only raced but also gendered, as seen in Japanese female English language learners'

romantic desires for white male NESTs (Takahashi 2013). These findings indicate that the government efforts to employ NESTs might both produce and reflect a complex array of symbolic and ideological meanings attached to English and English speakers (Seargeant 2009).

English language teaching at elementary schools. In the early 1990s, the government began exploring ways to offer English at elementary schools (EES). The initiative was influenced by complaints from the business community about the lack of English skills among workers (Butler 2007; Hashimoto 2011). The EES policy has been shaped and implemented through both bottom-up and top-down processes involving local schools, school boards, and the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (Butler 2007), demonstrating how this "early-start fallacy" (Phillipson 1992), which has actually been challenged empirically by scholars such as Muñoz (2014), has been widely supported.

During the 1990s, against a backdrop of neoliberal social restructuring through deregulation and decentralization, pilot EES programs were established. The 1998 curriculum revision (implemented in 2002) made EES available for schools as "foreign language activities" intended to promote "international understanding" rather than a formal school subject. In 2003, MEXT announced the "Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities" and stipulated enhanced instructional and research support for EES, which by that time had been implemented by approximately 50% of the schools nationwide. EES became required for Grades 5 and 6 in the 2008 curriculum revision (implemented in 2011). In 2013, MEXT released the "English Education Reform Plan Corresponding to Globalization" and recommended the introduction of English at Grade 3, an upgrade of "foreign language activities" for Grades 5 and 6 to a formal school subject (which would require creation and use of textbooks and assessment tools), and further enhancement of the quality of instruction through professional development of teachers. In 2014, MEXT formed an advisory group to develop detailed recommendations to carry out the above plan released in 2013.

Three facets of language ideology are worth noting. First, several policy documents on English language teaching released since 2013 make reference to preparing for the 2020 Tokyo Summer Olympics, demonstrating a false assumption that everyone visiting the events from abroad will communicate in English (Torikai 2014). Second, as in secondary schools, English is the sole focus of discussion, even though it is discussed in a framework of "foreign language" teaching. The ambivalence about positioning English in the curriculum is shown in the inconsistent use of "English" and "foreign language" in the 2014 advisory group's document mentioned above. Third, curricular discussions for both primary and secondary schools emphasize developing Japanese identity through learning English (Kobayashi 2011), which reflects the rightwing view of the revised Fundamental Law of Education. All in all, globalization as conceptualized in these discussions downplays heterogeneity and inscribes a monolingual and monocultural worldview.

Neoliberalism and language teaching. The term globalization parallels the neoliberal notion of a borderless society with free flow of capital, goods, people, and information without tight government regulations imposed on market, business,

labor, education, and other social services. Deregulation and privatization are supposed to stimulate competition, provide more choices for consumers, and invigorate the economy. Individuals who are placed in unstable labor conditions are deemed responsible for developing their human capital on their own as neoliberal subjects (Kubota 2011). While this neoliberal discourse became prevalent in Japan in the 1990s, neoconservative trends also influenced education reforms (Kawai 2009). Neoliberal influence on language education can be discussed in terms of conceptual foundations, the process of policy development, and policies themselves.

First, policy documents, such as the 2003 "Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities," call for fostering communication competence in English by rationalizing it as a strategy to survive increased global competition. Also, communication skills are deemed as part of neoliberal human capital – a notion that is frequently framed as "global human resources" in recent official discourses. Second, language education policies, such as EES, the addition of a listening test to the nationwide examination for university admissions, and the employment of NESTs, have been developed in response to recommendations made by major business associations, which would benefit from these policies (Erikawa 2014; Kubota 2011). Third, commercially available tests such as TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) continue to be recommended by business associations and government committees for assessing students and teachers of English. Erikawa (2014) argues that this policy as applied to university admissions represents neoliberal deregulation, benefiting testing businesses, and he warns of the washback effects of these tests.

The concern about raising students' English language skills to increase global competitiveness led to the 2013 implementation of the "teaching English in English" policy for upper secondary schools. The same guideline for lower secondary schools was proposed in 2013 by a council created in the Cabinet Office, and it is scheduled to be implemented in 2018. This reflects yet another facet of linguistic imperialism of English – the "monolingual fallacy" (Phillipson 1992).

The neoliberal trend for prioritizing English coexists with rightwing nationalism in language education, seen in the promotion of Japanese identity. The 2012 report of the Council on the "Promotion of Human Resources for Globalization Development," another council created in the Cabinet Office, conceptualized "awareness as the Japanese" as one of the three major traits of "global human resources" along with language and communication skills. While neoliberalism and nationalism appear to be at odds, they complement each other in the West (Harmes 2011) as well as in Japan, where nationalism functions as a means to unify citizens divided by socioeconomic gaps exacerbated by neoliberalism (Kawai 2009).

Teaching JSL

The rise of migrants has created demands for JSL instruction in public schools. Since 1991, MEXT has conducted surveys of the number of students in need of JSL support. Although the figure is small, the need is obvious. Of a total of 27,013

students with JSL needs in 2012, 87% spoke either Portuguese, Chinese, Filipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese as their mother tongue. The process of developing integrated education policies for this population has been slow; MEXT created JSL curriculum guidelines for elementary school in 2003 and lower secondary school in 2007 (Okano 2012), but implementation at the local level has been uneven. In 2014, MEXT announced more comprehensive guidelines for establishing a "special curriculum" for JSL instruction for both survival and academic language support at primary and lower secondary schools and recommended a pullout instructional model. Although the guidelines call for enhanced professional development for teachers, no teacher license in JSL exists yet.

Teaching students in need of JSL support has not been conducted uniformly across schools; some schools teach JSL in an assimilationist way, while others offer bilingual instruction in Japanese and students' mother tongues (Kanno 2008; Okano 2012). However, Kanno (2008) revealed through ethnographic research that one bilingual program she studied provided insufficient instruction in academic Japanese due to perception that the Brazilian students would not stay long term in Japan, failing to promote additive bilingualism.

In a broader context, social issues regarding the rise of the non-Japanese population has been discussed in terms of "multicultural co-living" (*tabunka kyôsei*), and various social services and systems have been established at a local level with respect to labor, health, social welfare, and education for newcomers. However, critics argue that, despite its good intentions, "multicultural co-living" is unidirectional in that it aims to integrate foreigners into the Japanese community, rather than recognizing their languages, cultures, and perspectives as legitimate in the mainstream community. This is reflected by the fact that minority rights are rarely mentioned in the discourse of "multicultural co-living." The government's position that only Japanese citizens are constitutionally obligated to provide their children with compulsory education has caused school non-enrollments among some newcomer children. Overall, the discourse of "multicultural co-living" has not erased a boundary between foreigners and Japanese – rather, it has strengthened the ideology of Japanese homogeneity and the existing power hierarchy (Heinrich 2012).

While teaching JSL in public schools can be described as a passive reaction to demographic change caused by globalization, teaching JSL to international students in higher education has been actively pursued as part of a neoliberal mission to bolster global competitiveness by educating and retaining high-quality human resources (Tsukada 2013). In 2008, the government announced a plan to host 300,000 international students by 2020. However, what is different from the previous initiative is offering courses in English. As part of the "300,000 International Students Plan," MEXT launched the "Global 30 Program" to select 30 universities that could offer English-medium programs with or without JSL requirements. This new framework for the selected universities and a few preexisting English-medium programs pose multiple challenges for international students, a majority of whom are from China. For example, the emphasis on English contradicts actual language requirements in the domestic labor market, negatively affecting their future job opportunities in Japan. In addition, some Chinese students feel alienated since they

are perceived as inferior Japanese and English speakers due to their linguistic and racial background (Tsukada 2013).

In other government documents, such as the aforementioned 2012 report of the "Council on the Promotion of Human Resources for Globalization Development," teaching JSL in higher education is framed as part of the national agenda for economic expansion overseas. Here, too, national profit, rather than benefit of international students, is emphasized, demonstrating a unidirectional orientation to globalization.

Problems and Difficulties

The term globalization has been increasingly used in public discourses in Japan, reflecting the influence of neoliberalism. Neoliberal language education policies and practices in Japan framed by the discourses of internationalization and globalization are characterized by multifaceted contradictions and tensions.

First, although an emphasis on teaching English will certainly benefit multinational corporations that often rely on English for global business operations, English proficiency alone cannot fulfill all demands for international business; qualitative interviews show that Japanese transnational workers recognize the need for proficiency in languages other than English, professional competence, and intercultural dispositions (Kubota 2013). The gap between business associations' promotion of English language teaching and transnational workers' perspectives requires further investigations.

Second, the above gap indicates the need for paying more attention to global multilingualism and plurilingual competency in language education. Only a small number of secondary schools offer languages other than English (e.g., French or German as a foreign language; Korean, Mandarin, or other languages as a foreign, community, or heritage language) (Gottlieb 2012; Kanno 2008; Okano 2012). Many universities that used to require second foreign languages now require English only (Gottlieb 2012).

Third, the assumption that the demand for English has increased and that English proficiency is indispensable for careers should be questioned. Terasawa (2015) conducted quantitative analyses of the data from several large-scale social surveys and revealed that the number of workers who use English has not increased and that only 10% of the entire population use English even minimally. This suggests that the rationale for learning English needs to be reconsidered.

Fourth, the monolingual and monoethnic orientation in English language teaching contradicts the pluralism, hybridity, and diversity that transnational businesses and globalized societies need to embrace. It also contradicts growing scholarly attention to concepts such as world Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and translanguaging, as well as issues of race.

Fifth, the gap between homogeneity and heterogeneity parallels a tension between entrenched nationalism and expanding neoliberal globalization. As in

other parts of the industrialized world, far-right, xenophobic movements have become visible in Japan. Language education defined only in terms of skills development for economic competitiveness will not foster international understanding and cooperation – a goal that is actually stated in the national curriculum. The purpose of learning a language needs to be redefined with a broader vision.

Future Directions

Research on language education in globalization has illuminated the ideological underpinnings of language policies. Language teaching and learning in relation to globalization can also be discussed in terms of sociological, political, and historical perspectives.

From a sociological perspective, investigating the nonformal language learning that taking place outside of schools and universities (e.g., Mandarin for business purposes, English and Korean for leisure) would provide insights into language ideologies, language desires, commodification of language, and other sociological significance attached to language learning. Also, as neoliberalism permeates our society, wealth inequality in education has widened. The so-called the "English divide" needs to be critically scrutinized.

The current spread and emphasis on English language teaching cannot be understood without taking into consideration Japan's post-war political relations with the United States seen even today. It would be valuable to investigate how the political dominance of the United States and Japanese government complicity directly or indirectly contributed to the emphasis on English in education policy.

Lastly, historical inquiries would inform critical understandings of contemporary language education policies. For instance, reviewing a shift in Japanese education from the 1920s to the 1930s, Lincicome (2009) discussed some progressive educators who advocated internationalism based on democracy, peace, and humanitarianism but later came to support imperialism. According to Lincicome, they cannot be labeled as complete converts, because their earlier support for democratic internationalism simply shifted to support for an imperialistic nationalism and nationalism had already existed in their silent support for the Emperor's sovereignty. This indicates that a synergy of nationalism and internationalism has always existed in modern Japan, influencing public debates and education policies during various historical periods. Historical inquiry into language education from critical perspectives would further facilitate understandings of the relationship between globalization/internationalization and language education in Japan.

Cross-References

► Foreign Language Education in the Context of Institutional Globalization

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

James Tollefson: Language Planning in Education. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

John Maher: Language Policy and Education in Japan. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

Butler, Y. G. (2007). Foreign language education at elementary schools in Japan: Searching for solutions amidst growing diversification. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 8*, 129–147.

Erikawa, H. (2006). *Kindai nihon no eigoka kyôiku shi: Shokugyô kei shogakkô ni yoru eigo kyôiku no taishûka katei* [A historical study of English language teaching in prewar Japan: A popularization process of English language teaching at technical schools]. Tokyo: Tôshin Dô.

Erikawa, H. (2014). Gakkô no gaikokugo kyôiku wa naniwo mezasu bekinanoka [What should foreign language education at schools aim for?]. In H. Erikawa, Y. Saito, K. Torikai, Y. Otsu, & T. Uchida (Eds.), *Gakkô eigo kyôiku wa nanno tame?* [What is English education for?] (pp. 1–40). Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobô.

Gottlieb, N. (2012). *Language policy in Japan: The challenge of change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Harmes, A. (2011). The rise of neoliberal nationalism. *Review of International Political Economy, 19*, 59–86.

Hashimoto, K. (2011). Compulsory 'foreign language activities' in Japanese primary schools. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 12*, 167–184.

Heinrich, P. (2012). After homogeneity: Maintaining unity in a loinguistically diversifying Japan. In N. Gottlieb (Ed.), *Language and citizenship in Japan* (pp. 19–36). New York/London: Routledge.

Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating bilingual and bicultural identities: Japanese returnees betwixt two worlds*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kanno, Y. (2008). *Language and education in Japan: Unequal access to bilingualism*. Hampshire: Palgrave.

Kawai, Y. (2009). Neoliberalism, nationalism, and intercultural communication: A critical analysis of a Japan's neoliberal nationalism discourse under globalization. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, 2*, 16–43.

Kobayashi, Y. (2011). Global Englishes and the discourse on Japaneseness. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 32*, 1–14.

Kubota, R. (2002). Impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 13–28). London: Routledge.

Kubota, R. (2011). Questioning linguistic instrumentalism: English, neoliberalism, and language tests in Japan. *Linguistics and Education, 22*, 248–260. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2011.02.002.

Kubota, R. (2013). "Language is only a tool": Japanese expatriates working in China and implications for language teaching. *Multilingual Education, 3*(4). Available from http://www.multilingual-education.com/content/3/1/4

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). Internationalising Japan: Nihonjinron and the intercultural Japanese language-in-education policy. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 2*, 32–46.

Lincicome, M. (2009). *Imperial subjects as global citizens: Nationalism, internationalism, and education in Japan*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Lummis, D. (1976). *Ideorogî to shite no eikaiwa* [English conversation as ideology]. Tokyo: Shôbun Sha.

Matsuda, A. (2003). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes, 22*, 483–496.

McConnell, D. (2000). *Importing diversity: Inside Japan's JET program*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Muñoz, C. (2014). Contrasting effects of starting age and input on the oral performance of foreign language learners. *Applied linguistics, 35*, 463–482.

Okano, K. (2012). Languages and citizenship in Education: Migrant languages in government schools. In N. Gottlieb (Ed.), *Language and citizenship in Japan* (pp. 58–78). New York/London: Routledge.

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

Rivers, D. (2010). Ideologies of internationalization and the treatment of diversity within Japanese higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 32*, 441–454.

Rivers, D., & Ross, A. S. (2013). Idealized English teachers: The implicit influence of race in Japan. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 12*, 321–339.

Seargeant, P. (2009). *The idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Segawa, H. (2012). *Sengo nihongo kyôikugaku to nashonarizumu: "Shikô yôshiki gensetu"ni miru hôsetsu to saika no ronri* [Post-war Japanese language teaching and nationalism: The logic of integration and separation as seen in the "discourse of thought patterns"]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, & C. L. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Takahashi, K. (2013). *Language learning, gender and desire: Japanese women on the move*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Terasawa, T. (2015). *"Nihonjin to eigo" no shakai gaku* [Sociology of "Japanese people and English"]. Tokyo: Kenkyûsha.

Torikai, K. (2014). *Eigo kyôiku ronsô kara kangaeru* [Reflections on the debates on English language teaching]. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobô.

Tsuda, Y. (1990). *Eigo shihai no kôzô* [Structures of English domination]. Tokyo: Dai San Shokan.

Tsukada, H. (2013). *The internationalization of higher education as a site of self-positioning: Intersecting imaginations of Chinese international students and universities in Japan* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Yamada, M. (2015). *The role of English teaching in modern Japan: Diversity and multiculturalism through English language education in globalized era*. New York/London: Routledge.

Parallel Language Strategy

Anne Holmen

Contents

Early Developments 302
Major Contributions 303
Work in Progress 306
Problems and Difficulties 308
Future Directions 309
Cross-References 309
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 310
References 310

Abstract

Since the turn of the century, many universities in non-Anglophone Europe have developed new language policies as a response to internationalization of higher education and academia. Researcher and student mobility has extended the use of English as medium of instruction and as medium of research cooperation and dissemination, while national languages are also used for both research and teaching Cots et al. (2014). In addition, they often function as the means of communication both within the university and between the university and society at large. In their language policy, some universities emphasize the use of English, but many aim at a balance between English and the national language(s) for a number of reasons. Arguments of mobility and ranking of universities and publications overlap with discussions about national and international relevance of higher education and research and often the arguments conflict. In the Nordic region where universities are publicly funded and considered a common good, the increased use of English is linked to the new foci of international research funding

A. Holmen (✉)
Centre for Internationalisation and Parallel Language Use, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
e-mail: aholmen@hum.ku.dk

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_26

and commodification of higher education. At the same time, there is a widespread concern for academic domain loss in the national languages (Harder 2009; Jónsson et al. 2013). As a consequence, universities are mandated to strengthen English as well as the national languages for academic purposes. To do this, many universities develop what is often referred to in the Nordic countries as a "parallel language strategy." This chapter will present the background and the theoretical discussions related to the introduction of the strategy and similar aspects of language policy.

Keywords
Parallel language use • Nordic region • Language policy • Higher education

Early Developments

Many universities in non-Anglophone Europe have developed new language policies as a response to internationalization of higher education and academia. They are motivated by an increasing use of English in teaching as well as research on the one hand and by a concern for the role of the national languages in academic domains on the other hand. In the Nordic countries, the balance between the two policy issues is often discussed under the heading of parallel language use. Parallel language use as a strategy for language policy was first introduced in a formal document in the Nordic Declaration of Language Policy in 2006 and was allegedly coined 5 years earlier at a Nordic language policy conference (Jónsson et al. 2013). The conference participants were concerned with the future of the national languages for academic purposes and saw parallel language use as a way of strengthening them as well as English. A similar idea was expressed in the Nordic Declaration of Language Policy from 2006 where "parallel language use" refers to the concurrent use of several languages in a situation where none of the languages abolish or replace each other. In particular, the term refers to the parallel use of English and one of the Nordic national languages. However, the declaration adds that the term may also apply to communication across several Nordic languages and to the language situation of people living in the Nordic countries who have a non-Nordic language as their mother tongue. Thus, the vision behind the declaration was to create a linguistic community of all citizens in the Nordic region by identifying parallel language use as a way of combining local languages with other local languages or with English. The declaration covers a geographical area referred to as "the multilingual Nordic community" which is characterized as a "pioneering region in language issues" because of its members' "endeavors to understand and respect one another's mother tongue" (2006, p. 92) and because language policies in the Nordic countries draw on public funding and aim at functioning transparently and democratically. It was the goal of the declaration to strengthen this so-called Nordic model of language policy and cooperation. However, despite being adopted by the ministers of Nordic affairs in 2006, the declaration has never been implemented in legislation, and in retrospect it

may be viewed as a utopian and unrealistic vision for Nordic language policy in general (Gregersen 2009). But the core term of parallel language use has survived within the domain of higher education, and although being challenged theoretically (e.g., Preisler 2009; Kuteeva 2014), it is frequently used in language policy documents across Nordic universities. In principle, the idea is to promote English as well as the use of the national languages. There are many signs of a rapid anglification taking place: a recent survey has shown that the Nordic countries are now among the European leaders in providing English-taught programs to international as well as domestic students (Wächter and Maiworm 2014) and that there has been a remarkably sharp increase since the turn of the century. Student and researcher mobility both into and out of the Nordic countries also brings about extensive use of English for academic and social purposes and so have publication practices done for a longer period of time. Altogether there has been a gradual expansion of English language use since the 1990s in Nordic academia. Presumably the fairly high level of English competence among the general population in the Nordic countries is a prerequisite for this to happen in a non-Anglophone context. However, the move toward English is only part of the picture. According to an extensive expert report on the language situation at Nordic universities (Gregersen 2014), the national languages have maintained strong positions as medium of instruction at BA level and within, e.g., arts and health professions, but also as the language of university administration at all levels, of most daily interaction among staff and students and of public outreach. This is the case across all five Nordic countries and even within disciplines which, like science and technology, are most prone to accept a shift into English. According to the report, there seems to be a complex division of labor between the two languages in question and a need to maintain and develop both for academic purposes in the local contexts. The intention of striking a balance between the two languages – and potentially also other languages of relevance in the local context – is now often referred to as the parallel language strategy of Nordic universities.

Major Contributions

Some Nordic universities refer explicitly to the terminology of parallel language use in their language policy; others do not. But they all somehow address the issue of finding a balance between English and the local language(s) and in some cases also a balance between English and other foreign languages. In the introduction to the abovementioned Nordic report, Gregersen and Josephson (Gregersen 2014, p. 20, my translation) put it this way: "In other words, all the Nordic universities are already now practicing a kind of parallel language use; two or more languages are being used by the same people for research, teaching, communication and administration." The data put forward in the five country reports in the same volume document this situation of parallel language use. However, Gregersen and Josephson also appeal to responsible bodies at Nordic universities and in Ministries of Education to develop the present situation of parallel language use into what they refer to as intelligent language strategies: "The burning problem is whether we profit enough from the

present kind of parallel language use. . . . An intelligent language strategy will, based on a thorough and recursive discussion, draw on all available language resources to target the research and educational goals set up" (2014, p. 20, my translation). For them an intelligent language strategy will not only be in the shape of a formal document or mere top-down regulation but will involve stakeholders at all levels of the university: the board and central management, deans and their faculties, heads of departments, individual teachers/researchers, students and administrative staff, and they see the crucial point of transformation in the dialogue between stakeholders and in interaction in practice rather than in formal documents. Here they draw on distinctions often found within the theoretical field of language policy between changes instigated as language policy from above through legislation and language management or carried out as language policy from below through language practices (cf. Spolsky 2008; Preisler 2009). Traditionally, the term language policy only carries the former meaning, either referring to institutional rules and regulations in which choice of language or language variety is prescribed or documents which express intentions of promoting or maintaining a given language or several languages in a specific context (see also "► Language Policy in Education. History, Theory and Praxis" by Bernard Spolsky). The language policies written out for Nordic universities are formal documents with one of these functions – either they prescribe or they motivate specific language behaviors. They may align with language practices at different organizational levels of the same university or only with some of these, but they will never be implemented in practice without the dialogue with stakeholders. Besides, as pointed out in several empirical studies (e.g., Söderlundh 2010; Bolton and Kuteeva 2012; Mortensen 2014; Ljosland 2014), language practices within universities formally governed by principles of parallel language use take many forms. They all underline the need to look into language policies as created "from below" to understand the complexity of parallel language use.

In Gregersen and Josephson's introduction to the volume on the language situation at Nordic universities, it is underlined that parallel language use is an empirical fact and that what is up for discussion is how it is shaped in different local contexts (Gregersen 2014, p. 25). However, in another chapter – on how to introduce English-medium instruction – parallel language use is seen as a normative ideal for universities who wish to secure a balance between English and the national language within academia (p. 90). In their analysis of the use of the terms parallel language and domain in Nordic policy documents, Jónsson et al. (2013) find the same combination of sociolinguistic description with normative prescription at the level of institutional and national language planning. They add a distinction between functional and absolute parallel language use. In this they draw on the understanding of the role of national languages expressed in the Nordic Declaration of Language Policy (2006, p. 91) as not only "essential to society" but also "complete" (or absolute) as they "can be used in all areas of society." This links the discourse on parallel language use with the discourse on domain loss concerning the national languages. Jónsson et al. (2013) see the introduction of a parallel language strategy as a tool to secure the continued use of the national languages for academic purposes through guaranteeing their use in educating the next generation of academics and

through furthering the development of scientific terminology within different disciplines. The use of the national languages for teaching and disseminating research is seen as taking place alongside the use of English for the same purposes. Based on their concern for the dominant role of English as the lingua franca of universities and the ensuing domain loss for Nordic languages, Jónsson et al. (2013) distinguish between horizontal and vertical parallel language use. They argue in favor of the Nordic national languages to be continuously developed in order to cater for both the needs of communicating about all relevant disciplines and to be able to do this directed toward research peers and students as well as laymen. Their study, which is based on a fairly large collection of Nordic policy documents, displays the complexity of the concept of parallel language use at policy level. But it also gives voice to a widespread concern among local linguists, politicians, and representatives of the national language councils in the Nordic countries about the future role of the national languages in a higher education sector increasingly dominated by English. A number of sociolinguists have argued against the idea of domain loss as an evitable consequence of parallel language use, based on empirical studies as well as conceptual lack of clarity (see references in Salö 2012). Furthermore, they underline that language mixing is a natural dimension of language use in multilingual communities and should not be rooted out in higher education.

Another theoretical discussion about parallel language use has evolved around how to conceptualize the relationship between the two languages. Preisler (2009) discards the notion of parallel language use because he sees a division of labor between the two languages involved which means that they will be used for different communicative functions and with different symbolic values attached to their use. Because language choice is always embedded in wider social structure and hierarchies, he sees them as complementary rather than parallel languages. In a response to Preisler, Harder maintains the term parallel language use as a wider concept of balanced domain-specific bilingualism which does not necessarily "entail absence of complementarity" (2009, p. 123) since it is not based on an either-or choice between the languages but rather on a both-and. By referring to the domain-specific bilingualism of institutions and people as "balanced," Harder draws on the original definition introduced in the Nordic Declaration of Language Policy where "parallel language use" refers to the concurrent use of several languages in a situation where none of the languages abolish or replace each other. From a sociolinguistic point of view, Preisler (2009) claims that this kind of balance between languages is not realistic in the long run and that the term parallel language is a normative misnomer.

In the preface to a volume on English in Denmark, Harder gives his readers another less theoretical reason for maintaining the terminology of parallel language use: "Parallel Language Use is a central concept because this is the name of the official policy adopted by the Danish authorities in response to a growing unease about the future of Danish" (2009, p. 8). This signals that the introduction of parallel language-related issues at Nordic universities is not only driven by internationalization but also by national language interests often expressed through reports from the national language councils directed to policy-makers. This point is also made by Cots et al. (2014) who include the Nordic countries in what they refer to as "the

European margins," i.e., areas of Europe where universities carry a key responsibility of maintaining and developing a local language for academic purposes and where the local language is not one of the major languages of Europe. But why do publicly funded universities with that responsibility introduce English to the extent which we have seen since the turn of the century? They do that because they see themselves as players in the global market for higher education and English is an instrument to "stay in business" (Mortensen and Haberland 2012). With the increased mobility of students and researchers and the harmonization of teaching programs following the Bologna Treaty in 1999 plus changes in research funding schemes, universities introduce English as a tool to attract their share of fee-paying international students and recruit international scholars to better compete about international research funding (see also "► The Economics of Language Education" by Francois Grin). The five country reports in Gregersen (2014) document similar patterns across the Nordic region: the number of students and researchers with an international background continues to grow, and with the transformation of the academic communities follows an increase in number of programs taught in English, in the share of English-medium textbooks and other teaching material and in the share of MA and PhD theses written in English. There are obvious disciplinary differences with science, technology, and business leaning toward more English and humanities, arts and law being more divided between the national languages and English. The spread of English in academia resembles the use of Latin at medieval European universities. Here, Latin was used as the only means of communication despite the fact that other languages were spoken in the immediate surroundings. However, the present spread of English as the lingua franca of research and as a tool for attracting international students and scholars is different because English is now being used as an instrument of marketization of higher education in competition with or in addition to the local languages which are being maintained to support major institutions of the nation-state (Mortensen and Haberland 2012). The latter is even more important because the Nordic universities of today do not only carry the responsibility of maintaining the national language to cater for the needs of the sectors of education, health, and law but are also characterized by wider participation among students and by a clearer demand for public outreach of research results. In order to develop the "intelligent language strategy" which Gregersen and Josephson call for (see above), it seems necessary not only to find new ways of balancing the use of relevant languages according to the local context but also to raise awareness about the role of languages for, on the one hand, issues of internationalization (e.g., Saarinen 2012) and, on the other hand, teaching and learning practices (e.g., Tange 2012; Kuteeva and Airey 2014).

Work in Progress

Although the concept of parallel language use is still somewhat undeveloped and undertheorized, it has had a clear impact on the creation of language policies within Nordic universities. With the term came an awareness of the status of English, both

as an important means of communication in academia and higher education but also as a possible threat to the position of national languages in the same domain. With the term came also an upsurge of interest in language policy in theory and practice at university level. Thus, a number of empirical studies have shown that there is a high level of general English competence among students and lecturers but also concerns for students' mastery of literacy skills in academic English, for the efficiency of their learning processes, and for lecturers' professional identity and experience with English-medium instruction (e.g., Hellekjær 2005; Jensen and Thøgersen 2011; Pecorari et al. 2011; Tange 2012; Bolton and Kuteeva 2012; Kling 2013). It seems that across the Nordic countries, high-level English for academic purposes is increasingly seen as a necessity but also as an explicit target to pursue for universities who wish to follow up on their language policy. Many universities now offer courses in Academic English for students and some also in-service training and translation services for faculty. Only a few studies have so far focused on similar issues concerning students' or lecturers' competence in the national languages (Háuksdottir 2012; Jürna 2014), despite the fact that a growing share of the university population has international background. The statistical data in the five country reports (Gregersen 2014) give a clear picture of remarkable changes in the composition of the university population within the last 20 years followed by changing patterns of language affiliation and resources. Some mobile students and newly recruited faculty have an academic background from an Anglophone context, whereas others do not, and very few arrive with a mastery of the local language for academic purposes. The growing diversity of students and lecturers is one of the major obstacles for carrying out teaching as parallel language use where both languages are used in the same teaching sessions, either through reading in English and lecturing and group work in the local languages or through language mixing. In addition, students are required to be good at reading in English, as course literature is often dominated by English, irrespective of the chosen medium of instruction. Kuteeva (2014) suggests that the introduction of the parallel language policy at Nordic universities was based on a situation where increased demands of academic English was in focus, but where it was also taken for granted that the university population mastered the national language at native speaker level. In policy terms, the goal was to bring in English in addition to the national language and not in replacement of this. But with that focus, the development of language skills in the national language was often ignored. This applies to newly arrived students and staff with a non-Nordic background but also to a certain extent to students and staff crossing borders within the Nordic region and to students with language minority background from the local context (Holmen 2015). To deal adequately with the language diversity of both students and lecturers appears as a major point of development for the Nordic universities which aim at internationalizing their core activities. Furthermore, according to Jørgensen (2012), the rationale behind parallel language use is guided by a norm of double monolingualism rather than by norms of integrated bilingualism or multilingualism. In general, Nordic universities have been somewhat hesitant about the recommendations to promote plurilingual competencies put forward by the European Union and the Council of Europe. A focal point is the position of other languages than

English and the national language(s) in the universities' language policy. Obviously, parallel language strategies have been formed to balance English and the national language; but there are important reasons for explicitly including other languages as well: curricular traditions, access to knowledge and cultures outside the Anglophone context, globalization of the academic labor market, resources tied to the human capital already present at Nordic universities, etc. So far only universities in Finland have included a goal of plurilingualism in their language policies (Gregersen 2014). However, recently a few Danish universities have decided to prioritize the inclusion of a wider repertoire of foreign languages in their language strategy. The idea behind, e.g., the French, German, and Spanish *Language Profiles* at Roskilde University and the strategy of *More Languages for More Students* at University of Copenhagen is to improve language skills of students across the universities through developing, e.g., academic literacy in a foreign language or language competence for field work or study periods abroad and possibly also by developing more ambitious, new forms of content-and-language integrated learning (Holmen 2015).

Problems and Difficulties

The ways in which parallel language use was first introduced at Nordic universities as a version of double monolingualism has called the attention to a number of problems. One concerns the downplay of other languages than English and the national language. Another concerns the inherent native speaker norm as a benchmark for use of the national language as well as English. This is highly problematic for several reasons. Not only does it misguide attempts to develop language skills which are appropriate for teaching and learning in the relevant Nordic contexts, it also tends to decontextualize language use and language users. By ignoring differences in language use which stem from the specific ways of constructing and transmitting knowledge in specific academic settings, the native speaker norm may be a barrier for developing discipline-specific language skills. According to Kuteeva and Airey (2014), disciplines differ not only in how each language is being used but also in how the two languages in a parallel language situation are connected. Within science and technology, the challenges mainly concern how to develop two sets of terminology with a fairly easy transfer between them. Within humanities and social science where language is a means of constructing knowledge, students and lecturers often need two kinds of academic literacy (one in the local language and one in English). This may explain why some lecturers experience lack of authenticity (Preisler 2014) or barriers to their professional identity (Kling 2013), whereas others see the implementation of the language policy as a mere pragmatic issue. Based on Larsen's (2013) study on exchange students in the University of Copenhagen, one might add that two kinds of academic literacy are not always sufficient for students who cross national and linguistic borders and need to orient themselves toward new learning environments and that similar challenges may be faced by domestic students with a language minority background – a group of students whose language

situation is hardly ever addressed in studies on language policy at Nordic universities (Holmen 2015). Furthermore, there is a concern that anglification may bring about new social barriers among students (Pecorari et al. 2011; Lueg and Lueg 2015). The awareness that "one size does not fit all" and the need to develop differentiated approaches based on finer contextualization of language use seem to be the main conclusion to newer studies on parallel language use.

Future Directions

To judge from the last 15 years, the parallel language strategy has been productive in raising awareness about the role of languages for internationalization of higher education and academia in the "European margins" of Northern Europe – although Saarinen (2012), Gregersen (2014), and others are still justified in arguing that languages should be considered explicitly when universities design their policies of internationalization. Sustainable and intelligent policies must build on the complex, sociolinguistic realities of modern academia, including insight into the role of languages for research and teaching communities and for students' interaction with these and with academic learning issues. In order to strengthen language development for students and staff, more detailed needs analyses in relevant contexts must be developed, but these must be based on the heterogeneity of the post-2000 university population and neither be restricted to English nor take the native speaker norm in the national language for granted. Keeping the languages separate at all costs seems to be an unnecessary and problematic course to take. Studies of language practices (e.g., Söderlundh 2010; Ljosland 2014; Mortensen 2014; Jürna 2014) emphasize that situations of parallel language use in practice are also situations of language contact, language mixing, code-switching, and emergent language forms and norms, which together undermine the definition of parallel language use as nonintegrated use of "complete" languages found in many policy papers. In view of the major challenges that universities face, it is to be hoped that the coming years will bring language policies which are built on the complex relationship between English and the national language as well as other relevant languages and which will draw on the language resources of the actual university population in its breadth. Most likely, there will be a need to fine-tune varieties of English to the Nordic contexts, to bring in a repertoire of other languages to cater for different functional needs, and to be more flexible about norms related to the national languages, e.g., viewing these as academic target languages rather than symbols of nativeness.

Cross-References

► Foreign Language Education in the Context of Institutional Globalization

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Bernard Spolsky: Language Policy in Education. History, Theory and Praxis. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Francois Grin: The Economics of Language Education. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Ofelia García: Translanguaging and Bilingual Education. In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

References

Bolton, K., & Kuteeva, M. (2012). English as an academic language at a Swedish university. Parallel language use and the 'threat' of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33*(5), 429–447.

Cots, J. M., Llurda, E., & Garrett, P. (2014). Language policies and practices in the internationalisation of higher education on the European margins. An introduction. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35*(4), 311–317.

Gregersen, F. (2009). Language policy. A view from the periphery of Europe. In P. Harder (Ed.), *English in Denmark. Language policy, internationalization and University teaching. Angles on the English-speaking world* (pp. 95–108). Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Gregersen, F. (2014). Hvor parallelt. Om parallelspråkighet på Nordens Universitet [How parallel. On parallel language use at Nordic universities]. Nordic Council of Ministers. *TemaNord, 2014*, 535.

Harder, P. (2009). Parallel language use. A case for active social construction. In P. Harder (Ed.), *English in Denmark. Language policy, internationalization and University teaching. Angles on the English-speaking world* (pp. 109–120). Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Háuksdottir, A. (2012). *Dansk som nøglen til uddannelse* [Danish as the key to education]. Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism 68. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.

Hellekjær, G. (2005). *The acid test. Does upper secondary EFL instruction effectively prepare norwegian students for the reading of English textbooks at Colleges and Universities?* PhD thesis, University of Oslo.

Holmen, A. (2015). Linguistic diversity among students in higher education: A resource in a multilingual language strategy? In A. H. Fabricius & B. Preisler (Eds.), *Transcultural interaction and linguistic diversity in higher education* (pp. 116–141). Palgrave: The Student Experience.

Jensen, C., & Thøgersen, J. (2011). University lecturers' attitudes towards English as the medium of instruction. *Iberica, 22*, 13–33.

Jónsson, S., Laurén, C., Myking, J., & Picht, H. (2013). *Parallelspråk och domene. Nordisk språkplanlegging på 2000-tallet med særlig vekt på forsknings- og utdanningssektoren* [Parallel language use and domain. Nordic language planning during the 2000´s with a special focus on research and education].Oslo: Novus.

Jürna, M. (2014). Linguistic realities at the University of Copenhagen. Parallel language use in practice as seen from the perspective of international staff. In A. K. Hultgren, F. Gregersen, & J. Thøgersen (Eds.), *English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices* (pp. 225–249). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jørgensen, J. N. (2012). Ideologies and norms in language and education policies in Europe and their relationship with everyday language behaviours. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 25* (1), 57–71.

Kling, J. (2013). *Teacher identity in English-medium instruction. Teacher cognitions from a Danish tertiary education context*. PhD thesis, University of Copenhagen.

Kuteeva, M. (2014). The parallel language use of Swedish and English. The question of 'nativeness' in university policies and practices. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35*(4), 332–344.

Kuteeva, M., & Airey, J. (2014). Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education. Reflections on recent language policy developments. *Higher Education, 67*, 533–549.

Larsen, S. (2013). *Re-contextualising academic writing in English. Case studies of international students in Denmark*. PhD thesis, University of Copenhagen.

Ljosland, R. (2014). Language planning confronted by everyday communication in the international university. The Norwegian case. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35*(4), 392–405.

Lueg, K., & Lueg, R. (2015). Why do students choose English as a medium of instruction? A bourdieusian perspective on the study strategies of non-native English speakers. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 14*(1), 5–30.

Mortensen, J. (2014). Language policy from below. Language choice in student project groups in a multilingual university setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35*(4), 425–442.

Mortensen, J., & Haberland, H. (2012). English. The new Latin of academia? Danish universities as a case. *International Journal of Sociology of Language, 216*, 175–197.

Nordic Declaration of Language Policy. (2006). Nordic Council of Ministers. http://www.norden.org/pub/kultur/kultur/sk/ANP2007746.pdf.. Accessed 21 July 2015.

Pecorari, D., Shaw, P., Irvine, A., & Malmström, H. (2011). English for academic purposes at Swedish universities. Teachers' objectives and practices. *Iberica, 22*, 55–78.

Preisler, B. (2009). Complementary languages. The national language and English as working languages in European Universities. In P. Harder (Ed.), *English in Denmark. Language policy, internationalization and University teaching. Angles on the English-speaking world* (pp. 10–28). Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Preisler, B. (2014). Lecturing in one's first language or in English as a lingua franca. The communication of authenticity. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia, 46*(2), 218–242.

Saarinen, T. (2012). Internationalization of Finnish higher education. Is language an issue? *International Journal of Sociology of Language, 216*, 157–173.

Salö, L. (2012). Domänförlust som språkideologisk representation. Språkvårdens diskurser om engelska i Sverige [Domain loss as a language ideological representation. Language planning discourses on English in Sweden]. *Nordand, 7*(2), 21–60.

Spolsky, B. (2008). Introduction: What is educational linguistics? In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 1–10). Malden: Blackwell.

Söderlundh, H. (2010). *Internationale universitet – locale språkval. Om bruket av talad svenska i engelskspråkiga kursmiljöer* [International universities – local language choices. On spoken Swedish in English-medium course environments]. PhD thesis, Uppsala University.

Tange, H. (2012). Wars of words: Management policy and employee practice at the International University. *Tamara, 10*(4), 5–15.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (Eds.). (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher education. The state of play in 2014. ACA papers on international cooperation in education*. Bonn: Lemmens.

Second Language Education in Canada

Margaret Early, Diane Dagenais, and Wendy Carr

Contents

Introduction 314
Early Developments 315
Major Contributions 316
Work in Progress 320
Problems and Difficulties 321
Future Directions 322
Cross-References 324
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 324
References 324

Abstract

Second language education in Canada is experienced by diverse populations in different ways across the country. English language learners (ELLs) comprise a significant number of those enrolled in second official language programs, and they are supported to varying degrees according to province or territory. Canada is renowned for its pedagogical approaches to integrated language and content learning, and recent research continues to explore this tradition, tracking both

M. Early (✉) • W. Carr (✉)
Department of Language and Literacy Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
e-mail: margaret.early@ubc.ca; wendy.carr@ubc.ca

D. Dagenais (✉)
Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, BC, Canada
e-mail: dagenais@sfu.ca

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_27

successes, such as the development of twenty-first-century literacies and multilingual pedagogies, and challenges, such as the exclusion of ELLs from mainstream official language classrooms.

The majority of Canadian students learn French as a second language in Core French classes. Several studies underscore the challenges faced by teachers who lack sufficient linguistic or methodological background or, in some cases, support, leading to less than satisfactory student performance and high attrition rates. The introduction of the *Common European Framework of Reference* and language portfolios has created a shift in some regions to adopt an action-oriented pedagogical approach with greater learner autonomy.

Work in progress includes research on identity and investment, innovative and inclusive pedagogical approaches, and resistance to monolingual teaching norms. The problem of ELLs' low success rates in high school is being addressed by efforts to support teacher professional learning at preservice and in-service levels. The integration of transformative multilingual and multimodal practices that draw on the full range of students' repertoires (in school, at home, and in the community) is seen as key for the future.

Keywords

Multilingual • Official language • Multiliteracies • French as a second language • Core French • English language learners • Integrated language and content • CEFR

Introduction

Canada is an increasingly multilingual country comprised of ten provinces and three territories, with two official languages, English and French. According to the 2011 Census of Population (Statistics Canada 2011), approximately 58% of the population reported English as their mother tongue, 22% French, and 20% a mother tongue other than English or French. According to the same census, nearly 213,400 people reported speaking an Aboriginal language most often or regularly at home.

The provinces and territories are responsible for education, and each has distinct policies and curricula, providing funding for education solely or jointly with local tax revenues. The Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, facilitates key activity areas of common interest, and the federal government provides partial funding to support programs for official minority languages (i.e., English or French where the other dominates). In view of such diverse geopolitical and economic factors, second language education has developed variously across regions and language program types. The following sections identify some of the more significant contributions, issues and initiatives that have been undertaken.

Early Developments

To contextualize early developments in second language (L2) education[1] in Canada: in response to growing domestic tensions, the federal government explicitly addressed issues of linguistic and cultural diversity, during the 1960s. In 1969, the Official Languages Act was enacted to give French and English equal status as Canada's official languages. Shortly thereafter, an Official Languages in Education (OLE) program, cost-shared by the federal government was established to encourage learning of both official languages. In 1982, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, entrenched in the constitution, reinforced official language rights, and in 1988 the Multiculturalism Act acknowledged Canada's ethnocultural diversity. Following the Official Languages Act, provisions were made for school students to learn the official language that is non-dominant in their province. Provisions were also made for instruction in other languages. The choice of other languages offered was, and remains, generally determined by school districts. Provinces/territories vary regarding when L2 courses begin and the mandatory grade level for completion, as a required course for graduation.

Yet, Canada's linguistic and cultural diversity has long been more complex than official policies at all levels of governance might suggest. The 2011 Census of Population (Statistics Canada 2011) reported that approximately 20.6% of the total population is foreign born, the highest proportion of foreign born population among G8 countries. Additionally, there are substantial numbers of Canadian born students who speak a language other than English or French at home and require support in the official language that is the medium of instruction in their school/province.

Provincial funding and resources have been available, from their earliest provision, for English language learning (ELL) programs in English medium schools, *francisation* classes in Francophone minority schools outside Quebec, and *classes d'accueil* (welcoming classes) in the French schools of Quebec. However, there exists no pan-Canadian, coherent, federal profile of policies, programs, and provisions concerning these services. Thus, it is difficult to present a single, unified account of early developments in L2 education across the country. Information and policy documents on provincial Ministry of Education websites reveal some similarities but significant variation for programs regarding such matters as service delivery models, instructional approaches, curriculum and assessment instruments, teacher certification requirements, resources for teachers, funding amounts per pupil per year, definition of qualifying students, time caps in programs, and credits toward graduation. Moreover, Mady and Turnbull's (2010) review revealed that federal policy documents have not acknowledged that nonofficial languages users might seek to learn both official languages. This oversight has been subsequently replicated

[1] In Canada, second language education refers to instruction provided to students in a language other than their first language. Second language programs are offered in a range of languages including both official languages.

in provincial/territorial educational policies. Thus, speakers of nonofficial languages, instructed in one official language, cannot ensure that they will receive L2 education in the other. Exclusion of ELLs from Core French classes often occurs because it is assumed that they cannot learn the two official languages simultaneously. Findings from subsequent studies (e.g., Mady 2008) have shown that ELLs perform as well as their non-ELL peers.

Provinces/territories also vary in the extent to which they have historically supported heritage language (HL) education in schools and which ones. As well, as Duff (2008) notes, designation of language courses as heritage or non-heritage (e.g., "international" L2s, in federal documents and provincial curricula) can be politically motivated. She provides an historical perspective on HL in Canada, together with a comprehensive review of Canadian research on HL education, plus a discussion of current and future issues (see also Duff and Li 2009).

Within this complex landscape, Canada remains renowned for its early development and innovative use of various language and content approaches to L2 pedagogy, immersion education being the most prominent. French immersion, which began in Quebec in the 1960s, teaches students through the medium of the L2, across the curriculum subject areas. These immersion programs served as a model for programs across Canada and internationally (see also Fred Genesee and Joseph Dicks, "► Bilingual Education in Canada" for an extensive review of bilingual education in Canada). One distinct but related area of early development addressed here is integrated language and content (ILC) teaching for ELLs.

ILC teaching has been influenced by several factors, arguably including immersion programs, Cummins' (1981) theory of social and academic language proficiency, and Mohan's (1986) theoretical contributions relating language and content teaching. It has been variously, albeit inconsistently, implemented in elementary and secondary classrooms across Canada since the 1970s/1980s. In some jurisdictions, for example, the Vancouver School District in British Columbia, English mother tongue, school-wide language across the curriculum policies/projects was also influential. Work in ILC teaching is one area of major contribution, along with contributions concerning teaching Core French as a second language that will be discussed in the following section (for related reviews, see Dagenais (2013) regarding multilingualism in Canada, policies, and education, Duff (2008) on heritage languages, and Lapkin et al. (2009) for a comprehensive literature review on Core French).

Major Contributions

As stated above, integrated language and content (ILC) instruction has been a major contribution to second language education in Canada. While, as previously noted, some ELL teachers had already been using this approach; it came to the fore in a more coordinated effort in the 1980s. Mohan published his seminal book *Language and Content* (1986). Working within a systemic functional linguistics perspective and based on a view of language as discourse in the context of social practice, Mohan's heuristic "A Knowledge Framework" looks explicitly at the role of

language and discourse within social practice to design tasks that intentionally address both the language and content area learning objectives. This work and related projects are reported in the 2001 special issue of *The Canadian Modern Language Review* on immersion and content-based instruction. Without providing an exhaustive review, other noteworthy contributions include a two-year ethnographic study by Duff (2004) in a Vancouver secondary school with a high concentration of students from Asian backgrounds. Her work revealed the discursive and cultural challenges faced by ELL students in mainstream social studies classes. In addition, Toohey, Waterstone, and Julé (2000) examined how more or less proficient speakers of English engaged in classroom activities, illuminating how their interpersonal relationships are implicated in their speech practices. Their findings indicated how adult participation practices may hinder or enhance opportunities for young ELL students' participation in learning. Roessingh and colleagues (see Roessingh 2004, for a review) have conducted a number of studies to report on their experiences of building an effective ELL program.

Several studies (e.g., Garnett 2010; Gunderson et al. 2014; Watt and Roessingh 2001) have also researched ELLs' dropout and graduation success rates in content/subject-area mainstream programs. Collectively, these studies highlight the challenges in tracking dropout (and "disappearance") rates, as well as variations in findings across studies. However, ethnocultural differences regarding academic and graduation success rates and issues related to socioeconomic status have emerged consistently. Some of these findings are discussed further in the "Problems and Difficulties" section below.

One of the most significant contributions to research is recent work exploring how L2 education might incorporate twenty-first-century literacies and multilingual pedagogies to take into account and build on the wide variety of languages, communication practices, and digital competencies that students bring to learning across the curriculum. A range of projects, many of them teacher-researcher collaborations, has been undertaken in different regions of the country, and most are situated in schools that enroll students from diverse language backgrounds (see Dagenais 2013, for a more detailed review). Various approaches have been adopted, including language awareness activities, dual language books, and child-produced videos, to name just a few that are described below.

In a Canada-wide *Multiliteracies (ML) Project* (www.multiliteracies.ca) that begun in 2002, teams of researchers and teachers, primarily in the Vancouver and Greater Toronto school boards, collaboratively implemented various approaches to supporting ELL multiliteracies development (see also Per Urlaub: "▶ Second Language Literacy Research and Curriculum Transformation in US Postsecondary Foreign Language Education" in this volume). These included the creation of multimodal dual language texts; digital sister-class projects, the use of the students' home languages in cross-language transfer to facilitate subject-area and academic literacy learning, both L1 and L2; and the design of multimodal pedagogical activities and spaces that afforded ELL students' opportunities and capacities to access knowledge from multiple perspectives and to forge links between the discourses of school, family, and community lives. Teachers in this project reported that issues around assessment

and accountability constrained their innovative efforts. A complementary study was conducted in three Vancouver schools to investigate the viability of Internet-based, teacher-authored accounts as an alternative accountability procedure in conveying to stakeholders students' multiliterate accomplishments and achievements (Potts forthcoming).

Moreover, drawing on Norton's (2000/2013) theoretical perspectives, research related to identity, investment, and language learning has also made a major contribution (see Bonny Norton: "▶ Language and Social Identity"). For instance, the term "identity texts" was first used in the context of the ML project, in an attempt to capture characteristics of the work produced by ELLs that drew on diversity, affirmed students' identities, encouraged them to use their multilingual abilities to understand and communicate knowledge, and to employ a wide range of modalities to make meaning. A number of case studies from the ML and other projects are reported in Cummins and Early (2011). A special issue of *Writing & Pedagogy* (Taylor and Cummins 2011) also reports Canadian researchers-teachers' contributions in this area, as do contributions to two special issues of *TESOL Quarterly*, both edited by Canadian scholars – Plurilingualism in TESOL: Promising controversies (Taylor and Snoddon 2013) and Multimodality in TESOL (Early et al. 2015).

In Vancouver, Darvin and Norton (2014) report on a project in a secondary school wherein students created their own personal digital stories that afforded them opportunities to draw on their transnational literacies. Learners' bilingual identities were affirmed as they were given choice concerning the language of narration and use of subtitles. Their findings also demonstrate how social class is implicated in the different social and learning trajectories of learners.

In another Vancouver-based project, a teacher-researcher team (Denos et al. 2009) worked in English language elementary schools and drew on children's knowledge of cultural practices as the basis for developing various print and visual literacy activities. For example, students of Punjabi-Sikh origin helped document the cultural resources and out-of-school language practices in their community. In another activity, students participated in intergenerational bilingual storytelling sessions that were recorded on digital devices, which formed the basis of child-produced drawings and bilingual narratives (Marshall and Toohey 2010).

In Toronto, Lotherington (2011) led a multiyear teacher-researcher collaboration in one elementary school and developed several novel teaching approaches, including multilingual storytelling using digital technologies to explore ways of bridging the gap between home and school literacies. The students also learned to become performers, narrators, and programmers, of mini-games and hypertext stories, in these 21st literacy projects (see more at http://multiliteracies4kidz.blog.yorku.ca).

Similarly, teacher-researcher groups working in Vancouver investigated how video production at school helped children represent their out-of-school practices in ways not possible in print literacy. In one project, Toohey et al. (2012) described how elementary and secondary age ELLs in India, Mexico, and Canada benefit from the production and exchange of videos about their lives because they were able to display competencies in different languages as they narrated their films and showcased their talents. In a second project, reported in a 2015 special issue of *TESOL*

Quarterly on multimodality, a team of researchers and teachers led by Toohey and Dagenais explored how the production of videos on sustainability and social justice by ELLs in a Vancouver elementary school enabled them to draw on their own experiences and make choices about the semiotic resources and materials needed to communicate their messages powerfully.

Shifting the focus from English language learning to French, the most common program option in Canada for approximately 85% of children who learn French is Core French. However, as Carr (2007) notes, lack of sufficient contact time and intensity together with limited teacher expertise has contributed to results that are less than satisfactory. Widespread complaints about the programs, along with negative attitudes toward L2s, and the dissatisfaction of teachers with their assignments are described by Lapkin et al. (2009) in their comprehensive review of the literature on Core French. They report that only 3% of Grade 9 Core French students continue in the program to high school completion. Their review, organized around three main topics (student diversity, delivery models, and instructional approaches), provides an extensive overview of major contributions and issues related to Core French.

Lapkin et al.'s (2009) findings concerning instructional approaches include the Accelerative Integrated Method (AIM), characterized by an exclusive use of the target language in the classroom; contextualized language experiences through stories, fables, and songs; the selection of high-frequency words used by native speakers; and the use of gestures associated with vocabulary words. Lapkin, Mady, and Arnott report that this approach has spread rapidly in Canada, and it is now estimated that a third of Core French students are exposed to it. Bourdages and Vignola (2014) conducted a case study of the application of AIM in a Grade 3 Core French classroom in Ontario and found that students exposed to AIM used French much more frequently in class than those who were not exposed to it and were more involved in oral expression in class, even though instruction was teacher-centered and students participated frequently in vocabulary repetition activities as a group. Conversely, Mady et al. (2009) studied students in 12 Core French classes (six that used AIM and six that did not) within one Ontario school board, testing them in listening, speaking, reading, and writing French, followed by an attitudinal questionnaire. They found no significant differences in performance or attitude between the two groups.

In their editorial to a special issue on trends in second language teaching and teacher education, Carr et al. (2011) identified the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) as a theme that interests French and English second language educators. While still far from widespread in classrooms across Canada, the authors see the engagement with the CEFR in Canadian schools as marking a paradigm shift in learning, teaching, and assessment of languages toward a greater emphasis on learner autonomy and action-oriented approaches in second language education. A subsequent special issue edited by Little and Taylor (2013) focused on pedagogical innovations based on the CEFR and the European Language Portfolio, including teacher reflection, goal-based instruction, student learning using a portfolio, and implications for teacher education and development.

Work in Progress

Many of the scholars whose works are cited in the "Major Contributions" section are continuing their lines of research with work in progress. For example, Darvin and Norton are further contributing to theory and research on language, identity, and investment through research on digital literacies with Filipino students, from diverse backgrounds, in secondary school contexts, in Vancouver. Early and Kendrick are conducting an exploratory study examining the affordances and challenges of an inquiry-based approach for enhancing multilingual and monolingual students' literacy learning for the new economic and social realities of the twenty-first century. Gunderson and colleagues (e.g., Gunderson et al. 2014) are researching and developing L2 assessment measures and issues regarding "kinetic diversity." Naqvi and colleagues (e.g., Naqvi et al. 2012) are currently conducting research in elementary classrooms in Calgary that extends Naqvi's previous work using dual language books, together with other empowering multilingual approaches, to enhance learners' metalinguistic awareness and demonstrate how transculturalism can be employed to reimagine pedagogy. Also in Calgary, Roessingh continues her research on the role of vocabulary and reading on the long-term academic success of ELLs. In Toronto, Cummins et al. (2015) continue to work with educators in the greater Toronto region to research the effect of teaching through a multilingual lens on students' identity affirmation and achievement. Lotherington, Jensen, and colleagues' teacher-researcher collaborations around new literacies in multicultural classrooms are ongoing. Toohey and Dagenais are currently examining how teachers in French and English schools in Vancouver are taking up *ScribJab* (www.scribjab.com), a website and iPad application that enables authors to produce, illustrate, record, and publish online dual language books. Thus far, authors of different ages, from preschool children to adults, have produced over 300 books in over 20 languages at their level of development. Armand and teams of teachers (www.elodil.umontreal.ca) are developing language awareness pedagogies and have produced a series of videos that offer concrete illustrations of multilingual teaching practices in Quebec schools. Their website provides a wealth of resources for teachers, including lesson plans and assessment tools.

These projects suggest that a grassroots transformation in language teaching is taking place in several locations where Canadian educators are negotiating space for the inclusion of more languages in classrooms, despite policy measures that do not support such inclusion. Educators are pushing back at monolingual policies that have marginalized learners who speak nonofficial languages and resisting the pressure to conform to a monolingual teaching norm.

With respect to assessing French second language student proficiency, there has been some interest in Canada in implementing the European *Diplôme d'études de langue française* (DELF) in a number of jurisdictions. Based on a study in one Ontario school district, Vandergrift (2012) found that students, teachers, and parents thought this assessment tool to be a fair and appropriate measure of French proficiency. His analysis highlights how little empirical research there has been on this

test both in Canada and Europe and signaled some problems with the listening tasks, unfamiliar cultural references, and the cost.

Problems and Difficulties

Despite the innovations and collective efforts of researchers, teachers, and other stakeholders, problems and difficulties remain in L2 education in Canada. Derwing and Munro (2007) reviewed the policies that gave rise to English as a second language (ESL) instruction offered to children and youth in English language schools and Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC), an ESL program available to adults outside Quebec. Important challenges and difficulties that emerged from their review still need to be addressed in both contexts. These include a lack of ELL-focused teacher education and administrative oversight in schools and the fact that federally funded LINC programs for adults are plagued by problems such as regional inequities in the amount of language training available, the quality of instruction, and the preparation of teachers.

Other problems in L2 education in schools for English language learning continue to be, as noted above, that high school completion/graduation is not attained by an unacceptably high percentage of migrant learners. Studies indicated variation across ethnocultural background, and while some studies reported a high correlation with socioeconomic status, Garnett (2010) revealed that, "an indicator of socio-economic status only partially attenuates its [ethno-cultural background] effects" (p. 677). So, disaggregating data from large-scale studies and undertaking follow-up studies to better understand which particular populations are most "at risk," with respect to academic success and secondary school completion, and why, is overdue. Addressing the educational needs of all migrant students to achieve their full potential is a continuing challenge across jurisdictions. Cummins and Early (2015) argue for the importance of developing school-based language policies to address administrative oversights and lack of ELL-focused preservice teacher training and in-service professional development, such as reported by Derwing and Munro (2007). Cummins and Early provide a template to assist schools to engage in a collaborative language and instructional planning process that engages all educators and invites parental involvement.

Similarly, issues around inadequate teacher preparation remain a problem in Core French, together with the challenges of how to improve the language proficiency of classroom teachers who are required to teach Core French (Carr 2007; Lapkin et al. 2006).

In 2010, the *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* published a special issue on second language teacher education that focused on challenges and opportunities experienced by teachers and teacher educators. Articles in this issue examined innovative practices, such as study abroad for FSL teachers, peer feedback among native and nonnative English speaking student teachers, preservice teachers' participation in a WebCT discussion forum, use of language portfolios, and teacher preparation for Core French generalists. Contributors from across Canada had

participated in a national symposium involving researchers and teacher educators from the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers, and the Society for the Promotion of the Teaching of English as a Second Language in Quebec. Another theme explored in the issue was inclusion of diverse learners in French second language classrooms. The challenge for second language educators and policy-makers at all levels is to recognize, and innovatively capitalize on, the rich linguistic diversity that exists in Canadian classrooms. Too commonly, de facto "English Only" and "French Only" policies prevail resulting in missed opportunities for students' development of heritage (academic) language competence over the course of their schooling in an official language medium. Concurrently, "international" language teaching, such as Spanish and Mandarin, too commonly results in high dropout rates and unsatisfactory results despite the presence of large numbers of speakers of these languages who could be called upon as resources in Canadian schools. There remains much to be done to break down the boundaries restricting fluid use of diverse languages in classrooms and in developing corresponding language programs and policies. There are, therefore, a number of current problems in second language education in Canada that demand redress, some of which are considered in the next section.

Future Directions

As pointed out above, with respect to English language learning in schools, the literature regarding multilingual learners reveals that they adopt a variety of multilingual and multimodal practices at home and in the community that are not commonly drawn on as resources in schools. Yet, research such as the multilingual/multimodal projects reported in this review provides sound evidence that these pedagogies are engaging for learners since they enable them to produce richly layered texts in different languages and multiple modalities. Moreover, they are more inclusive of the students' families and communities and affirm and impact identity constructions. So, one direction for future studies is to expand these pedagogies into a larger variety of educational contexts, including content-based classrooms, particularly in secondary school contexts, which to date have been under researched. Attention to how language and other modes work to construct knowledge across disciplines and transculturally also deserves more systematic focus in future research studies. It would be interesting and important to address the effect of L2 education in these multilingual and transcultural learning environments on monolingual students from an official language background. Additionally, it will be vital to research the relative benefits of transformative multiliteracies pedagogies for diverse student groups across linguistic, ethnocultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Recent studies in this area are generally case studies or ethnographies conducted over months or years, but there are, to our knowledge, no research studies on the

long-term effects of such transformative pedagogies that draw on the full range of students' semiotic and communicative repertoires. There is a clear need for long-term tracking studies of students who have been participants in classrooms where rich multilingual/multimodal pedagogies are employed. Such studies have the potential to heighten understanding with respect to (a) how these changes in pedagogy will shape language practices and constructions of multilinguals and multilingualism in the future and (b) importantly the long-term impact of such pedagogies on student achievement. The role and affordances of digital tools would constitute an important component of these studies.

With respect to teaching Core French, we draw from the Lapkin et al. (2009) review to suggest that future directions for research should include researching and documenting effective, inclusive teaching practices and varied approaches or teaching models, e.g., intensive or compacted formats, so that these might be clearly articulated and the information widely distributed. Like the ELL pedagogies described above, here too the affordances of digital tools warrant further research. Issues regarding ELLs and other minority populations in French second language programs are another area for future inquiry. Moreover, as has been mentioned above, there is considerable interest in establishing realistic, research-based objectives for Core French, supporting students as autonomous language learners (see Kristmanson et al. 2013) and making second language classrooms more inclusive (Arnett and Mady 2013).

Enduring challenges exist in the field of second language education in a country with two official languages (English and French) and diverse populations learning these and other languages. ELLs, with notable exceptions, still do not enjoy the same potential for school success because they are often not exposed to appropriate pedagogical approaches to delivering content and language, which speaks to inadequate teacher education or professional development. Further, many ELLs continue to face policy-driven exclusion from second (or, in many cases, additional) language classrooms where their English learning could be enhanced as they acquire an additional language. Another ongoing challenge relates to the lack of linguistic and methodological expertise among many of the country's Core French teachers, contributing to low proficiency and high attrition among secondary school students (more pronounced in western provinces). All of these are areas that require attention in the future with respect to theory and praxis, including research and policy, programs, and provisions, in teacher education programs and education systems across the country.

At the same time, innovative practices and rich research agendas show promise in multilingual, multimodal, and inclusive second language education as well as in pedagogies informed by the *Common European Framework of Reference*, including the valuing of student autonomy, an action-oriented approach to teaching and learning, and use of portfolio-based assessment. These developments, together with strong interest among researchers and educators alike, bode well for the future of Canadian second language education.

Cross-References

▶ Second Language Literacy Research and Curriculum Transformation in US Postsecondary Foreign Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Donna Patrick: Language Policy and Education in Canada. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Bonny Norton: Language and Social Identity. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Joseph Dicks: Bilingual Education in Canada. In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

Bonny Norton: Identity, Language Learning and Critical Pedagogies in Digital Times. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

Dr. Diane Pesco: Language Socialization in Canadian Indigenous Communities. In Volume: Language Socialization

References

Arnett, K., & Mady, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Minority populations in Canadian second language education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bourdages, J., & Vignola, M. J. (2014). Profil lexical à l'oral d'élèves de français langue seconde exposés à l'approche gestuelle AIM. *Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée/Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 78–100.

Carr, W. (2007). *Teaching core French in British Columbia: Teachers' perspectives*. Resource document. BC Association of Teachers of Modern Languages. http://www.bcatml.org/CFinBC2007.pdf. Accessed 2 Jun 2015.

Carr, W., Dicks, J., & Lapkin, S. (Eds.). (2011). Special issue on trends in second language teaching and teacher education. *Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée/The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(1).

Cummins, J. (1981). Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. *Applied Linguistics, II*(2), 132–149.

Cummins, J., & Early, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Cummins, J., & Early, M. (2015). *Big ideas for expanding minds: Teaching English language learners across the curriculum*. Toronto: Rubicon Press/Pearson Canada.

Cummins, J., Hu, S., Markus, P., & Montero, M. K. (2015). Identity texts and academic achievement: Connecting the dots in multilingual school contexts. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*(3), 555–581.

Dagenais, D. (2013). Multilingualism in Canada: Policy and education in applied linguistics research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 3*(2), 286–301.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2014). Social class, identity, and migrant students. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 13*(2), 111–117.

Denos, C., Toohey, K., Neilson, K., & Waterstone, B. (2009). *Teacher research in multilingual classrooms*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2007). Canadian policies on immigrant language education. In R. Joshee & L. Johnson (Eds.), *Multicultural education policies in Canada and the United States* (pp. 93–106). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Duff, P. (2004). Intertextuality and hybrid discourses: The infusion of pop culture in educational discourse. *Linguistics and Education, 14*(3-4), 231–276.

Duff, P. (2008). Heritage language education in Canada. In D. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 71–90). New York: Routledge.

Duff, P., & Li, D. (2009). Indigenous, minority and heritage language education in Canada. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 66*(1), 1–8.

Early, M., Kendrick, M., & Potts, D. (2015). Multimodality in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*(3), 447–460.

Garnett, B. (2010). Toward understanding the academic trajectories of ESL youth. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 66*(5), 677–710.

Gunderson, L., D'Silva, R., & Murphy Odo, D. (2014). *English only instruction and immigrant students in secondary schools: A critical examination* (3rd ed.). Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Kristmanson, P., Lafargue, C., & Culligan, K. (2013). Experiences with autonomy: Learners' voices on language learning. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 6*(4), 462–486.

Lapkin, S., MacFarlane, A., & Vandergrift, L. (2006). *Teaching French as a second language in Canada: Teachers' perspectives*. Resource document. Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers. https://www.caslt.org/pdf/FSL-Report-En.pdf. Accessed 2 Jun 2015.

Lapkin, S., Mady, C., & Arnott, S. (2009). Research perspectives on Core French: A literature review. *Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée/The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12*(2), 6–30.

Little, D., & Taylor, S. (Eds.). (2013). Special issue on implementing the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and the European Language Portfolio: Lessons for future research. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 69*(4).

Lotherington, H. (2011). *Pedagogy of multiliteracies: Rewriting Goldilocks*. New York: Routledge.

Mady, C. (2008). *Opening the doors to official language learning for allophones*. Resource document. Canadian Parents for French. http://cpf.ca/en/files/04_Allophone_E.pdf. Accessed 2 Jun 2015.

Mady, C., & Turnbull, M. (2010). Learning French as a second language: Reserved for Anglophones? *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 99*, 1–23.

Mady, C., Arnott, S., & Lapkin, S. (2009). Assessing AIM: A study of grade 8 students in an Ontario school board. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 65*(5), 703–729.

Marshall, E., & Toohey, K. (2010). Representing family: Community funds of knowledge,bilingualism, and multimodality. Harvard Educational Review, 80, 221–241.

Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading: Addison Wesley.

Naqvi, R., Thorne, K., Pfitscher, C., Nordstokke, D., & McKeough, A. (2012). Reading dual language books: Improving early literacy skills in linguistically diverse classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Research, 11*(1), 3–15.

Norton, B. (2000/2013). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow: Longman/Pearson Education.

Potts, D. (forthcoming). *Multimodality, multilingualism and the recontextualization of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Roessingh, H. (2004). Effective high school ESL programs: A synthesis and meta- analysis. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 60*(5), 611–636.

Statistics Canada. (2011). *Linguistic characteristics of Canadians: Language, 2011 census of population*. Government of Canada. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/assa/98-314-x/98-314-x2011001-eng.pdf. Accessed 14 Feb.

Taylor, S. K., & Cummins, J. (2011). Second language writing practices, identity, and the academic achievement of children from marginalized social groups: A comprehensive review. *Writing & Pedagogy, 3*(2), 183–188.

Taylor, S. K., & Snoddon, K. (2013). Plurilingualism in TESOL: Promising controversies. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3), 439–445.

Toohey, K., Waterstone, B., & Julé, A. (2000). Community of learners, carnival and participation in a Punjabi-Sikh classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 56*(3), 421–436.

Toohey, K., Dagenais, D., & Schulze, L. (2012). Second language learners making video in three contexts. *Language and Literacies, 14*(2), 75–96.

Vandergrift, L. (2012). *The DELF in Canada: Stakeholder perceptions*. Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers. https://www.acpi.ca/documents/Delf_anglais.pdf. Accessed 2 Jun 2015.

Watt, D., & Roessingh, H. (2001). The dynamics of ESL drop-out: Plus ça change. . . . *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne de langues vivantes, 58*(2), 203–222.

Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in the Asia-Pacific Region

Yuko Goto Butler

Contents

Introduction 328
Early Developments 329
The Initial Implementation Context of CLT and TBLT in the Asia-Pacific Region 329
Major Contributions 330
Highlighting the Importance of Contextualized Implementation 330
Work in Progress 332
Recent Progress: Searching for Contextualized Adaptations 332
Problems and Difficulties 333
Future Directions 335
Cross-References 337
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 337
References 337

Abstract

Communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based language teaching (TBLT) were introduced to Asia as an alternative to traditional methods to teaching second/foreign languages, such as the grammar-translation method. Since then, CLT and TBLT have grown in popularity and have been promoted as central components in curricula and syllabi in many countries in the Asia-Pacific region. In several studies, however, researchers have observed that CLT and TBLT are often not used as intended in Asian classrooms, and they have also identified a number of challenges and constraints that teachers face when implementing these pedagogies. More recently, various innovative strategies to implementing CLT/TBLT in Asian classrooms have been taken, including

Y.G. Butler (✉)
Educational Linguistics Division, University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education, Philadelphia, PA, USA
e-mail: ybutler@gse.upenn.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_28

negotiating with local factors and adapting CLT/TBLT to work with existing methods. Such adaptations highlight the importance of contextualization when implementing CLT/TBLT.

Although CLT and TBLT have gradually gained wider acceptance in Asian classrooms, a few unsolved issues remain, such as (a) how to situate CLT/TBLT in highly exam-oriented educational systems and societies, (b) how to incorporate form-focused instruction in CLT/TBLT to meet the needs of the learners and to maximize learning outcomes, (c) and how best to support teachers in employing CLT/TBLT. The adaptations of CLT/TBLT in Asia also illustrate that there is no such thing as a universally best pedagogical method or approach across context and time, whether CLT, TBLT, or any other approach. This chapter concludes by suggesting future directions for research and pedagogy on CLT/TBLT in Asia. The findings confirm the importance of having a flexible approach to implementing CLT/TBLT in Asian contexts.

Keywords
Communicative language teaching (CLT) • Task-based language teaching (TBLT) • Task-based assessment • Technology • Asia-Pacific region

Introduction

Traditional, structure-based language teaching, such as grammar and translation methods, has faced repeated criticism for not being effective in the Asia-Pacific region. With the growing need for international communication, policy makers and educators in various Asian nations have recognized communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based language teaching (TBLT) as promising pedagogies for their citizens' second/foreign language learning and have promoted CLT/TBLT to teachers, often through top-down policies.

Despite policy intentions, however, the implementation of CLT/TBLT in Asia has faced a number of challenges. Specifically, in order to respond to stakeholders' needs, various modifications and adaptations have been made. Viewing such adaptation processes as a way of contextualizing these teaching approaches, rather than as inappropriate implementations of them, this chapter highlights the importance of contextualizing all pedagogical approaches, including CLT/TBLT, to meet local needs. The chapter also sheds light on unsolved challenges in the contextualization of CLT/TBLT in Asia and presents suggestions for future directions for CLT/TBLT implementation.

The majority of research papers on CLT/TBLT in the Asia-Pacific region have come from selected areas, such as China (including Hong Kong), Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. Research from other areas in the region has been relatively limited. Therefore, the following discussion inevitably depends on the information from those areas where research has been conducted; more research from other areas

would be of great benefit to enhance our understanding of CLT/TBLT implementation in the region. Finally, the terms *Asia-Pacific region* and *Asia* are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

Early Developments

The Initial Implementation Context of CLT and TBLT in the Asia-Pacific Region

CLT was introduced to Asia in the 1970s, followed thereafter by TBLT. The premise of CLT is to develop communicative competence through meaningful interactions, as opposed to the traditional methods, which primarily focus on language forms and structures. However, CLT is far from "a monolithic and uniform approach" (Ellis 2003, p. 28). From the outset, CLT has taken two broad forms: weak CLT and strong CLT. While both emphasize communication, they differ in important ways. Proponents of weak CLT say that language functions, which should be the primary target of language learning, can be identified and analyzed systematically and can be taught by incorporating communicative activities into syllabi and materials. In contrast, strong CLT, grounded in proposals such as Krashen and Terrell's (1983) natural approach, advocates that language acquisition is only possible through natural communication without any direct control by the teacher (Littlewood 2014).

The importance of communicative competence in a foreign language, English in particular, was repeatedly addressed among educators, business communities, and policy makers in Asia, but CLT did not gain wide recognition in the region until the late 1980s and the early 1990s. Soon thereafter CLT became a central component of curricula and syllabi in many nations in the region, including China, Hong Kong, Japan, Malaysia, South Korea, and Vietnam (Nunan 2003). But CLT was often realized in the policies as "a new and unquestionable orthodoxy" (Littlewood 2014, p. 359), and such treatment was partially responsible for teachers' confusion about and resistance to it, as described below.

TBLT became popular in Asia in the late 1990s, and the term *tasks* has gradually replaced *communicative activities* in policy and educational documents since then. However, the relationship between CLT and TBLT is not totally clear. Some researchers consider TBLT to be "the latest realization of CLT" (Nunan 2003, p. 606), while others consider TBLT to be a post-method pedagogy not associated with any particular method (Kumaravadivelu 2006). As with CLT, TBLT is not a unitary pedagogy. The definition of *a task* itself varies among researchers, although all definitions share certain core features, such as focusing on meaning, having a clear communicative goal, and involving real-world language use (Skehan 1998). Also like CLT, TBLT has a weak version and a strong version. Weak TBLT (also referred to as *task-supported language teaching*) allows learners to use tasks as a means of analyzing language, whereas strong TBLT advocates subconscious learning only through tasks. Thus, in strong TBLT, the syllabus should be exclusively

composed of tasks. Reports indicate that the introduction of TBLT in Asia resulted in similar confusion and resistance among teachers as generated by the earlier introduction of CLT.

In sum, with globalization, many Asian countries became concerned about their citizens' insufficient communicative skills in English (and other second/foreign languages). The premise of CLT and TBLT – developing communicative competence through meaningful interaction – was perceived as a savior for their educational systems' stagnant approaches to foreign language education. Multiple views of CLT/TBLT (weak and strong versions) were introduced, usually in a top-down manner through policy changes and without sufficient teacher training.

Major Contributions

Highlighting the Importance of Contextualized Implementation

A number of studies have addressed the many challenges of implementing CLT in the Asia-Pacific region. Many of these studies involved surveys and interviews with stakeholders or classroom observations, and they described gaps in implementation between policy and actual practice. Ultimately, many so-called communicative activities introduced in classrooms deviated little from the traditional, form-focused, or audio-lingual methods they were meant to replace (see Butler 2011 for a list of such studies). These studies also identified the sources of difficulties in implementing CLT.

It is significant that these observers in Asia (a) questioned the implicit assumption that CLT should work for everybody irrespective of context and (b) highlighted the importance of context in any pedagogical implementation (Bax 2003; Littlewood 2014). Some researchers, such as Cameron (2002), further argued that skills and knowledge for effective communications promoted in CLT are based on a particular – and not necessarily universal – ideology of genres and styles of communication.

Researcher-identified constraints to implementing CLT in Asia can be largely classified into three types: (a) conceptual constraints, (b) classroom-level constraints, and (c) societal-institutional-level constraints (Butler 2011, pp. 39–43).

The conceptual constraints are twofold. The first stems from a conflict between the central principles of CLT and the traditional local values of teaching and learning in Asia. For example, it is a common argument that traditional Confucian notions of teaching and learning in Asia (e.g., the teacher as owner and provider of knowledge, and the learner as recipient of knowledge; valuing literacy over the acquisition of practical knowledge and skills) conflict with the practical, student-centered aspects of CLT. It is important to note, however, that this value-mismatched argument has been criticized for oversimplifying matters and ignoring the cultural diversity across contexts within Asia. The second set of conceptual constraints stem from teachers' and learners' so-called misunderstanding of CLT, such as their belief that CLT

concerns only oral communication, that explicit grammar teaching is not allowed in CLT, that the teacher's role is minimal in CLT, and that CLT is only realized through group or pair activities (Savignon 2005). In interpreting stakeholders' perceptions of CLT, however, we need to remember that CLT was introduced originally as an alternative to traditional instructional methods in Asia; as such, certain contrastive aspects of the existing approaches may have been overemphasized. Given that similar concerns have been addressed about TBLT (Ellis and Shintani 2013), it is likely that these stakeholders' perceptions of CLT/TBLT can be partially attributed to the multiple versions of CLT/TBLT (i.e., weak and strong versions of CLT/TBLT), coupled with insufficient teacher training on their use.

The second set of researcher-identified constraints – those at the classroom level – include a variety of contextual limitations associated with classroom teaching. For example, studies often indicate that teachers were not well trained to introduce communicative activities or tasks in class, nor were they given sufficient support to carry out CLT/TBLT. A lack of teaching materials and performance-based assessment tools aligned with instruction has been noted as well. In large classrooms, teachers often found it challenging to introduce interactive communicative activities and to ensure that everybody participated in them. Consequently, teachers had difficulty managing their classes in ways considered appropriate in their given cultural contexts. Jean's (2009) study, "Key issues in applying the communicative approach in Korea: Following up after 12 years of implementation," found that the major constraints perceived by Korean primary and secondary school teachers – large class sizes, lack of support for in-service and preservice teachers, and lack of materials for communicative activities – did not change between 1996 and 2008. These classroom-level constraints were persistent, at least in the Korean teachers' eyes, despite the fact that some of the contextual situations were improved (e.g., class sizes were reduced from 45–50 to 30–37 students per class, and more professional support was provided to teachers) during the 12 years.

As for constraints at the societal-institutional level, rigorous college examination systems prevailing in Asia were considered to be the most significant obstacle for implementing CLT/TBLT, particularly in secondary schools. Teachers and students may not have found CLT/TBLT to be the most efficient and effective means of preparing for the exams. Parallel to Jean's (2009) finding mentioned above, even though many Asian nations have started to include oral communicative assessments in their college entrance exams, researchers often failed to find intended positive washback effects (effects or impacts of exams) in actual classroom practice (e.g., Cheng et al. 2004; Gorsuch 2000). Limited opportunities to use the target language outside of the classroom also hinder implementing CLT/TBLT in places where English has been traditionally taught as a foreign language or in other foreign language teaching contexts. With respect to English, it is important to note that opportunities to use the language outside of the classroom increasingly vary by learners' socioeconomic status as well as by region, which may in turn influence stakeholders' motivation to use CLT/TBLT in the classroom.

Work in Progress

Recent Progress: Searching for Contextualized Adaptations

As TBLT has gained recognition in curriculum and language education policies in many parts of the Asia-Pacific region, a growing number of empirical studies have investigated how best to adapt it in context, rather than simply pointing out the challenges of implementing it. At first, the focus was on the post-secondary level, where teachers usually have greater autonomy in their instruction compared with primary and secondary school levels; but studies conducted at primary and secondary school levels have gradually grown in number as well. Since the late 2000s, in addition to individual journal articles, we have seen a few special issues featuring TBLT in Asia (e.g., *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 2006; *Asia Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2009) and edited books on TBLT that include empirical research from Asia (e.g., Shehadeh and Coombe 2012; Thomas and Reinders 2015). Additionally, a number of professional language teachers' associations in the Asia-Pacific region have created special interest groups for members to actively exchange TBLT experiences.

Recent research on TBLT in the Asia-Pacific region falls roughly into two types: studies on task designing (planning and task construction) and studies on task implementation. Although the task-designing studies are psycholinguistic in nature and primarily involve testing hypotheses concerning the relationships between task characteristics and conditions (e.g., task complexity and planning time) and students' performance (with respect to accuracy, complexity, fluency, and/or interaction), such laboratory studies should help teachers identify types of tasks that are most suitable for their instructional goals and their students' needs and thus serve as a foundation for designing curricula/syllabi and planning lessons.

Studies on task implementation, on the other hand, are often nonexperimental, classroom-based case studies and are primarily concerned with identifying factors that make the adaptation of TBLT possible in a given context. These studies tend to favor task-supported instruction (weak TBLT) over strong TBLT, and they indicate the importance of flexibility in TBLT planning and implementation that is sensitive to the social, cultural, and educational environment, instructional goals, and students' characteristics and needs. For example, Carless (2007), based on interviews with secondary school teachers in Hong Kong, identified three key elements for adapting TBLT: (a) allowing greater roles of form/grammar learning in tasks, (b) incorporating tasks while considering students' examination requirements, and (c) putting greater emphasis on reading and writing. Conciliation with locally accepted approaches (such as PPP, a method composed of presentation, practice, and production) was possible when doing so allowed teachers to take advantage of the strengths of different methods, instead of dismissing the existing ones completely. Similarly, a case study at a Thai university that analyzed a 4-year implementation of TBLT (Watson Todd 2006) revealed that the program made some major adaptations while implementing TBLT. The adaptations included (a) reducing the number of tasks that were employed in class, (b) allowing a role

for explicit grammar instruction, and (c) incorporating a summative examination as part of the assessment in the course. With these modifications, Watson Todd reported that the curriculum became the product of "a mixed methodology," instead of being "a pure version of TBLT" (p. 9).

Greater involvement of teachers, from planning tasks to assisting students during tasks, has also been suggested as a key factor for successfully adapting TBLT for Asian contexts. Various types of scaffolding and feedback techniques, as well as encouragement, have been suggested as ways for teachers to facilitate student performance (e.g., Shintani 2014). As exemplified in a Japanese university case study in Lingley (2006), when developing material in a certain context, teachers may need to redefine the notion of "authenticity" and modify original texts to make them accessible for their students. Teachers may also need to prepare form-focused pre-activities, such as explicit vocabulary instruction, so that students can engage in tasks meaningfully.

A number of studies also indicated that teachers' beliefs about CLT/TBLT, rather than actual contextual constraints, influenced their practice and their students' performance. For example, Iwashita and Li (2012) reported on a case study in a Chinese university where the teacher's positive attitude about TBLT made it possible to have frequent interaction and active student involvement despite an unfavorable condition for implementing TBLT (e.g., a large class and students' unfamiliarity with TBLT). In Nishino (2012), Japanese high school teachers' perceptions of students' needs and the teachers' confidence (self-efficacy) in conducting CLT directly influenced their classroom practice.

Individual teachers' pedagogical skills also appear to influence their TBLT practice greatly. Butler (2015) found that even though the "same" task was used in a task-based assessment for primary school students in China, individual teachers interacted with students and offered them feedback differently. Similarly, Chan (2012) discovered that there was substantial variability among Hong Kong primary school teachers' strategies for enacting TBLT in their classrooms; the researcher suggested that "what is most important in shaping learning in the TBLT classroom is not the task per se, but rather the interweaving of pedagogic strategies at various levels of complexity as teachers respond to students' needs in the immediacy of the classroom environment" (p. 187).

Problems and Difficulties

Although CLT and TBLT have gradually been adapted for use in the Asia-Pacific region, a few unsolved challenges remain. Major challenges include (a) how to situate TBLT in a highly exam-driven educational system, (b) how best to balance between forms and meaning in task design and implementation, and (c) how to assist teachers in implementing TBLT in a way that is responsive to their needs and constraints.

Perhaps the most difficult challenge for implementing CLT/TBLT in Asia is figuring out how to negotiate the use of CLT/TBLT within highly exam-oriented

educational systems and societies. While it is critically important to have a close alignment between instruction and assessment, task-based assessment and communicative performance-based assessment have not yet been widely employed in the classroom in Asia. In many Asian nations, norm-referenced examinations have had a substantial impact on teaching and learning, and teachers and students – as well as parents – place a great deal of emphasis on such exams. In implementing CLT/TBLT, it is necessary to drastically change the system itself as well as people's attitudes about learning and assessment.

Many Asian nations have modified their exam systems in recent years. For example, several high-stakes exams, including college entrance examinations, now incorporate listening tests, although speaking tests are not yet common in such assessments. Researchers, however, often have failed to find the intended positive washback effects from these changes. It is suggested that multiple factors influence washback effects and that they do so in a complicated manner. Moreover, as mentioned already, teachers' perceptions about exams are often found to be more influential over their practice than actual exam-related pressures and constraints (Cheng et al. 2004).

Compared with research on pedagogy related to tasks (task design and implementation), task-based assessment (TBA) has been a relatively under-researched topic. In theory, as Long and Crookes (1992) suggested, TBA should be conducted "by way of task-based criterion-referenced tests" (p. 45). However, a number of issues need to be clarified, including how criteria should be determined (e.g., linguistic performance vs. task completion), how and by whom the task should be selected in order to best correspond to the criteria (e.g., selection based on constructs or work samples), and how and by whom learners' performances should be rated and validated. To make the last point more complicated, traditional psychometric notions of validity and reliability may not be applicable, depending on the purpose of the TBA (e.g., the extent to which the TBA is used for summative or formative purposes). We still have limited understanding of how best to use TBA as an *assessment for learning* and to provide meaningful feedback to students. One can expect that teachers should play significant roles in this process. However, if teachers are not sufficiently empowered in the assessment practice and decisions, top-down policies of CLT/TBLT would likely be ineffective (Butler 2011).

It is worth paying attention to a 2005 reform enacted in Hong Kong that made school-based assessment (SBA) part of the Hong Kong Certificate of Education Examination (HKCEE), a high-stakes examination at the end of secondary school. SBA, an in-class, task-based performance assessment, accounted for 15% of students' total English marks on the HKCEE. In SBA, teachers assessed their students against criteria, while adjusting the assessment tasks according to individual students' proficiency levels. Various concerns were raised at the initial stage of its implementation, including concerns related to fairness, increase of teachers' workload, and teachers' qualifications as assessors. However, after receiving substantial support, the teachers gained more confidence and control over SBA, and it appears to have gradually become entrenched in the English curriculum in Hong Kong (Davison and Hamp-Lyons 2010). While this is certainly a promising development,

some issues remain. For example, after examining the students' interactions during group discussion, Luk (2010) found that students made a "collective attempt to present a best impression of themselves as well as the whole group through ritualized, institutionalized, and colluded talk" (p. 46), and such behaviors resulted in inauthentic interactions. Luk's example nicely illustrates a difficulty when a task-based performance assessment is imposed on two contradicting roles, namely, a showcase of one's best performance and a means of authentic communication (Butler 2011).

The second challenge concerns when and how best to incorporate form-focused instruction in TBLT. As we have seen already, the desire for form-focused lessons is generally strong in Asia. Although most TBLT methodologists acknowledge that some sort of form-focused component needs to be incorporated in TBLT, they do not agree on the timing and strategies for doing so. It is suggested that the form-focused component is best suited to the post-task phase, but not to the pre-task and during-task phases, in order to avoid turning an opportunity for authentic communication into a predefined vocabulary and grammar exercise (Willis 1996). However, this recommendation often appears to be counterintuitive for teachers, especially those who are used to the PPP method. In Asia, suggested modifications of TBLT often include form-focused instruction at the pre-task phase due to students' needs and other institutional requirements (e.g., requirement to cover prescribed vocabulary and grammatical items in the curriculum). The question remains, however, if incorporating form-focused instruction or activities at the pre-task phase is indeed effective, as opposed to incorporating them at other phases. Ellis (2003) suggested that form-focused instruction can be introduced at any of the three phases. In addition to the question of timing, further questions concern which forms should be used and how the form-focused instruction should be carried out to maximize task effectiveness while keeping the communication authentic and meaningful. Unfortunately, we have very little empirical research to inform teachers on these matters.

The third challenge is how to support teachers in adapting CLT/TBLT to their respective contexts to maximize effectiveness. Even if teachers understand the basic principles of CLT/TBLT, the various constraints addressed above make it difficult for them to implement it. As we have seen already, teachers' attitudes toward CLT/TBLT and their pedagogical skills and strategies influence their practice greatly. What kind of support do teachers need in order to develop confidence and appropriate skills and strategies for employing CLT/TBLT? How should such support be delivered, and by whom? Top-down, policy-led implementations often have a limited effect, but we know little about how to achieve an optimal balance between top-down and bottom-up approaches to assisting teachers.

Future Directions

Research on CLT/TBLT in Asia suggests a number of potential directions for better implementing these approaches in Asian contexts. Due to limited space, I focus on just two such directions: (a) adapting contextually appropriate and feasible

conceptualizations and strategies for CLT/TBLT and (b) widening the application of tasks both inside and outside of traditional language classrooms, including using technology in TBLT.

First, in searching for contextually appropriate and effective implementation, a more flexible approach to CLT/TBLT appears to be indispensable. As we have seen already, research has shown that, in top-down implementations of CLT/TBLT, teachers often did not implement CLT/TBLT as the policies intended. The "original" format was interpreted, modified, or changed by various stakeholders as they negotiated a number of contextual constraints. One could argue that the most current practice of CLT/TBLT in Asia can no longer even be characterized as CLT/TBLT. Instead of seeing this as a failure or an inappropriate implementation, however, we just might benefit from treating it as a natural process of making pedagogical approaches (including CLT/TBLT) workable in context. In this process, it would not be surprising to see variations in practice across contexts, and such practices will likely continue to evolve. To avoid sending a misleading message that there is a single effective methodology – and that every teacher should subscribe to it – Littlewood (2014) suggested that we should abandon the term CLT. Instead, he advocated *personalizing practice* in his model of "communication-oriented language teaching" (p. 358), in which teachers are allowed to use various means to achieve successful communication, based on their professional experiences, their students' needs, and the feasibility of the approach.

Second, we can start seeing that the application of tasks is expanding beyond traditional language classrooms. The use of tasks in content language integrated learning (CLIL) has been on the rise worldwide, including in Asia (e.g., García Mayo 2015). Among various advances, one of the most prominent is the use of technology in TBLT. Technology has gained attention both as a communicative means of tasks and as communicative targets in TBLT (e.g., Thomas and Reinders 2010). Expanding digital spaces makes it possible for learners to broaden their opportunities to receive input or to use the target language by interacting with others as well as with the computer. Various online and off-line functions in technology create greater options for designing and implementing tasks. Technology may also allow learners to select and engage in tasks according to their skill levels and interests (i.e., personalized TBLT), which is often difficult within a tight curriculum and in a crowded classroom. As technology permeates our daily lives as a major means of communication, technology-mediated exchanges provide a venue for authentic communication. Moreover, technology-mediated TBLT would open a door for deepening our understanding of the role of affective factors such as motivation. This is promising because the affective domains in TBLT have not been well investigated in past research. For example, Freiermuth and Huang (2012), after analyzing interactions between Japanese and Taiwanese college students during an online chat task, found that well-designed online task in which students were required to reach a consensus could increase their task motivation, namely, "willingness to communicate, task attractiveness, task innovativeness and the need to communicate in the target language" (p. 61). While technology-mediated TBLT may have the potential to overcome a number of constraints against CLT/TBLT in Asia, we still have a very limited

understanding of how best to use technology in TBLT. It would be of great interest to many practitioners to figure out how technology-mediated TBLT incorporates the elements of focus on form. We also know little about how teachers' roles in technology-mediated TBLT have changed as classrooms have become increasingly networked. Moreover, we need to better understand how to assist teachers in using technology for designing and implementing tasks in their classrooms. As Lai and Li (2011) rightly pointed out, technology and TBLT can make mutually beneficial contributions; technology can inform better learning in TBLT, and TBLT can help to improve the learning through technology.

Ultimately, the history of implementing CLT and TBLT in Asian contexts highlights the importance of contextualization. As Prabhu (1990) suggested several years ago, there is no universally best pedagogy across context and time. Instead, it is important to take flexible and personalized approaches to pedagogy.

Cross-References

► Task-Based Instruction and Teacher Training
► Task-Based Teaching and Learning: Pedagogical Implications

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Gillian Wigglesworth: Task and Performance Based Assessment. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment

Marta Gonzalez-Lloret: Technology and Task Based Language Teaching. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

References

Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal, 57*, 278–287.

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 36–57.

Butler, Y. G. (2015). Task-based assessment for young learners: The role of teachers in changing cultures. In M. Thomas & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Contemporary task-based language teaching in Asia* (pp. 348–365). London: Bloomsbury.

Cameron, D. (2002). Globalization and the teaching of 'communication skills'. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 67–82). London: Routledge.

Carless, D. (2007). The suitability of task-based approaches for secondary schools: Perspectives from Hong Kong. *System, 35*, 595–608.

Chan, S. P. (2012). Qualitative differences in novice teachers' enactment of task-based language teaching in Hong Kong primary classrooms. In A. Shehadeh & C. A. Coombe (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts* (pp. 187–213). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cheng, L., Watanabe, Y., & Curtis, A. (2004). *Washback in language testing: Research contexts and methods*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Davison, C., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2010). The Hong Kong certificate of education: School-based assessment reform in Hong Kong English language education. In L. Y. Cheng & A. Curtis (Eds.), *English language assessment and the Chinese learner* (pp. 248–266). New York: Routledge.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2013). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. London: Routledge.

Freiermuth, M. R., & Huang, H. (2012). Bringing Japan and Taiwan close electronically: A look at an intercultural online synchronic chat task and its effect on motivation. *Language Teaching Research, 16*, 61–88.

García Mayo, M. P. (Ed.). (2015). Learning language and content through tasks: Exploring the interfaces. Special volume in *System, 54*.

Gorsuch, G. J. (2000). EFL educational policies educational cultures: Influences on teachers' approval of communicative activities. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 675–710.

Iwashita, N., & Li, H. L. (2012). Patterns of corrective feedback in a task-based adult EFL classroom setting in China. In A. Shehadeh & C. A. Coombe (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts: Research and implementation* (pp. 137–161). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jean, J. (2009). Key issues in applying the communicative approach in Korea: Follow up after 12 years of implementation. *English Teaching, 64*, 123–151.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. London: Pergamon.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 59–81.

Lai, C., & Li, G. (2011). Technology and task-based language teaching: A critical review. *CALICO Journal, 28*, 498–521.

Lingley, D. (2006). A task-based approach to teaching a content-based Canadian studies course in an EFL context. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*, 122–139.

Littlewood, W. (2014). Communication-oriented language teaching: Where are we now? Where do we go from here? *Language Teaching, 47*, 349–362.

Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus deign. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*, 27–56.

Luk, J. (2010). Talking to score: Impression management in L2 oral assessment and the co-construction of a test discourse genre. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 7*, 25–53.

Nishino, T. (2012). Modelling teacher beliefs and practices in context: A multimethods approach. *The Modern Language Journal, 96*, 380–399.

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*, 589–613.

Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method – Why? *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 161–176.

Savignon, S. J. (2005). Communicative language teaching: Strategies and goals. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 635–651). Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Shehadeh, A., & Coombe, C. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts: Research and implementation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shintani, N. (2014). Using tasks with young beginner learners: The role of the teacher. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 8*, 279–294.

Skehan, P. (1998). Task-based instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18*, 268–286.

Thomas, M., & Reinders, H. (Eds.). (2010). *Task-based language learning and teaching with technology*. London: Continuum.

Thomas, M., & Reinders, H. (Eds). (2015). *Contemporary task-based language teaching in Asia*. London: Bloomsbury.

Watson Todd, R. (2006). Continuing change after the innovation. *System, 34*, 1–14.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. London: Collins.

Issues in Heritage Language Learning in the United States

Olga Kagan and Kathleen Dillon

Contents

Introduction and Definition 340
Early Developments 342
Publications 343
Research 345
Policy 348
Curriculum and Materials Development 348
Work in Progress 349
Problems and Difficulties 350
Placement and Assessment 350
Study Abroad for Heritage Learners 351
Future Directions 352
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 353
References 353

Abstract

This chapter traces the history of this latest field of language education from its inception, when the number of heritage languages taught at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels was very small, through to the present when new immigrant languages have also become the focus of research and ASL and Native American languages are included in the roster of heritage languages. "Issues in Heritage Language Learning in the United States" reports on the

O. Kagan (✉)
Department of Slavic, East European and Eurasian Languages and Cultures, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
e-mail: okagan@humnet.ucla.edu

K. Dillon (✉)
University of California at Davis, Davis, CA, USA
e-mail: kd35@georgetown.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_3

major contributions in research, publications, and curriculum development, and it proposes an ongoing research agenda to include the issues, endeavors, and solutions shared internationally. To deconstruct the influence of demographic changes and the planning challenges they present to administrators is an imperative for the field. Other issues such as the metric for evaluating growth in heritage language proficiency, identity, curriculum and assessment, ties with heritage communities, and questions of education policy are of ongoing importance.

Keywords

Heritage Language curriculum development • Heritage language demographics • Heritage Language history • Heritage Language policy • Heritage Language research • Heritage Language teaching • Heritage learner assessment • Heritage learner definition • Heritage learner identity • Heritage learner motivation • Heritage learner placement

Introduction and Definition

The heritage language field arose in the United States as a consequence of the language profession's recognition that heritage learners of immigrant languages now constitute a major demographic group for a large number of K-16 language programs. After the events of September 11, 2001, heritage students' knowledge became increasingly valued in the United States as the federal government became mindful of the need for competent speakers of foreign languages, especially languages considered vital for national security.

Wiley et al. (2014) observe that "Although the United States is often characterized as an Anglophone country, it has a rich multilingual legacy" (p. 3). While the linguistic diversity of the country is not new, interest in preserving multilingualism is recent. During the past 15 years, efforts have expanded to understand the nature of a particular brand of bilingualism that has become known as heritage language ability and to find educational solutions for the preservation and advancement of heritage languages.

According to the 5-year American Community Survey 2009–2013 conducted by the US Census Bureau, the number of people in the United States who speak a language other than English is about 20.7%, an all-time high. Table 1 compares the changes in the numbers of speakers of languages other than English and Spanish most frequently spoken at home in the United States from 2000 to 2013.

The term heritage language is Canadian in origin; it was coined when the "Ontario Heritage Languages Programs" (Cummins 2005, p. 585) were launched in 1977. The term entered the US vernacular in the late 1990s. As yet there is no single, universally accepted definition of the terms heritage speaker or heritage learner. For example, Spanish courses for students we would label "heritage speakers" are typically labeled "Spanish for Native Speakers."

Table 1 Comparison of the ten most commonly spoken languages for the population 5 years and older for the United States (with the exception of English)

2000 US Census, Summary File 3			Table B16001: Language spoken at home by ability to speak English for the population 5 years and older for United States 2009–2013 US Census Community Survey 5-year estimates		
Rank	Language	N Speakers in millions	Rank	Language	N Speakers in millions
	Spanish	28,1		Spanish	37,5
1	Chinese	2,022,143	**1**	Chinese	2,896,766
2	French (incl. Patois and Cajun)	1,643,838	**2**	Tagalog	1,613,346
3	German	1,382,613	**3**	Vietnamese	1,399,936
4	Tagalog	1,224,241	**4**	French (incl. Patois and Cajun)	1,307,742
5	Vietnamese	1,009,627	**5**	Korean	1,117,343
6	Italian	1,008,370	**6**	German	1,063,773
7	Korean	894,063	**7**	Arabic	924,374
8	Russian	706,242	**8**	Russian	879,434
9	Polish	667,414	**9**	Italian	708, 966
10	Arabic	614,582	**10**	Portuguese or Portuguese Creole	693,469

Several definitions have been proposed by researchers in the United States. The best known definition belongs to Valdés (2000, p. 1) who describes heritage speakers as "individuals raised in homes where a language other than English is spoken and who are to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language." Fishman (2001, p. 81) characterizes a heritage language as having "particular family relevance to the learners" and identifies three groups of heritage speakers: speakers of colonial, indigenous, and immigrant languages. Van Deusen-Scholl (2003, p. 222) refers to learners who "have been raised with a strong cultural connection to a particular language through family interaction" as learners "with a heritage motivation." Polinsky (2008, p. 149) defines heritage language as the "language which was first for an individual with respect to the order of acquisition but has not been completely acquired because of the switch to another dominant language."

For the purpose of discussing heritage language education, a description that emphasizes the dichotomy between foreign language acquisition that "is usually begun in a classroom setting" and heritage language acquisition that "begins in the home" (UCLA Steering Committee 2001, p. 8) can serve as a working definition.

While the term "heritage" has gained traction, heritage speakers and their needs are so heterogeneous that a multidimensional approach to the definition proposed by Wiley (2014) may be beneficial. He categorizes heritage languages by type of educational program, by type of learner, and by community needs. He suggests that while pedagogical definitions have "utility for curricular planning and learner

need assessment" (p. 21), community-based language learning has its own set of perspectives that may differ from the institutionalized K-16 approaches. He further delineates a language use perspective, subdividing it into such categories as "societal needs"; "standard and regional dialects, including diglossia"; and "particular needs of bilingual or multilingual/translingual communities" (p. 22). This perspective on the field as a multidimensional construct reflects the place of heritage languages and their speakers in their sociocultural and educational reality. Lynch (2014) believes that "a more comprehensive understanding of the term 'heritage language' will likely emerge from systematically tracking the acquisition, use, competence, repertoires, attitudes, and practices of individual speakers in their everyday lives over a number of years, particularly from childhood to adolescence, and into adulthood and middle age" (p. 240).

A comparison of the 2000 and 2013 Census data reveals how much has changed. Spanish remains the number 1 language other than English spoken in the home, and the numbers of speakers have grown significantly: There were 28 million people speaking Spanish in 2000, and in 2013, the number reached 35 million. Other languages moved up or down the list. The numbers of speakers of some other languages have increased, whereas others have gone down. For example, Tagalog replaced French as #2, Vietnamese is now in the third place replacing German, Korean moved from the seventh place to the fifth, and Arabic became #7. Changes in demographics are of importance as they may determine what languages need to be offered in the educational system as heritage languages.

Early Developments

Scholarly interest in heritage language preservation can be traced back to the mid-1960s and early 1970s. Joshua Fishman's publications laid the foundation for what eventually became known as the field of heritage language education, most notably his seminal work on the sociology of language, *Language Loyalty in the United States* (1966). Guadalupe Valdés has been involved in efforts to maintain and preserve heritage languages among minority populations since the mid-1970s. While much of her work has focused on the teaching of Spanish to Hispanophone students in the United States, Valdés prepared the groundwork for research and instruction in other heritage languages.

In the late 1990s, interest in English–Spanish bilingualism broadened to include an effort to embrace and preserve all languages spoken in the United States. Russell Campbell (Campbell and Peyton 1998), Richard Brecht (Brecht and Ingold 1998; Brecht and Rivers 2000) were among early advocates of providing instruction designed for heritage speakers. Even before national security became an issue of concern, Brecht and Ingold advocated drawing on the capabilities of heritage speakers to strengthen linguistic readiness, pointing out that foreign language instruction on the college level seldom results in the proficiency needed for professional work.

The Center for Applied Linguistics convened the first national conference dedicated to heritage language teaching, "Heritage Languages in America" in 1999. Selected papers from the conference were published as "Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource" (Peyton et al. 2001). The conference focused on the need to create heritage programs in K-16 and in communities and demonstrated that the nascent heritage language field was in need of a research agenda. A research agenda was proposed in the UCLA Steering Committee Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report (2001). The report advocated multidisciplinary research with a focus on the heritage speaker, the family and the community, attention to language-specific issues, educational policies, programmatic priorities, and assessment.

The second national conference on heritage languages was organized by the Center for Applied Linguistics in 2002. This conference's goals were to develop public awareness of the economic, personal, and social benefits of proficiency in heritage languages and promote the inclusion of heritage language issues in the national dialog, to shape a national heritage language policy and share information on best practices, to develop collaboration among all constituent groups, and to devise a plan for moving from rhetoric to action.

The funding of a new Title VI National Heritage Language Resource Center at UCLA (http://www.nhlrc.ucla.edu) in 2006 affirmed the importance of the field. The Center was refunded in 2010 and again in 2014. The Center is dedicated to the development of research, teacher education, and the production of instructional materials pertaining to heritage language education. The Center has conducted a large number of research institutes, teacher workshops, and two international conferences (2010 and 2014).

The numbers of speakers of heritage languages depend among other reasons on the ebb and flow of immigration and migration. For educational institutions, local demographics are of paramount importance. Fee et al. (2014) compare the number of speakers of languages spoken in the homes in the states of New York, Florida, Texas, and California with the K-12 enrollments in these languages (p. 17). Chinese is spoken by over 134,000 5–18-year-olds in California, but only 12,000 students are enrolled in Chinese classes. In New York, there are close to 70,000 of speakers of Chinese in the K-12 age group, but only 7000 study Chinese at school. Kagan (2014) has conducted a study of languages taught in public high schools in Los Angeles and has determined that only a handful of community languages are offered and that the languages of some very large communities (Tagalog, Persian, Russian) are either not offered at all or are offered only sporadically.

Publications

When heritage speakers pursue formal study of their heritage language, they present a challenge to language educators who are trained to teach foreign language learners, that is, students without previous knowledge of the target language. Numerous volumes dedicated to heritage language education have been published since

2000. The first such volume *Teaching Heritage Language Learners: Voices from the Classroom* (Webb and Miller 2000) resulted from the project "Collaborative Teacher Education Program: A Model for Second Language Instruction for Inner City Schools," sponsored by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and Hunter College, NY. Its aim is to prepare teachers of Spanish, Haitian Créole, and French to work with heritage language learners.

Selected papers from the 1999 heritage language conference were published as *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource* (Peyton et al. 2001) and resulted in establishing the field in the United States.

Mi Lengua: Spanish as a Heritage Language in the United States (Roca and Colombi 2003) examines theoretical issues involved in teaching Spanish to Spanish heritage learners and reports on classroom research studies at all levels of instruction. Although the volume's focus is on Spanish, its offerings, which include an abundance of practical suggestions for heritage language educators, also apply to other heritage languages.

Heritage Language Education: A New Field Emerging (Brinton et al. 2008) is a multidisciplinary collection of articles that positions heritage speaker education at the intersection of language policy, linguistics and applied linguistics, psychology, and pedagogical practice. In addition to theoretical findings, this collection presents a range of case studies in such less commonly taught languages as Chinese, Japanese, Russian, and Korean.

Several volumes focused on Asian heritage languages have contributed to the base of knowledge about Chinese, Korean, and Japanese as heritage languages (Kondo-Brown 2006; Kondo-Brown and Brown 2008; He and Xiao 2008). Two books dedicated to Spanish have also appeared in the past several years (Beaudrie and Fairclough 2012; Fairclough 2014).

Language Diversity in the USA edited by Potowski (2010) offers a view of the history, vitality, and educational opportunities in native American languages as well as 12 immigrant languages. The volume makes it clear that the numbers of speakers in some of the languages continue to grow (e.g., Chinese, Vietnamese, Arabic), while some others are diminishing (French, Polish, Italian) reflecting the comparative demographic table above.

The online Heritage Language Journal (HLJ), the first and so far the only serial publication in the heritage field, has been published by the UCLA Center for World Languages since 2003. In addition to *General Issues,* special issues with guest editors address the concern of specific languages: Chinese, Russian, TESOL, Korean, Spanish linguistics, and Spanish assessment. Others have explicated key issues in the field as a whole: *Identity* (Fall 2010), *Language Vitality in the US* (Spring 2013), *Advancing Heritage Language Speakers' Skills* (Fall 2013).

A special volume of the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (2005), based on a 2001 US–Australian conference, examines themes of community and identity; policy, language ecology, and teacher education; program and curriculum; and assessment (Hornberger 2005, p. 102). A 2005 issue of the *Modern Language Journal* devoted its Perspectives section to heritage education in

recognition of heritage learners who are now "foregrounded in professional discussions" (Byrnes 2005, p. 582).

An issue of the *Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* (2013) records the most recent state-of-the-art linguistic research on heritage languages. The keynote article in the issue is "Defining an 'ideal' heritage speaker: Theoretical and methodological challenges" by Benmamoun, Montrul, and Polinsky who have taken the search for the ideal definition in a new direction. They initiate their discussion with Chomsky's focus of linguistic theory on "an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its (the speech community's) language perfectly. . ." (p. 259) and trace the expansion of the learner field across the brief history of heritage language research. This article serves as an important benchmark in that it signals a research imperative for the future. The authors point out that ". . .as far as research in the United States and Canada is concerned, there are very few, if any, empirical studies of adult heritage speakers who have full command of their heritage language" (p. 264).

The Handbook of Heritage, Community, and Native American Languages in the United States: Research, Policy, and Educational Practice, edited by Wiley et al. (2014), provides an overview of languages spoken in the homes and communities, patterns of acquisition, retention and language loss, revitalization of languages, and efforts to develop models of heritage language education. Another handbook (Kagan et al. forthcoming) will look at the issues of heritage language education transnationally and will present models of institutionalization of heritage/community education in a large number or countries.

Research

The preservation and teaching of heritage languages has become an increasingly popular topic at national conferences on language acquisition and teaching, including the American Association for Applied Linguistics, the Modern Language Association, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, and language-specific conferences, which routinely have panels dedicated to heritage language research and practice.

Virtually all research suggests that an understanding of heritage language learning and teaching requires attention to an array of issues including proficiency, identity, curriculum and assessment, ties with heritage communities, and questions of policy. Hornberger (2003) locates heritage speakers' proficiency on a continuum of bilingualism that suggests the deficiency of a single instructional approach. Learners may, for example, demonstrate high-level competence in speaking and listening while having no functional literacy skills. Moreover, due to the home-based nature of their language acquisition, even heritage speakers with high proficiency in speaking and listening generally lack the skills shaped by formal education that would allow them to function in an academic or professional setting. Heritage speakers also may display traits of nonstandard or émigré language and dialectic features, and their language may be marked by code switching, English borrowings and calques, all

Table 2 Comparison of heritage language and traditional language learners

Knowledge and competencies	Typical heritage language learners	Traditional foreign language learners
Phonology	Pronunciation, stress, and intonation are close to native speaker level; may be dialect	Have acquired most of the phonological system of a standard dialect; pronunciation is accented
Grammar	Use much of the grammatical system appropriately, are not familiar with the rules	Familiar with grammatical rules, but cannot use them fluently nor comprehend them fully in real-life communication
Vocabulary	Have acquired extensive vocabulary, but range is limited to home, community, and religious institutions; a large number of "borrowings" from the majority language are noted	Vocabulary is extremely limited, but consistent with the prestige dialect
Sociolinguistic rules	Control registers relating to verbal interactions with family and community members; competence is limited by range of social interactions	Have very limited knowledge and control of sociolinguistic rules except for those appropriate to the classroom
Literacy skills	Have not developed literacy skills beyond elementary levels. However, are capable of developing such skills quickly, can learn to process lengthy texts early upon acquiring literacy	Have a good to very good foundation for development of literacy

features that require tailored instruction if heritage speakers are to acquire standard professional level language skills.

For the purposes of designing courses for heritage language learners, the most important factor is understanding not only how heritage speakers differ from native speakers but also how heritage and foreign language learners differ. Table 2 offers a comparison of the abilities of heritage speakers with no schooling in the language and foreign language learners, based on the features identified in Campbell and Rosenthal (2000, pp. 169–170).

Because of heritage learners' prior and extensive exposure to language, approaches that take their global knowledge into account are considered to be most beneficial. Such approaches have been termed "macro-approaches" by Kagan and Dillon (2001). A macro-approach is a global or top-down approach that builds on learners' initial abilities in speaking and listening. A micro-approach, by contrast, builds competency from the bottom up, by isolating the elements of the language and gradually increasing in complexity. Instructional needs of heritage learners can be best met by "macro-approaches" in curricular and material development, as illustrated in Table 3.

Carreira and Kagan (2011) report on the results of a study of 1800 learners of 22 heritage languages. They analyze students' self-reported identities and motivations for maintaining their heritage languages. The vast majority of the respondents are

Table 3 Pedagogical needs: non-heritage versus heritage learners

Teaching domains	Non-heritage learners	Heritage learners
Pronunciation and intonation	Instruction throughout course of study	Typically none
Vocabulary	Full range	Age appropriate/literary/academic/formal
Grammar	Micro-approach (e.g., case by case)	Macro-approach (i.e., by concept)
Reading	Small texts, gradually and slowly increasing in volume and complexity	Fairly large and complex texts almost from the very beginning
Writing	Sentence level, gradually advancing to paragraph level. The writing even at high levels of proficiency rarely approaches native ability	High degree of internal grammar allows expansive writing assignments at early stages of instruction. Macro-approach to writing: concentrate on the content and gradually improve spelling, grammar, and stylistics
Speaking	Micro-approach: initially restricted to dialog, gradually progressing to monologue and discussion	Macro-approach: emphasis on monologue and discussion
Listening	Micro-approach: short simple texts, gradually increasing in volume and complexity	Macro-approach: full range of native language input, i.e., movies, documentaries, lectures
Culture	Micro-approach: initially isolated cultural items	Macro-approach: full range of native language input, audio, visual, and print

Source: Kagan and Dillon (2001, p. 513) (Reprinted with permission)

interested in finding out about their cultural and linguistic roots and also in being able to communicate with relatives in the United States and abroad. Heritage speakers of Chinese and Spanish also feel that the knowledge of their heritage language may be useful to them professionally. The respondents on the whole express a positive feeling about their home language and desire to maintain it. Based on their findings, the authors recommend macro-approaches (Kagan and Dillon 2001) to teaching that include discourse-based, content-based, genre-based, task-based, and experiential, in particular community-based, curricula.

A study of heritage speakers of Russian and Spanish (Martin et al. 2013; Swender et al. 2014) demonstrates the ability of heritage speakers to function at the superior level of proficiency (ACTFL Guidelines 2012) and catalogues the features that do not allow them to reach this high level of proficiency. This and similar future research may assist teachers in developing the most beneficial curricula for heritage learners.

Valdés has argued repeatedly that "the pedagogies and practices currently used for teaching heritage languages are essentially atheoretical." She has pointed out that in the case of heritage language courses, "classroom practices, effective as they may superficially appear, are not based on coherent theories about, for example, how second dialects are acquired, how proficiency in high-level registers is developed, how bilinguals are able to expand the range of a non-dominant language, and how

skills (e.g., reading and writing abilities) transfer across languages" (Valdés 2000, pp. 389–390).

At the conclusion of his comprehensive review of the HL field, Lynch (2014, p. 240) provides an extensive list of future research efforts and expresses his hope "that, in the next several years, we will see a greater number of studies devoted specifically to child learners of HL, to matters of literacy development, and the measurable effects of particular pedagogical practices. Empirical studies that consider HL community practices in a general sense are of the essence, as are longitudinal studies that address the complex ways in which language evolves over the lifespan."

Policy

Fishman (1978, p. ix) is of the opinion that "the 'unity' of mankind must be built upon a recognition and acceptance of mankind's diversity" that includes "societal multilingualism." We have come a long way since 1978 in recognizing the value of bi- or multilingualism in the form of heritage language competence in the United States, but an understanding of linguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic factors that is crucial for developing "a coherent heritage language education policy" (UCLA Steering Committee 2001, p. 11) remains inadequate. "There has been, in recent years, increased interest and support to help linguistically diverse students acquire speaking, reading, and writing abilities in their home languages" (Wiley 2005, p. 208). There is still, however, no policy that would facilitate transforming the United States into a "language competent American society" (Tucker 1991, p. 78).

In 1986, Hakuta described a dire need to dissolve "the paradoxical attitude of admiration and pride for school-attained bilingualism on the one hand and scorn and shame for home-brewed immigrant bilingualism on the other" (p. 229). While the situation may be less dire today than in 1986, there still lacks understanding of what kind of education speakers of immigrant languages need, and there is still no policy to ensure the preservation and advancement of these speakers' proficiency. Even though there are some federal and state initiatives that support the teaching of heritage languages, they are not significant enough to make a difference (Wiley 2014, p. 47).

Curriculum and Materials Development

Although there is no standard approach to teaching heritage languages, some approaches have been suggested by various researchers and practitioners. Among the commonly discussed issues are the applicability of foreign language methodology to heritage language curricular design, tracking heritage learners, and teaching them in mixed classes.

At the end of each chapter of *Mi Lengua: Spanish as a Heritage Language* (Roca and Colombi 2003), the editors include a practical section titled "Pedagogical

Implications for the Teaching of Spanish as a Heritage Language in the U.S." Volume contributors propose the use of "challenging academic material" (p. 141), providing students with "extensive experience in Spanish in all modes, registers, and a variety of dialects" (p. 192); and the value of "the content-based and genre- based approaches" (p. 230). In the same volume, Lynch (p. 37) recommends that "HL pedagogy should emphasize grammatical and lexical development through discourse-level activities. Discrete-level activities, transformation exercises, grammar paradigms, metalinguistic rules, and long vocabulary lists will likely hinder HL learners more than help them."

Researchers and practitioners alike debate the alternatives of teaching heritage learners in mixed classes or of tracking them (Pino Gonzales and Pino 2000). When heritage learners are tracked, separate instruction generally is limited to the first 1 or 2 years of instruction. The rationale is that after 1 or 2 years, heritage learners can be taught together with foreign language learners. Experience indicates that this practice is deficient and that the needs of heritage learners remain different from the needs of foreign language learners even at advanced levels. Kagan and Dillon's (2003, p. 100) matrix for heritage learner education includes a multiyear sequence together with components such as proper placement, time on task, and programmatic rigor; specific instructional materials; an uninterrupted, comprehensive curriculum; instructors trained in heritage language acquisition; consideration of the home/community native speaker environment; and a metalinguistic framework that raises awareness of importance of grammatical accuracy and register. Nevertheless, administrative challenges at many institutions make it impossible to offer heritage language tracks as is demonstrated by Carreira's (2014) survey of 300 heritage language programs across the nation. Carreira recommends applying differentiated instruction approaches to teaching mixed classes if tracking is not possible.

The textbook *Heritage Language Teaching: Research and Practice* (Beaudrie et al. 2014) is the first comprehensive work that discusses individual learners' proficiencies, approaches to teaching and assessment, gaps in grammar, and vocabulary acquisition. The authors provide examples from Spanish, Chinese, Russian, and several other heritage languages.

Work in Progress

A new direction for the field involves examining features of English as a heritage language outside of the United States. Polinsky (personal communication) notes that heritage English differs noticeably from baseline native English and that the differences have their roots in phenomena besides transfer from the dominant language. In general, heritage English displays characteristic properties of other HL: lack of recursion, pronoun resumption, and over-regularization.

Polinsky's examination of English as a heritage language in France and Israel is an indication that the heritage field can no longer be viewed as a US phenomenon (personal communication). In order to expand the field, US researchers need to look beyond their own borders and incorporate the theoretical and practical experience of

a large variety of other countries. Two examples illustrate the need to investigate heritage languages transnationally: (a) Chinese speakers can be found not only in the United States and other English-dominant countries but also in Europe, Latin, and South America, etc., and (b) large numbers of Russian heritage speakers reside not only in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain but also in Germany and Israel. The former Soviet Union has been experiencing large-scale migration, and the phenomena of Russian as a heritage language and languages of the former Soviet republics as heritage languages have become significant to educators. A volume entitled *A Handbook on Heritage Language Education around the world*: *From Innovation to Program Building* (Kagan et al. forthcoming) offers a broad look at institutions across the world that teach heritage languages to students in K-16 and also in community contexts.

Problems and Difficulties

As we go forward, we believe that the most pressing issues for the heritage language field include:

- Further development of the theoretical base
- Policy formulation and implementation
- Continued research into heritage language maintenance and loss
- Improvement and development of language-specific curricula and instructional materials
- Identification of best practices in heritage language instruction
- Clearer understanding of placement and assessment protocols
- Design of study abroad programs that concentrate on the specific needs of heritage learners

Placement and Assessment

The application of the Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPIs) and the ACTFL (2012) Guidelines to evaluate the oral proficiency of heritage learners remains a topic of debate among leaders in the field. Objections to using the guidelines are largely based on the observation that because they have acquired their language in a naturalistic environment, heritage speakers have competencies that substantially differ from the competencies of traditional foreign language speakers for whom the ACTFL Guidelines were designed. Valdés (1989) argued that since the Guidelines compare students against the standard of the educated native speaker and do not take native nonstandard varieties into account, they may not accurately measure the oral competency of speakers of these nonstandard varieties. However, Kagan and Friedman (2004) found that the OPI can be an effective placement instrument for learners of Russian. More recently Martin et al. (2013) and Swender et al. (2014) identified what prevents heritage speakers of Spanish and Russian from achieving a

high level of proficiency in spoken language. A similar research project on Chinese is under way. Once more research has been conducted, the ACTFL Guidelines should be amended to include instructions on conducting OPIs with heritage language speakers.

Placement and assessment of heritage learners continues to be complicated by attitudes that these students may encounter in the educational system. As Wiley (2005, p. 597) writes, "[when] school stigmatizes the varieties of home and community language, it may undercut the motivation to learn at school." Addressing similar concerns, Valdés (2000, p. 388) stresses that knowing which dialects are spoken in émigré communities, and how those dialects are regarded within the communities and by monolingual native speakers in the target country, is important, since effective heritage instruction is designed to "expand the bilingual range," that is, to build on existing knowledge rather than stigmatize it.

An additional issue is the lack of tests for many of the least commonly taught languages. For example, while some school districts are ready to add a Seal of Biliteracy (e.g., California, http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/sealofbiliteracy.asp) to high school diplomas, many heritage students may not be able to demonstrate proficiency in their home language because tests exist for only a limited number of languages and because many languages are not offered at all in K-12.

Study Abroad for Heritage Learners

Study abroad experiences and resulting gains for foreign language students have been the focus of several important research studies (Brecht et al. 1993; Cohen et al. 2003). As yet, few studies have examined in-country experience of heritage learners who are participating in study abroad programs in increasing numbers. Davidson and Lekic (2013, pp. 108–110) compared Russian heritage learners with foreign language students in the Russian Overseas Flagship Program. Students were tested according to the Interagency Language Round Table (ILR) Oral Proficiency Test ratings as well as the official Russian government Test of Russian as a Foreign Language (TORFL) multimodal score reports. Their study determined "that the heritage subjects in the present study attained levels of literacy and communicative proficiency in the target language very close to that of an educated native speaker (level 4) as a result of participation in a year-long, structured, overseas immersion-learning program." However, the authors acknowledged what is a common concern in data gathering on overseas study thus far, which is "the small size of the heritage datasets available." In addition to the Davidson and Lekic study, Moreno (2009) explores the experiences of 17 HL learners who chose to study abroad in 2007 and 2008 to improve their HL proficiency, examining "the complexities associated with learning a heritage language (HL) abroad, specifically with regard to identity, expectations, and beliefs about language and language learning, by examining the ways that HL learners talk about themselves" (Moreno 2009, p. vii).

In addition to the need for larger data sets, current understanding indicates two other key areas of concern regarding overseas programs for heritage learners:

(1) they have not yet identified nor adapted to heritage learners' instructional needs and (2) successful articulation between home institutions and study abroad requires more information about how to prepare heritage students for study abroad.

Future Directions

In 1998, Brecht and Ingold called for a national effort to supply what is absent in the field of heritage education, including the study of heritage communities, development of the principles of effective program design, curricula, materials, and the establishment of an infrastructure that will promote the sharing of knowledge and resources to provide appropriate heritage language instruction.

An understanding of the cultural, historical, and linguistic contexts that define heritage speakers must be at the center of continuing work in the heritage language field. Factors, such as an immigrant community's density, relationship to the home country, rate of continuing immigration, average level of education, and the extent of commercial activity conducted in the immigrant language, may be anticipated to influence the character of language retention and language shift (UCLA Steering Committee 2001) and thus must be central concerns of future development. Still not enough is known about why some language groups are more likely to retain their languages, or retain them longer, than others. Similarly, insufficient research has been done on the conditions under which language shift occurs and whether these conditions are identical for each group. Cummins (2005, p. 585) determined that in the Canadian population "there is massive attrition of students' heritage language competence over the course of schooling." This loss of an enormously valuable resource, a factor in the United States as well, can be stemmed only through research-based curricular, pedagogical, and policy interventions. As recommended by Benmamoun et al. (2013), longitudinal studies would help us understand the language maintenance of individual learners and could also measure the impact of educational programs. However, because the field has been developing for only 15 years and because the existing programs are not yet stable, such studies may have to wait.

More studies such as Wang (1996) on Chinese heritage schools, Shin (2005) on Korean children's biliteracy, and Ivanova-Sullivan (2014) on the features of Russian heritage speakers are vitally needed in other languages in order to develop broad-scale understanding of the language-specific issues that should underpin curricular and programmatic development and design. Sociological studies indicate that immigrants of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries no longer sense a contradiction between "an ethnic identity and an American identity" (Zhou 2004, p. 153). This sense of identity among heritage speakers plays a role in motivating heritage speakers to study their heritage languages. As witnessed by submissions to the Heritage Language Journal, language educators are researching the connection between motivation and identity.

While many issues on the research agenda articulated by the UCLA Steering Committee Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report (2001) have been addressed, its call for a multidisciplinary approach "to explore the diverse

aspects of heritage language maintenance and development" still needs to be heeded. Researchers "from other fields, including economists, scientists and social scientists would . . . have important roles in measuring the effects of heritage language learning on the individual, the family, the community, and the nation" (p. 4). In addition, there is a need to investigate heritage speakers, communities, and programs transnationally. Such a large-scale multidisciplinary and international effort is fundamental to the maturation of the heritage field, We believe that three main directions for research in the future are (1) investigations of commonalities and differences among heritage speakers of one language living in different countries with different dominant languages; (2) research into the impact of community, church, and Saturday schools on heritage language maintenance; and (3) collecting and sharing evidence of successful heritage language programs from numerous regions of the world.

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Agnes Weiyun He: Heritage Language Learning and Socialization. In Volume: Language Socialization

Wayne Wright: Language Policy and Education in the USA. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). Proficiency guidelines -speaking. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012

Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Beaudrie, S. M., Dukar, C. M., & Potowski, K. (2014). *Heritage language teaching: Research and practice*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2013). Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. *Journal of Theoretical Linguistics, 39*(3–4), 129–181.

Brecht, R. D., & Ingold, C. W. (1998). Tapping a national resource: Heritage learners in the United States. ERIC Digest EDO-FL-98-12, ERIC clearinghouse on languages and linguistics. Retrieved from www.cal.org/ericcll/digest/brecht01.html

Brecht, R. D., & Rivers, W. P. (2000). *Language and national security in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

Brecht, R. D., Davidson, D., & Ginsberg, R. (1993). *Predictors of foreign language gain during study abroad*. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

Brinton, D., Kagan, O., & Bauckus, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Heritage language education: A new field emerging*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Byrnes, H. (2005). MLJ perspectives. *Modern Language Journal, 89*(4), 582–585.

Campbell, R., & Peyton, J. K. (1998). Heritage students: A valuable language resource. *ERIC Review, 6*(1), 31–35.

Campbell, R., & Rosenthal, J. W. (2000). Heritage languages. In J. W. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Handbook of undergraduate second language education* (pp. 165–184). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carreira, M. (2014). Teaching heritage language learners: A study of program profiles, practices, and needs. In P. P. Trifonas & T. Aravossitas (Eds.), *Rethinking heritage language education* (pp. 20–44). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Carreira, M., & Kagan, O. (2011). The results of the National Heritage Language Survey: Implications for teaching, curriculum design, and professional development. *Foreign Language Annals, 44*(1), 40–64.

Center for Applied Linguistics. (1999). Heritage languages conference underscores need to preserve languages. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/heritage/conferences/postconf.html

Center for Applied Linguistics. (2002). 2nd national conference on heritage languages in America. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/heritage/conferences/2002/

Cohen, A. D., Paige, R. M., Kappler, B., Demmessie, M., Weaver, S. J., Chi, J. C., & Lassegard, J. P. (Eds.). (2003). *Maximizing study abroad: An instructors' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA).

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 89* (4), 585–592.

Davidson, D., & Lekic, M. D. (2013). The heritage and non-heritage learner in the overseas immersion context: Comparing learning outcomes and target-language utilization in the Russian flagship. *Heritage Language Journal, 10*(2), 88–114.

Fairclough, M. (2014). *Spanish as a heritage language. The Routledge handbook of hispanic applied linguistics*. New York: Routledge.

Fee, M., Rhodes, N., & Wiley, T. (2014). Demographic realities, challenges, and opportunities. In T. G. Wiley, J. K. Peyton, D. Christian, S. C. K. Moore, & N. Liu (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States: Research, policy, and educational practice* (pp. 6–18). New York: Routledge.

Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (1966). *Language loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (1978). *Advances in the study of societal multilingualism*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J. A. (2001). 300-plus years of heritage language education in the United States. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 81–98). Washington, DC/McHenry: Center for Applied Linguistics/Delta Systems.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.

He, A. W., & Xiao, Y. (Eds.). (2008). *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry* (Vol. 2). Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Heritage Language Journal. Retrieved from http://www.heritagelanguages.org

Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (2005). Introduction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *8*(2–3), 101–108.

Ivanova-Sullivan, T. (2014). *Theoretical and experimental aspects of syntax-discourse interface in heritage grammars*. Boston: Brill.

Kagan, O., & Dillon, K. (2001). A new perspective on teaching Russian: Focus on the heritage learner. *Slavic and East European Journal, 45*, 507–518. Reprinted in *Heritage Language Journal* 1. www.heritagelanguages.org

Kagan, O., & Dillon, K. (2003). Heritage speakers' potential for high level language proficiency. In H. Byrnes & H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 99–112). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Kagan, O., & Friedman, D. (2004). Using the OPI to place heritage speakers of Russian. *Foreign Language Annals, 36*(4), 536–545.

Kagan, O. (2014, December 21). Schools should help the children of immigrants become truly bilingual. Los Angeles Times. Retrieved from http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-1222-kagan-heritage-languages-20141222-story.html

Kagan, O., Carreira, M., & Chik, C. (forthcoming). *A handbook on heritage language education: From innovation to program building*. New York: Routledge.

Kondo-Brown, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Heritage language development: Focus on East Asian immigrants* (Vol. 32). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Kondo-Brown, K., & Brown, J. D. (Eds.). (2008). *Teaching Chinese Japanese, and Korean heritage language students: Curriculum needs, materials, and assessment*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lynch, A. (2003). Toward a theory of heritage language acquisition: Spanish in the United States. In A. Roca & C. Colombi (Eds.), *Mi Lengua. Spanish as a heritage language in the United States. Research and practice* (pp. 25–50). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Lynch, A. (2014). Editor's commentary: The first decade of the *Heritage Language Journal*: A retrospective view of research on heritage language acquisition. *Heritage Language Journal, 12*(3), 224–242.

Martin, C., Swender, E., & Rivera-Martinez, M. (2013). Assessing the oral proficiency of heritage speakers according to the ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2012 – Speaking. *Heritage Language Journal, 10*(2), 73–87.

Moreno, K. (2009). *The study abroad experiences of heritage language learners: Discourses of identity*. Dissertation. Retrieved from http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/9744

Peyton, J. K., Ranard, D. A., & McGinnis, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource*. Washington, DC/McHenry: Center for Applied Linguistics/ Delta Systems.

Pino Gonzales, B., & Pino, F. (2000). Serving the heritage speaker across a five-year program. *ADFL Bulletin, 32*, 27–35.

Polinsky, M. (2008). Heritage language narratives. In D. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Potowski, K. (Ed.). (2010). *Language diversity in the USA*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Roca, A., & Colombi, M. C. (Eds.). (2003). *Mi Lengua. Spanish as a heritage language in the United States. Research and practice*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Shin, S. J. (2005). *Developing in two languages: Korean children in America*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Swender, E., Martin, C. L., Rivera-Martinez, M., & Kagan, O. E. (2014). Exploring oral proficiency profiles of heritage speakers of Russian and Spanish. *Foreign Language Annals, 47*(3), 423–446.

Tucker, R. (1991). Developing a language competent American society: The role of language planning. In A. G. Reynolds (Ed.), *Bilingualism, multilingualism, and second language learning* (pp. 65–79). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

US Census Bureau. (2000). United States Census 2000, Summary File 3. Retrieved from www.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). *Table B16001: Language spoken at home by ability to speak English for the population 5 years and older for United States [data table]*. American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, 2009–2013. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Available from http://www.census.gov

UCLA Steering Committee. (2001). *Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report*. University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/heritage/priorities.html

Valdés, G. (1989). Teaching Spanish to Hispanic bilinguals: A look at oral proficiency testing and the proficiency movement. *Hispanica, 72*, 392–401.

Valdés, G. (2000). The teaching of heritage languages: An introduction for Slavic-teaching professionals. In O. Kagan & B. Rifkin (Eds.), *The learning and teaching of slavic languages and cultures* (pp. 375–403). Bloomington: Slavica.

Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2003). Toward a definition of heritage language: Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 2*(3), 211–230.

Wang, X. (Ed.). (1996). *A view from within: A case study of Chinese heritage community language schools in the United States*. Washington, DC: The National Foreign Language Center.

Webb, J., & Miller, B. (Eds.). (2000). *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom*. Yonkers: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Wiley, T. (2005). *Literacy and literacy diversity in the United States* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC/McHenry: Center for Applied Linguistics/Delta Systems.

Wiley, T. (2014). The problem of defining heritage and community languages and their speakers: On the utility and limitations of definitional constructs. In T. Wiley, J. Peyton, D. Christian, S. Moore, & N. Liu (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States: Research, policy, and educational practice* (pp. 19–26). New York: Routledge.

Wiley, T., Peyton, J., Christian, D., Moore, S., & Liu, N. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States: Research, policy, and educational practice*. New York: Routledge.

Zhou, M. (2004). Assimilation, the Asian Way. In T. Jacoby (Ed.), *Reinventing the melting pot: The new immigrants and what it means to be American* (pp. 139–153). New York: Basic Books.

Foreign Language Learning in K-12 Classrooms in the USA

Myriam Met and Adriana Melnyk Brandt

Contents

Introduction 358
Early Developments 359
Language Education in the Post-Sputnik Era 359
Language Education Policy Today: Who Decides Who Studies a Foreign Language and for How Long? 360
Major Contributions 361
Work in Progress 362
New Approaches to Assessment 362
New Approaches to Instruction 364
Building Infrastructure 366
Problems and Difficulties 366
Future Directions 368
Cross-References 368
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 368
References 369

Abstract

The climate for foreign language learning in US schools today is far improved from the context that prevailed prior to the new millennium. Spurred by critical national needs for a broad spectrum of Americans who can communicate successfully across linguistic and cultural borders, innovations in the field are leading to enhanced competencies in using languages for a variety of purposes. Less commonly taught languages have emerged as mainstream offerings, raising new

M. Met (✉)
National Foreign Language Center, The University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA
e-mail: myriammet@gmail.com

A.M. Brandt (✉)
School of Education, Dixie State University, Saint George, UT, USA
e-mail: abrandt@dixie.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_17

questions and considerations for teacher preparation and professional development. Research is providing new insights into how language proficiency develops in instructional settings, driving evidence-based instructional practices along with new measures of teacher effectiveness. Attention to backward design has shaped new approaches to curriculum and instruction across K-12 language instruction, leading to proficiency-oriented approaches to learning and assessment. Administrators and foreign language teachers at the K-12 level seek ways to allow longer sequences of language study that culminate in higher levels of student proficiency, leading to a more widespread implementation of dual language immersion programs across the nation. Technology is facilitating approaches to assessing the oral proficiency of language learners who in the past might have been assessed only with paper and pencil measures. As a result, foreign language programs in today's K-12 schools are experiencing greater effectiveness as demonstrated by increased student performance, though several challenges and areas of need remain.

Keywords

Backward design • Proficiency targets • Proficiency assessment • Immersion • Teacher effectiveness • Less commonly taught languages • LinguaFolio • Seal of biliteracy

Introduction

Not since the post-Sputnik era has so much attention been given to the learning of languages other than English. The tragic events of September 11, 2001, combined with a globalized economy, and increasing linguistic and cultural diversity within communities across America have created a need for language competence that will ensure national security, a thriving economy, and a cohesive society.

The USA has no language policy, nor a language education policy. Despite sporadic and unsuccessful attempts to mandate English as the official language of the USA and despite state-level referenda that have abolished bilingual education in a few states, there has been little effort at the national or state levels to shape which languages are taught in K-12 schools, which learners are allowed to study foreign languages[1], how long they continue their study, and what the goals of such study should be.

Despite the lack of formal policy, a new landscape has prevailed since the mid-2000s. In January 2006, President Bush announced the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI), aimed at promoting security and national prosperity, including expanding foreign language learning. The resultant momentum for

[1]This chapter will use the term "foreign language" to refer to languages other than English taught in schools.

teaching and learning languages led to multiple nationally funded programs for students and language teachers. The 2013 Languages for All International Forum brought together key stakeholders to respond to key overarching questions: Is it desirable and feasible to provide all learners in our education system the opportunity to study a second language? If so, how? If not, why not? Forum participants affirmed the importance of expanded need and demand for languages, technological access to opportunities for study, scientific understanding of language acquisition, and understanding of best practices for language learning and acquisition at the K-12 level (Abbott et al. 2014, p. 3). Responding to this demand is the current focus of the field.

Early Developments

Language Education in the Post-Sputnik Era

September 11 provided an impetus for defense-related needs for Americans to know the languages of the world, just as Sputnik provided in an earlier era. Subsequent to the launch of Sputnik, interest in languages was tied to national defense, the Cold War, and the related competition with the former Soviet Union, with the federal government playing a significant role in shaping language education policy. Substantial federal funding under the 1957 National Defense Education Act (NDEA) provided important support for the expansion of language offerings and increased enrollments at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels, particularly for study of languages that were in the national interest, extensive funding for improving teacher knowledge and skills to produce a cadre of well-prepared teachers aware of current best practices (at that time, practices associated with the audio-lingual method), and the development of new materials aligned with prevailing theories of learning, primarily Skinnerian behaviorism (Curtain and Dahlberg 2004; Liskin-Gasparro 1984; Omaggio-Hadley 2001).

NDEA led to enthusiasm among schools and districts in offering languages in the elementary grades, which in turn led to numerous new programs taught face-to-face or through television. Language laboratories, thought to provide the kind of practice suggested by Skinner's operant conditioning, were being installed in secondary schools. The primary methodology favored by language educators was the audio-lingual method in which language was seen as a habit to be formed through a variety of drills designed according to notions of stimulus response (Omaggio-Hadley 2001).

A number of factors resulted in declining interest in language education. Early language learning programs did not produce better results in high school than those of students who delayed starting language learning until later. Lack of age-appropriate curriculum, ineffective and inappropriate instructional methodologies, and insufficient age-appropriate materials, along with a critical shortage of teachers prepared to work with young learners, all contributed to a lack of evidence supporting the efficacy of starting language study early (Curtain and Dahlberg 2004). Similarly, language laboratories – among early powerful technology tools – were not found to enhance student achievement (Kelly 1976). Again, a number of

factors contributed to these findings, including inadequate training for teachers on how to use this technology and how it might best be integrated into their instructional programs.

Language Education Policy Today: Who Decides Who Studies a Foreign Language and for How Long?

Historically, language education policy is in the purview of the states, as is education in general. Most states determine whether foreign languages are required for high school graduation or not (as of 2014, only four of fifty states mandate such a requirement), whether access to language study is required (as of 2014, 27 states had such a requirement), and whether language study is recognized through special "merit" diplomas (many states award such recognition) (for an overview of language education policy in US elementary and secondary schools, see Brown 1994; Met 1994).

Beginning in the mid-1980s, a number of states mandated that foreign language learning be offered to or required of all students during the elementary grades, with different states determining different age spans. Although required to provide foreign language instruction to students in elementary schools, many states found that the legislation was not accompanied by state funding, and numerous school districts subsequently terminated their programs. On the other hand, states such as Georgia, and much later Delaware and Utah, provided incentive funding for schools or districts wishing to start programs. As of this writing, the Utah initiative to make immersion education a widespread offering in its schools has resulted in over 100 new programs between 2008 and 2014.

In the absence of state requirements, decisions about language offerings and requirements are in the hands of local school boards. Traditionally, most school districts offered foreign languages to students at the high school level and often only to the college bound; the presence of high school programs has remained stable across recent decades (see Rhodes and Pufahl 2009), though some districts have expanded access to foreign language study to a broader range of students and to encompass additional language choices. However, the story is quite different at the elementary and middle school levels. Some school districts have reported an increase in the percentage of elementary and middle school students studying foreign languages. These programs often are part of a trajectory culminating in the International Baccalaureate, which requires foreign language study. That said, while the 1990s saw an uptick in the number of elementary and middle school students who were enrolled in a foreign language course (Draper and Hicks 1994, 2002), a 2008 national survey found that the percentage of elementary and middle schools offering foreign language instruction decreased from 1997 to 2008 (Rhodes and Pufahl 2009). This decline can be attributed to several factors, the most prominent of these being limited funding sources to sustain language programs. Nonetheless, subsequent to the data collection for this survey, the number of foreign language immersion programs significantly increased. Leading the states, Utah, and then Delaware and Georgia, began state-level initiatives accompanied by legislative funding. At the district and school levels, dramatic increases in interest

and efforts to start new programs, particularly in Chinese, added to the growing momentum for early language learning.

Major Contributions

The current interest in promoting learning languages other than English in the USA comes as a welcome departure from the apathy and disdain for language learning that has prevailed for decades. Based on their own personal experiences – beginning language learning late in their academic career, finding pedagogical approaches limited in their effectiveness, and relative successes in the job market despite lacking proficiency in any language besides English – many Americans believe that language learning is unsuccessful in our schools and not an essential for career advancement. As has been described, global changes have begun to shift that view (for a fuller discussion, see Met 2001).

Optimism for the future rests not only on the positive policy climate but also on a series of initiatives taken within the foreign language field that are more likely than ever to contribute to K-12 learners becoming competent in additional languages. One such initiative has been the development and implementation of national standards for language learning. Born of the national standards movement of the mid-1990s, and supported by federal funds, a consortium of professional associations produced both generic and language-specific content standards for what all students should know and be able to do upon exiting high school: Standards for Foreign Language Learning. The Standards emphasize what students can do with language, rather than what they know about it, and focus on five interconnected goal areas, often referred to as the "5 Cs": Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. These goal areas were further divided into eleven standards that provided additional focus on key components of second-language learning and intercultural communication (see American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages website for additional information).

To date, the Standards have been implemented with mixed success throughout the USA. In most states, state standards and curriculum frameworks have been produced that align with the national standards. Since states, not the federal government, regulate education, national standards are voluntary. State standards may serve as frameworks, guidelines, or mandates, depending on state law and practice. At the local level, district curricula and professional development are helping to bring Standards to the classroom. However, a survey conducted by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (hereafter "ACTFL") revealed that not all teachers are prepared to implement Standards, due either to limitations of preservice teacher preparation programs or limited opportunities for in-service professional development. Furthermore, in some states and local districts, standards and curriculum frameworks reduce the 5 Cs to only include Communication and Culture; consequently, educators seek guidance on how to address Connections, Comparisons, and Communities in their teaching and student learning (Phillips and Abbott 2011). In 2014, ACTFL released a refreshed version of the

Standards, *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages*. This refresh was prepared to respond to implementation challenges in the field, to address more effectively the needs of signed and less commonly taught languages (LCTLs), and to align national standards to other contemporary educational movements related to literacy, twenty-first century skills, and the Common Core Standards.

In a deliberate and focused effort at coherence, standards for teachers have been developed and are aligned with standards for student learning. That is, programs of teacher preparation, as well as the performance of novice and accomplished teachers, are all expected to ensure that what happens in classrooms allows students to attain the outcomes described in the national standards. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), in partnership with ACTFL, outlines standards that apply to teacher preparation programs seeking accreditation; the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC 2002) Model Core Teaching Standards describe what novice teachers should know and be able to do, while the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS 2013) describe the competencies of accomplished teachers.

In the mid-2000s, states increasingly adopted and implemented measures to evaluate teacher effectiveness and award merit-based pay for all US teachers. Development and implementation of such measures varies from state to state; however, the widespread use of measures developed by US evaluation experts such as the Danielson Group and Marzano Center contributes to a sense of consistency across states. In addition to these state-wide measures to describe teacher effectiveness overall, a few states saw a need for specific frameworks to help non-foreign language professionals, such as building administrators, understand the observable behaviors of effective foreign language teachers. One such framework is the Teacher Effectiveness for Language Learning Project (TELL Project 2012), which was jointly developed by language experts from a small consortium of states. The TELL framework articulates seven domains of effective foreign language educator performance alongside a suite of observation checklists, educator self-assessments, and resources for professional development. The TELL project's purpose was to define the characteristics and behaviors that effective foreign language teachers exhibit, as a way to apply a content-specific lens to broad state-level effectiveness frameworks. This approach has since been adopted by several national professional organizations of other content areas, including visual and fine arts, and additional content-specific frameworks are currently being developed.

Work in Progress

New Approaches to Assessment

While the goal areas of the national standards have moved the field toward an integrated communicative approach to teaching and learning, few emphases have left such a lasting impact on the field as the focus on proficiency. As language educators intensified their focus on the outcomes of language learning, their work

was consistent with growing interest in "backward design." Backward design is based principally on the work of Wiggins and McTighe, *Understanding by Design* (1998). Backward design begins with an analysis of goals and objectives, describing what students would do to demonstrate their learning. This demonstration is the core of the assessment, thus beginning the planning process with a detailed, clear understanding of acceptable evidence of student learning, followed by a gap analysis to determine the gap between current levels of student knowledge/performance and the desired level. Strategies for enabling students to gain the knowledge and skills required to meet expectations and provide the expected evidence of learning (instruction) are then aligned with best practices in the discipline.

With the emphasis on proficiency, backward design required that attention be focused on what students could do with language. Traditional approaches to assessment measured what students knew about language, but rarely asked for evidence that students could use their knowledge in communicative performance. Tests were largely paper and pencil and often tested discrete components of language, such as vocabulary and grammar. With the advent of the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Guidelines and the move toward communicative language teaching came the recognition that discrete point testing and paper/pencil measures could not realistically capture students' ability to use language to communicate.

The essential inclusion of assessment as part of the backward design process has clear implications for both formative and summative assessment of students' proficiency growth during the course of instruction, as well as over time. The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) had been developed in the late 1980s to assess performance on the ACTFL rating scale, with resulting extensive training provided to ensure inter-rater reliability. It was and continues to be a reliable and valid tool for assessing language proficiency and is widely used for a variety of purposes, including determining whether teacher candidates are sufficiently proficient to earn licensure.

Secondary school teachers recognize the value of the ACTFL OPI, but find it not feasible for assessing their own students. The OPI requires extensive (and costly) training, so that many classroom teachers are simply unable to become certified testers. The time required to administer the OPI is not feasible for teachers with 150 or more students to be tested several times a semester or year. Further, most schools require teachers to submit grades within a short time after administering final examinations, contributing to the impracticality of the OPI for end-of-course testing in secondary schools.

A variety of approaches to performance assessment suitable for classroom use have evolved. ACTFL took the lead in developing a framework for Integrated Performance Assessments (IPA) that model how classroom teachers might integrate assessment with instruction and focus on performance, rather than discrete point knowledge. The IPA is comprised of three communicative tasks – Interpretive, Interpersonal and Presentational – integrated around a particular theme or content area, and reflects how language is actually used in the real world or the classroom. The three tasks are integrated so that "each task provides the information and elicits the linguistic interaction that is necessary for students to complete the subsequent task" (Adair-Hauck et al. 2013).

Given the challenges of assessing the proficiency of large numbers of students, researchers turned to technology as a means of efficiently determining the ability of students to communicate in a foreign language. In 1999, the Center for Advanced Second Language Studies (CASLS) began development of the Standards-based Measurement of Proficiency (STAMP), online assessments of spoken and written language that align with the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and with national standards. At the time of this writing, those assessments have been developed in nine languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish. ACTFL also responded to the need for online assessments that were economically feasible by developing two additional assessments: the Oral Proficiency Interview–Computer (OPIc) and the ACTFL Assessment of Performance toward Proficiency in Languages (AAPPL). The OPIc mirrors the traditional OPI, but the interview questions are delivered through a computer program and via a virtual avatar. This delivery allows the test to be taken on-demand and at a time convenient both to student and to the evaluators. The AAPPL test (ACTFL 2012) is designed for students in fifth through twelfth grades, although some immersion programs have reported success in using the AAPPL with students as young as third graders. The AAPPL asks learners to engage in technology-rich performance tasks, such as participating in a virtual video chat or creating a poster or journal entry. This assessment measures student performance in interpersonal speaking, presentational writing, and interpretive reading and listening and provides scores aligned with the Proficiency Guidelines.

Self-assessment has attracted increased attention in the past decade, particularly as teachers and learners strive to promote lifelong learning by meeting the communities' goal of the national standards. To this end, the National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL) developed LinguaFolio, patterned after the European Language Portfolio. LinguaFolio is a self-assessment portfolio consisting of three parts: a language passport that describes students' experiences and abilities with languages, including formal diplomas, certificates, or assessment scores; a language biography, in which students record their language learning history and reflect on their goals and experiences; and a dossier, in which students place evidence of their language skills, achievements, and performances (LinguaFolio 2014). LinguaFolio includes checklists of "can-do" statements that represent functional performance tasks. These statements are correlated with ACTFL's Proficiency Guidelines and encourage learners to self-assess progress and proficiency development over time.

New Approaches to Instruction

In the spirit of backward design, the emphasis on language performance and proficiency at the K-12 classroom level has impacted not only classroom and programmatic assessment but also instructional approaches. Teachers increasingly have adopted practices that move learners toward their proficiency growth, and these practices require that teachers keep proficiency targets at the front and center of their planning. By focusing on what students have to be able to do in order to reach certain

proficiency targets, teachers shift their instructional focus to designing the types of tasks that encourage the level of linguistic interaction that prepares students to function appropriately in certain ways and in certain contexts. In the 2010s, the National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL) and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) jointly produced the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Statements (ACTFL 2013) to guide this classroom-level emphasis on proficiency. These progress indicators employ student-friendly language to articulate what learners can do in the language at various proficiency levels and in all three modes of communication. While these Can-Do Statements were originally designed for student self-assessment of proficiency development as part of the LinguaFolio suite, many classroom teachers have found these statements useful as they develop course curriculum, unit plans, daily lesson objectives, and lesson tasks that promote language performance en route to proficiency growth.

In addition to emphasizing proficiency growth, a variety of instructional approaches have also focused on the integration of content, culture, and language learning across recent decades (Christian and Rhodes 1997; Curtain and Dahlberg 2004; Met 1998). Elementary school foreign language curricula reinforce and enrich other content areas of the curriculum; in middle schools, thematic units integrate language with other content; at the postsecondary level, Foreign Language Across the Curriculum models vary across institutions, but share the commonality of using languages other than English as a medium for content learning.

Continued interest in integrated approaches is evidenced by the growth of immersion programs. As noted earlier, immersion programs have experienced a remarkable expansion in number in the years since the beginning of the twenty-first century. Some attribute this growth to reliable data that show that immersion students succeed in attaining high levels of proficiency while continuing to make expected progress in reading, language arts, and other academics. Moreover, immersion programs can be implemented and sustained at a substantially lower cost than other models, such as FLES, so they tend to attract advocates who are mindful of budget constraints either now or in the future. Parents flock to these programs because of their reputation for results, both in terms of language outcomes and academic attainment.

Immersion programs in North America were originally designed for students who knew English and were adding another language. In the 1990s another immersion model rapidly gained popularity in the USA: dual language programs (Christian et al. 1997; Lindholm-Leary 2001). Also called two-way immersion, these programs bring together speakers of English with speakers of the target language in an immersion program. While program models vary, with some devoting 90% of the school day to the non-English and with others dividing the day between the two languages 50–50%, the primary characteristic of these innovative programs is that students are learning language from one another as well as from the teacher (Christian et al. 1997; Lindholm-Leary 2001). Spanish-English dual language programs are the most common, but programs in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Navajo have also been established. Immersion programs – whether foreign language immersion or two-way immersion – are recognized as providing high levels of language competence in both English and the non-English language while ensuring that students meet expectations

for academic performance (Fortune and Tedick 2008; Genesee 1987; Hamayan et al. 2013; Lindholm-Leary 2001; Swain and Lapkin 1991; Tedick and Christian 2011; Thomas and Collier 2012).

Building Infrastructure

The continued successful expansion of language learning in the USA depends on high-quality instruction and on well-articulated programs. In response to a dramatic increase in demand for learning Chinese in K-12, the Asia Society convened leaders in the language education and Chinese teaching field to determine what would be required to increase current enrollments in Chinese by 5%. Their report highlighted the critical need for infrastructure development, particularly for expanding the pool of highly qualified teachers and for instructional materials (Stewart and Wang 2005). Similarly, the National Foreign Language Center explored the current state of foreign language offerings, with particular emphasis on less commonly taught languages, and developed white papers outlining key recommendations for the field (see Ingold and Wang 2010; Jackson and Malone 2009). These white papers issued charges to state education agencies, institutions of higher education, and local school districts to expand capacity for foreign language teacher certification and ongoing professional development, as well as program development and implementation at all levels in K-16.

Technology is increasingly utilized as an instructional delivery system and as a means to expand access to language learning. In the past, video-based programs, such as Georgia Public Television's SALSA series, had been utilized to develop students' rudimentary language skills when a qualified foreign language teacher was unavailable. However, advances in digital communication technologies have expanded availability of and access to language programs while also providing opportunities for meaningful virtual communication with peers and qualified language instructors. Virtual high school courses (e.g., Kentucky, Florida, Ball State University) and entirely online high schools (e.g., K-12, Stanford University Online High School) have developed course offerings in foreign languages that are widely available to high school students across the USA.

Problems and Difficulties

Although great progress has been made in reshaping policy and practices in K-12 language education, much work is still in progress.

Bringing the standards into classrooms requires vigorous continued efforts. The national *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages* and some state standards are voluntary, as is the use of proficiency progress indicators. As a result, in those K-12 settings where there is a lack of professional development, or a poor understanding of how standards and proficiency indicators are more powerful than previous (or previously nonexistent) expectations, or where there is a lack of funding to revise existing curricula and related materials, change will come very slowly. Further, standards for student learning are only useful if students are enrolled in

foreign language courses. Despite an increase in high school level offerings and enrollments, due in part to increased access to Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and dual-credit courses for college credit, most students do not begin language learning before high school (Rhodes and Pufahl 2009; Draper and Hicks 2002). Despite an increase in dual-immersion offerings at the K-8 level, opportunities to develop meaningful levels of language proficiency are limited in the elementary and middle grades. The majority of elementary and middle school programs are limited in contact time and therefore resulting outcomes. Most classes meet for 60 min or less per week; many programs aim only or language and culture exposure and appreciation (Rhodes and Pufahl 2009).

Likewise, curriculum and program articulation remains a challenge across schools and grade levels. Unfortunately, for many students, changing teachers or changing schools often means revisiting the same material previously taught. Some students report taking first-year language courses in the elementary grades, again in secondary school, and yet again in college. The National Security Education Program, a federal program, has funded several K-16 pipeline initiatives and language roadmap development projects to address these foreign language articulation challenges within local or state-level educational systems. However, these initiatives are not yet widespread throughout the USA, leaving articulation gaps in many pockets of the country.

In addition, many states and local school districts have implemented policies and mechanisms by which learners can earn high school credit by demonstrating proficiency in various content areas, including foreign language, and this movement continues to grow. The credit-by-proficiency approach has benefitted a broad range of learners, such as students who speak languages other than English in the home, or those who have significant outside experience through summer intensive study or living abroad. Furthermore, as of early 2016, 14 states and the District of Columbia implemented legislation to award a Seal of Biliteracy for students who attain a high level of proficiency in two or more languages by high school graduation. The Seal of Biliteracy is a gold seal that is stamped on the transcript or diploma of a graduating senior, which can be used as documentation of proficiency for future educational or employment purposes. However, this credit-by-proficiency approach is not without its own challenges. Some students have experienced resistance by school counselors and administrators to credit by proficiency, particularly if they seek to demonstrate proficiency in a language not offered as part of their traditional high school language offerings. Furthermore, the assessment measures by which students demonstrate their proficiency vary across state and local contexts and vary significantly in what they assess and thus value.

As the landscape shifts and language education becomes a priority, it is likely to exacerbate an existing teacher shortage. In some parts of the USA, and particularly since enrollments in Spanish have jumped to over 75% of the total foreign language enrollment, it is difficult to find Spanish teachers. As interest in languages less commonly taught has gained momentum, the teacher shortage is even more severe. For many of the less commonly taught languages, there are few institutions that prepare teachers of those languages, and choices among materials for instruction are highly limited and often outdated. Initiatives such as the National Foreign Language

Center's STARTALK program and online teacher preparation programs have emerged as effective ways to address these shortages, though these programs are not yet offered system-wide across the USA. Developing such programs requires significant amounts of funding, funding that has not yet been widely available within education.

Future Directions

The changing landscape of language education policy reported in this chapter has been spurred in large part by issues of national security. On the one hand, there are concerns about our ability to promote peace, to understand the motivations of those who wish harm to the USA, and to interpret the intelligence that our government gathers. Clearly, these rest on language skills and cultural understanding. On the other hand, our national security also rests upon our ability to maintain a strong presence in the global economy. To do that, current and future generations of Americans will need to be able to communicate effectively across linguistic and cultural boundaries or be left behind those who can. Although these needs are legitimate and important and have energized language educators, it is also helpful to look back at other times in our history when languages were important for their instrumental value – whether for political or economic reasons – and be cognizant of the subsequent trajectory of support for foreign language learning.

As languages become a more integral part of American students' educations, it would be promising if the value of knowing other languages were acknowledged for its contribution to a well-rounded general education, for the academic and/or cognitive benefits it may provide, or, simply, for the personal enjoyment that can derive from direct access to the people of other cultures, their arts, and their lives.

Cross-References

► The Role of the National Standards in Second/Foreign Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Christina Higgins: Language Education and Globalization. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Joseph Sung-Yul Park: Researching Globalization of English. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Lorena Llosa: Assessing Students' Content Knowledge and Language Proficiency. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment

Viniti Vaish: Biliteracy and Globalization. In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

Wayne Wright: Language Policy and Education in the USA. In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

Abbott, M., Brecht, R. D., Davidson, D. E., Fenstermacher, H., Fischer, D., Rivers, W. P.,. . ., & Wiley, T. (2014). Languages for all? final report. Resource document. Center for advanced study of language. Retrieved from http://www.casl.umd.edu/sites/default/files/LFA2013_FinalReport.pdf

ACTFL Assessment of Performance toward Proficiency in Languages. (2012). American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Retrieved from http://aappl.actfl.org

Adair-Hauck, B., Glisan, E. W., & Troyan, F. J. (2013). *Implementing integrated performance assessment*. Alexandria: ACTFL Publications.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2013). NCSSFL-ACTFL can-do statements. Resource document. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/Can-Do_Statements_2015.pdf

Brown, C. (1994). Elementary school foreign language programs in the United States. In R. D. Lambert (Ed.), *Foreign language policy: An agenda for change* (Vol. 532, pp. 164–176). Philadelphia, PA: Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Christian, D., & Rhodes, N. (1997). Innovative second language education in North America. In G. R. Tucker & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Second language education, Vol. 4, pp. 165–174). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Christian, D., Montone, C., Lindholm, K., & Carranza, I. (1997). *Profiles in two-way immersion education*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Curtain, H., & Dahlberg, C. A. (2004). *Languages and children: Making the match*. Boston: Pearson.

Draper, J., & Hicks, J. (1994). Foreign language enrollments in public secondary schools, fall 1994. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(3), 303–306.

Draper, J., & Hicks, J. (2002). Foreign language enrollments in US public high schools 1890–200. Resource document. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Retrieved from http://aappl.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/Enroll2000.pdf

Fortune, T. W., & Tedick, D. J. (2008). *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Hamayan, E., Genessee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction from A to Z: Practical guidance for teachers and administrators*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Ingold, C. W., & Wang, S. C. (2010). The teachers we need: Transforming world language education in the United States. Resource document. National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland. Retrieved from http://www.nflc.org/publications/the_teachers_we_need.pdf

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, INTASC Foreign Language Standards Committee. (2002). Model standards for licensing beginning foreign language teachers: A resource for state dialogue. Resource document. Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from http://programs.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/ForeignLanguageStandards.pdf

Jackson, F. H., & Malone, M. E. (2009). Building the foreign language capacity we need: Toward a comprehensive strategy for a national language framework. Resource document. National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland. Retrieved from http://www.nflc.org/publications/Building_The_Foreign_Language_Capacity_We_Need

Kelly, L. G. (1976). *25 centuries of language teaching*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

LinguaFolio. (2014). Resource document. National council of state supervisors for languages. Retrieved from http://www.ncssfl.org/LinguaFolio/index.php?linguafolio_index

Liskin-Gasparro, J. E. (1984). The ACTFL proficiency guidelines: An historical perspective. In T. V. Higgs (Ed.), *Teaching for proficiency: The organizing principle* (pp. 13–31). Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company.

Met, M. (1994). Foreign language policy in US secondary schools: Who decides? In R. D. Lambert (Ed.), *Foreign language policy: An agenda for change* (Vol. 532, pp. 149–163). Philadelphia, PA: Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Met, M. (2001). Why language learning matters. *Educational Leadership, 59*(2), 36–40.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2013). *World languages standards* (2nd ed.). Resource document. Author. Retrieved from http://boardcertifiedteachers.org/sites/default/files/ECYA-WL.pdf

The National Standards Collaborative Board. (2015). *World-readiness standards for learning languages*, 4th ed. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Omaggio-Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Phillips, J. K., & Abbott, M. (2011). A decade of foreign language standards: Influence, impact, and future directions. Resource document. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/national-standards-2011.pdf

Rhodes, N. C., & Pufahl, I. (2009). Foreign language teaching in U.S. schools: Results of a national survey. Resource document. Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/what-we-do/projects/national-k-12-foreign-language-survey

Stewart, V., & Wang, S. (2005). Expanding Chinese language capacity in the United States. Resource document. Asia Society. Retrieved from http://asiasociety.org/files/expandingchinese.pdf

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1991). Additive bilingualism and French immersion education: The roles of language proficiency and literacy. In H. G. Reynolds (Ed.), *Bilingualism, multiculturalism, and second language learning: The McGill conference in Honour of Wallace E. Lambert* (pp. 203–214). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tedick, D. J., & Christian, D. (2011). *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

TELL Project. (2012). Teacher effectiveness for language learning framework. Resource document. AdvanceLearning. Retrieved from http://www.tellproject.org/framework/

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed world*. Albuquerque: Fuente Press.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Part IV

Teacher Preparation and Professional Development

Overseas Training of Chinese Secondary Teachers of English

Daguo Li and Viv Edwards

Contents

Introduction 374
Early Developments 374
Major Contributions 375
Problems and Difficulties 379
Future Directions 381
Cross-References 382
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 382
References 383

Abstract

This chapter offers an overview of continuing professional development (CPD) for Chinese teachers of English. We examine reasons for the growth of English teaching and the importance attached by the Chinese government to the role of CPD in the implementation of educational reform. We discuss early responses to these developments in the form of in-country collaboration with overseas partners, courses delivered by Chinese providers, and overseas programs. An overview of research points, on the one hand, to the willingness of teachers to embrace reform and, on the other hand, the limited evidence of change in the classroom. Resistance to reform is explained in terms of preoccupation with examinations by the society at large and the particular difficulties facing the less-developed western provinces and rural areas. Particular challenges facing CPD delivered in China include the low levels of linguistic and cultural competence of English

D. Li (✉)
International Study and Language Institute (ISLI), University of Reading, Reading, UK
e-mail: d.li@reading.ac.uk

V. Edwards (✉)
Institute of Education, University of Reading, Reading, UK
e-mail: v.k.edwards@reading.ac.uk

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_21

teachers. These limitations are minimized when CPD takes place in English-speaking countries where benefits include increased proficiency in English, as well as heightened awareness of pedagogical choices and intercultural understanding. However, the associated challenges include sustainability and the need for overseas providers to work together with participants to ensure that content and delivery match actual needs. Directions for future research are suggested, with particular attention to the needs of multilingual ethnic minority and rural communities.

Keywords
China • Teachers of english • Continuing professional development • Overseas collaboration • Sustainability

Introduction

Continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers is playing an increasingly important role in educational reform internationally (Day and Sachs 2008). China is no exception to this trend and CPD is now an established feature of national educational policies. In recent years, a growing number of Chinese teachers of English have had the opportunity to participate in short training courses overseas in predominantly English-speaking countries such as the UK, the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. This new development raises a number of issues for both sponsors and providers concerning appropriateness, impact, and sustainability of interest not only in the context of China but in many other settings where English teaching is receiving greater prominence.

Early Developments

Although English has been a compulsory subject in middle schools in China since 1902, Russian was the preferred foreign language until the breakdown in diplomatic relations with the former USSR in the 1960s, at which time it gave way to English. It was only in the wake of globalization and China's Open Door policy, however, that the instrumental value of English for the development of the nation and the socio-economic prospects of the individual have been widely acknowledged, leading to a huge demand for English teachers (Pan and Block 2011). In 2002 an estimated 470,000 teachers were involved in the teaching of English at the secondary level (Wang 2007). In the following year, the new English National Curriculum (Ministry of Education 2011) lowered the age for compulsory English instruction to Grade 3 (children aged 9 to 10) in less-developed areas and Grade 1 (ages 6 to 7) in more developed areas. These changes are estimated to have created a further 300,000 teachers of English (Wang and Gao 2008). The need for CPD and pedagogical training in this new work force is particularly pressing in light of the low levels of

proficiency in English achieved by many English teachers (Wang 2014; Shen and Wang 2009).

Dissatisfaction with the outcomes of English teaching has led to far-reaching reform (Wang 2007; Pan and Block 2011), characterized by the desire for quality, innovation, and a gradual move away from a deep-seated preoccupation with the examination-driven curriculum, as evidenced in national policy documents such as the *National Medium-to-Long-Term Plan for Education Reform and Development (Guo jia zhong chang qi jiao yu gai ge he fa zhan gui hua gang yao*) (Xinhua News 2010). Of particular note are the two new curricula, the 2001 National English Curriculum Standards, and the 2003 National English Curriculum Standards for Senior Middle School (the "new curricula" for short).

The emphasis of the new curricula is very much in line with western developments such as communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based language teaching (Butler 2011). This represents a significant shift in focus from traditional approaches, which rely heavily on a notion of language teaching that emphasizes knowledge transmission (e.g., vocabulary and grammatical structures) and in which teachers closely follow a prescribed, authoritative textbook. Teacher reception has been mixed. Wang (2007) reports that the vast majority of teachers surveyed welcomed the changes advocated. Similarly, in a study of British Council teacher-training partnerships with Chinese universities, Gu (2005: 291) offers evidence of Chinese teachers' "openness to CLT methodologies and a willingness to change and improve their teaching practice." However, change and innovation in English language education (ELE) is often characterized by a feeling of insecurity, vulnerability, and pressure on the part of many teachers (Wang 2007). Appropriate levels of training and support for teachers' professional development are clearly fundamental to the success of the reform agenda as embodied in the new curricula.

Major Contributions

For this reason, CPD for teachers has been recognized as a priority at national level and there is a growing awareness among teachers of the importance of career-long learning (Ministry of Education 1999; Xinhua News 2010). There is a wide range of models of delivery. In some instances, an overseas provider has worked in collaboration with Chinese partners on courses delivered wholly in China. On other occasions, responsibility for delivery has laid solely with Chinese trainers in education colleges run by provincial and municipal educational authorities and in tertiary teacher education and other institutions of higher learning. Examples include the short training courses for key teachers organized at the provincial level in the early 2000s (Li and Edwards 2013) and the more recent national drive to train teachers, particularly those from rural areas (Ministry of Education and Ministry of Finance 2010). In still other cases, overseas institutions and organizations have delivered courses in English-speaking countries.

Gu (2005) and Yan (2008) describe the first model of delivery: collaboration with a Chinese partner on courses organized in China, in this case as part of a Sino-British

development project which ran between 1997 and 2002. In common with many aid-funded projects, this initiative involved input from expatriate specialists and provision of "on-the-job counterpart training." Both authors focus on obstacles to the long-term sustainability of programs of this kind. Gu (2005) uses questionnaire and interview data from a sample of 24 Chinese universities that had hosted the project to highlight differences in perception not only between the British specialists and Chinese teachers but among the British specialists; she concludes that culturally appropriate methodology is essential to the organization of courses in cross-cultural contexts. Yan (2008) also draws on questionnaire and interview data, in this case collected from participants in a 1-year program for trainee teachers of English in Hubei Province. Attention is focused on the neglect of cultural differences and local needs, for example, different perceptions of accreditation, lack of relevance to the local context of western pedagogical ideas such as teacher-made course design/syllabi, use of English as the only medium of instruction, and inclusion of a component on English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in the program. Such issues seem to have arisen as a result both of the external funders' lack of local knowledge and of insufficient communication between the two sides.

Most examples of CPD, however, are delivered entirely by Chinese trainers. To support the implementation of the new curricula, a national in-service teacher-training program was designed using a cascade model (Yan 2012; see also, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Finance 2010). Initially, this took the form of short training courses lasting between 2 and 3 weeks with participants nominated by provincial educational authorities. The focus of the courses was on the goals of the reform, the accompanying textbooks, and the approaches to teaching embedded in the new curricula. When participants returned to their provinces, they were expected to deliver workshops, which usually extended over 10 days during the summer break, to colleagues in surrounding districts. These courses were supplemented by monthly events delivered by a local expert, which were designed to build on existing knowledge of the reform and facilitate implementation. In addition, workshops and seminars were organized at district and school levels.

Wang (2013) describes one such initiative in an evaluation (2008–2012) of a 240-credit-hour course for teachers in 30 urban primary schools in Nanjing, Jiangsu Province. The course had three main aims: to increase proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening; to develop intercultural communicative competence; and to improve practical skills in areas such as classroom management and curriculum design. Alongside this program of more formal learning, participants were encouraged to work in apprenticeship mode with more experienced colleagues, to make classroom observation visits to other schools, and to attend regional and national workshops and seminars. The majority of the "jiaoyanyuan" (teaching and research fellows) or trainers responsible for the organization and delivery of this program had completed a 1-year PGCE (Postgraduate Certificate in Education) at a UK university. On the basis of classroom observation/s, a questionnaire survey of 45 participants and 45 nonparticipants in the program and interviews with teachers, colleagues, and pupils, Wang (2013) concludes that, although attitudes toward the new curricula were extremely positive, very little change could be detected in

classroom practice. Inadequate professional expertise, student resistance, lack of school support, and "examination culture" were proposed as major constraints on attempts to implement reform.

Yan (2012) describes another initiative. The first stage of a study of English secondary teachers' perceptions and implementation of the new English curriculum reform focused on three teachers in Hubei Province at different phases of their careers; it drew on observation, post-class discussions, and interviews. The second stage involved senior teachers responsible for the delivery of the national "all teachers' professional development project" (*quanyuan peixunjihua*). In spite of widespread enthusiasm for the new curriculum and associated pedagogies, classroom realities fell short of national requirements. Teachers highlighted the significant challenges to their beliefs, student resistance, lack of support from management, and the negative effects of the all-pervasive examination culture as major obstacles to progress.

The courses organized in China have in fact attracted considerable criticism. Zhang (2014), for instance, reports that all 38 teachers on a short course at a UK university expressed dissatisfaction with their previous experience of professional development. Overseas-based CPD, in contrast, has two obvious advantages over courses delivered in China: immersion in the target language for teachers whose proficiency in English is often fairly limited and firsthand exposure to authentic intercultural experience.

Overseas provision consists of courses of varying lengths in the UK, Australia, the US, Canada, and New Zealand, which offer firsthand experience of other education systems as well as exposure to the target language and local cultures. During the decade 2000 to 2010, for instance, more than 3000 Chinese teachers of English were sent to the UK alone, based on the present authors' rough estimate. Courses are offered at both preservice and in-service levels. In some cases the Chinese language teaching professionals enroll in existing courses, such as Masters' programs; in other cases, English teachers attend tailor-made, short-term courses varying in length from 1 to 6 months.

One of the earliest studies of overseas CPD was undertaken by Burnaby and Sun (1989) and involved a survey of 14 Chinese teachers in higher education participating in a cooperative program designed to prepare participants for academic work and study attachments in Canada. Data obtained from this source was supplemented by interviews with ten university teachers of English. The findings focus firmly on the appropriateness or otherwise of western "communicative" approaches in China, a topic which was attracting considerable discussion in the English language teaching literature at the time (Pennycook 1994). A consensus emerged among participants that CLT was best suited to students planning to visit English-speaking countries and cited the curriculum, traditional teaching methods, class sizes, resources, and the current professional skills of teachers as reasons that this approach was ill-suited for Chinese classrooms.

In later studies, this resistance to change appears to be weaker. Conway and Richards (2007) evaluate a 6-month course at a New Zealand University designed for eight experienced teachers of English from a vocational polytechnic in Shanghai.

In order to establish the extent to which their needs had been met and to provide a basis for future improvement, two data sources were analyzed. They included a letter written by each participant to a colleague reflecting on their time in New Zealand and responses to a questionnaire based on the teachers' initial expression of needs and the content covered in the program. Finally, the teachers were asked to provide three reflections over a period of 6 months to assess the extent to which the course had met their needs on their return. On-course reflections focused mainly on development of their knowledge of teaching and learning and suggested that, in general, their needs had been met. The post-transfer reflections demonstrated that teachers continued to use new techniques to motivate their students, to experiment with project work, and to explore the role of the teacher. However, the authors acknowledge that, had they more fully explained the purpose of the needs assessment, it might have been possible to generate more extensive, in-depth data. They also stress the importance of establishing dialogue with participants early in the course in order to respond to additional needs as they arise.

Although the main focus for this contribution is Mainland China, discussions of CPD in Hong Kong also throw light on our understanding of this topic. Bridges (2007) describes an intensive 6-week CPD course in Australia designed to prepare Chinese-speaking English teachers from Hong Kong for the Langua*ge Proficiency Assessment for Teachers (English Language)* (LPATE). The program followed the syllabus prescribed by the mandatory language proficiency requirement for teachers in secondary and primary schools. The focus of this study was on participant perceptions of the development of their English language skills, their understanding of pedagogy, and their development of intercultural understanding. The unique colonial history of Hong Kong and the requirements of the sponsoring authorities led Bridges to reflect on the importance for the effective delivery of the forces driving INSET initiatives, the curriculum in the country of origin, and local norms in pedagogy. She also draws attention to the limitations of the one-shot nature of short-term INSET programs and to the need for continuing support on participants' return in order to increase the probability of longer-term impact.

Several studies by the same authors (Edwards and Li 2011; Li and Edwards 2013; Li and Edwards 2014) report on different aspects of 3-month courses for teachers of English from the western provinces of China delivered at a UK university. Unlike the studies reported above, these authors focus more on the impact of the overseas experience on participants' teaching on their return than on course evaluation. Based on interviews, focus group discussions involving 48 English teachers who had participated in the program over a number of years and 9 of their colleagues who had not taken part, and interviews with 10 senior managers and classroom observation, Edwards and Li (2011) and Li and Edwards (2013) examine aspects of the Chinese situation that are supportive of change as well as those that constrain innovation. Evidence is offered both of innovation in classroom practice and "reinvention" of innovations to ensure a better fit with local needs. Using responses to a questionnaire from 229 returnee teachers in 15 cohorts in addition to the data collected as part of the earlier study, Li and Edwards (2014) highlight the importance of follow-up for the returnee teachers at the national level.

While the earlier studies aim for breadth, Zhang (2014) is interested in depth. She draws on data collected from a cohort of 38 teachers in the same program, using pre- and post-course surveys; focus group discussions with the whole cohort at the end of the course; and interviews with five of the participants both before they left the UK and again 6 months later. In all the studies of this program, evidence is presented for changes in teachers' philosophies of education directly attributable to participation in the courses, for improved teacher competencies (linguistic, cultural, and pedagogical) in the classroom, and for the ways in which returnees are undertaking new roles and responsibilities that exploit their new understandings. However, Zhang (2014) explores cultural understanding in greater depth, not least in the context of participants' experience of 3 months spent in a home stay family setting. By the end of the course, individuals could be placed along a continuum in terms of the extent to which they had achieved intercultural sensitivity or to which their stereotypes had been challenged. In particular, the data collected from the case study teachers 6 months after their return suggests that their experiences had helped them achieve a more balanced worldview, enhanced understanding of issues relating to culture, and the ability to act as a bridge between British and Chinese culture in their teaching. This study also demonstrates a nuanced understanding of the constraints facing teachers on return, including the lack of enthusiasm for CPD on the part of some colleagues and the challenges of working in the less-developed western provinces.

Wang (2014), too, focuses on the UK, in this case, on a convenience sample of 91 Chinese secondary teachers of English who had studied on various programs between 2004 and 2009. Questionnaire responses from 91 participants and 20 interviews served as the basis for an exploration of the influence of the study abroad experience on language proficiency, teaching ideology, and their status as nonnative English-speaking teachers. Length of study abroad emerged as an important determinant of teachers' attitudes toward their jobs and their own performance as teachers. Those who had spent more time in the UK appeared to be more aware of the role of English as an international language and to have a more positive view of the potential of both L1 and L2 as resources in the L2 classroom. Wang also highlights the importance of study abroad for professional development. Reflection on aspects of pedagogy and cultural awareness in an English-speaking country appeared to help build participants' confidence in their effectiveness as teachers.

Finally, Keengwe and Kang (2013) report the findings of a 3-year study on the implementation of a technology-rich curriculum for Chinese teachers of English. They point to the need not only to provide appropriate support for in-service teachers in their efforts to innovate but also to develop a sound understanding of the needs of these teachers on the part of curriculum developers.

Problems and Difficulties

The summary of major contributions above highlights a number of ongoing problems and difficulties for English teachers in China. Limited competence in English remains one of the foremost challenges. The recognition of benefits of spending time

in an English-speaking country is, however, an important step forward. In Hong Kong, for instance, an immersion experience is mandatory at both preservice and in-service levels. The scale of the challenge for Hong Kong (population 7.2 million), of course, pales into insignificance when viewed alongside the CPD needs of Mainland China (1.4 billion). The numbers of teachers able to spend time in an English-speaking environment, while large and growing, will necessarily remain limited. Yet, at the same time, one of the effects of greater exposure to English in recent years through film, TV, and the Internet has been to increase the confidence and proficiency levels of younger students and teachers.

The same observation applies to cultural awareness (Byram and Feng 2004). The benefits of study abroad extend well beyond language proficiency: intercultural competence improves; so, too, does confidence in incorporating elements of the foreign culture in teaching. Inevitably, the level of intercultural sensitivity of participants acquired on overseas-based CPD varies considerably from one person to the next, as does the extent to which stereotypes are challenged. However, there can be little doubt that those teachers who have studied abroad, and particularly those who have stayed with local host families, display greater intercultural awareness and confidence than those who have studied only in China.

The early history of CLT was associated with "one-size-fits-all" assumptions of cultural superiority (Pennycook 1994). While noting that some aspects of innovation represent serious challenges, it would be wrong to suggest that this approach has nothing of value or relevance to Chinese language classrooms. Nor should we conclude that Chinese teachers are either unable or unwilling to adopt ideas from other cultures, provided adequate training and support are provided. While traditional practices still seem to predominate, particularly in the less-developed western provinces, there is no shortage of evidence of willingness to experiment and change.

An emerging theme in research on the CPD of Chinese English language teachers in recent years worth noting is the mismatch between Western and Chinese education ideologies, curricula, and pedagogical practices and the consequent challenges facing Western-trained returnee Chinese teachers in their local classroom and workplace contexts (e.g., Pu and Pawan 2013; Li and Edwards 2014). The wider debate on cultures of learning and intercultural adaptation, as discussed, for example, in Jin and Cortazzi (2011), shed light on this new theme. It is also important to recognize that the challenges facing teachers in the less-developed western provinces – very large classes, lower levels of English, limited human and material resources, and lack of support and sympathy on the part of administration and colleagues (see, e.g., Zhang 2014) – may be different from those encountered by teachers in the more affluent coastal regions and therefore more daunting. The less favorable situation of teachers from less-developed regions and rural areas may have a negative effect on teacher motivation and willingness to experiment with innovative practice.

Yet several aspects of the Chinese situation predispose teachers to change. These include the evident dissatisfaction of many educators with the effectiveness of English teaching in China and the supportive policy environment. Robinson and Latchem (2003: 239) identify two conditions which need to be fulfilled if new teaching methods are to become established: first they have to be "proven in

practice"; and second, they should be adopted by "a critical mass of teachers who, together, reinforce each other's beliefs, reduce the risks of innovation and eventually change the culture of teaching." The fact that Chinese teachers form strong "communities of practice" (Li and Edwards 2013; Pawan and Fan 2014) creates opportunities to see the results of innovation and stimulate discussion of new ideas with colleagues. The studies reviewed above suggest that, although the benefits of overseas training vary considerably from one teacher to the next, those with overseas experience are better equipped and more willing to implement reform. As such, they can be seen as opinion leaders with considerable influence among their peers; when trusted colleagues successfully adopt new methods, this offers valuable reassurance.

Given the urgency of the modernization project, it is not surprising that the national, provincial, and local education authorities, as well as the individual schools who are investing in overseas CPD, should expect that returnees share what they have learned with colleagues. This cascade model, however, is by no means unproblematic: when those involved in the delivery of the training are not sufficiently experienced or have not yet achieved a full understanding of the relevant issues, their ability to replicate course content is inevitably limited.

Last but by no means least, attention must be paid to the responsibilities of overseas program providers. Where teacher educators and teachers work at cultural boundaries (as is the case in any partnership between overseas providers and Chinese clients), there is a real danger that providers are constrained by their inability to see beyond the prism of their own experience. It is imperative that those involved in overseas CPD have a sound understanding – and ideally, firsthand experience – of the teaching conditions of course participants and a genuine commitment to work together to ensure that content and delivery match participants' needs.

Future Directions

Given the huge numbers of teachers and learners of English, China clearly represents fertile ground for research; exposure to and collaboration with Chinese researchers also offers many opportunities for greater articulation with international studies on professional development, study abroad and immersion experiences, and second language learning and teaching. The following are some suggestions for lines of inquiry likely to prove particularly rewarding.

The population of China consists of 56 ethnic groups. Research on CPD to date, however, has tended to focus on the Han majority rather than minority communities. The work of Li and colleagues reviewed above is based on teachers from the western provinces, a substantial proportion of whom belong to ethnic minorities, and there has been no focus to date on the special challenges facing teachers and students for whom English is a third language (after their mother tongue and Mandarin). The emergence of research on bi- and trilingual education programs in China (see, for instance, Feng 2007) will hopefully serve as a springboard for the development of CPD that responds to these needs.

Attempts to support the professional development of teachers in rural areas, including the use of distance learning, are emerging. Robinson (2008), for instance, describes how the Gansu Basic Education project (2001–2007), funded by the European Union and the Chinese government, improved access, equity, and quality in professional development for rural teachers in this western province. Although no attention was paid specifically to teachers of English, the use of ICT (information and communications technology) in CPD for this particular group is likely to be a fruitful area of exploration for future research. In a similar vein, the widespread use of mobile technology and social media (such as QQ and WeChat) in China represents another useful avenue, particularly in terms of the development of online communities and knowledge creation (Li and Edwards 2014).

The rapid growth of the English immersion schools established in many parts of China with the help of central, provincial, and municipal governments offers further opportunities for researchers. For instance, some 55,000 children were enrolled in English immersion schools in Shanghai alone in 2005 (Hu 2005). Very little research, however, has been conducted on the professional development needs of teachers working in these schools (Song and Cheng 2011).

Finally, the focus of much of the earlier research on the needs of English teachers in China was on higher rather than basic education, reflecting the fact that most teachers of English studying overseas at this time were affiliated with universities (Wang and Gao 2008). Although subsequently attention turned to the primary and secondary sectors, it is likely that the spotlight will return to university teachers. Much work, however, remains to be done both on documenting the current situation, assessing needs, and evaluating attempts to meet these needs.

Cross-References

► Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in the Asia-Pacific Region
► The Role of the National Standards in Second/Foreign Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Anne-Brit Fenner: Cultural Awareness in the Foreign Language Classroom. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism
Nike Arnold: Technology and Second Language Teacher Professional Development. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology
Ofelia García: Multilingual Language Awareness and Teacher Education. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

References

Bridges, S. (2007). Learner perceptions of a professional development immersion course. *Prospect, 22*(2), 39–60.

Burnaby, B., & Sun, Y. (1989). Chinese teachers' views of western language teaching: Context informs paradigms. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 219–238.

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 36–57.

Byram, M., & Feng, A. (2004). Culture and language learning: Teaching, research and scholarship. *Language Teaching, 37*, 149–168.

Conway, C., & Richards, H. (2007). Meeting the needs of visiting EFL teachers. *TESOLANZ Journal, 15*, 71–88.

Day, C., & Sachs, J. (2008). *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers*. Maidenhead: Open University Press with McGraw-Hill Education.

Edwards, V., & Li, D. (2011). *Confucius, constructivism and the impact of continuing professional development of teachers of English in China*. London: British Council Research Papers.

Feng, A. W. (Ed.). (2007). *Bilingual education in China: Practices, policies, concepts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gu, Q. (2005). The perception gap in cross-cultural training: An investigation of British Council English language teaching projects in China. *International Journal of Educational Development, 25*, 287–304.

Hu, G. (2005). Professional development of secondary EFL teachers: Lessons from China. *Teachers College Record, 107*, 654–705.

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Researching Chinese learners: Skills, perceptions, intercultural adaptations*. Houndmills: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Keengwe, J., & Kang, J. J. (2013). Preparing in-service language teachers to design and implement technology-rich curriculum. *Education and Information Technologies, 18*, 609–619.

Li, D., & Edwards, V. (2013). The impact of overseas training on curriculum innovation and change in English language education in Western China. *Language Teaching Research, 17*, 390–408.

Li, D., & Edwards, V. (2014). English language teaching and educational reform in Western China: A knowledge management perspective. *System, 47*, 88–101.

Ministry of Education. (1999). *Jiao yu bu 1999 nian gong zuo yao dian* [Priorities of the Ministry of Education for 1999]. Retrieved October, 2014, from http://www.eol.cn/article/20050819/3147517.shtml

Ministry of Education. (2011). *English curriculum standards for compulsory education*. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Publishing Group.

Ministry of Education & Ministry of Finance. (2010). *National teacher training programme*. http://www.gov.cn/zwgk/2010-06/30/content_1642031.htm. Accessed 5 June 2013.

Pan, L., & Block, D. (2011). English as a "global language" in China: An investigation into learners' and teachers' language beliefs. *System, 39*, 391–402.

Pawan, F., & Fan, W. (2014). Sustaining expertise through collaborative/peer-mediated and individual reflections: The experiences of Chinese English language teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 41*, 71–88.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.

Pu, H., & Pawan, F. (2013). *The pedagogy and practice of western-trained Chinese english language teachers: Foreign education, Chinese meanings*. New York: Routledge.

Robinson, B. (2008). Using distance education and ICT to improve access, equity and the quality in rural teachers' professional development in western China. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 9*, 1–17.

Robinson, B., & Latchem, C. (2003). *Teacher education through open and distance learning*. London: Routledge.

Shen, F. Y., & Wang, X. Y. (2009). Who can become "ideal English teachers". *Journal of Shandong Foreign Languages Teaching, 30*, 48–57.

Song, X., & Cheng, L. (2011). Investigating primary English immersion teachers in China: Background, instructional contexts, professional development, and perceptions. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 39*, 97–112.

Wang, Q. (2007). The national curriculum changes and their effects on English language teaching in the People's Republic of China. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 87–105). New York: Springer.

Wang, P. (2013). Assessing the impact of 240-credit-hour programme for urban primary school teachers of English in China. *English Language Teaching, 6*, 97–104.

Wang, D. (2014). Effects of study abroad on teachers' self-perceptions: A study of Chinese EFL teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5*, 70–79.

Wang, W., & Gao, X. (2008). English language education in China: A review of selected research. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 29*, 380–399.

Xinhua News. (2010). *Guo jia zhong chang qi jiao yu gai ge he fa zhan gui hua gang yao (2010–2020)* [National medium-to-long-term plan for education reform and development (2010–2020)]. http://www.gov.cn/jrzg/2010-07/29/content_1667143.htm. Accessed 5 June 2013.

Yan, C. (2008). Mutual adaptation: Enhancing longer-term sustainability of cross-cultural in-service teacher training initiatives in China. *System, 36*, 586–606.

Yan, C. (2012). 'We can only change in a small way': A study of secondary English teachers' implementation of curriculum reform in China. *Journal of Educational Change, 13*, 431–447.

Zhang, X. (2014). *Impact of residential courses in the UK on the continuing professional development of Chinese teachers of English and educational change in Western provinces in China*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Reading, Reading.

The Professional Development of Foreign Language Instructors in Postsecondary Education

Linda von Hoene

Contents

Introduction 386
Early Developments 386
Major Contributions 389
Problems and Difficulties 392
Future Directions 393
Cross-References 394
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 394
References 394

Abstract

This review traces developments in the preparation of foreign language instructors in postsecondary education from the post-World War II period to the present. It highlights the increasing systematization of TA professional development programs starting in the 1960s and the influence of proficiency standards and the emergence of the fields of second language acquisition and applied linguistics in the 1980s. The formalization of the role of the Language Program Director in the 1980s and the articulation of standards for this position are also discussed. The review also brings to light revised models of TA professional development in foreign language education proposed in the 1990s that are informed by applied linguistics, literacy, and other theoretical discourses. Trends in the late 1990s such as a focus on the professional development of lecturers are also discussed. The impact of the 2007 MLA report, Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World, and the implications of that report for TA professional development are featured. The review also discusses recent changes

L. von Hoene (✉)
Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) Teaching and Resource Center, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA
e-mail: vonhoene@berkeley.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_29

in TA professional development such as the emergence of certificates in foreign language teaching. Challenges in TA professional development, in particular the limitation of time devoted to professional development in the graduate curriculum and the resulting difficulty in incorporating the full range of theoretical discourses into TA professional development, are also discussed. Areas for future research, including an analysis of the current content of TA professional development courses and the impact of certificate programs on hiring are also presented.

Keywords
Professional development • TA • Preparation of foreign language instructors

Introduction

The teaching of foreign languages in postsecondary education is carried out by a heterogeneous group of instructors: tenure-track professors and graduate teaching assistants whose training is most frequently in literary and cultural studies and non-tenure-track instructors, often native speakers, with master's or Ph.D.'s in literature and cultural studies or linguistics. The initial professional development of these instructors takes place within the framework of graduate programs, when these instructors serve as teaching assistants and, in most cases, receive formal preparation in teaching undergraduate language courses. The ongoing professional development of these instructors once they have assumed faculty positions is usually left to the devices and initiative of the individual instructor. In isolated cases, ongoing professional development may be provided by a university-wide language center or through a centralized office of instructional development. Because of the foundational role played by teaching assistant professional development programs in the preparation of foreign language instructors, this review will focus primarily on research on graduate-level programs. Although to a lesser degree, the review will also address research on the professional development of language program directors, faculty who oversee the preparation of teaching assistants, and other faculty, in particular those in adjunct and non-tenure-track lecturer positions.

Early Developments

As Schulz (2000) and Hagiwara (1976) observe, publications on foreign language teacher education prior to the 1950s focused primarily on secondary school instructors. With the postwar increase in undergraduate enrollments as a result of the GI bill and the dramatic increase in foreign language enrollments brought on by the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958, foreign language departments at research universities began to rely almost exclusively on the use of teaching assistants to conduct introductory foreign language courses. This use of teaching assistants, most of whom were fresh out of college and had never taught before, thus

served as the catalyst for research and discussion about the formal preparation of postsecondary foreign language instructors.

Publications from the mid-1950s to the early 1980s on the professional development of postsecondary instructors focus primarily on the need to establish systematic preparation for teaching assistants and provide recommendations for doing so. In this period, a number of articles discussing best practices emerge in journals such as the *Modern Language Journal* (e.g., Remak 1957; Dalbor 1967; Azevedo 1976), *Foreign Language Annals* (e.g., Ervin and Muyskens 1982), the *ADFL Bulletin* (e.g., DiDonato 1983), and disciplinary journals such as the *French Review* (e.g., Gilbert and McArthur 1975).

Initial recommendations for providing teaching assistant preparation first appear in the 1955 Modern Language Association (MLA) conference report (PMLA 70.4, 1955). The report, based on five meetings of 18 foreign language department chairs, identifies a number of in-service teacher preparation activities already underway at several of the represented institutions, including methods courses, class visitation, general supervision, and collaboration in the preparation and grading of exams and calls for a formal certification program for foreign language graduate assistants that would consist of courses (e.g., in phonetics, applied linguistics, methods) and the passing of a nationally standardized exam that would be given under the auspices of the MLA.

From the early 1960s to the late 1970s, several major surveys of foreign language, doctorate-granting departments were undertaken to assess more systematically the status of graduate teaching assistant preparation and to provide recommendations. MacAllister's 1964 report (MacAllister 1964), based on a survey of foreign language departments undertaken by the MLA with support from the Carnegie Corporation and two subsequent conferences, revealed that almost 60% of the 52 responding departments (39 universities) provided no training whatsoever for their teaching assistants. Of those that did, preterm orientations, meetings with supervising faculty periodically throughout the semester, and classroom visits were the most common practices. Ten departments (approximately 20%) had semester-long courses on teaching foreign languages in college which were not, however, compulsory for graduate students who did not teach while pursuing their degree. The report compared the lack of systematic training for college-level teachers with the more substantial and methodical clinical preparation for doctors and called on the MLA to exert its influence with the 500 colleges it counted as members to improve the situation. The report identified qualities needed by language instructors and called for proficiency testing prior to the first assignment, a graduate-level course on methods in foreign language teaching and learning, and the establishment of summer institutes, similar to the NDEA institutes provided for secondary school teachers.

In 1969, another comprehensive survey of graduate programs in foreign languages was conducted by the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the American Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL). The findings of this report (Hagiwara 1970) indicated improvements since the 1964 MacAllister report, but much more work was still needed. The most prevalent activities included course-wide departmental final evaluations,

class visits by senior faculty, and regular meetings with old and new assistants. Approximately half of the departments provided demonstration classes, and half asked students to evaluate their teaching assistants. Though up from the 1964 MacAllister report, only 28% of the responding departments required a course in applied linguistics or methods. One of the most striking observations made by Hagiwara is the fact that a large majority of the supervisors of teaching assistants were in the rank of assistant professor or below, a sign he interprets as a devaluation of this activity. This topic will be picked up more substantially in publications during the 1980s.

In 1978–1979, two additional surveys were undertaken. Randomly sampling 90 universities, Nerenz et al. (1979) found that a full 91% of departments required a methods course of TAs. Another survey, conducted by Schulz (1980) who surveyed 370 foreign language, comparative literature, and linguistics departments representing 78 universities, showed less progress. (The discrepancy may have been due to the inclusion in Schulz's survey of linguistics and comparative literature departments, where TA preparation was established much later). Sixty-nine percent of the reporting departments offered preservice training, up from 38% in 1969, and almost 38% required a methods course, 10% more than the number offering required methods courses in Hagiwara's survey 10 years earlier. Twenty-eight percent of departments offered both preservice and in-service trainings as compared to 11% in Hagiwara's research. Schulz notes that student evaluation of TAs had risen substantially, but she also highlights the fact that none of the programs she surveyed required proficiency testing of TAs prior to the first appointment. Schulz provides a checklist of recommendations for TA development programs. A similar list of recommendations was provided by DiDonato (1983).

One last survey was undertaken by Gibaldi and Mirollo publications in 1981. While this MLA-funded report did not provide statistical summaries, it gives 17 recommendations for the teaching assistant apprenticeship and presents case studies of current programs. Perhaps most importantly, the report called upon departments to commit themselves to excellence in preparing college-level instructors.

In addition to presenting particular programs that prepare teaching assistants for their instructional roles, publications in the 1980s concentrate on the emerging role of the language program coordinator. As the need to prepare TAs for teaching became more accepted, greater attention was given to the role of the supervisor, his or her status in the department, and the background qualifications that the person brought to the position. Picking up on concerns raised by Hagiwara (1970), Schulz (1980) states: "Relatively few departments seem to recognize the need for specialized training as a prerequisite for the duties of TA trainer and supervisor" (p. 2). Several articles that appear in the 1980s point to this concern, calling for the establishment of standards in hiring language program coordinators. Lee (1987), for example, reports on a 1985 resolution by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation that articulates standards for language program coordinators. The MLA articulates standards for this position in the 1986 volume of *Profession*. Reflecting this increased focus on the professional development of language program

coordinators, in 1980 a professional organization is established, the American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Program (AAUSC), whose mission is to "promote, improve, and strengthen foreign language and second language instruction in the US; to strengthen development programs for teaching assistants, teaching fellows, associate instructors, or their equivalents; to promote research in second language acquisition and on the preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; and to establish a forum for exchanging ideas, experiences, and materials among those concerned with language program direction." By the end of the 1980s this focus on the language program coordinator leads to the establishment of a journal devoted to the continued professional development of this group of individuals, *Issues in Language Program Direction*. The attention given to the language program coordinator dovetails with significant directions that begin to develop in the 1980s that have a profound effect both on the teaching of foreign languages and the preparation of instructors: the ACTFL proficiency standards and the reconceptualization of language learning through the fields of second language acquisition and applied linguistics. Articles published in the 1980s in the *ADFL Bulletin* (one entire volume devoted to standards, 1986) signal these new directions.

Major Contributions

Central publications on the professional development of language instructors appear in the AAUSC series, *Issues in Language Program Direction*. In addition to isolated articles scattered throughout a number of these volumes, the series devotes three issues (Walz 1992; Rifkin 2001; Allen and Maxim 2011) to this topic. Of note in the first volume of the series is an extensive bibliography by Benseler and Cronjaeger (1991) on teaching assistant development signaling that this topic has now became a formal area of research.

Publications that appear in the 1990s in this series and elsewhere reflect major shifts in the professional preparation of teaching assistants. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the new focus on standards and preparation for the assessment of proficiency is evidenced by articles such as Murphy (1991) and the publication in 1993 of Omaggio's *Teaching Language in Context: Proficiency Oriented Instruction*, a book that would become one of the standard texts in methods courses for teaching assistants at many universities in the 1990s. A second shift evidenced by the research in the 1990s picks up on concerns raised earlier by Hagiwara (1976) and calls on departments to move from the preparation of teaching assistants for the immediate instructional needs of the institution to the education and professional development of graduate students as future faculty (e.g., Azevedo 1990; Pons 1993; Chaput 2001). This trend resonates with and is influenced by similar shifts in the field of TA development in higher education in general in the 1980s and 1990s (e.g., Nyquist et al. 1991) and the emergence of Preparing Future Faculty programs at many research universities through funding from the American Association of Universities and Colleges (AAUSC) and the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS)

and later by the Pew Charitable Trusts. In addition to emphasizing this longer range view of professional development, research on TA development in the 1990s reveals a shift from a view of teaching as the application of methods to one that is predicated on reflective practice and classroom research (e.g., Wildner-Bassett 1992; Kinginger 1995; Dhawan 2001; Mcdonough 2006). These directions are influenced by the work of Schön (1983) on the reflective practitioner and that of Allright, Crookes, and others on action research. This movement beyond training and methods at all levels of foreign language teacher education is summed up by representative titles from this decade: *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach* (Wallace 1991) and *Beyond Training* (Richards 1998). In the 1990s, the full maturation of the fields of applied linguistics and second language acquisition theory, the shift in foreign language departments from an exclusive focus on literature to one that included cultural studies, and the impact of poststructuralist theory on the humanities lead to publications that begin to challenge current, instrumental approaches to foreign language study (e.g., Kramsch 1995) and teaching assistant preparation. Fox (1992) and Rankin (1994) call for a revised model of TA training that will incorporate applied linguistics. Von Hoene (1995) uses feminist, postcolonial, and psychoanalytic theory to rethink the preparation of graduate students for teaching and makes recommendations to break down the rigid divide (noted by many authors in the AAUSC series and elsewhere) that exists in foreign language departments between the study of language on the one hand and the study of literature on the other. Building on work done by Kramsch and Nolden (1994), Kern (1995) encourages the incorporation of literacy in the preparation of teaching assistants to enable them to guide students in developing critical literacy in a foreign language.

One early application of a literacy approach to foreign language acquisition (Byrnes 2001) was undertaken in the German department at Georgetown University where the undergraduate curriculum was substantially revised through the lens of narrativity and genre. These revisions led to significant changes in the manner in which teaching assistants were prepared for teaching and the broader involvement of faculty in the professional development of graduate students. By rethinking the divide between language and literature through the concept of literacy, the responsibility for teaching assistant preparation is distributed among all faculty in the department. The language program coordinator in this model becomes less isolated, and the link between language and literature is once again restored.

In the late 1990s, research begins to appear on the professional development of lecturers (Van Deusen-Scholl et al. 1999; von Hoene and Van Deusen-Scholl 2001; Bernhardt 2001a; Robin 2001). While the increased use of lecturers and adjunct faculty in higher education reflects a structural change in university staffing over the last several decades and is not limited to foreign language departments, the percentage of lecturers at any one university is often concentrated in the teaching of languages. This is particularly true of the so-called less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) and at colleges and universities that do not offer Ph.D. programs. Van Deusen-Scholl et al. (1999) report on research on the professional development needs of lecturers at a major research university. Following up on this work, von Hoene and Van Deusen-Scholl (2001) call into question models of lecturer

"professionalization" which are often steeped in a colonialist, top-down discourse. They describe an alternate model developed at UC Berkeley that draws on the input of lecturers and provides support for their ongoing professional development. Bernhardt (2001a) points to two generations of lecturers, one trained in second language acquisition theory and applied linguistics and an older generation whose teaching does not benefit from these more recent developments. Robin (2001) describes many of the difficulties involved in providing professional development support to adjuncts who often teach on more than one campus and may lack the time and incentive for ongoing professional development activities.

The publication in 2007 of the MLA report, *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*, constitutes a threshold moment for research on graduate student professional development primarily due to the almost complete absence of this topic in such an important report. This oversight, not lost on those involved in graduate student professional development (Pfeiffer 2008; Schechtman and Koser 2008), provides the impetus for Allen and Negueruela-Azarola's (2010) comprehensive overview of the research on graduate student professional development from 1987 to 2008 and the subsequent 2011 AAUSC volume, *Educating the Future professoriate for the 21st Century* (Allen and Maxim 2011). The central question the 2011 volume attempts to address is how to prepare future faculty for the very changes called for in the 2007 MLA report, in particular a movement from an instrumental approach to language learning to one whose goal is "translingual and transcultural competence" within a "coherent curriculum in which language, culture, and literature are taught as a continuous whole" (MLA 2007).

While the MLA report was forward looking, it benefited greatly from research and recommendations from the decades leading up to its publication report. For example, Kramsch's (1993) concept of a "third space" anticipates the translinguistic and transcultural position of the language learner in the MLA report; Kern's (1995, 2000) and Byrnes (2001) focus on literacy address ways to overcome the bifurcated nature of foreign language departments. Other publications prior to the MLA report also focus on the need to incorporate such things as the teaching of culture (Arens 1991), literature (Bernhardt 2001b; Pfeiffer 2002; Barnes-Karol 2003), and broader theoretical discourses such as feminist and postcolonial theory (von Hoene 1995, 1999) into the preparation of graduate students for teaching.

The articles that appear in the 2011 AAUSC volume, Educating the Future Foreign Language Professoriate for the 21st Century (Allen and Maxim 2011), highlight programs, mainly in their infancy, that draw on this earlier research and incorporate it into a rethinking of graduate student professional development. Kern (2011) and Paesani (2011) advocate for a literacy-based approach in which TAs are prepared to assist students in developing a critical understanding of cultures through the analysis and interpretation of texts. Reeser (2011) demonstrates how teaching graduate students how to teach texts can be incorporated into graduate literature and culture seminars. Rather than limiting professional development to one course – a change called for since the early 1990s (Lalande 1991) – this program provides a professional development model that could be used by faculty members teaching any graduate-level course. Blyth (2011) reports on a course on cultural linguistics

that also enables graduate students to rethink their approach to language and culture called for in the MLA report.

More recent research confirms a slightly heightened attention to graduate student professional development in the form of courses on topics such as teaching film (Sturm 2012), teaching and technology, and language program director development (Enkin 2015). The emergence of certificates in foreign language teaching and second language acquisition (e.g., at Yale, Michigan State, Maryland, and University of Washington) that augment offerings in the Ph.D. program and prepare graduate students specifically for the teaching of foreign languages is another indicator of this change.

Problems and Difficulties

While most departments require one semester of teacher training, the content of these courses in general has not kept up with the most recent research in applied linguistics. As a result, research is outpacing practice. If one looks at syllabi of courses for graduate student instructors on how to teach foreign languages, one finds a primary if not exclusive focus on communicative competence. In some cases, supplemental texts are added on topics ranging from teaching literature, culture, and the use of technology. Two major challenges can be seen. First, how to get language program directors to incorporate into these courses research consistent with the development of the competencies called for in the MLA report. Second, given that this cannot be taught in one semester, how can additional seminar time be devoted to professional development that would produce these outcomes? Though some of the more commonly taught languages have a two-semester series, the standard practice at most research universities remains one methods course (Allen and Negueruela-Azarola 2010). While some exceptions to this rule can be seen (e.g., courses on the teaching of film, literature, literacy, or program direction), these are exceptions rather than the norm.

Second, the professional development of graduate students is not a shared enterprise in most departments, and language program directors are often not viewed as core faculty. While the Georgetown model is a touchstone and example of transformations that may be possible, few departments have made similarly substantive changes that would bridge the language/literature divide. In other words, approaches involving team teaching (Schechtman and Koser 2008) or the incorporation of pedagogical approaches in graduate seminars (Reeser 2011), though feasible and in the latter case highly replicable, have not taken root eight years out from the MLA report.

Given the narrowing of the job market for Ph.D.s in foreign language departments, departments will also need to consider their roles in preparing graduate students for expanded career paths beyond the academy, echoing Wurst (2008) who discusses the development of skills through a Ph.D. program that may be transferable to other career paths as well.

Professional development programs for non-tenure-track faculty, though receiving greater attention through the development of language centers on a number of campuses (e.g., Berkeley, Stanford, Yale, Pennsylvania,), are still quite limited. Given the structural shift in higher education to a more temporary, adjunct workforce, a cohesive approach to the professional development of adjunct faculty has become increasingly important. As Robin (2001) and Bernhardt (2001a) note, many lecturers currently teaching languages in higher education have either outmoded training or no training at all in second language acquisition theory and applied linguistics. As a result, language programs vary widely in the degree to which they are informed by the most recent research findings in these fields.

Future Directions

1. A comprehensive research study should be conducted of syllabi for courses that prepare graduate students for teaching foreign languages, literatures, and cultures. Publication of the results would enable a broader understanding of the status of graduate student professional development and would lay bare the gaps that may exist between current practice and the development of the competencies advocated by the MLA report. Research on how well these courses prepare graduate students to teach heritage students and less commonly taught languages should also be included in this study.
2. Best practices such as those installed at Georgetown and in the courses developed by Reeser (2011) and Paesani (2011) should be shared widely. The MLA could convene workshops for ladder-rank faculty and department chairs on getting more faculty involved in the professional development of graduate students so that departments understand their role in teaching graduate students how to operate between languages and cultures and how to teach their students to do the same.
3. Research needs to be conducted on the emergence of graduate certificates in second and foreign language teaching. As the academic job market narrows in foreign language and literature departments, are these certificate programs assisting graduate students in securing positions? To what extent do these programs focus on second language acquisition and teaching methods rather than the broader field of applied linguistics that may be essential in preparing graduate students for teaching for translingual and transcultural competence?
4. More research needs to be conducted on the degree to which the preparation graduate students receive in teaching fits the needs of their future careers. Research of this sort would give a basis upon which to make recommendations for courses on the graduate level in areas such as cross-cultural literacy, stylistics, language and identity, language and power, and semiotics. Most colleges and universities have a centralized unit that provides professional development for faculty. Research is needed on how these units currently support the professional development of instructors in foreign languages and how these units can work together to supplement each other's work.

5. While some progress has been made in increasing the applied linguistics training of language program coordinators, many still need to develop this expertise. Release time and other incentives should be granted for lecturers to acquire the knowledge base needed to teach students how to develop translingual and transcultural competence. Ideas might include reading groups, lecture series, and research grants as provided, for example, by the Berkeley Language Center. Research on the impact of these activities on the professional development of lecturers should be pursued.

Cross-References

► Applied Linguistic Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Ofelia Garcia: Multilingual Language Awareness and Teacher Education. In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

Nike Arnold: Technology and Second Language Teacher Professional Development. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

References

Allen, H. W., & Maxim, H. H. (Eds.). (2011). *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century.* Boston: Heinle.

Allen, H. W., & Negueruela-Azarola, E. (2010). The professional development of future professors of foreign languages: Looking back, looking forward. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(3), 377–395.

Arens, K. (1991). Teaching graduate students to teach culture. *ADFL Bulletin, 23*, 35–41.

Azevedo, M. (1976). Pre-service training for graduate teaching assistants. *The Modern Language Journal, 60*(5/6), 254–258.

Azevedo, M. (1990). Professional development of teaching assistants: Training versus education. *ADFL Bulletin, 22*(1), 24–28.

Barnes-Karol, G. (2003). Teaching Literature to the undergraduate foreign language major: A framework for a methods course. *ADFL Bulletin, 34*, 20–27.

Benseler, D., & Cronjaeger, C. (1991). The preparation and support of graduate teaching assistants in foreign languages: A bibliography. In S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges in the 1990s for college foreign language programs* (pp. 207–232). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Bernhardt, E. (2001a). The professional development of highly experienced and less experienced teachers: Meeting diverse needs. In B. Rifkin (Ed.), *Mentoring foreign language teaching assistants, lecturers, and adjunct faculty* (pp. 41–53). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Bernhardt, E. (2001b). Research into the teaching of literature in a second language: What it says and how to communicate it to graduate students. In V. M. Scott & H. Tucker (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 195–210). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Blyth, C. (2011). The relevance of cultural linguistics to foreign language graduate education: From "language and culture" to "language as culture". In H. W. Allen & H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating*

the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century (pp. 149–168). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Byrnes, H. (2001). Reconsidering graduate students' education as teachers: "It takes a department!". *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), 512–530.

Chaput, P. (2001). Language teaching: Raising expectations. In B. Rifkin (Ed.), *Mentoring foreign language teaching assistants, lecturers, and adjunct faculty* (pp. 191–222). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Dalbor, J. B. (1967). A realistic look at the training of college foreign language teachers. *The Modern Language Journal, 51*(4), 209–214.

Dhawan, S. (2001). Getting to know the face in the mirror: Reflection in practice for teachers and teacher educators. In B. Rifkin (Ed.), *Mentoring foreign language teaching assistants, lecturers, and adjunct faculty* (pp. 89–118). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

DiDonato, R. (1983). TA training and supervision: A checklist for an effective program. *ADFL Bulletin, 15*(1), 34–36.

Enkin, E. (2015). Supporting the professional development of foreign language graduate students: A focus on course development and program direction. *Foreign Language Annals, 48*(2), 304–320.

Ervin, G., & Muyskens, J. (1982). On training TAs: Do we know what they want and need? *Foreign Language Annals, 15*(5), 335–344.

Fox, C. (1992). Toward a revised model of TA training. In J. Walz (Ed.), *Development and supervision of teaching assistants in foreign languages* (pp. 191–207). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Gibaldi, J., & Mirollo, J. (Eds.). (1981). *The teaching apprentice program in language and literature*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.

Gilbert, C., & McArthur, J. (1975). In-service teacher preparation of French graduate assistants: Design and evaluation. *The French Review, 48*(3), 508–521.

Hagiwara, M. (1970). Training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants. *ADFL Bulletin, 1*(3), 37–50.

Hagiwara, M. (1976). The training of graduate teaching assistants: Past, present and future. *ADFL Bulletin, 7*(3), 7–12.

Kern, R. (1995). Redefining the boundaries of foreign language literacy. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Redefining the boundaries of language study* (pp. 61–98). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kern, R. (2011). Teaching language and culture in a global age: New goals for teacher education. In H. W. Allen & H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 3–16). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Kinginger, C. (1995). Toward a reflective practice of TA education. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Redefining the boundaries of language study* (pp. 123–142). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (Ed.). (1995). *Redefining the boundaries of language study*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Kramsch, C., & Nolden, T. (1994). Redefining literacy in a foreign language. *Die Unterrichtspraxis, 27*(1), 28–35.

Lalande, J. (1991). Advancing the case for an advanced methods course. In S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges in the 1990s for college foreign language programs* (pp. 151–166). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Lee, J. (1987). Toward a professional model of language program direction. *ADFL Bulletin, 19*(1), 22–25.

MacAllister, A. (1964). The preparation of college teachers of modern foreign languages. *PMLA, 79*(2), 29–43.

Mcdonough, K. (2006). Action research and the professional development of graduate teaching assistants. *Modern Language Journal, 90*(1), 33–47.

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). *Foreign language and higher education: New structures for a changed world.* Retrieved from https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World

Modern Language Association. (1986). ADFL Bulletin 18.1.
Murphy, J. (1991). The graduate teaching assistant in the age of standards. In S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges in the 1990s for college foreign language programs* (pp. 129–149). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
Nerenz, A., Herron, C., & Knop, C. (1979). The training of graduate teaching assistants in foreign languages: A review of literature and description of contemporary programs. *French Review, 52* (6), 873–888.
Nyquist, J., Abbott, R., Wulff, D., & Sprague, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach*. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.
Omaggio-Hadley, A. (1993). *Teaching language in context: Proficiency oriented instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
Paesani, K. (2011). A Literacy-based approach to foreign language teacher development. In H. W. Allen & H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 60–81). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
Pfeiffer, P. C. (2002). Preparing graduate students to teach literature and language in a foreign language department. *ADFL Bulletin, 34*(1), 11–14.
Pfeiffer, P. C. (2008). The discipline of foreign language studies and reforming foreign language education. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*, 296–298.
Pons, C. (1993). TA supervision: Are we preparing a future professoriate? In D. Benseler (Ed.), *The dynamics of language program direction* (pp. 19–31). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
[n.a.]. (1955). Preparation of college foreign language teachers. *PMLA, 70.4*, 57–68.
Rankin, J. (1994). Hit or miss, or missing: The role of second language acquisition research in language teacher training. *Die Unterrichtspraxis, 27*, 18–27.
Reeser, T. (2011). Preparing graduate students to teach: The role of literature faculty. In H. W. Allen & H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 45–69). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
Remak, H. (1957). The training and supervision of teaching assistants in German. *The Modern Language Journal, 41*(5), 212–214.
Richards, J. (1998). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rifkin, B. (Ed.). (2001). *Mentoring foreign language teaching assistants, lecturers, and adjunct faculty.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
Robin, R. (2001). Working with lecturers and part-time faculty: A case study of Russian in the national capital area. In B. Rifkin (Ed.), *Mentoring foreign language teaching assistants, lecturers, and adjunct faculty* (pp. 173–189). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
Schechtman, R., & Koser, J. (2008). Foreign languages and higher education: A pragmatic approach to change. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*, 309–312.
Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
Schulz, R. (1980). TA training, supervision, and evaluation: Report of a survey. *ADFL Bulletin, 12*(1), 1–8.
Schulz, R. (2000). Foreign language teacher development: MLJ perspectives-1916–1999. *The Modern Language Journal, 84*(4), 495–522.
Sturm, J. (2012). A graduate course in film pedagogy. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(2), 246–259.
Van Deusen-Scholl, N., von Hoene, L., & Moeller-Irving, K. (1999). The professionalization of language teachers: A case study of the professional development needs of lecturers at the University of California, Berkeley. In L. K. Heilenman (Ed.), *Research issues in language program direction* (pp. 245–275). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
von Hoene, L. (1995). Subjects-in-process: Revisioning TA development through psychoanalytic, feminist, and postcolonial theory. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Redefining the boundaries of language study* (pp. 39–57). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
von Hoene, L. (1999). Imagining otherwise: Rethinking departments of foreign languages and literatures as departments of cross-cultural difference. *ADFL Bulletin, 30*(2), 226–229.

von Hoene, L., & Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2001). Creating a framework for the professional development of lecturers: The Berkeley model. In B. Johnston & S. Irujo (Eds.), *Research and practice in language teacher education: Voices from the field* (pp. 229–241). Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.

Wallace, M. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers. A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walz, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Development and supervision of teaching assistants in foreign languages*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Wildner-Bassett, M. (1992). "Poof! You're a teacher!" Using introspective data in the professional development of beginning TAs. In J. Walz (Ed.), *Development and supervision of teaching assistants in foreign languages* (pp. 153–169). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Wurst, K. (2008). How do we teach language, literature, and culture in a collegiate environment and what are the implications for graduate education? *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 41*(1), 57–60.

Teacher Training in Bilingual Education in Peru

Virginia Zavala

Contents

Introduction 400
Early Developments 400
Major Contributions: Problems and Difficulties 402
The Amazonian Region 402
The Andean Region 405
Work in Progress 407
Future Directions 408
Cross-References 409
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 409
References 410

Abstract

Teacher training in bilingual education in Peru, a country with a total of 40 indigenous languages, constitutes a recent phenomenon that started in the decade of 1990, after bilingual education was already taking place in primary schools through experimental programs since the 1970s. This chapter will review the situation of teacher training in both the Andean and the Amazonian region, taking into account the difference in the number of languages and the ways in which indigenous identity is dealt with. Teacher training in bilingual education faces multiple struggles that are still difficult to overcome: the specialization in Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE) is imparted almost exclusively in Spanish, the dichotomy of mother tongue/second language is insufficient to encompass the wide spectrum of bilingualism that characterizes the students involved, indigenous literacy is still not assumed within a social practice perspective,

V. Zavala (✉)
Sección Lingüística y Literatura, Departamento de Humanidades, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, Peru
e-mail: vzavala@pucp.edu.pe

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_31

language and culture are addressed within purist ideologies, and homogenizing policies for the admission process erase students' diversity, among others. Furthermore, despite the fact that there is a deficit of IBE teachers in the country, the percentage of institutions with this specialization is still quite low.

Keywords
Bilingual Education • Indigenous Languages • Peru • Spanish • Teacher Training

Introduction

Peru is a multilingual society in which around 40 different indigenous languages struggle to survive. In an attempt to come to grips with this linguistic diversity and to offer a high-quality education to its population, different initiatives with bilingual education involving Spanish and indigenous languages have been implemented in the country (see also Luis Enrique López and Inge Sichra: Bilingual Education in Andean Latin America in a Neoliberal Economy). Although since the 1920s some concern was aroused regarding the education of the indigenous population (Trapnell and Zavala 2013) and later on some experiments were implemented in the Amazonian region (Citarella 1990), it was not until the educational reform of 1972 – and the official recognition of Quechua in 1975 – that the first National Policy on bilingual education was proposed, and this type of education started taking place in primary schools. For a long time, teachers who were involved in the bilingual framework had not been formally trained in this educational approach. In the best cases, the ones who were already working in bilingual schools received a whole week's training twice a year, but this was clearly not enough for them to understand the program and to be able to respond to the challenges posed by this type of schooling. In the case of the Andean region specifically, this type of specialization in most institutions of higher education approximately started 10–20 years ago, although in the Amazonian region it had started earlier. Due to the fact that these two regions constitute very different realities in terms of linguistic and cultural dynamics and that this type of education has followed distinct paths in both of them, this chapter will describe both experiences separately.

Early Developments

Some universities in Peru offer a specialization in bilingual education for the indigenous population. Since 1985 the University of Altiplano in Puno and the National University of the Amazonia have offered – respectively – the Masters in Andean Linguistics and Bilingual Education and an undergraduate specialization in Bilingual Education in its Faculty of Education. Both universities could be considered pioneers in teacher formation in Intercultural Bilingual Education (hereafter, IBE) in Peru. Other universities started to offer specializations in IBE much later

(since 2000) but have not had much sustainability. Since 2013, during President Humala's government, more universities are offering an IBE undergraduate career in Faculties of Education within the framework of "Beca 18," an affirmative action program for high school students with high academic performance from economically, linguistically, and culturally marginalized contexts (Ministerio de Educación 2014). Although one of the goals of this program is to reduce the deficit of IBE teachers in the country, some of these new universities imparting this specialization do not have a trajectory of work in the field and sometimes reproduce a civilizing discourse when training students with an indigenous background (Gavina Córdova, personal communication).

Training in this kind of education is imparted mostly by what are known as the "Institutos de Educación Superior Pedagógica" (hereafter, IESP), institutions – with a nonuniversity status – that report directly to the Ministry of Education, in which people study to be teachers for 5 years. This preservice teacher training in bilingual education is complemented by an in-service teacher training. The latter is carried out by way of courses for teachers who are already working in bilingual schools and which not only do not satisfy their real demands and needs but also are imparted within a perspective that focuses on repairing or correcting the gaps of the basic training (López 1996). This chapter will only consider the preservice teacher training in bilingual education (from now on, teacher education) that takes place within the IESPs.

In the 1970s, the educational initiative for the indigenous people only addressed the bilingual aspect of the situation. In the 1980s, its range was extended to include cultural problems in order to build a more pertinent educational alternative for those groups. Hence, the IESPs train teachers not only in bilingual education but also in IBE with the aim of framing bilingual education in a wider cultural proposal. Nevertheless, educators still hold different notions of what BI and IBE are, and, for example, some of them do not conceive an intercultural education that is not at the same time bilingual. This chapter concentrates on the bilingual aspect of teacher education within IBE.

At the end of the 1980s, there were five institutions of higher education – two in the Andes and three in the Amazonian area – in which primary school teachers specialized in IBE. However, national or international private entities had to finance these institutions, since the initiative from the Peruvian State only started in the 1990s. With the goal of homogenizing basic criteria for the construction of a diversified curriculum, between 1992 and 1993, the Ministry of Education's entity in charge of IBE organized three participative workshops in order to create a curricular model for teacher education in this type of specialization. The design of this curricular model constituted the first attempt to incorporate linguistic and cultural aspects into the new proposal and allowed teacher educators from the Andes and the Amazonian regions to question the orientation of the curriculum that was used in Peru (Trapnell et al. 2004). Although this curriculum ought to have been experimentally applied in ten educational institutions as from 1994 (in eight IESPs and two universities), only three of them started to apply it. This was mainly due to the removal of the entity in charge of this type of education within the

Ministry. The new curriculum was revised after a few years in order to adapt it to the innovations introduced in the new official curriculum of teacher education in 1996, and from this revision, a new diversified curriculum of teacher education in IBE was produced for the Andean region. While the IESPs from this region had felt pressure from the Ministry of Education to *adapt* its curriculum to the official one, one IESP from the Amazonian region (FORMABIAP) had the opportunity to build a more experimental proposal and to *redesign* the official curriculum. It is important to mention that it was in 1997, with the restructuring of some of the departments of the Ministry of Education, when teacher education in IBE officially began.

In 2004, there were around 14 IESPs (eight in the Andes, one on the coast, and five in the Amazonian region) offering specialization in IBE throughout the country (Burga 2004). However, in 2007, García's government (2006–2011) submitted the "Nota 14" policy in order to norm the admission process in the IESPs through a unique exam in order to "guarantee" the entry of students with a good academic level. This policy was catastrophic for teacher training in IBE because the majority of the applicants – mostly coming from rural areas – could not reach the grade of 14 (out of 20), and many of the IESPs had to close their IBE programs. Between 2007 and 2009, only 16 students got into careers of IBE in the whole country, and in 2010, there were only five IESPs offering the specialization (Defensoría del Pueblo 2011). During Humala's government, the "Nota 14" policy was abolished, and in 2014, there were 22 IESPs and eight universities authorized to implement IBE programs. In addition, since 2014 there is a new experimental curriculum design for the career of Intercultural Bilingual Education in first-level education and in primary education that is still being discussed.

Major Contributions: Problems and Difficulties

The Amazonian Region

In the Amazonian region, there are a total of 42 indigenous peoples that speak 38 or 40 languages (Pozzi-Escot 1998). The largest indigenous group is the Asháninka (with a total of 52,461 speakers), next, the Awajun (with a total of 45,137 speakers), and the Shipibo-Conibo (with a total of 20,178 speakers). However, in comparison to Peru's major languages, Quechua and Aymara, the speakers of these Amazonian languages represent less than 1% of the total population (Chirinos 2001). In this area there are five IESPs that offer preservice teacher education in IBE. Only the case of FORMABIAP will be reviewed in this section.

The Teacher Training Program for Intercultural Bilingual Education in the Amazon Basin (FORMABIAP) started in 1988 by way of an agreement between an IESP and the Interethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest (AIDESEP), thanks to the initiatives of indigenous organizations who demanded an education that respected their language and their culture. After more than 25 years of existence, this program has received prizes from both inside and outside the country, and today it represents a beacon for IBE in Peru and Latin America. According to the

agreement, the indigenous organization is responsible for selecting the students to join the program, the teacher educators who will participate in it, and the curricular contents, while the IESP guarantees pedagogic quality and is in charge of providing the official title from the Ministry of Education (Gashé 2002).

During the last 5 years, the program has lost strength, since it no longer receives external financial aid nor money from the State, and its educators earn a salary much lower than the one from school teachers. Although the program sought a State subsidy by appealing to the ILO Convention, it did not get it. In addition, the policy of "Nota 14" to norm the admission process of all the IESP also affected the development of FORMABIAP, which did not receive any new students for several years.

Similar to what happened with the National University of the Amazonia, the proposal for training teachers in IBE in FORMABIAP emerged as a response to the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, due to the fact that this institution, which had been working in the Amazonian region since 1945, did not really seek to maintain the languages and cultures of indigenous people but to convert them to the protestant religion (Montoya 1990). Hence, while the Summer Institute of Linguistics proposed a transitional model of bilingual education, where the indigenous languages served as a medium to acquire certain religious beliefs, FORMABIAP opted for a maintenance model, since the goal was to reconcile students with their origins so that they would be empowered to accept their identity and their language as indigenous people (Trapnell 2003). In comparison to the Andean experience, since the beginning this program defined itself more as an intercultural program than as a bilingual one.

In fact, as is the case with some regions of Bolivia and Ecuador, in the Peruvian Amazonian region, indigenous peoples conceive IBE as an education that goes beyond the classroom and that does not only seek to improve children's academic achievements. In that sense, it constitutes a political project that involves alternative representations of both school and society and challenges hegemonic concepts of development, equity, and educational quality. Within the right to determine what type of education, society, and development indigenous peoples want for themselves, FORMABIAP has done a lot of work incorporating knowledge, techniques, history, and learning strategies from indigenous peoples as curricular content (Burga 2004).

In 1988, the program started to implement its proposal with seven indigenous peoples (Ashaninka, Aguaruna, Huambisa, Shipibo, Kukama, Huitoto, and Bora), although along the years others have been incorporated (Nomatsiguenga, Achuar, Chayahuita, Candoshi, Tikuna, Quechua, and Shiwilu). The students who were accepted into the program had to speak the indigenous language and needed to be supported by authorities from their original communities who had to guarantee that as soon as they graduated they would return to their communities to work as teachers in the local schools.

Starting with seven languages was a difficult task, mainly because at the time there were no national linguists with expertise in any of them. In the case of some languages, the program decided to hire international linguists, who visited the

program on a regular basis. Peruvian linguists, most of them from Lima, joined the program but had to learn the indigenous languages from indigenous elders ("sabios"). In order for the program to be sustainable, the ultimate goal was to hire local people as language teachers. Therefore, from the beginning, these linguists worked with indigenous teachers in order to make them aware of how their language worked. Initially, the program design itself did not consider the possibility of courses given in indigenous languages. Hence, during the first years of the program, the linguists coming from Lima worked as teacher educators, and although they discussed examples in the indigenous languages, their classes were taught in Spanish. However, today most of the teacher educators in the ISP are indigenous, and they are the ones who teach their language to the future teachers belonging to their indigenous groups. Moreover, while at the beginning only the language workshops were taught in the indigenous languages, today some courses from other areas of the curriculum are also taught entirely in these languages (Trapnell, personal communication).

Spanish constitutes a second language (L2) for the majority of the students, although for Kukama and Shiwilu speakers, Spanish is their first language (L1). With the aim of retrieving these indigenous languages, these speakers learn them as L2 in workshops with teachers who use the indigenous languages during the entire class. This constitutes an important achievement of FORMABIAP, considering that the State and many IESPs from the Andean area still deal with a static L1/indigenous language–L2/Spanish language model. Nevertheless, although the students make significant progress in learning their indigenous language, at the end of their training, they still do not reach high levels of competence (Domínguez and Monroe 2005).

For the rest of the students, there are Spanish workshops in which educators apply a second language methodology. Nevertheless, following a content-based approach, educators take for granted that the students will process the information as if they were native speakers of Spanish when working in other areas of the curriculum. In other words, although students complain about the difficulty of both technical words and the structure of certain academic texts, educators neither state different goals for them nor do they evaluate them differently according to their competence in the language (Domínguez and Monroe 2005). Teacher educators have to deal with a great diversity in relation to the Spanish competence of their students, and they do not know how to handle this. It is a fact that students improve their Spanish throughout the 5 years of their basic formation training, but, for many of them, the competence that they acquire upon graduating is still not satisfactory for being school teachers.

The program has always emphasized two issues: the grammatical analysis of the indigenous languages and the development of indigenous literacy. Today, the emphasis given to grammatical analysis of the indigenous languages has been criticized by the teacher educators themselves, since they now acknowledge that the importance given to them was overvalued in order to demonstrate that indigenous languages and Spanish are on an equal footing regarding their grammatical structure. Not only is it a fact that there are other strategies that could be implemented in order to demonstrate that all languages should be valued (and to

value them), but it is also true that there are some other topics of metalinguistic awareness that are not present in the curriculum and that need to be discussed in a bilingual program, such as the cognitive processes that individuals who learn a second language undergo (Baker 2001). The emphasis on grammatical analysis has also shown that when students teach in schools, they use grammar as a methodological strategy, ignoring that grammatical analysis only contributes indirectly to the teaching of a second language (Domínguez and Monroe 2005; Vigil 2005). Literacy in indigenous languages has always been a field of struggle (Zavala 2014), not only because it is always judged in relation to Spanish literacy but also because there is still no consensus around the literacy practices that would need to be developed (see also Inge Sichra: Language Diversity and Indigenous Literacy in the Andes).

The Andean Region

According to the census of 2007, 13.03% of the population has Quechua as their mother tongue and 1.72%, Aymara as their mother tongue. Currently, there are 15 IESPs that offer the IBE career with Quechua and four with Aymara (which were created more recently). The 15 IESPs in the Quechua regions offer this type of specialization in areas where the indigenous language is spoken by more of 50% of the population (such as Apurímac, Ayacucho, Huancavelica, Cuzco, and Puno). Besides the University of Puno, the pioneer in preservice teacher training in IBE in this area was the Urubamba state teacher training and technical college in Cusco, which was sponsored by the Catholic University of Lima and Canada's McGill University at the end of the 1980s. In this chapter, I will detail the case of the IESPs that started to impart this type of teacher preparation at the end of the 1990s and that were technically advised by the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) until 2007.

It is well known that in terms of indigenous identity, there are important differences not only between the Amazonian and the Andean region but also between the Peruvian Andean region and the Ecuadorian and Bolivian ones (Degregori 1998). In Peru, the Amazonian indigenous organization is sizeable and robust, its members define themselves as indigenous, and they struggle to be acknowledged as different from the dominant culture. But in the Andes the situation is totally different, since people do not want to define themselves as indigenous, and, on the contrary, they struggle to be incorporated in the mainstream culture. For instance, in this region many teacher educators' main goals are to overcome poverty, learn Spanish, and continue on to professional training, and none of them are members of indigenous organizations in the region. Based on this discourse, they sometimes show pejorative attitudes toward indigenous peasants and conceive Quechua as linked to poor and illiterate people and only useful for rural areas. After all, in the Andes there is a strong association between schooling (and being successful in life) and abandoning one's indigenous language and culture. However, due to the pressure felt by the IBE discourse, people

simultaneously maintain an argument about valuing and preserving Andean culture and the importance of IBE.

Within recent years, these IESPs have started to discuss cultural aspects of the curriculum in order to adapt it to different realities. In many cases the intercultural perspective reflects a folkloric conception of culture, and the discussion around the topic is far from dealing with epistemological issues (Burga 2004). However, in other cases (which have increased over the years), it reveals a "decolonizing" approach with influences from an organization called Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinas (PRATEC). In 2001, this organization started a big movement that brought together hundreds of teachers in Nuclei of Andean Cultural Affirmation (NACA) in different regions of the country. Although PRATEC assumes a critical position toward the homogenizing project of the school and seeks to recover the ancestral cultural knowledge from the communities involved, it tends to put too much emphasis on the supposedly radical difference between "Andean knowledge" and "Western knowledge" without discussing aspects of change, contact, negotiation, and cultural dynamism. This option favors a dichotomous approach, which does not correspond with the everyday practices of people and cultural groups (Trapnell and Zavala 2013).

Regarding linguistic issues, most of the teacher educators have gained more confidence in using the official alphabet and the orthographic rules for writing Quechua (Córdova et al. 2005). Furthermore, the IESPs have developed technical and academic terminology for linguistic and educational topics. For instance, in 2003 educators from five of the IESPs in the Andean area developed a bilingual dictionary of mathematical terms, which they use in their classes (Córdova and Zavala 2004). It can also be stated that in comparison to the situation of a decade ago, nowadays in these IESPs, there is much more acceptance of Quechua and a better attitude toward this language, and educators and students who speak Quechua fluently have prestige among their peers (Córdova et al. 2005).

Nevertheless, in most IESPs the specialization in IBE has been imparted during many years almost exclusively in Spanish. Paradoxically, after receiving their education in Spanish, the new teachers go to work to the bilingual schools and have to use both Quechua and Spanish systematically with the children in class. Although most teacher educators do not know what to teach in Quechua and what not, when to do it, and with what purpose (Zuñiga 2001; Córdova et al. 2005), there are a few IESPs that have recently designed an institutional policy concerning the use of both languages in the curriculum. They now believe that all contents from the curriculum should not be necessarily developed in both languages and that the use of Quechua and Spanish could be distributed according to the different courses and contents.

Since the start of IBE in the schools, Quechua has been equated with the dominant or native tongue (L1) and Spanish with the second language (L2). In these IESPs this model has been replicated, despite the fact that Quechua is not the dominant tongue of most of the educators nor of most of the students. It is clear that expressions such as *mother tongue* and *second language* are insufficient to encompass the wide spectrum of bilingualism that characterizes the situation of the country

and IESP students in particular, who are mostly bilinguals but with different types of oral and written abilities in both languages. Hence, the situation of heritage language speakers of Quechua or emergent bilinguals (García 2009) is erased (see also Ofelia García and Angel Lin: Translanguaging and Bilingual Education). It seems that insufficient consideration is given to the difference between IBE in primary schools and in higher education and that the labels "L1" and "L2" in the curriculum really refer to the indigenous children from bilingual schools (Zuñiga 2001). Indeed, the use of this static IBE model – still anchored within a paradigm of monolingual communities – only contributes to a false impression in the students' minds about their sociolinguistic scenario (Trapnell et al. 2004).

A belief in the importance of speaking a "pure" language, one without interferences from another tongue, has influenced discriminatory practices toward those who speak an Andean Spanish with Quechua interferences, on the one hand, and those who speak Quechua with Spanish interferences, on the other hand. Thus, the use of Quechua has also turned into a powerful mechanism that marginalizes some teacher educators and students and which not only does not allow more presence of the language in the public sphere but also restricts the initiative of some educators who are willing to use it in the classroom (Zavala 2007). In the new experimental curriculum from 2014, there is definitely more discussion on sociolinguistic issues such as variation, language change, language contact, and issues of power in language use.

Work in Progress

Teacher preparation in IBE with Amazonian languages is going through important changes due to the fact that the preparation in some languages has been decentralized. Hence, FORMABIAP is now working with less languages since four of them, belonging to big indigenous groups (Ashaninka, Aguaruna, Huambisa, and Shipibo), are being incorporated into proposals from universities in other regions of the country, which are closer to where these groups live. This will definitely contribute to a better formation of this population.

The new experimental curriculum design from 2014 (for both Amazonian and Andean regions) reveals an important progress in relationship to the last one. While the previous one was organized within more technical criteria (three thematic axes of (a) language teaching pedagogy, (b) workshops, and (c) linguistic theories), the current one contemplates six areas that include (a) communication and society, (b) development of communication in the indigenous language, (c) development of communication in Spanish, (d) artistic and corporal education, (e) curriculum and communication, and (f) new technologies. This new curriculum addresses language issues from a social practice perspective, tries to develop a critical language awareness approach, seeks to critically discuss initiatives for developing alphabets and literacies in indigenous languages, makes explicit that the institutions will not teach the indigenous languages to the students but only diverse and new linguistic repertoires, and constantly mentions the pursuit of "critic interculturality." However,

the document still reveals a simplistic view of the phenomenon of bi-/multilingualism. The dichotomy between "mother tongue" and "second language" and the "two solitudes" assumption in bilingual education against code-switching in the classroom (Cummins 2008) are just two issues that are worth addressing (see also James Cummins, Transfer: Challenging two solitudes).

If we consider that the total number of public IESPs is 122, the percentage of institutions with this specialization is quite low, in comparison, for example, to the situation in Bolivia (Luykx 1999). This is why 25,000 IBE teachers are needed in the system in order to cover the demand of the IBE schools, 46% of the teachers in IBE schools do not have a degree in EIB, and 59% of teachers from the Amazonian region do not speak the language of their students (Defensoría del Pueblo 2011). It is also important to point out that although these 22 institutions are known as IESP IBE, they implement this specialization only on the level of grade school and, in a very few cases, on the first-level education. There are no cases of teacher education in secondary education with a specialization in IBE, although the Ministry of Education is currently working in a proposal for implementing bilingual education at secondary level.

Future Directions

From the above discussion, it is clear that teacher preparation in IBE still has a long way to go and that without the support of the Ministry of Education, the changes are both slow and fragile. Currently, there is a plan for improving the quality of teacher training in IBE within the Ministry of Education, and the new experimental curriculum design is part of this undertaking. Nevertheless, it is well known that changes in the official curriculum, in terms of the written document, do not necessarily generate changes in teaching practice. In the following years, it will be crucial to guarantee the coherence between the official and the lived curriculum.

Research on the aims of IBE should be conducted in different regions since this kind of education is not always conceived as immersed in the same type of social and political expectations. As Aikman (2012) puts it, while some of these programs' main aim is to strengthen indigenous language and culture (although they vary in the degree of indigenous control and self-determination), others' implicit main goal is to facilitate the integration of these people into the national society. In the IESPs specifically, more reflection on the goals of teacher preparation in IBE, and IBE in general, needs to be developed because both educators and students (especially from the Andean region) repeat definitions of IBE without being clear on where they are heading. The lack of a general curriculum before this new experimental curricular design did not contribute to reaching a consensus of approaches and perspectives.

Research on language ideologies within the IESPs will help to reveal the implicit beliefs about Spanish and the vernacular language that legitimate language use of both teacher educators and students. Now that the new curriculum incorporates a perspective of critical language awareness throughout the formation, it is

fundamental that teacher educators and students in the IESPs reflect upon and struggle against linguistic discriminatory practices in the institution (López 2007). In addition, although a social perspective of literacy is starting to get into the discourse of teacher educators, this is in its initial stage. Indigenous literacy should be a topic that is more reflected upon, since the way some of the programs have dealt with it is not conducive to the revitalization and maintenance of the indigenous languages involved (Vigil 2005; Domínguez and Monroe 2005). In fact, most of the issues discussed around indigenous literacy have concerned the alphabet or the creation of neologisms rather than the need, for example, to augment the number of *real* writers in *real* contexts (Street 1984) (see also Brian Street, New Literacies, New Times: Developments in Literacy Studies). A purist ideology in addressing language and cultural issues has clearly erased the contributions that new technologies and digital literacies could make for the development of indigenous languages, specifically in relation to youth literacy practices (see also Sirpa Leppanen: Youth Language and Literacy Practices in Multilingual Online Environments). Finally, it is also important to address how teacher and students cope with developing an academic literacy/voice required in the IESPs and what clashes teachers and students encounter with respect to epistemological, power, and identity issues in practicing this type of literacy (Turner 2003) (see also Mary Lea: Academic Literacies in Theory and Practice). For instance, clashes between academic/scientific knowledge, personal/experiential knowledge, and indigenous mythic/cosmological knowledge have already been documented in higher education with indigenous populations (Luykx 2004).

Cross-References

- ▶ Learning and Teaching Endangered Indigenous Languages
- ▶ Overseas Training of Chinese Secondary Teachers of English
- ▶ The Professional Development of Foreign Language Instructors in Postsecondary Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

James Cummins: Teaching for Transfer in Multilingual School Contexts. In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

Luis Enrique López: Indigenous Bilingual Education in Latin America. In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

Ofelia García & Angel M.Y. Lin: Translanguaging in Bilingual Education. In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

Sirpa Leppanen: Multilingualism and Multimodality in Language use and Literacies in Digital Environments. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

References

Aikman, S. (2012). Interrogating discourses of intercultural education: From indigenous community to global policy forum. *Compare, 42*(2), 235–257.

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Burga, E. (2004). *La formación de recursos humanos en educación intercultural bilingüe* [Training human resources in intercultural bilingual education]. Lima: Dirección de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural. Unpublished manuscript.

Chirinos, A. (2001). *Atlas lingüístico del Perú* [Linguistic atlas of Perú]. Cusco: Ministerio de Educación-Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Citarella, L. (1990). Perú. In F. Chiodi (Ed.), *La educación indígena en América Latina* [Indigenous education in Latin America] (pp. 7–226). Quito: GTZ & ABYA-YALA.

Córdova, G., & Zavala, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Diccionario de Matemática Castellano-Quechua* (propuesta inicial) [Dictionary of mathematics Castellano-Quechua. Tentative proposal]. Lima: PROEDUCA-GTZ.

Córdova, G., Zariquiey, R., & Zavala, V. (2005). *¿Falacias en torno del desarrollo del quechua? Una reflexión desde la formación docente EBI* [Falacies around the development of Quechua. Reflections based on teacher education in IBE]. Cuaderno de Trabajo #5. Lima: Ministerio de Educación y Cooperación Técnica Alemana.

Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Bilingual education, Vol. 5, pp. 65–75). Boston: Springer.

Defensoría del Pueblo. (2011). *Informe Defensorial 152: Aportes para una política nacional de educación intercultural bilingüe a favor de los pueblos indígenas del Perú*. Lima: Defensoría del Pueblo.

Degregori, C. (1998). Movimientos étnicos, democracia y nación en Perú y Bolivia [Ethnic movements, democracy and nation in Perú and Bolivia]. In C. Dary (comp.), *La construcción de la nación y la representación ciudadana en México, Guatemala, Perú, Ecuador y Bolivia* [The construction of the nation and the representation of citizenship in México, Guatemala, Perú, Ecuador and Bolivia]. Guatemala: FLACSO.

Domínguez, R., & Monroe, J. (2005). *Sistematización de la experiencia del FORMABIAP (1988–2005)* [Systematization of the FORMABIAP experience 1988–2005]. Unpublished manuscript.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century. A global perspective*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gashé, J. (2002). El difícil reto de una educación Amazónica [The difficult challenge of an Amazonian education]. In E. Alcaman, H. Díaz Polanco, R. Fornet Betancourt, J. Gasché, G. Giménez, E. C. Huenchulaf, C. Lenkersdorf, R. Torga, & H. Zemelman (Eds.), *Interculturalidad, sociedad multicultural y educación intercultural* [Interculturality, multicultural society and intercultural education] (pp. 119–158). México: Castellanos editores, Asociación Alemana para la Educación de Adultos, Consejo de Educación de Adultos de Latino-América.

López, L. (1996). Donde el zapato aprieta: tendencias y desafíos de la educación bilingüe en el Perú. *Revista Andina 14*(2):295-342.

López, L. (2007). Bilinguismo y educación superior [Bilingualism and higher education]. In R. Cuenca et al. (Eds.), *Nuevos maestros para América Latina* [New teachers for Latin America]. Madrid: Morata.

Luykx, A. (1999). *The citizen factory. Schooling and cultural production in Bolivia*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Luykx, A. (2004). *Epistemologies in collision: Mythic, experiential and scientific discourses in the academic socialization of indigenous graduate students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

Ministerio de Educación del Perú–Programa Nacional de Becas. (2014). *Beca 18 Educación Intercultural Bilingüe. Expediente Técnico 2014*. Lima: Ministerio de Educación del Perú.

Montoya, R. (1990). La escuela y el mito civilizatorio de occidente [The school and the Western civilizatory Mit.]. In: *Por una educación bilingüe en el Perú* [Towards bilingual education in Perú] (pp. 85–109). Lima: Mosca Azul.

Pozzi-Escot, I. (1998). *El multilingüismo en el Perú* [Multilinguism in Perú]. Cusco: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de las Casas".

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Trapnell, L. (2003). Some key issues in intercultural bilingual education teacher training programmes as seen from a teacher training programme in the Peruvian Amazon basin. *Comparative Education, 39*, 2.

Trapnell, L., & Zavala, V. (2013). *Dilemas educativos ante la diversidad. Volumen XIV de la Colección del la Historia del Pensamiento Educativo Peruano*. Lima: Derrama Magisterial.

Trapnell, L., Burga, E., Domínguez, R., & Neira, E. (2004). El currículo diversificado de formación docente EBI en cinco institutos pedagógicos del área andina: Evaluación participativa [The diversified curriculum of teacher education in IBE in five ISPs of the Andean area: participative evaluation]. Lima: PROEDUCA-GTZ. Unpublished manuscript.

Turner, J. (2003). Academic literacy in post-colonial times: Hegemonic norms and transcultural possibilities. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 3*(3), 187–197.

Vigil, N. (2005). De lo homogéneo a lo homogéneo. La enseñanza de las lenguas indígenas y del castellano en el programa de formación de maestros bilingües de la amazonía peruana [From a homogeneous perspective to a homogeneous perspective again: the teaching of indigenous languages and Spanish in the Teacher Education Programme of the Amazonian Basin]. Unpublished manuscript.

Zavala, V. (2007). Una mirada a la formación docente en educación bilingüe intercultural en la zona andina del Perú [An account of teacher education in intercultural bilingual education in the Peruvian Andean area]. In R. Cuenca et al. (Eds.), *Nuevos maestros para América Latina* [New teachers for Latin America]. Madrid: Morata.

Zavala, Virginia; Luis Mujica; Gavina Córdova & Wilfredo Ardito. (2014). *Qichwasimirayku. Batallas por el quechua*. Lima: Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.

Zuñiga, M. (2001). El uso del quechua y del castellano en la formación docente en educación bilingüe intercultural [The use of Quechua and Spanish in teacher education in intercultural bilingual education]. In R.L. Vallejo, & M. Zuniga (Eds.), *Formación docente en educación bilingüe intercultural* [Teacher education in intercultural bilingual education]. Lima: Ministerio de Educación y GTZ.

Nonnative-Speaking Teachers of English as a Foreign Language

Oleg Tarnopolsky

Contents

Introduction 414
Early Developments: Defining and Differentiating ESL and EFL Contexts 415
Major Contributions 417
Some Advantages of NNS EFL Teachers over Their NS Colleagues 417
Challenges of NNS EFL Teachers and Their Positioning in Relation to Their NS EFL Colleagues 418
Problems and Difficulties 420
Future Directions 421
Cross-References 422
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 422
References 422

Abstract

The chapter analyzes current views concerning teachers of English who teach it in the context when students learn it as a foreign language (EFL), i.e., outside English-speaking countries. Relative positions and advantages and disadvantages of teachers of English who are native speakers of the language and nonnative speakers of it (sharing their students' mother tongue) are compared and contrasted. In EFL contexts highly qualified nonnative-speaking teachers of English appear to have a number of advantages that their native-speaking colleague cannot enjoy. These advantages include the option of using the

O. Tarnopolsky (✉)
Department of Applied Linguistics and Methods of Foreign Language Teaching, Alfred Nobel University, Dnipro, Ukraine
e-mail: otarnopolsky@mail.ru

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_32

students' mother tongue whenever and wherever it can facilitate and accelerate the process of learning English, preparedness for developing students' interlingual and intercultural awareness and for understanding students' specific difficulties in learning English which are due to the influence of their native language and home culture, as well as the ability to function as achievable models of EFL mastery to the students. On the other hand, nonnative-speaking EFL teachers have a number of disadvantages as compared to native speakers: foreign accent and other imperfections in English, not being aware of the most recent developments in the language they teach, the cultures of the English-speaking nations, and the latest methods of teaching both. This chapter suggests some ways of capitalizing on the advantages of the nonnative and native EFL teachers with the view of mutually eliminating their respective disadvantages.

Keywords

English as a foreign language (EFL) • Nonnative-speaking EFL teachers (NNS EFL teachers) • Native-speaking EFL teachers (NS EFL teachers) • Comparative advantages of NNS and NS EFL teachers • Comparative disadvantages of NNS and NS EFL teachers • Collaborative work of NNS and NS EFL teachers

Introduction

With the global expansion of English as an international language (see also Park: "▶ Researching Globalization of English"), another expansion is taking place, that of teaching and learning English as a foreign language (EFL). As Graddol (2006, p. 72) points out, English in secondary and tertiary education in many non-English-speaking countries of the world has changed its position from being one of the academic subjects into the position of *a basic skill* to be acquired – something without which an educated person simply cannot exist (like literacy). Naturally, in such a situation, in terms of numbers of both students and teachers, EFL may well be the most widespread form of teaching and learning English because it embraces all those innumerable cases when English is taught and learned outside the inner circle countries where it is an ordinary means of communication and taught as a second language (Kachru and Nelson 1996).

The expansion of EFL raises two questions: (i) what are the differences between the contexts in which English is taught as a foreign language (EFL) and as a second language (ESL)? and (ii) since the number of native-speaker professional EFL teachers is insufficient to meet the demand worldwide, in what ways can nonnative-speaker (NNS) EFL teachers (sharing the L1 of their students) contribute most meaningfully to the profession and be as effective as their native-speaker colleagues? In this chapter, I will compare EFL and ESL contexts and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of nonnative EFL teachers.

Early Developments: Defining and Differentiating ESL and EFL Contexts

The answer to the second question in this chapter – how NNS EFL teachers can be most effective – largely depends on the answer to the first question, in which ways ESL and EFL teaching are different. Some people would argue that a qualified NS EFL teacher will always be in a better position than his/her NNS colleague of equal qualification – simply because the language and culture that she/he teaches to his/her students will always be, or at least "look," more "authentically native." However, it is useful to explore the NNS EFL teachers' strengths and weaknesses.

It should be noted that EFL (or ESL) teaching is not always monolithic and requiring one approach. A lot of "mixed" cases are quite common. For instance, some speakers of Chinese or Greek who live and work in a Chinese community in a big US or Canadian city (see, for instance, Maguire 2010) may not need communication in English on a daily basis. So when such a group of Chinese or Greek speakers start classes in English within their own community, teaching should be closer to EFL than to ESL since it takes place in a single-language subculture. On the contrary, teaching English in Germany to a linguistically diverse classroom including speakers of German, Turkish, Greek, etc., makes it somewhat akin to ESL, but such "mixed" cases are not going to be considered in this chapter. Only clear-cut EFL situations will be analyzed, that is, the situations of monolingual classes with students learning English in their own countries within their own single-language culture where their L1 is spoken and English has no internal communicative function or sociopolitical status.

It is taking into account such unambiguous EFL situations that the issue of similarities and differences in EFL/ESL teaching was discussed in the 1980s–1990s. Those discussions can be considered as early contributions to what is analyzed in this chapter – early not in the chronological sense but in the sense of laying the grounds for answering the major question, concerning the role of EFL teachers, and especially NNS EFL teachers, in the global expansion of English. Some authors did not see the difference between EFL and ESL teaching, asserting that second-language acquisition data were fully applicable to foreign language learning (Savignon 1990; VanPatten 1990). Yet, many other authors supported the idea that the two processes should not be considered as identical or even similar. For instance, Seliger (1988, p. 27) stressed that, despite the universality of manner and order of acquiring an L2, nothing can disprove the possibility of different effects for an L1 transfer in contexts where students have little or no exposure to the L2 outside the classroom and where all the other students speak the same L1. Wildner-Bassett (1990) drew an important distinction between students' real communication in second-language settings and their artificial communication in foreign language settings. Therefore, Kramsch (1990; see also Kramsch 2003; Pawlak 2006) considered a separate agenda for a foreign language learning research as distinct from SLA research (see also Lado: "► Methods in Multilingualism Research").

In general, three principal differences between EFL/ESL teaching and learning emerge based on the analysis of assumptions on this issue made in the professional literature. The first difference is that EFL learners inevitably lack rich and varied comprehensible input in the target language, as compared to ESL learners (Tarnopolsky 2000, 2015). This is due to the fact that EFL has reference to the speech community outside the country where it is being learned (Berns 1990b; Paulston 1992), and in that country, it is not one of the primary means of communication. The result is that for EFL students, particularly in expanding circle countries (Kachru 1986), unlike their ESL counterparts, the sources of comprehensible or any other input in English are more or less limited and can be found mostly inside their EFL classroom. In recent years, the situation in this respect has been much improved, thanks to the Internet, its resources, and possibilities (Warschauer et al. 2000; Barrett and Sharma 2003; Tarnopolsky 2012), but that does not change the fact that for EFL students, live, face-to-face communication in English is limited to the classroom (see also de Saint-Georges: "► Researching Media, Multilingualism and Education"). Such limitations in comprehensible input and scarcity of live, face-to-face communication in English require, as a sort of compensation, a greater focus on language form, grammar, and formal instruction (Bley-Vroman 1990; Doughty 1991; Herron and Tomasello 1992; Pawlak 2006; Tarnopolsky 2015; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993).

The second difference is the limited use of learners' L1 as a support in EFL learning. If paying greater attention to focus on language form activities is required (see above), students will get much clearer ideas about the target language structures by way of comparing some of them with their mother tongue structures. It was widely recognized in the 1990s that even if such comparisons were not done explicitly, they would inevitably be done by adolescent and adult students themselves because "whether we like it or not, the new language is learned on the basis of a previous language" (Stern 1992, p. 282). So it is more rational to do the comparisons explicitly when and where they can facilitate understanding of L2 structures. When done explicitly, they enhance students' interlingual awareness, and such awareness, in its turn, fosters the use of transfer strategies (Deignan et al. 1997; Schweers 1997). Some researchers (e.g., Auerbach 1993) suggest that the use of L1 in this function would be advisable, even for ESL classrooms – and all the more so in monolingual EFL classes where the NNS EFL teachers share the L1 of their learners. Therefore, unlike ESL, the supporting properties of learners' L1 can and must be regularly used in EFL situations and become a valuable instrument in presenting meaning (Cook 1999, p. 201) (see also Li Wei, "► Research Perspectives on Bilingualism and Bilingual Education" and Garcia, "Researching Translanguaging").

The third difference between ESL and EFL teaching can be formulated as a need for broader use of intercultural (home culture versus target culture) comparisons in EFL classrooms with the aim of enhancing EFL learners' cross-cultural awareness. This is due to the fact that, unlike ESL, EFL students are not immersed in the target language cultural and speech community. They never come across what Hymes (1986, pp. 63–64) called its norms of interaction and norms of interpretation in real

communication practice. That is why they will inevitably tend to transfer behavior characteristics of L1 speech community into interaction with native speakers of their L2 (cf. Chick 1996), which may result in intercultural miscommunication. It is in constant contacts with native speakers that ESL students mostly acquire the rules of speaking appropriate to the target culture – those rules that define target "language behavior during social interaction" (McGroarty 1996, p. 11). EFL learners have very few such contacts; therefore, one important way to make them understand and learn the culture of interaction appropriate to the target speech community is to explicitly and systematically make comparisons and emphasize differences. Those differences to be explicitly compared, explained, and emphasized are differences in patterns of sociolinguistic behaviors characteristic of target culture communication in the students' L2 versus home culture communication in their L1 (Tarnopolsky 2000; Tarnopolsky and Sklyarenko 2003). Without such explicit intercultural comparisons and explanations, it may be difficult for EFL teaching to achieve what Hornberger (1996) considers to be an integral and fundamental part of L2 teaching – acquiring the target speech community's culture of interaction (see also Vaish: "► Ethnic Identity and Second Language Education").

Major Contributions

This section addresses the second and major question in this chapter regarding NNS/NS EFL teachers, concerning their relative strengths and weaknesses.

Some Advantages of NNS EFL Teachers over Their NS Colleagues

The three major differences between ESL and EFL teaching discussed above allowed Tarnopolsky (2000, p. 35) to point out the three major advantages of NNS EFL teachers over NS EFL teachers in EFL situations when the group of learners is monolingual and when NNS EFL teachers share the mother tongue of their students.

1. Assuming a learning environment with homogenous groups of learners, it is possible for NNS EFL teachers to use their students' mother tongue whenever and wherever it can facilitate and accelerate the process of learning English.
2. They are much better equipped for developing their students' interlingual awareness by making comparisons and letting them clearly see the similarities and differences in the structures of their L1 and target language. Thus, they can better foster the learners' acquisition of those transfer strategies (transfer from L1 into L2) that are an important prerequisite for target language learning.
3. They are better equipped for developing their students' intercultural awareness by making comparisons of similarities and differences between the L1 and target culture, which is the only way of developing learners' target culture sociolinguistic behaviors in the conditions where students have no or very little direct contact with target cultural communities.

Two other advantages of NNS EFL teachers were also defined. The first of them is the fact NNS EFL teachers, who share the mother tongue of their students and who may have worked through similar problems of learning English, are better prepared to cope with those specific learners' problems originating from incompatibilities or differences in the target and native languages (Tang 1997).

A final, purely psychological advantage was pointed out by Cook (1999, p. 200) who wrote that:

> . . . students may feel overwhelmed by native-speaker teachers who have achieved a perfection that is out of students' reach . . . . Students may prefer the fallible nonnative-speaker teacher who presents a more achievable model.

These advantages point to some strengths of nonnative-speaking EFL teachers compared to native speakers (O'Dwyer 1996). Widdowson (1994) strongly objected to the assumption that a native speaker is always better as a teacher of English than a teacher whose mother tongue is not English. This view found support in the often expressed opinion that different kinds of teaching materials are needed in different countries and there cannot be one and the same teaching method for all countries (Berns 1990a, pp. 104–105). This means that participation of NNS EFL teachers and specialists in organizing and carrying out EFL teaching becomes very important.

The sketch of the NNS EFL teacher above represents an idealized situation, assuming highly qualified teachers meeting all professional requirements. Real teachers of English (both NNS and NS) are never ideal and may be placed along a continuum of expertise (Rampton 1990), but this chapter will focus its analysis on somewhat idealized cases of highly qualified teachers to make its general conclusions. However, all the listed advantages of NNS EFL teachers should not lead to adopting a view that NS EFL teachers should have no say in EFL teaching situations and that only their NNS colleagues can be the absolute authorities on all related issues. Such a view is unacceptable due to a number of challenges that NNS EFL teachers face – even those of the highest qualifications.

Challenges of NNS EFL Teachers and Their Positioning in Relation to Their NS EFL Colleagues

The challenges for NNS EFL teachers are fairly obvious and can be summarized as five principal points:

1. NNS EFL teachers as a rule have a foreign accent and might have other more or less serious imperfections in their English that the best of them often cannot get rid of during their career. The reason is that if an L2 is first learned in adolescence and adulthood (which is very often the case with future NNS EFL teachers), native-like pronunciation is rarely achieved, despite years of practice (Walsh and Diller 1981). In general, stopping short of native-like success in a number of areas is quite a common occurrence (Towell and Hawkins 1994, pp. 14–15). And that

occurrence is probably the most important and painful challenge for NNS EFL teachers. Realization that they fall short of the native-speaker ideal is one of the causes of a kind of "professional inferiority complex" from which a number of NNS EFL teachers not infrequently suffer.
2. For NNS EFL teachers, however competent they are, it is very difficult to be aware of the most recent developments in the English language that, as every other living language, is constantly changing.
3. The same can be said about the NNS EFL teachers' cultural awareness – that is, the awareness of the most recent developments in the English-speaking nations' cultures, including the developments in patterns of sociolinguistic behaviors.
4. Another challenge is the limited availability to NNS EFL teachers of the latest and most advanced teaching materials and methods developed in English-speaking countries – that is, those that are better known to their NS EFL colleagues.
5. The last and perhaps most serious challenge is the fact that in many parts of the world, both school and university authorities may believe that a native speaker is *always* the best teacher of English and thus prefer to be taught or to employ NS EFL instructors to the detriment of their NNS colleagues who, not infrequently, may be better qualified (Kubota 2004). This is one of the visible manifestations of what has been termed as *linguistic imperialism* (Canagarajah 1999; Phillipson 1992).

Thus, NNS EFL teachers have numerous strengths but may face some significant challenges as well. This leads to quite an interesting conclusion concerning the mutual positioning of NNS and NS EFL teachers in EFL teaching. Taking into account everything said above, it becomes clear that NNS EFL teachers face limitations where the NS EFL teachers have their greatest advantages: authentic native English, full awareness of its most recent linguistic and cultural developments, and better awareness of the most advanced and recent developments in the ways of teaching the language. On the other hand, NS EFL teachers must face challenges as well: no or little command of their students' L1 and home culture, lack of ability to develop their interlingual and intercultural awareness, lack of understanding the learners' L1-related language problems, and presenting a model that learners may believe unachievable. This means that, in some respects, the positions of NNS and NS EFL teachers in EFL teaching are *complementary*, and this *complementariness* has to be taken into account when discussing the ways of improving such teaching.

In view of the significance of EFL teaching and learning in the context of the global expansion of English, it is quite surprising how little work on EFL is in progress in comparison with ESL. Still less, if any at all, work is in progress concerning the role that NNS EFL teachers play in the global context nor has much research been done on the challenges that they face. Given the complementary positions of both categories of EFL teachers, as discussed above, the time has come to find practical ways to solve their problems to improve the level of EFL teaching.

The Council of Europe made the most interesting and far-reaching attempt in this respect. It developed the *Common European Framework of Reference for*

Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment (2001) that is a part of the set of documents related to the implementation of the so-called Bologna process. *The Common European Framework of Reference* provides the guidelines for all foreign language teachers and administrators and sets quite specific requirements to the level of teachers' qualifications making no distinctions between NS and NNS teachers.

Indeed, those distinctions appear to gradually vanish. It gave Canagarajah (citing Howatt and Widdowson 2004) grounds to point out that "'non-native' English teachers are regaining the agency they had in the formative period of the 14th-century Europe" (Canagarajah 2006, p. 28), that is, a position of equality with NS teachers, if not supremacy in EFL teaching. Anyway, NNS EFL teachers nowadays hardly encounter numerous situations in which they have really serious reasons to complain that they are marginalized as compared to their NS colleagues. This is why the last of the five disadvantages of NNS EFL teachers listed above may be regarded as temporary and to perhaps disappear soon.

In the last two sections of this chapter, I will discuss the problems and difficulties in the field of EFL teaching as well as future directions.

Problems and Difficulties

Both NNS and NS EFL teachers face a number of challenges that cannot be eliminated or at least not completely. For instance, the number of NS EFL teachers is growing worldwide. Their greatest disadvantage is not knowing (or having very little knowledge) of their students' L1 and culture. These difficulties could disappear if they learned both thoroughly. An earlier study by Ellis (2006) convincingly proves the greatest professional advantages that NS teachers can get if they undertake learning an L2. But can this be expected of average, even highly qualified, NS EFL teachers who most frequently are freelancers teaching and living in one and the same country for a couple of years and then moving on to a different country? They would not be able to do some thorough learning and use the acquired proficiency during a comparatively short period of their stay. Even "long timers" in one and the same country not infrequently know very little about its language and culture. Therefore, the difficulties of NS EFL teachers that result from their insufficient command of the local language and culture are probably here to stay.

The same can be said about the difficulties of NNS EFL teachers. Their disadvantages are not all of equal importance. For instance, the practically ineradicable foreign accent is a comparatively minor disadvantage. This is due to the attitudes toward World Englishes with their enormous varieties of accents (Kachru 1986; Kachru and Nelson 1996), as well as to the requirement of teaching *International English* for global communication (McKay 2002). The norms of pronunciation in this lingua franca are far from being as strict as when one of the inner circle varieties of English is taught (e.g., Jenkins 2000, 2004). But other challenges listed above theoretically can and should be taken care of. Ideally, NNS EFL teachers should visit English-speaking countries for professional purposes often and for relatively long periods of time, which is practically impossible for a vast majority (great numbers of

NNS EFL teachers do not enjoy an opportunity of visiting an English-speaking country even once in their lifetime). This does not mean that no attempts should be made at all to address the specific issues that NNS EFL teachers' face, but it is doubtful that a satisfactory solution can be found easily. There are, however, some other ways of addressing the problems of both NS and NNS EFL teachers. I will outline several suggestions for achieving this in the next section.

Future Directions

One can try to *reduce the disadvantages* by giving opportunities to NS EFL teachers of learning as much as possible about the country where they are going to teach EFL or where they are already teaching it (learning the language, culture, traditions of the country, the peculiarities of its population, etc.). Such learning will not fully eliminate all disadvantages or solve all the problems and difficulties, but it will somewhat reduce these, and NNS EFL teachers can be of great help to their NS EFL colleagues in that respect. That requires broad cooperation between these two categories of teachers.

NNS EFL teachers can also, if not eliminate, at least reduce their disadvantages, problems, and difficulties in a similar way by constantly practicing and improving their command of the language they teach, the cultures of the English-speaking nations, the latest developments in methods, and materials for teaching English. There are different ways to accomplish that, including different forms of in-service and out-of-service training. Perhaps, in what concerns improving the teaching methods, for both NNS and NS teachers, the most important thing is gaining command of what Kumaravadivelu named *principled pragmatism* that, according to him, is best suited to today's *postmethod era* (Kumaravadivelu 2003; Thornbury n.d.; Akbari 2008). Principled pragmatism means pragmatically and rationalistically using in teaching practice everything from different, even opposing, approaches to EFL that can improve the target language and communication proficiency of a definite group of EFL students in a definite and specific conditions of their EFL learning and acquisition. Broad cooperation of all EFL teachers – whether NS or NNS – working in the same country, city, or educational institution is most productive for attaining the best results in designing most effectively a definite pragmatic approach in each specific case since that cooperation can be constant or at least quite regular. NS EFL teachers, for example, can become more involved in teacher training for developing NNS EFL teachers' ability to pragmatically combine different up-to-date teaching approaches to best suit every particular EFL teaching situation.

One more suggestion would be to build on the complementary strengths of *NNS and NS EFL teachers* by adopting a team-teaching approach, which would allow the NS EFL teachers to focus on specific topics, such as conversational English, patterns of sociolinguistic behavior, rhetoric in writing academic essays in English, etc. There is some experience in using such an approach in countries like Ukraine, and the results are very promising.

In view of everything said above, it can be concluded *that the future for the EFL teaching profession in the conditions of global expansion of English lies in building on the strengths of all EFL teaching professionals (both NS and NNS) working collaboratively within the same country.*

Cross-References

- ▶ Developing Instructor Proficiency in Oral Language Assessment
- ▶ Overseas Training of Chinese Secondary Teachers of English
- ▶ Sociolinguistics and Language Education
- ▶ The Professional Development of Foreign Language Instructors in Postsecondary Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Joseph Sung-Yul Park: Researching Globalization of English. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Viniti Vaish: Ethnic Identity and Second Language Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Manka M. Varghese: Language Teacher Research Methods. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Beatriz Lado: Methods in Multilingualism Research. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Ingrid de Saint-Georges: Researching Media, Multilingualism and Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Li Wei: Research Perspectives on Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Ofelia Garcia: From Researching Translanguaging to Translanguaging Research. In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

References

Akbari, R. (2008). Postmethod discourse and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(4), 641–652.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 9–32.

Barrett, B., & Sharma, P. (2003). *The internet and business English*. Oxford: Summertown Publishing.

Berns, M. (1990a). *Contexts of competence: Social and cultural considerations in communicative language teaching*. New York/London: Plenum Press.

Berns, M. (1990b). "Second" and "foreign" language in second language acquisition/foreign language learning: A sociolinguistic perspective. In B. VanPatten & J. F. Lee (Eds.), *Second*

language acquisition/foreign language learning (pp. 3–11). Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
Bley-Vroman, R. (1990). The logical problem of foreign language learning. *Linguistic Analysis, 20*, 3–49.
Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). TESOL at forty: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 9–34.
Chick, K. J. (1996). Intercultural communication. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 329–348). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 185–209.
Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching and assessment*. Strasbourg.
Deignan, A., Gabrys, D., & Solska, A. (1997). Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities. *ELT Journal, 51*(4), 352–360.
Doughty, C. (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from an empirical study of SL realization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 431–469.
Ellis, E. M. (2006). Language learning experience as a contributor to ESOL teacher cognition. *TESL-EJ, 10*(1), 1–28. Retrieved from the Internet at http://tesl-ej.org/ej37/a3.html as of August 21, 2006.
Graddol, D. (2006). *English next. Why Global English may mean the end of English as a foreign language*. British Council.
Herron, C., & Tomasello, M. (1992). Acquiring grammatical structures by guided induction. *The French Review, 65*, 708–718.
Hornberger, N. (1996). Language and education. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 449–473). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Howatt, A. P. R., & Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A history of English language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hymes, D. (1986). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Jenkins, J. (2004). ELF at the gate: The position of English as a lingua franca. *The European English Messenger, 13*(2), 63–69.
Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.
Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. L. (1996). World Englishes. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 71–102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kramsch, C. J. (1990). What is a foreign language learning research. In B. VanPatten & J. F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/foreign language learning* (pp. 27–33). Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
Kramsch, C. (2003). *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
Kubota, M. (2004). Native speaker: A unitary fantasy of a diverse reality. *The Language Teacher, 28* (1), 3–10.
Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Maguire, M. H. (2010). Lessons in understanding Montreal heritage language contexts: Whose literacies and voices are privileged? *Cahiers de L'ILOB/OLBI Working Papers, 1*, 25–50.

McGroarty, M. (1996). Language, attitudes, motivation, and standards. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 3–46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O'Dwyer, L. M. (1996). Putting the T in TESOL. *TESOL Matters, 6*(2), 21.

Paulston, C. B. (1992). *Linguistic and communicative competence: Topics in ESL*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pawlak, M. (2006). *The place of form-focused instruction in the foreign language classroom*. Kalisz-Poznań: Wydział Pedagogiczno-Artystyczny w Kaliszu, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.

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

Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). Displacing the "Native Speaker": Expertise, affiliation and inheritance. *ELT Journal, 44*(2), 97–101.

Savignon, S. J. (1990). In second language acquisition/foreign language learning, nothing is more practical than a good theory. In B. VanPatten & J. F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/foreign language learning* (pp. 185–197). Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Schweers, C. W. (1997). Language transfer. What do we know? *TESOL Matters, 7*(5), 10.

Seliger, H. (1988). Psycholinguistic issues in second language acquisition. In L. M. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition* (pp. 17–40). New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tang, C. (1997). On the power and status of nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 557–580.

Tarnopolsky, O. (2000). EFL teaching and EFL teachers in the global expansion of English. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 16*(2), 25–42.

Tarnopolsky, O. (2012). *Constructivist blended learning approach to teaching English for specific purposes*. London: Versita.

Tarnopolsky, O. (2015). Communicative-analytic method in teaching English to adults at commercial language schools and centers in Ukraine. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences, 65*, 16–26. Switzerland: SciPress. Retrieved from the Internet at www.scipress.com/ILSHS.65.16 as of December 21, 2015.

Tarnopolsky, O., & Sklyarenko, N. (2003). *Lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns in the USA*. Kyiv: INKOS.

Thornbury, S. (n.d.) Methods, post-method, and métodos. Retrieved from http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/methods-post-method-métodos

Towell, R., & Hawkins, R. (1994). *Approaches to second language acquisition*. Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Theory and research in second language acquisition and foreign language learning: On producers and consumers. In B. VanPatten & J. F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/foreign language learning* (pp. 17–26). Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction. *The Modern Language Journal, 77*(1), 45–57.

Walsh, T. M., & Diller, K. C. (1981). Neurolinguistic considerations on the optimum age for second language learning. In K. C. Diller (Ed.), *Individual differences and universals in language learning aptitude* (pp. 3–21). Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.

Warschauer, M., Shetzer, H., & Meloni, C. (2000). *Internet for English teaching*. Alexandria: TESOL.

Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 377–389.

Wildner-Bassett, M. E. (1990). Coexistence discourse worlds: The development of pragmatic competence inside and outside the classroom. In B. VanPatten & J. F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/foreign language learning* (pp. 140–152). Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Task-Based Instruction and Teacher Training

Klaus Brandl

Contents

Introduction 426
Problems and Difficulties 426
Toward a Common Understanding of TBLT 426
Some Challenges 427
Major Contributions 429
How Do Teachers Implement Tasks or a Task-Based Syllabus? 429
Teachers' Challenges with Implementing Tasks and a Task-Based Syllabus 430
Teachers' Perceptions of Task-Based Instruction and the Impact of Training 432
Work in Progress: Methodological Principles and Guidelines 433
Understanding Task Concepts 433
Understanding Task Goals and Pedagogical Intentions 434
Having a Solid Command of Task Routines 434
Training Needs to Be Hands-on and Experiential 434
Future Directions 435
Cross-References 436
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 436
References 436

Abstract

In teacher education, the increasing use and acceptance of task-based language teaching (TBLT) as a strong form of Communicative Language Teaching raises questions about how to best train teachers in this approach to foreign language teaching. This chapter addresses some fundamental issues underlying TBLT and provides an overview of the research on teachers' challenges in implementing this approach. The chapter concludes with a set of guidelines for teacher educators that are conducive to the successful training in this approach.

K. Brandl (✉)
Department of Germanics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
e-mail: brandl@uw.edu; brandl@u.washington.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_34

Keywords
Task-based instruction • Teacher training • Foreign language education • Communicative language teaching • Second language acquisition • Methodological principles • Task implementation

Introduction

In the last two decades, task-based language teaching (TBLT) or forms of TBLT have become increasingly widespread and accepted. Littlewood (2004) has pointed out "The task-based approach has achieved something of the status of a new orthodoxy [. . .] and publishers almost everywhere are describing their new textbooks as task-based" (p. 319). While teachers in a wide range of settings are being told by curriculum leaders that this is how they should teach, the goal of training teachers in TBLT raises numerous questions for teacher educators: Which aspects of TBLT are crucial in successfully teaching and in training this approach? What demands does TBLT place on teachers and learners? How compatible is TBLT with teachers' belief systems and current practices in effective language instruction? What challenges and struggles do teachers experience in TBLT?

The goal of this chapter is manifold: First, I briefly discuss some issues related to task-based instruction. Second, I provide an overview of the main research findings on challenges and struggles that teachers experience in TBLT. And last, I present a set of methodological guidelines that are essential to a successful implementation of TBLT and are relevant in teacher training.

Problems and Difficulties

Toward a Common Understanding of TBLT

Though frequently misunderstood, TBLT is not a fixed method but rather constitutes an approach to language teaching. TBLT has evolved out of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and is generally considered a strong form of CLT, which uses tasks to create contexts for natural language use and as central units to form the basis of daily and long-term lesson planning.

There is no single TBLT "methodology," but rather a number of different approaches (Ellis 2009a; Klapper 2003). The different versions of TBLT are reflected in different interpretations of the use of tasks and principles of learning in L2 pedagogy (Andon and Eckerth 2009; Ellis 2009a). Some of the characteristics that distinguish different approaches to TBLT concern the following issues: how to achieve attention to form, e.g., through corrective feedback; the design and implementation of task cycles, i.e., from pre-task planning to post-task follow-ups; the use of group work; and the use of focused and unfocused tasks.

Finally, it has to be pointed out – even though controversial – that task-based approaches are seen by many as hybrid approaches following a syllabus that not only consists of primary and pedagogical tasks but also of traditional strategies such as explicit grammar explanations.

Some Challenges

TBLT is not without its problems: There is no agreement on the definition of a task and how to enact a task-based syllabus. Specifying task difficulty also remains elusive. Needless to say, dealing with these issues in teacher training is essential to helping teachers develop strategies for managing these challenges.

Challenges with the Definition of a "Task"

In TBLT numerous attempts have been made to define a "task." For example, Van den Branden (2006) provides a list of 15 different definitions. The plethora of definitions that have been proposed shows that there is still an ongoing debate about what constitutes a task. While the range of these different definitions reveals disagreement on what a task is, nevertheless, some core principles have emerged that are repeatedly emphasized as being essential. These are meaning has primacy; students should work toward a goal or outcome; the task should resemble a real-world activity stimulating real language use; and learners should engage in some sort of a work plan. The "meaningful principle" is the most essential and the only principle deeply grounded in SLA research. As emphasized by some scholars, the use of language for a communicative purpose involving comprehending, manipulating, and producing language (Van den Branden 2009) – while keeping meaning in focus and while learners use their own linguistic resources (Ellis 2009b) – must be seen as the driving force of SLA. All other principles are suggested strategies for syllabus and task designers and thus are considered vital to the process of task implementation and play an important role in teacher training.

Challenges with Assessing Task Difficulties

The Cognition Hypothesis claims that tasks should be designed and sequenced for learners based on increases in their cognitive complexity (Robinson 2001, 2005). To do so presupposes an understanding of what makes a task complex and difficult for individual learners. Robinson (2007) suggests that task complexity and difficulty can be best understood by looking at factors that are intrinsic to the task, those that are attributed to individual learner differences, and the task condition.

Task intrinsic factors comprise processing demands that are a result of attentional focus, working memory, and reasoning that are imposed by the structure of the task on the learner (Robinson 2001). For example, following directions on a complex map involves a higher degree of attentional focus and working memory than following directions on a simplified map. Other impacting cognitive factors have to do with the extent to which prior knowledge is required, the availability of planning time, and the number of task elements (Robinson 2001). Part of complexity

is also the linguistic demands (Candlin 1987), such as specific vocabulary and grammatical structures that are involved in performing the task.

How learners respond to underlying cognitive factors, and as a result how difficult they perceive task complexity, further depends on a variety of learner-specific factors. These include affective factors such as motivation, confidence, and anxiety, as well as variables in capability such as aptitude, proficiency, and intelligence (Robinson 2001).

Finally, the conditions under which learners perform a task may further exacerbate the extent of difficulty. Factors that impact the conditions are those that cause communicative stress or raise the communicative demand of a task (Candlin 1987; Skehan 1996; Robinson 2001). Such factors have to do with the number of interactants, familiarity of the speaker with these, the speaker's status (superiority, authority), the directionality of the interaction (e.g., one way or two way), the amount of time, and the stakes of the outcome (e.g., the results of a test).

Given the multitude and variance of factors that play a role and that are inextricably intertwined, establishing task difficulty remains an elusive endeavor. As Robinson (2001) points out, task complexity and learner factors cannot be assumed to be in a fixed relationship. Learners differ in intelligence, aptitude, and motivation. As a result, the difficulty of the task fluctuates with different learners and can only be approximated by considering complexity factors, conditions, and learner factors as they relate to each other.

Challenges with Enacting a Task-Based Syllabus

The challenge of training TBLT methodologies is further complicated by different interpretations of what a task is and also by different positions on how to enact a task-based syllabus.

One position maintains that task-based syllabi are essentially of the noninterventionist type (Van den Branden 2009). This means, as Ellis (2003) puts it, it does not "seek to dictate what linguistic form a learner will learn at any time" (p. 228). Such a position is conformant with the definition of a task as a work plan, which claims, as Van den Branden (2009) further states, that "a learner's syllabus cannot be imposed on the syllabus developer. As agreed by many researchers, learners cannot be seen as passive individuals subjected to the transmission of one form of knowledge in one particular way, but are active individuals who evolve as learners based on their own individual goals, prior learning experiences and abilities" (Lantolf and Pavlenko 1995). This stance further argues against the assumption that students will learn teacher-targeted knowledge if they follow a preplanned sequence of tasks (Willis 1996), which suggests that preplanning and task sequencing have little pedagogical value. As documented in research and also from teacher experience, the observations that many particular types of instruction are limited and have only short-term effects further support this view.

In contrast, another position argues that mindfully planned instruction plays a vital role in the learner' success and influences learning in immediate contexts and over time. Several arguments support such a stance: some researchers agree that certain targeted forms require more attention than others (Hulstijin 1995; DeKeyser 2005).

In task design it is difficult to insure that learners will always notice target forms or keep targeted structures in focus, and hence there is a need for narrow structuring. Task goals and intended outcomes also need to be in alignment with learner processing abilities and proficiency levels. Given the cognitive and linguistic demands of any task performance in language learning – needless to say, such demands vary widely based on different design factors – task structuring, grading, and repetition are indispensable in successful task implementation. Such methodological practices are imperative not only to support the learning process but also to make task implementation feasible. Without such considerations, task implementation may result in lack of learner participation, task breakdowns, learning anxiety and stress, and the impoverished use of language. And lastly, learners also benefit from other forms of instruction than just task implementation.

Major Contributions

Research on teachers' implementation of TBLT falls into two categories: There are those that have taken a more evaluative and normative approach by looking at teachers' struggles and challenges with task implementations as well as by analyzing teachers' conceptual understanding of and their attitudes toward key principles underlying TBLT. A second type of research simply describes how teachers go about implementing TBLT viewed from a neutral perspective.

Questions of importance are as follows: How do teachers conceptualize TBLT? How do teacher go about implementing tasks or a task-based syllabus? What challenges and struggles do they experience? What are teachers' attitudes toward TBLT, and how compatible do they perceive TBLT with their current instructional practices? Answers to these questions provide us with valuable insights into TBLT and are essential to teacher training.

How Do Teachers Implement Tasks or a Task-Based Syllabus?

As Van den Branden (2009) points out, tasks are not blueprints for action. A number of empirical studies carried out in authentic classrooms have shown that teachers and students reinterpret the tasks they are offered by syllabus developers in ways that suit their own purposes, learning needs, interaction styles, and personal preferences. They often change their designs, deviate from suggested procedures, and often go about task implementation in their own idiosyncratic ways.

For example, a study by Brandl (2009) who investigated how five novice French teaching assistants implemented a task-based syllabus in first-year university-level foreign language classes has shown that teachers choose selectively from the prescribed task-based syllabus. While most of the teachers were emphasizing the tasks that were presented at the beginning and end of a unit, none of teachers followed the prearranged curriculum verbatim or in the sequence as it was arranged.

In another study, Van den Branden (2009) invited a group of experienced teachers to work with tasks to see how they would implement these tasks in their classrooms. His findings show that all the teachers regarded the tasks that they were given as the drafts of a work plan, rather than as a scenario, which they were strictly to follow from the beginning to end. Rather than the task modifying the teachers' behavior, the teachers adapted the task by modifying the tasks in various and idiosyncratic ways.

Another study by Andon and Eckerth (2009) looked at four experienced ESL instructors and asked in what ways these teachers integrated the practices and underlying principles associated with TBLT with other pedagogical approaches and techniques. Similar to Brandl (2009) and Van den Branden's (2009) findings, Andon and Eckerth (2009) reported that their teachers did not follow "official" TBLT-related pedagogic recommendations in a slavish way. As they further put it, "Far from subscribing to a pre-specified approach to language teaching, all four teachers experiment with different elements of TBLT, reject some of them, embrace others, and combine all of them with other pedagogical elements" (p. 305).

Teachers' decisions to modify tasks, on how to structure and arrange task sequences, whether to deviate from a task-based syllabus or even to admit tasks or stages in the task cycle, are motivated by an array of different considerations. These may be stimulated by external or teacher-specific factors. External factors include logistic challenges, learner needs, ability, and immediate performance assessment. For example, based on his studies with experienced teachers, Van den Branden (2009) observed that teachers make changes "in order for the task to suit their own purposes and intentions; to match conditions of task performance with their expectations of (individual) students' performance and competences; to avoid tensions with regard to time management, the organisation of the activity or physical aspects of task performance (such as reducing noise in the classroom" (p. 304).

Other studies have pointed out that teachers also make changes for affective reasons, based on their personality types, teaching styles and preferences, and how they interpret key principles associated with TBLT and task design factors such as task complexity. For example, in Brandl's study (2009), teachers associated "authenticity," "real materials," and "real culture" with TBLT. They wanted their students to have fun and like the target culture, which inspired them to integrate nonprescriptive materials, e.g., songs or videos from YouTube.

Teachers' Challenges with Implementing Tasks and a Task-Based Syllabus

Teachers implementing TBLT for the first time have been reported to struggle with a variety of task-related issues. One issue that has been repeatedly pointed out has to do with task complexity and being able to assess task difficulty. As suggested by Linsen (1994), teachers often have a tendency to interpret tasks as too difficult. In her study, she found that teachers often manipulated tasks by oversimplifying task procedures or changing the task itself, in particular when they anticipated that their students would not be able to cope with the tasks. For instance, the teachers in her

study simplified the vocabulary in a text or asked the students to fill in only one word instead of writing complete sentences. Others left the task unchanged but modified the original way in which it was to be implemented or stretched out the introduction phase by explaining all difficult words in the text before the students were allowed to read it.

In another study, done by Timmermans (2005, cited in Van den Branden 2006), experienced teachers were found to readapt reading tasks, originally designed as silent readings, in favor of the more traditional strategies that ask students to read a text out loud and line by line because they were concerned their students would not be able to understand the material when reading silently and alone.

Some research has also reported that teachers struggle with understanding what a task is and task designs (Carless 2004; Ellis 2009a; Brandl 2009). For example, Ellis (2009a) reports on a study by Carless (2004) who examined the implementation of TBLT in the context of Hong Kong's "target-oriented curriculum" in elementary schools. He found that the tasks that teachers employed often resulted in "practice" rather than genuine communication. Key issues that emerged in the implementation of the tasks were (1) wide use of the students' mother tongue and (2) many of the tasks resulted in nonlinguistic activity, such as drawing, rather than using L2 as there was little L2 production. In a more recent study, Brandl (2009) investigated how four first-time teaching assistants implemented TBLT in a first-year French language program at the university level. His classroom observations revealed that there was limited interaction among students, the majority of contributions was made by only a few students, and that students frequently felt overwhelmed by what they were supposed to do. In his follow-ups on teachers' understanding of task design, he further found that the teachers often were not able to explain the purpose of a task or identify linguistic skills which warranted attention in the form of task preparation and which students needed to keep in focus during task implementation.

A third issue concerns the learning and implementing of task routines. The implementation of tasks necessitates the sequencing of pedagogical tasks in procedural steps by following particular task cycles. For example, pre-task routines involve task preparation such as helping students learn or recall task-related vocabulary and phrases, cuing of grammatical structures, and clarifying and modeling task procedures. During-task strategies involve monitoring and assessing learner performance, and post-task activities involve follow-ups and debriefings. Copious research has shown that teachers, in particular, in their first year of instruction, not only are primarily concerned with task routines but often feel overwhelmed and struggle with the many details that require attention during the implementation process (Bullough 1989; Lidstone and Hollingsworth 1990; Brandl 2009; McAllister et al. 2012).

One of the core principles of TBLT is based on co-constructive, cooperative, and interactive learning (see Brandl 2008; Ellis 2003). This principle places the implementation of pair and group work at the core of TBLT. Given its learner-centered approach, it comes as no surprise that in particular this principle has received quite a bit of attention in research on TBLT.

Some early research has shown that teachers often do not like group work and only hesitatingly introduce it in their classrooms (Hillewaere 2000; Linsen 1994),

because the classroom becomes noisy, learners are disorganized, and lower-proficiency students do not participate. Other reasons frequently mentioned are that teachers resist adapting to group tasks work because they do not like to give up control (Van den Branden 2006).

More recent studies have confirmed teachers' challenges in implementing group work and identified a variety of issues associated with such practices. They find it difficult managing heterogeneity in terms of students' language and motivational levels; getting students to work effectively together, to stay on task; and assessing individual and uneven students' contributions (Brandl 2009; McAllister et al. 2012).

Teachers' Perceptions of Task-Based Instruction and the Impact of Training

In the study of teacher's cognition, teachers' belief systems have long been recognized as a crucial factor influencing their teaching practices. These beliefs are usually shaped by their own experiences as learners of languages, their cultural backgrounds, their own learning styles, and personalities. As Van den Branden (2009) puts it, "What language teachers do in the classroom is inspired by what they know, believe and think" (p. 403). Some studies have investigated novice and experienced teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and self-perceptions of changing roles after being trained in TBLT.

Within second-language teacher education (SLTE), the most common social contexts that provide opportunities for learning constitute pre- and in-service methods' seminars and workshops, classroom observations or video critiques, and formal or informal meetings between supervisors and instructors or among peers (see Brandl 2000). The most common training element being part of a long-standing tradition is the methods course. As Johnson (2009) points out, it "operate[s] under the assumption that it is necessary to provide teachers with discrete amounts of disciplinary knowledge, usually in form of general theories and methods that are assumed to be applicable to any teaching context" (p. 14). This belief has led some researchers to investigate the influence of training, e.g., the effect of particular programs or methods courses on teachers' growth.

Early research on the effectiveness of methods classes only shows mixed results. When being trained in specific teaching methods, teachers tend to implement them during their practice teaching, but often go back to their own ideas about language teaching soon after the training (Almarza 1996). Teachers also do not change in homogeneous ways and vary in the extent to which they master the principles promoted in a course (Richards et al. 1996).

Some recent studies have investigated the impact of training in TBLT and the teachers' and learners' reactions to task-based courses (McDonough and Chaikitmongkol 2007; McAllister et al. 2012). For example, as reported by Ellis (2009a), McDonough and Chaikitmongkol (2007) investigated the teachers' and students' reactions, and teachers' concerns on a newly developed task-based course, which replaced a traditional focus-on-forms course, at a university in Thailand.

The new curricular changes resulted in increased learner dependence. Students also recognized that the course was relevant to their real-world academic needs but less so to their needs outside the academic context. The teachers' main concern, at least among some teachers, was the lack of grammar teaching.

McAllister et al. (2012) explored fourteen teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and self-perceptions to learning and teaching after two years of implementing task-based language program. It particular, this study aimed at investigating teachers' beliefs about their pedagogic roles and practices. Some of the practices in particular that they looked at included the importance of interaction/co-construction, that is, the use of group work, and the role of task repetition.

Though all teachers were in agreement on the importance of group work, half of the teachers continued to support traditional "transmission" approaches. Some of the teachers also interpreted the notion of repetition in a traditional sense as referring to exercises involving repetitive drills. Teachers reported that the use of group work led to more active oral participation, which they further contributed to the students' progress. It also allowed them to provide more individualized feedback and get their students to know better individually compared to times when they only were teaching in teacher-centered ways. Regarding the teacher's perception of the use of real-world tasks, the majority of the teachers had the perception that working with real-world tasks led to increased student investment, students' being more active, and thus impacted the quality of their task outcome.

Work in Progress: Methodological Principles and Guidelines

Evidence emerging from the research reviewed above alludes to a range of factors that allow us to ameliorate the problems that arise in the implementation of TBLT and that need attention in teacher training. Such factors can be task related or teacher driven. Task-related factors concern the interpretation of task concepts and design factors; teacher-driven factors have to do with how teachers understand their role and their ability to take on different roles, their command of task routines, and their ability to assess learner performance. Obviously, such factors are dynamically interwoven and involve mindful decision-making on when to intervene and make adjustments.

The following sections provide a list of methodological principles that are fundamental to teacher learning:

Understanding Task Concepts

It has been repeatedly pointed out that teachers' understanding of the concepts of task (or what a task is) and task-based learning can contribute to the success of task-based syllabi (Andon and Eckerth 2009; Brandl 2009; Ellis 2009a; McDonough and Chaikitmongkol 2007). Despite some disagreement on the interpretation of task criteria (see Ellis 2009b), for TBLT to work, teachers need a clear understanding

of what such criteria are and what they mean. This further requires a theoretical understanding of how a task as a device or work plan engages learners in "certain types of information processing that are important for effective language use and/or for language acquisition from some theoretical standpoint" (Ellis 2009b, p. 113). At the level of work plan, it further involves understanding how a task distinguishes itself from an exercise (see Ellis 2003, 2009a) and a communicative activity (see Brandl 2008).

Understanding Task Goals and Pedagogical Intentions

Teachers need to have an understanding of intended task goals. This also involves the ability to identify underlying skill components that are required for learners to perform a task or that are intended for learners to keep in focus. This skill plays a vital role in allowing teachers to provide optimal task preparation in support of the learners' actual task performance. It further helps with keeping learners focused, staying on task, and also assessing task outcomes.

Fundamental to understanding task designs is also an awareness of factors that make a task difficult. Teachers can learn about such factors in theory. However, assessing actual task difficulty is challenging. Task difficulty factors are tightly interwoven, and learners respond to them in idiosyncratic ways, which makes their impact often hard to predict. Thus, understanding task difficulty factors requires trialing, and understanding of how students learn is best understood through experience.

Having a Solid Command of Task Routines

Task management and control constitute vital components that impact successful task implementation. Therefore, teachers need to have a solid command of general task routines. They need to know how to engage with pre-task preparation, task monitoring, and post-task debriefing and be subjected to detailed and intensive practice about these lesson phases. Considering the plethora of different designs, both novice and experienced teachers who are new to TBLT need training in the implementation of task-specific procedural steps. In particular, idiosyncratic and complex task designs warrant special attention. Such training, which needs to be ongoing, is arguably relevant not just to TBLT but to any form of teaching. It speaks to the importance of teacher involvement in course development and to the importance of teacher education. It underlies the successful implementation of any innovation in language teaching.

Training Needs to Be Hands-on and Experiential

Many teacher trainers agree that teacher training should be hands-on, experiential, and task-based (Van den Branden 2006; Brandl 2008). Needless to say, a teacher

trainer needs to walk the talk when training foreign language teachers. Teachers need many hands-on opportunities where they can try out and experiment with TBLT methodologies in a safe environment under the guidance of an expert trainer. This practice will allow them to experience TBLT in action and will prepare them for some of the challenges. Examples of such training elements constitute writing reflective journals, peer/expert observations, task/case study analyses, developing tasks, developing lesson plans, and microteaching (Brandl 2008).

One training element that is in particular noteworthy is the need for trainees to be involved in the development of the task materials. There are several reasons that justify such practices not only for novice teachers in training but also for experienced teachers who are new to TBLT. It promotes a deeper understanding of task-based concepts and design factors. Furthermore, it teaches instructors to make curricular adjustments and changes. It allows them to adapt materials that measure up to task-based criteria and to meet program- and learner-specific needs within their own teaching contexts. For novice teachers in training, it is advisable to follow a progression that proceeds from task analysis to modifying existing traditional materials and ultimately to designing tasks from scratch.

Future Directions

CLT and task-based instruction as a strong form seem to have stood the test of time. Sufficient empirical evidence exists that accounts for the effectiveness of principles of learning underpinning such approaches to language teaching (see Ellis 2009a). In practice, however, as pointed out above, teachers use TBLT only as one type of methodology integrated with others. For TBLT to gain more wide-stream acceptance, more research is needed regarding its practical and implementational challenges.

The implementation of a task-based syllabus seems to be easier with students at the intermediate and advanced levels. More work is needed to demonstrate the design, implementation, and arrangement and balancing of focused and unfocused tasks in a syllabus that follows a circular approach. This issue is in particular relevant to beginning language students, who are very limited by their own language resources, and when teaching morphologically complex languages that make the implementation of more narrowly guided and focused tasks indispensable.

There is a scarcity of research on task implementation with novice and experienced teachers. More research is also needed on how novice and experienced teachers conceptualize CLT and TBLT, about their understanding of task designs including underpinning principles. Furthermore, more detailed qualitative accounts of what is really taking place are needed when teachers are trying to take on some form of TBLT (see Carless 2012) and what initial and ongoing challenges in task implementation they encounter.

Little research on effective teacher training practices specific to TBLT exists. Little is known about successful training practices, its long-term effects, and, in general, how teacher trainers go about teaching principles of TBLT.

The bulk of research in TBLT is based on EFLT. Research on the adaptation of TBLT of languages with morphologically complex structures and the teachers' views, struggles, and challenges in these languages are needed.

Despite its claims to follow communicative and TBLT-based approaches, many textbooks follow a combination of TBLT and traditional methodologies. This leaves teachers with the task of developing their own or adapting traditional materials to TBLT-based materials. Do instructors engage in such practices and how successful are they in doing so?

This chapter proposes a set of skills and knowledge areas that are essential to the successful implementation of TBLT. These guidelines have emerged from research with teachers on the implementation of TBLT, their struggles, challenges, and perceptions. In essence, many of these suggestions are not that different from training language teachers in other methodologies. As Ellis (2009b) reminds us, like other kinds of language teaching, TBLT involves a syllabus and includes a methodology. Teachers need to decide which type of task to include in a lesson, how to structure the lesson and arrange tasks in sequence, and how to implement a task, that is, whether to have a task performed with the whole class, individually, or in groups, so it best facilitates the learning process. Needless to say, such methodological decisions touch the core of any language teacher education program. The learning of effective decision-making also calls for a long-term engagement.

Cross-References

- ▶ Applied Linguistic Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education
- ▶ Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in the Asia-Pacific Region
- ▶ Task-Based Teaching and Learning: Pedagogical Implications
- ▶ The Professional Development of Foreign Language Instructors in Postsecondary Education

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Gillian Wigglesworth: Task and Performance Based Assessment. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment

References

Almarza, G. (1996). Student foreign language teacher's knowledge growth. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 50–78). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Andon, N., & Eckerth, J. (2009). Chacun à son gout? Task-based L2 pedagogy from the teacher's point of view. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*(3), 286–310.

Brandl, K. (2000). Foreign language TAs' perceptions of training components: Do we know how they like to be trained? *The Modern Language Journal, 84*(3), 355–371.
Brandl, K. (2008). *Communicative language teaching in action*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.
Brandl, K. (2009). Implementational demands in task-based teaching: The teachers' perspective. *e-FLT online, 6*(2), 117–125.
Bullough, R. V. (1989). *First-year teacher: a case study*. New York: New York Teachers College.
Candlin, C. (1987). Towards task-based language learning. In Candlin C. & D. Murphy (Eds.), *Language learning tasks* (pp. 5–22). London: Prentice Hall.
Carless, D. (2004). Issues in teachers' reinterpretation of a task-based innovation in primary schools. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*, 639–662.
Carless, D. (2012). TBLT in EFL settings. In A. Shehadeh & C. A. Coombe (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts: Research and implementation* (pp. 345–358). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
DeKeyser, R. (2005). What makes learning a second language grammar difficult? A review of issues. *Language Learning, 55*(Suppl. 1), 1–25.
Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ellis, R. (2009a). Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*(3), 221–246.
Ellis, R. (2009b). Task-based research and language pedagogy. In K. Van den Branden, M. Bygate, & J. Norris (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching* (pp. 109–129). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Hillewaere, K. (2000). *Evaluatieonderzoek van het onderwijsbeleid ten aanzien van etnische minderheden in het lager onderwijs*. Gent: Universiteit Gent, Steunpunt ICO.
Hulstijin, J. (1995). Not all grammar rules are equal. Giving grammar instruction its proper place in foreign language teaching. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 359–386). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: a sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
Klapper, J. (2003). Taking communication to task? A critical review of recent trends in language teaching. *Language Learning Journal, 27*, 33–42.
Lantolf, J. P., & Pavlenko, A. (1995). Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 15*, 38–53.
Lidstone, M., & Hollingsworth, S. (1990). *Assessing change in beginning teachers' cognition and performance: The model of complexity reduction*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, Boston.
Linsen, B. (1994). Met vallen en opstaan: de introductie van taakgericht taalonderwijs. En praktijkbeschrijving uit het basisonderwijs in Vlaanderen. In S. Kroon & T. Vallen (Eds.), *Nederlands als tweede taal in het onderwijs. Praktijkbeschrijvingen uit Nederland en Vlaanderen* (pp. 131–159). 's- Gravenhage: Nederlandse Taalunie Voorzetten 46.
Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal, 58* (4), 319–326.
McAllister, J., Narcy-Combes, M.-F., & Starkey-Perry, R. D. (2012). Language teachers' perceptions of a task-based learning program in a French University. In A. Shehadeh & C. A. Coombe (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts: Research and implementation* (pp. 314–342). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
McDonough, K., & Chaikitmongkol, W. (2007). Teachers' and learners' reactions to a task based EFL course in Thailand. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*, 1071–1132.
Richards, J. C., Ho, B., & Giblin, K. (1996). Learning how to teach in the RSA Cert. In D. Freeman & C. J. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 242–259). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 27–57.

Robinson, P. (2005). Cognitive complexity and task sequencing: A review of studies in a componential framework for second language task design. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 43*(1), 1–33.

Robinson, P. (2007). Task complexity, theory of mind, and intentional reasoning: Effects on L2 speech production, interaction, uptake and perceptions of task difficulty. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 45*, 193–213.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 38–62.

Timmermans, S. (2005). Zin in lezen. Onderzoek naar krachtige leeromgevingen voor begrijpend lezen in het eerste leerjaar. Leuven: Steunpunt Nederlands als Tweede Taal/Centrum voor Taal en Migratie (intern rapport).

Van den Branden, K. (2006). Training teachers: Task-based as well? In K. Van den Branden (Ed.), *Task- based language education: From theory to practice* (pp. 217–248). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van den Branden, K. (2009). Mediating between predetermined order and chaos: the role of the teacher in task-based language education. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*(3), 264–285.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Edinburgh: Addison Wesley Longman.

Developing Instructor Proficiency in Oral Language Assessment

Margaret E. Malone

Contents

Introduction 440
Early Developments 441
Major Contributions 442
Coursework and Textbooks 443
Scholarly Research 444
Professional Development Opportunities 445
Problems and Difficulties 445
Future Directions 448
Cross-References 450
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education 451
References 451

Abstract

Preparing language teachers for the realities of the classroom and supporting them in their ongoing professional development are both a challenge and a responsibility. In today's testing-centered culture, it is crucial for teachers to be prepared for the current realities of language assessment as well as to continually refresh their knowledge and skills in a changing landscape.

This chapter explores the avenues through which language instructors develop and exhibit consistent skills in language assessment, specifically in assessing oral skills. Language proficiency is the extent to which an individual can communicate in a variety of situations, from routine to unexpected and formal to informal situations, and it is considered independent of any specific course of study or textbook. Any examination of an instructor's skills and knowledge in developing, selecting, and using language assessment, then, must look beyond an instructor's

M.E. Malone (✉)
Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA
e-mail: malonem@georgetown.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_35

ability to administer and score standardized or centrally developed tests and must also explore an instructor's ability to first determine what needs to be tested and then to develop or select, administer, score, and report the results of a test and subsequently use the results to improve classroom learning.

To investigate the current state of language instructor skill and ability in conducting assessments, specifically oral assessments, I begin by examining some early developments in oral proficiency assessment and how its principles and practices have been disseminated to language instructors. Next, I identify the major contributions to the development of instructor knowledge, skill, and ability in oral language assessment. Then, I discuss problems and difficulties inherent in not only developing instructor ability in assessment but also in maintaining it. Finally, I look at future directions and recommend improvements.

Keywords
Assessment literacy • Oral proficiency assessment • Professional development

Introduction

One important role of the language instructor is to assess student progress toward both specific course learning objectives and general language proficiency to support students in using language in real-life situations. Because of its centrality to interpersonal communication, oral proficiency assessment is perhaps the most obvious use of language in the "real world." In order to effectively assess student outcomes, language instructors must both understand the principles of oral proficiency assessment and be able to apply these principles in a consistent way to measure student progress and determine how to examine course objectives to improve teaching and learning.

Language assessment literacy (Inbar-Lourie 2008; Taylor 2009), or the extent to which instructors are proficient in assessment principles and practices as they relate to language teaching and learning, has recently become the focus of research and discussion in the language testing field. The focus of such research, however, is quite general and tends to emphasize general language assessment literacy rather than the extent to which language instructors are proficient in assessing oral language.

Therefore, the issue of instructor proficiency in oral language assessment is multifaceted; to avoid confusion with the large issue of student language proficiency, I refer to this instructor proficiency as "skills and knowledge." In first defining what instructor skill and knowledge are or should be in oral proficiency assessment, it is first necessary to define oral proficiency assessment and how it manifests itself in language teaching and learning. It is then necessary to examine the knowledge and skills instructors need to effectively assess oral skills and the challenges and opportunities of helping instructors attain these skills and knowledge.

Early Developments

Assessing oral language is challenging because oral language is by nature variable. While assessment of writing can be narrowed to a definitive, written piece that each reader shares, oral language can easily vary in understanding between any two listeners simply because oral language produced in live time disappears quickly. Even when the student response is recorded and replayed at a later time, differences in listener background or familiarity with the student's language patterns or any recording infelicities can result in different perceptions of the response by different listeners. In addition, listening to the recorded response more than once can change the listener's perception (Buck 2001). Therefore, assessing oral language is inherently complicated. At the same time, assessing oral language is an essential part of any language instructor's role and certainly crucial to the communicative success of most students. As Lowe (1988) points out, one reaction we often hear from past language students is "I studied (language) for (#) years, and I can't even order a cup of coffee!" Therefore, defining oral language and determining how to best assess it are a challenge for language learners and instructors alike: how do we determine how much language students can learn and speak and, then, how do we assess it?

A previous work (Spolsky 1977) has defined three major phases of language testing: prescientific, psychometric, and sociolinguistic; at present, language testing has entered a phase focused on accountability that includes not only large-scale testing of students but also the use of student language scores for teacher evaluation. In this chapter, I focus on the "communicative competence" period (Canale and Swain 1980) or "the proficiency period" (Barnwell 1996), a period in language teaching and, increasingly, in language assessment that highlighted the importance of oral language proficiency. Although dates for the periods of language testing are fungible and overlapping, perhaps the most important milestone in oral proficiency testing was the development, release, and adoption of the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) scale, a scale that defines language proficiency (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) according to six levels, labeled 0–5. The ILR scale and the accompanying tests, including listening, reading, writing, and a face-to-face oral proficiency interview, commonly referred to as the Foreign Service Interview (FSI), originally developed to assess the language proficiency of US Foreign Service Officers, have had a widespread impact on language proficiency assessment within the US government. By 1982, the FSI was being used for proficiency assessment across a number of US government agencies, including CIA, State Corps, and Peace Corps (Barnwell 1996). However, the scale was considered too concentrated on the high levels of proficiency to be relevant for US foreign language learners in secondary and post-secondary programs.

As a result, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), funded by a grant from the US Department of Education, collaborated with foreign language specialists across the United States to adapt the ILR scales for use with US higher education. Upon release

of the ACTFL Guidelines and their review, ETS and ACTFL hosted workshops for language faculty to learn to conduct oral proficiency interviews (OPIs) and apply the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines to rate their students' proficiency. In addition to the workshops conducted, Liskin-Gasparro (1987) produced *Testing and Teaching for Oral Proficiency: A Familiarization Kit*. This kit included an overview of oral proficiency assessment according to the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and sample interviews in several languages, annotated for use by instructors.

Although print and audio materials such as Liskin-Gasparro's (1987) book became available, and workshops to train teachers to apply the *ACTFL Guidelines* became more widespread, such professional development was hardly ubiquitous. In addition, early efforts focused on institutions of higher education (IHEs) rather than K–12. As a result, such efforts, although helpful for those who participated and learned to assess their students' oral proficiency, were in no way universal. Furthermore, many in the language testing field (Bachman and Savignon 1986; van Lier 1989, among others) criticized the ACTFL Guidelines for a lack of empirical evidence and consistency with theories of second-language acquisition. Therefore, although efforts to provide professional development in oral proficiency assessment became more accepted from the time of Lado's 1961 volume through the 1990s, such efforts were not coordinated. Moreover, no national empirical study of oral proficiency outcomes at any educational level has been conducted since Carroll's (1967) study of language proficiency outcomes of foreign language majors.

In reflecting on early developments, from the release of the ILR scale and the accompanying government tests, including the FSI, in the late 1950s through the emergence of the ACTFL Guidelines in the late 1980s, great changes were made in both development and availability of an approach to assess student oral proficiency. However, such efforts were mainly restricted to foreign language instruction at IHEs.

Major Contributions

In the thirty-plus years between the development and release of the ACTFL Guidelines and professional development focused on oral proficiency testing, the accompanying emphasis on authentic communication in language education and assessment of student oral proficiency have played an important role in language education. As the previous section demonstrated, however, professional development focused on oral proficiency assessment was initially targeted for instructors at IHEs who would use the ACTFL Guidelines and OPI to rate their university-level students. Over the past 25 years, there has been an increased emphasis on teacher accountability. Consistent with this focus, there is an increased emphasis on providing pathways toward knowledge and skills in oral proficiency assessment for language instructors through preservice coursework and textbooks on language assessment, scholarly research, and availability of professional development opportunities for language instructors.

Coursework and Textbooks

How are preservice instructors, from K–12 language teachers to university language faculty, prepared to assess their students? One approach would be to quantify the extent to which K–12 and university language faculty are required to take a class on language assessment. Little research exists on such requirements, both in times past and today; however, it is safe to say that such requirements were and continue to be varied. For K–12 teachers, such requirements vary depending on the place in which a teacher is licensed and can therefore be different locally or nationally. For the university language faculty, requirements for language assessment courses lack universality and are dictated by the university requirements for graduation. Therefore, preservice requirements for coursework in language assessment have traditionally been unsystematic.

Another measure is the availability of texts and the content included in textbooks on language assessment. As Brookhart (1999) noted, general assessment textbooks often focus on measurement issues as opposed to classroom issues, and many do not address the wide range of issues that classroom teachers may face, such as integrating reliable assessment methods into their already limited teaching and planning time. Malone (2008) conducted a short analysis of available books on language assessment over a nearly 40-year period between 1967 and 2005. The analysis found a wide variation of book length and number of references as well as a wide variation in the content. Lado's seminal work, published in 1961, was the first such book published on language testing and set the standard for the many texts to follow. However, it is important to note that Lado's book was considered less a volume for teacher use and more a scholarly work. Valette (1969) first described directions for language testing and then developed a handbook to assist instructors in developing assessment tasks. By contrast, Cohen's first book on language assessment, released in 1980, was revised in 1994. Bayley's review speaks volumes about the changes in language assessment textbooks between 1980 and 1994:

> The extensively revised second edition of Andrew Cohen's *Assessing Language Ability in the Classroom*, as its title suggests, is concerned with assessment as it impacts on the experience of teachers and learners in the communicative classroom. The volume, directed to a broad audience of language educators and teachers in training, provides clear guidelines to assist practitioners to evaluate and develop assessment instruments. In addition, Cohen offers numerous examples to illustrate the ongoing daily assessment that forms part of a well-conceived language class. (Bayley 1995, para 1)

Bayley's review highlights the importance of the revisions Cohen made to his work; if Lado's initial efforts were intended to professionalize the field of language testing, Cohen (1994), Bachman and Palmer (1996, 2010), Genesee and Upshur (1996), Weir (1993), Hughes (2003), and others, in developing new textbooks, understood, recognized, and addressed the practical issues facing language instructors in understanding the principles of assessment and applying them in the classroom. As the list of references indicates, the early to mid-1990s represented a

milestone in the publication of language testing texts aimed at teachers; a number of well-respected applied linguists and leaders in language teaching research released such volumes. Rather than simply focusing on the basics of language testing, these new offerings went a step further and provided practical advice to instructors on how to assess their students' language. However, Davies (1998), in a review of Genesee and Upshur (1996), warned:

> The "how" of evaluation is thoroughly dealt with, and the book [Genesee and Upshur, 1996] raises practical issues important to the teacher: how to place students in the appropriate level, how to plan new units of instruction, how to select textbooks etcetera, what homework to set, how to plan instructional objectives and plans. We are provided with detailed discussion on methods of information gathering: conferences, interviews, journals, objectives-referenced tests, observation, portfolios, questionnaires, and standardized tests. There is less guidance about what to evaluate or what the data collected by the teacher mean linguistically. (Davies 1998, p. 589)

Davies' criticism extends beyond Genesee and Upshur (1998) and to the field in general: with so many approaches to assess student progress, on what should instructors focus? Moreover, in assessing oral language, how is oral language defined and how do instructors define it, assess it, and monitor its progress?

It is also important to examine the content of such textbooks relative to what language instructors need to know and be able to do when using tests in their classrooms. Brindley (2001) points out that the content of language testing books does not always reflect the content teachers need to master for classroom-based assessment. However, despite the growing number of textbooks on language assessment and testing from Lado's seminal 1961 book until the mid-1990s, such books are limited in their impact. Although the existence of such books indicates that they are viewed as viable by textbook publishers, such books can only provide guidance and directions between their covers and within the interpretations provided in formal and information instructional settings. Such books do not necessarily reflect nor predict instructor behavior in assessment. The following sections presents a brief review of scholarly research that has shed some light on this issue.

Scholarly Research

A review of the literature revealed limited research on how to increase instructor knowledge and skill in oral proficiency assessment. A great deal of applied linguistics research in language testing explores the experiences of raters of language tests. Frequently, raters of large-scale language tests include a group (or are exclusively drawn from) practicing language teachers. Elder et al. (2007), for example, explored rater attitudes toward an online training program for writing assessment; Cavella and Malone (2008) investigated effective ways to provide professional development on oral proficiency to language instructors via distance learning efforts. Such research, while important, provides neither wide-reaching nor consistent professional development to a large group of instructors.

Magnan (1991) explored approaches to working with teaching assistants (TAs) learning to assess their students both effectively and consistently across the many sections they taught. Magnan's focus on TAs is admirable; because there is so little consistency in how language teachers and future faculty are educated in language assessment via formal coursework (Malone 2008), providing professional development to this group may have a more lasting impact than a single graduate-level course on assessment. Magnan points out "Backwash effects have an additional dimension: not only do tests direct how undergraduates learn; they also serve as models that influence how TAs teach throughout their professional careers" (p. 138). In other words, Magnan recommends working with TAs to help them learn how and when to assess their students and how to provide feedback to build a foundation on which they can establish good assessment practices to continue throughout their careers.

Much of the scholarly research, however, focuses on language assessment literacy in general rather than on developing specific skills in oral proficiency assessment and rating (Inbar-Lourie 2008; Taylor 2009; Malone 2013). While developing general knowledge and skills in the principles and practice of language assessment is of course essential for language instructors, assessing oral proficiency – from creating assessments using appropriate scales and rubrics to rating reliably to reporting results in a way that is transparent, comprehensible, and encourages future learning – is less emphasized in the scholarly literature. Therefore, the next section investigates some of the major initiatives in the United States to provide professional development on language assessment.

Professional Development Opportunities

A web search revealed ten major resources to provide professional development in assessment for language instructors. Table 1 describes them in some detail.

As Table 1 demonstrates, there are nearly one dozen sources of face-to-face and virtual professional development opportunities in the United States for language teachers available, from one-day workshops to week-long institutes. This table shows that professional language organizations, such as ACTFL, universities (such as the University of Minnesota), and a number of not-for-profits (such as the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) and WestEd) provide such opportunities annually. In addition, the opportunities vary in their focus on foreign language and ESL teachers.

Although these opportunities are helpful, it is nonetheless sobering that they are short term and do not provide follow-up once teachers return to the classroom. The next section addresses some of the problems and difficulties of such efforts.

Problems and Difficulties

As evident throughout the chapter, there are a number of challenges in discussing how and the extent to which language teachers become proficient in assessment in general and certainly in oral proficiency in particular. Often called language

Table 1 Professional development resources

Organization and title	Brief summary	Oral proficiency focus
ACTFL: Workshops for Curriculum, Instruction, and Performance Assessment	Provide professional development customized to support curriculum, instruction, and student performance	Can be customized to include oral proficiency
ACTFL: Proficiency Workshops	Provides proficiency assessment workshops at different locations across the country or at specific institutions. Workshop foci include the concepts and strategies for assessing functional language ability, through the oral proficiency interview (OPI) or proficiency tests for writing, reading, or listening	Yes, with a focus on the ACTFL OPI
Center for Applied Linguistics – Assessment for Language Instructors: The basics	Online course focused on the four basic principles of assessment: validity, reliability, practicality, and impact	No, but there is a follow-on course to address oral proficiency
World Language Assessment: Get in the Mode	Website to help world language educators improve student proficiency through a variety of assessment strategies	Yes
WestEd: English Learner and Accountability Evaluation Support	Project to support school districts and state education agencies improve their assessment, evaluation, and accountability policies, practices, and systems for English learners	Not specified
San Diego State University: English Language Development for Academic Literacy Certificate Program	Certificate program for K–12 teachers and other educational professionals with specialized preparation for developing academic literacy assessment, curriculum, and teaching methods specifically designed to meet the needs of ELLs	Not specified
The Center for Standards and Assessment Implementation: Academic Language Professional Development	Provides teacher professional development trainers with resources to help teachers support student language demands of instruction and assessment aligned with college- and career-ready standards	No
Florida Standards: English Language Arts Formative Assessment System (ELFAS)	Provides teachers with access to teaching strategies, lesson suggestions, supplemental materials, and information about	No

(*continued*)

Table 1 (continued)

Organization and title	Brief summary	Oral proficiency focus
	formative assessments and the Language Arts Florida Standards	
Stanford Language Center: Professional development program	Professional development to help teachers improve including oral proficiency assessment	Yes
Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (University of Minnesota): Summer Institute on Developing Assessments for the L2 Classroom	A one-week institute to formative and summative assessment models as well as performance and proficiency levels	Yes

assessment literacy, which refers to the knowledge, skills, and experience language instructors have in language assessment (Taylor 2009), recent research shows that such literacy is sporadic.

One of the main problems is, of course, as a review of both the literature and the professional development offerings available to US instructors, that there is no way to measure or even estimate the extent to which language instructors are skilled and knowledgeable about assessment nor to determine how such knowledge and skills are maintained. Because there is no way to determine the extent to which teachers possess and apply knowledge of oral proficiency or, indeed, assessment at all, the true problem is that it is likely that language instructors do not possess a shared understanding of assessment principles or of any common scale for oral proficiency assessment. In other words, we do not know what such instructors know or do not know; therefore, it is difficult to even establish a starting point for any discussion of assessment knowledge and skills.

There are three deficiencies that mark the inherent problems and difficulties of instructor knowledge and skills in oral proficiency: (a) a lack of a shared understanding of what oral proficiency is on any international, national, or local level; (b) a lack of evidence on what knowledge and skills any teachers have and apply in the classroom; and (c) a lack of structured programs for both preservice and in-service teacher education to develop, maintain, and improve this understanding so as to lead to instructor skill and knowledge.

First, there is no evidence that language instructors on an international, national, or local level share a common understanding of any proficiency guidelines nor of any approaches to assessment that would link them. While the CEFR and some related scales are used in a variety of settings across Europe and, in some cases, other places in the world, there is no indication that these scales are universally understood. In examining a number of European language and language testing conferences, session titles include “Is My B1 Your B1” and other such sessions that indicate that tests differ based on the language of the test and its country of origin. The case is hardly different in the United States; although the ACTFL Guidelines

were originally developed for US settings, a survey of 1600 language teachers conducted in 2006 (Malone 2008) indicated that teachers do not understand the tenets of the ACTFL Guidelines. If teachers do not even understand the basics of oral proficiency, how can they apply such principles in a consistent manner for their students?

Second, there is limited research on the current state of instructor knowledge and skills in oral proficiency assessment. The last survey of this type conducted in the United States was in 2006 and included only 1600 instructors (Swender et al. 2006). While this effort yielded a great deal of information, the fact remains that there is no body of evidence that has researched and provided for the current state of instructor knowledge in this area. Because such information does not exist, there is not only no way to determine the state of knowledge but also no way to determine how to improve it and where the strengths and deficiencies lie.

Finally, there is no clear definition of what is required in terms of oral proficiency or standard assessment in order to become a licensed teacher or instructor at an IHE, both in terms of preservice instruction at the university level and in terms of ongoing professional development. Like all fields, language assessment is constantly changing, and, even if such preservice training were mandatory, instructors would require regular follow-up to ensure that they learn new approaches and techniques. Moreover, although the number of textbooks available on language assessment has increased during the past 50 years, there is no evidence that textbooks result in positive classroom practices.

In short, the greatest difficulty in the issue of language instructor knowledge and skills in oral proficiency assessment is the very lack of knowledge of what exists and the extent to which instructors assess oral proficiency, how they provide feedback to students when they do assess oral proficiency, and how they use this information to improve classroom learning.

Future Directions

As scholarly research demonstrates, supported by examinations of available professional development opportunities for language instructors, there is no clear evidence as to the proficiency of language instructors in selecting, developing, administering, rating, and sharing the results of oral proficiency assessments with their students. Moreover, there is no evidence that there exists a shared understanding of the principles of oral proficiency assessment among instructors that could serve as a foundation from which instructors could develop their own proficiency about oral language assessment. As a result, we can reach no empirically based conclusions about language instructor knowledge and skills in oral language assessment; we can conclude, however, that such knowledge is idiosyncratic based on a specific instructor's background and experience, as well as their interest in assessing oral language.

Earlier, I identified three deficiencies of instructor knowledge and skills in oral language assessment: a lack of a shared understanding of what oral proficiency is on any international, national, or local level; a lack of evidence on what proficiency any

teachers have and apply in the classroom; and a lack of structured programs for both preservice and in-service teacher education to develop, maintain, and improve this understanding so as to lead to instructor proficiency. I explore ways to address each of these deficiencies to improve instructor knowledge and skills in oral language assessment.

Lack of a shared understanding of what oral language is and how to measure it on any international, national, or local level

Perhaps the first deficiency to address is that of what constitutes oral language and how to measure it. While both Europe and the United States have internationally recognized standards for and tests to determine oral language, the fact remains that these standards have limited and uneven dissemination to classroom teachers and use in classrooms. While language testing specialists discuss these standards and critique them, the knowledge and skills to assess oral language have not yet trickled down to many classrooms. Until oral language assessment is mandated, it will not be encouraged. Therefore, the best way to develop a shared local or national understanding of language assessment is to mandate oral language assessments at important junctures in education (e.g., after the third year of high school or the fourth semester of university study, depending on local norms) and to disseminate the results widely. In addition to developing instructor understanding of oral language, students, parents, and administrators also need to develop an understanding of what students should know and be able to do after specific courses of instruction and to demand high-quality programs that will yield such results.

Lack of evidence on the level of proficiency instructors have and apply in the classroom regarding oral language assessment

There is little empirical, widespread research on what level of knowledge instructors have and apply to their classrooms. Even if a preservice course on language assessment with a module on oral proficiency were required for all teachers, such knowledge is not enough. It is important to understand as well how frequently instructors assess oral proficiency, as well as the standards they use to do so and how they communicate the results to their students. Local, national, and international investigations of instructor practices should be conducted via surveys, interviews, and classroom observations from the primary to university levels to determine both the knowledge instructors have and how they apply it in the classroom.

Lack of structured programs for both preservice and in-service teacher education to develop, maintain, and improve understanding of oral proficiency assessment

This deficiency must be addressed in two ways: via preservice language instructor education and ongoing professional development. For preservice language instructor education, it is difficult enough to find out the extent to which all instructors are required to take any assessment course. Requiring a language assessment course with a healthy emphasis on oral language assessment would help both to raise instructor knowledge about this issue and to establish the understanding that oral language assessment is essential. However, a review of currently available language

assessment syllabi shows that, like many other courses, language assessment courses are intensive and have little time to devote solely to oral language assessment. It may behoove schools of education and university-level Ph.D. and Master's programs to consider adding a two-semester language assessment course requirement: one semester to focus on principles of assessment and one to focus on classroom practice.

However, preservice training is insufficient; although it can certainly establish expectations for future instructors, as professionals, they need ongoing support to ensure that they remain up to date and, indeed, use the standards and assessments consistent with their institution. Ongoing support can also help instructors to effectively use new technologies and tools to facilitate such assessment.

To make the situation more difficult, oral language is time-consuming to measure. When primary and secondary school instructors teach multiple classes of 25 or more students, oral proficiency assessment is not just a matter of developing and supporting a shared understanding of oral language and having and being able to use available tools to assess proficiency. The time-consuming nature of oral language assessment requires an investment of time and resources to ensure that student performance is rated reliably without posing an undue burden on their instructors.

Oral language assessment provides an opportunity for students to understand how the language they have learned is applicable in the real world, through oral communication with other speakers of the language. For instructors, too, developing proficiency in oral language assessment is a useful skill. As Bernhardt (2006) writes:

> Over the years, the Stanford Language Center has developed a fully articulated professional development program. At this point, 98% of all instructors (including graduate students) have taken at least the MOPI training. Of all full time staff, 30% have been ACTFL-OPI fully certified or are on their way. The level of professional conversation is outstanding within programs as well as across programs. Professional development and student assessment have provided a lingua franca for the language instructors. (p. 589)

Therefore, developing a shared understanding of and knowledge and skills in assessing oral language assessment can benefit not only students and individual instructors but also whole programs, as it provides a common language with which to discuss student performance. Until such time as such lingua franca exists and support is provided to language instructors on assessment in general and oral assessment in particular, it will be difficult to assess student performance in a valid and reliable manner.

Cross-References

► Applied Linguistic Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education
► Task-Based Instruction and Teacher Training

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Gillian Wigglesworth: Task and Performance Based Assessment. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment

Ofra Inbar: Language Assessment Literacy. In Volume: Language Testing and Assessment

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (n.d.). Assessment and professional development. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/assessment-professional-development. Accessed 27 Jun 2015.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests* (Vol. 1). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. F., & Savignon, S. J. (1986). The evaluation of communicative language proficiency: A critique of the ACTFL oral interview. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(4), 380–390.

Barnwell, D. P. (1996). *A history of foreign language testing in the United States: from its beginnings to the present*. Tempe: Bilingual Press.

Bayley, R. (1995). Review of the book *Assessing language ability in the classroom* by A.D. Cohen. Boston: Heinle and Heinle. http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume1/ej03/ej03r12/. Accessed 19 Jan 2016.

Bernhardt, E. B. (2006). Student learning outcomes as professional development and public relations. *Modern Language Journal, 90*(4), 588–590.

Brindley, G. (2001). Language assessment and professional development. In C. Elder & A. Davies (Eds.), *Experimenting with uncertainty: Essays in honour of Alan Davies, 11* (pp. 137–143). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brookhart, S. M. (1999). Teaching about communicating assessment results and grading. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 18*(1), 5–13.

Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing listening*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Carroll, J. B. (1967). Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college. *Foreign Language Annals, 1*(2), 131–151.

Cavella, C., & Malone, M. (2008). Teaching principles of assessment online. In S. Goertler & P. Winke (Eds.), *Opening doors through distance language education: Principles, perspectives, and practices.* CALICO Monograph, 7.

Cohen, A. D. (1994). *Assessing language ability in the classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Cohen, A. D. (1980). *Testing language ability in the classroom*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Davies, A. (1998) Review of the book *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education* (p. 27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elder, C., Barkhuizen, G., Knoch, U., & Von Randow, J. (2007). Evaluating rater responses to an online training program for L2 writing assessment. *Language Testing, 24*(1), 37–64.

Genesee, F., & Upshur, J. A. (1996). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education* (p. 27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2008). Constructing a language assessment knowledge base: A focus on language assessment courses. *Language Testing, 25*(3), 385–402.

Lado, R. (1961). *Language testing: The construction and use of foreign language tests. A teacher's book*. London: Longmans.

Liskin-Gasparro, J. E. (1987). *Testing and teaching for oral proficiency*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Lowe Jr., P. (1988). The unassimilated history. *Second Language Proficiency Assessment: Current Issues*, 11–51.

Magnan, S. S. (1991). Just do it: Directing TA toward task-based and process-oriented testing. In R. Teschner (Ed.), *Assessing foreign language proficiency of undergraduates. Issues in language program direction: A series of annual* (pp. 135–161). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Malone, M. E. (2008). Training in language assessment. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 2362–2376). Springer US.

Malone, M. E. (2013). The essentials of assessment literacy: Contrasts between testers and users. *Language Testing, 30*(3), 329–344.

Spolsky, B. (1977). Language testing: An art or a science. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Congress of Applied Linguistics.* Hochsculverlag, Stuttgart, pp. 7–28.

Swender, E., Abbot, M., Vicars, R., & Malone, M. E. (2006, November). The assessment of performance and proficiency in testing: A report. Presentation at the convention of the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages, Nashville.

Taylor, L. (2009). Developing assessment literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 29*, 21–36.

Valette, R. M. (1969). *Directions in foreign language testing*. New York: Modern Language Association.

Van Lier, L. (1989). Reeling, writhing, drawling, stretching, and fainting in coils: Oral proficiency interviews as conversation. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(3), 489–508.

Weir, C. J. (1993). *Understanding and developing language tests*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Index

A
Academic genres, 102, 103
Accountability, 155
Accuracy, 87
Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival (AICLS), 217
Affective factors, 428
Affective reasons, 430
African-American Vernacular English (AAVE), 19
Amazonian languages, 407
Amazonian region, 408
"America 2000" education initiative, 155
American Association of University Supervisors and Coordinators (AAUSC), 144
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), 146, 155, 181
Analytic syllabus, 89
Andes, 405
Apartheid, 238, 242, 246, 247
Applied linguistics, 4
  early developments, 4–6
  and language learning, 6–8
  problems, 10–11
  SL/FL education, 8–10
Asian heritage languages, 344
Assessment literacy, 445
Audio-lingualism, 87
Australia's community languages. *See* Community languages
Authentic communicative tasks, 153

B
Balanced domain-specific bilingualism, 305
Bantu Education Act, 240, 242
Bilingual education, 112, 113, 121, 215, 227, 228
Bureaucratic settings, 101–102

C
Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), 73
Chomsky's linguistic theory, 345
Classroom-based assessment, 444
Co-constructive learning, 431
Code switching, 20
Cognition hypothesis, 427
Cognitive and linguistic demands, 429
Cognitive complexity, 427
Cognitive factors, 428
Coherence, and transparency, 154
Collaborative Teacher Education Program, 344
Collaborative work of NNS and NS EFL teachers, 421
Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), 154
  for Languages, 154, 319
Commonly taught languages, 366
Communication, 87, 289
Communicative approach, 436
Communicative competence, 87, 129, 153, 160, 172
Community language(s)
  bilingual schools, 227
  curriculum and assessment, 232
  demography and delivery, 233
  Erebus International, 230
  guiding principles, 228
  higher education programs, 233
  professional language organizations, mobilization of, 228

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

N. Van Deusen-Scholl, S. May (eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8

Community language(s) (*cont.*)
status of languages, 233
types of institutions, 226
Communicative language teaching (CLT), 4, 7, 86, 181, 185, 186, 375, 426
aims of, 88
audio-lingualism, 87
challenge, 335
classroom-level constraints, 331
communicative competence, 87, 330
conceptual constraints, 330
grammar-translation, 87
societal-institutional-level constraints, 331
strong CLT, 329
teachers' beliefs, 333
weak CLT, 329
Comparative advantages of NNS and NS EFL teachers, 417
Comparative disadvantages of NNS and NS EFL teachers, 418–420
Comprehension, 139
Computer-mediated communication, 199, 206
Concept-based instruction (CBI), 60, 63, 64, 66, 132
Conditions for learning/learning conditions. *See* L2 learning
Connected learning, 159
Constraints, 379
Content and language integrated learning (CLIL), 72, 74–81, 232
advantages of, 115
classroom discourse, 116
definition, 112
early developments, 113–115
effects of, 119
institution planning, 119
leaners' communicative skills, 115
outcomes, 121
students' academic performance, 115
Content and language integration, 117, 118
theme-based, 74
Content and language learning, 112, 121
Content-based instruction (CBI)
adjunct, 73, 75
certification and specializations, 82
CLIL, 72, 74–82
CoBaLTT, 73
content-compatible language, 76
content-obligatory language, 76
CORI, 78
definition, 72
educational and cognitive psychology, 77
FLAC, 74
FLES, 74
instructional model, 73
language-and content learning obectives, 72–73
models, 71–75, 77–81
models and frameworks, 73
outcomes, 77–78
professional development, 77–79, 81
professional-development schemes, 81
prototypical model, 73
sheltered, 73, 75
SIOP, 75, 77–78
theme-based, 73
Content-based language instruction, 140
Content-based teaching, 112, 115
Content language integrated learning (CLIL), 336
Content learning, 114, 115
Context, 44, 50
Continuing Professional Development (CPD), 374
Contrasting theories, L2 learning
anxiety and other emotions, 30, 35–37
Brown's principles, 33–35
complexity, 28–38
Ellis' model, 29, 34
Gagné's conditions, 29–30
Lave and Wenger's theories, 31
Norton's sociocultural theories, 31–32, 35, 37
positive psychology, 35–37
risk/risk-taking/adversity, 33–34, 36
sociocultural contexts and environments, 29, 31–34, 36–37
Spolsky's conditions, 32–33, 37
Vygotsky's theory of dialogic learning, 30
Zhao and Lai's theory, 34–35 (*see also* L2 learning)
Co-operative learning, 431
Core French, 316, 319, 321, 323
Corporate language, 105
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards, 181
Creole, 19
Creolization theory, 49
Critical period, 51
CTLs, 184, 188
Cultural nationalism, 289
Culture, 201–203, 205, 206
Cultures and Languages Across Curriculum, 170
Curriculum, 232
Curriculum 2005, 238, 243

D
Design factors, 429
Development, 266, 274
Digital literacy, 143, 174
Digitally-mediated communication, 174
Diglossia, 20
Discourse Completion Tasks (DCTs), 130
Diversity, 296
Domain loss, 304
Double monolingualism, norm of, 307
Dynamic assessment, 60, 62

E
Ecological perspectives, 11
Education, 268, 276
Educational policies, 374
Educational reform, 374
Effectiveness of methods classes, 432
Electronic credentials, 163
Endangered languages, 214
English, 267, 270, 272, 273
English as a foreign language (EFL), 414
English language learners (ELLs), 315, 318, 321, 323
Ethnic minorities, 381
Ethnic schools, 228
Ethnic Schools Associations, 230
European Commission, 113
European Language Portfolio (ELP), 154
European Union, 112
  policies, 113
  policy goals, 120
Evidence, 152
Examination, 377
Explicit and implicit processes, language acquisition, 51
Explicit language knowledge, 89

F
First-time teaching assistants implemented TBLT, 431
Five Cs, 146
Fluency, 87, 128
Focus on forms, 88, 89
Foreign language(s), 288, 289, 292–294
  education, 6, 11, 63
  instructor, professional development (*see* Professional development)
  learning (*see* L2 learning)
  teacher education, 386
  teaching, 387, 392, 393
Foreign Service Interview (FSI), 441
Formative assessment, 156
French as a second language, 316
Future professoriate, 391

G
Genre, 143
Geographical dialectology, 17
Globalism, 49
Globalization, 49, 53, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174, 288, 290, 374
  english language teaching, 293
  language ideologies, 291
  neoliberalism and language teaching, 293–294
  NESTs, politics of, 292–293
  teaching JSL, 294–296
Government, 267
Grammar-translation, 87

H
Heritage language
  categories, 342
  curriculum and materials development, 348
  definition, 341
  early developments, 342–343
  national conference on, 343
  policy, 348
  problems, 350
  publications, 343–345
  research, 345–348
Heritage Language Journal (HLJ), 344
Hong Kong, 378

I
Identity, 44, 50
Immersion, 73, 74, 80, 380
Immersion program, 73, 365
Immersion schools, 216
Impact, 378
Indigenous language(s), 215, 409
Indigenous language and culture, 408
Indigenous literacy, 409
Individual differences, 128
Innovation, 378, 380
Instruction, 267
Integrated bilingualism/multilingualism, 307
Integrated e-portfolio, 160
Integrated language and content (ILC), 316
Interaction, 88

Interactive learning, 431
Intercultural bilingual education, 402
Intercultural communicative competence, 376
Interlanguage, 46, 49
Internationalization, 168
International table, 268
Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), 181

J
Japanese as a second language (JSL), 288, 290, 294–296
Joint National Committee for Languages (JNCL), 181

L
LANGSNAP project, 132
Language, 267
  of academic content areas, 71, 73, 76
  acquisition, 255, 260
  assessment literacy, 447
  change, 220
  contact, 19–21
  and content integration, 119
  decline, 214
  ideologies, 291
  learning, 114, 119
  planning, 254
  policy, 240–243, 246
  policy from above, 304
  policy from below, 304
  revitalization, 220
  standards, 21–22
Language-and content-learning objectives, 72, 73
Language for specific purposes (LSP), 98, 106
  early history of, 99
  systematic study of, 99
  use of, 99
Languages Across the Curriculum (LAC), 170
  policy in Singapore, 269–273
  regional policies, 273–274
Less commonly taught languages (LCTLs), 184, 187, 188
Learner-centered approach, 431
Learning content, 118
Learning of target language and content, 113
Lecturer, 386
L2 education, 253, 256, 258, 260
Legal language, 99
Lexical-syntactic calques, 48
LinguaFolio®, 155, 157, 364
Linguistic demands, 428
Linguistic imperialism, 289
Linguistic variation, 18–19
Literacy, 181, 184, 186, 188

M
Macro-approach, 346
Mainland China, 378
Markedness, 47
Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program, 217
Meaningful principle, 427
Mediation, 59, 60, 63
Medical discourse, 102
Methods course, 432
Middle East, 252, 253, 258, 259
Migrant languages, 227
Milestones, 163
Models of delivery, 375
Modern Language Association of America (MLA), 144
Mother-tongue education, 244
Multilingual pedagogies, 317, 323
Multilingualism, 239, 241, 242, 296
Multiliteracies, 142, 173, 317, 322
Multimodality, 142, 202–204

N
National Heritage Language Resource Center, 343
National identity, 288
National Languages Policy, 229
National Policy on Languages, 229
Native speaking EFL teachers (NS EFL teachers), 418–420
Neoliberalism, 288
Neurolinguistic research, 53
New curricula, 375
New literacies, 142, 173
No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), 156
Non-Anglophone context, 303
Non-language subject matter, 72
Non-native speaking EFL teachers (NNS EFL teachers), 417–421
North Africa, 252, 254, 258, 259
Novice teachers, 435

O
Official language, 314, 316, 322
Oral language assessment, 441

Oral language proficiency, 441
Oral Proficiency Guidelines and Interview (OPI), 128, 350
Outcomes-based education (OBE), 238, 243
  student, 160
Overgeneralization, 46

P
Pair and group work, 431
Parallel language use
  definition, 302, 305
  domain loss, 304
  higher education, 303
  norm of double monolingualism, 307
  norms of integrated bilingualism/multilingualism, 307
  principles of, 304
Pedagogical tasks, sequencing of, 431
Pedagogy, 379
Peru, 400, 402
Pidgins, 19
Plain language, 100, 101
Pluralism, 296
Polinsky's examination, heritage language, 349
Post-task activities, 431
Post-task debriefing, 434
Pre-and in-service methods seminars, 432
Pre-planning and task sequencing, 428
Presentation-practice-production (PPP), 88, 89
Pre-task preparation, 434
Pre-task routines, 431
Private speech, 60, 61
Professional communication, 98, 105, 106
  economic–technical setting, 100–101
  legal and bureaucratic settings, 101–102
  medical–social setting, 102
  science and academic setting, 102–103
Professional development, 442, 445
  and education, 389
  for faculty, 393
  graduate student, 391, 393
  of language program directors, 386
  of lecturers, 390
  of postsecondary instructors, 387
  TA development, 390
Professional discourse, 103, 105, 107
Proficiency, 44, 46, 52, 87, 128
  in English, 375
  targets, 364

Q
Quechua, 400

R
Reader-response theory, 142
Reading, 138
Reading-writing connections, 141
Real world tasks, 433
Reflection, 161
Rubrics, 163
Rudd Report, 229
Russian Overseas Flagship Program, 351

S
SALA project, 129
Schema theory, 139
School(s), 269, 271, 277
School education, 226
Scientific discourse, 103
Seal of Biliteracy, 367
Second language acquisition (SLA), 59, 63, 64, 66, 86, 88, 90, 91, 94, 199–202, 389, 393
Second language learning, 7. *See also* L2 learning
Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE), 432
Sheltered instruction, 73, 75
Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), 75, 77, 78
Simplification, 46
Sociocultural theory (SCT)
  CBI, 63
  learning, development and education, 63
  origin, 58
  symbolic mediation functions, 59
  and ZPD (*see* Zone of proximal development (ZPD))
Sociolinguistics
  description, 16
  early developments, 17–18
  language and globalization, 22–23
  language change and standards, 21–22
  language contact, 19–21
  linguistic variation, 18–19
  problems in, 23
Sociology of language, 16
South Africa
  colonial history, 238, 240
  educational systems, 244
  multilingualism, 239

South Africa (*cont.*)
new language policy, 241–242
official languages, 243
students' literacy levels in, 244
Speech acts, 130
Standards, for language learning, 155
Study abroad, 126, 171
early developments, 126–127
language learning in, 126
Stylistic variants, 47
Subject-specific competence, 115
Subject-specific discourse, 117
Subject-specific grammatical and lexical features, 116
Subject-specific language, 116
Subject-specific literacies, 118
Super-diversity, 53
Sustainability, 374
Symbolic competence, 143, 172
Synthetic syllabus, 89
Systemic-functional linguistics, 143

T
TA development, 388, 389
TA preparation, 388
TA professional development. *See* Professional development
Task(s), 86
criteria, 433
definition, 427
design, 429, 431, 434, 435
difficulties, 427
difficulty factors, 434
goals, 434
implementation, 435
monitoring, 434
planning, 90
repetition, 90
routines, 431
task-based syllabus, 428
teachers implement, 429–430
as work plan, 428
Task complexity, 90
and difficulty, 430
Task-based assessment (TBA), 334
Task-based language teaching (TBLT), 426
analytic syllabus, 89
challenges, 333, 335
CHC, 91
effectiveness of, 93
focus on form, 89
implementation of, 90, 94
stakeholders' perceptions of, 331
strong TBLT, 329
synthetic syllabus, 89
teachers' perspective, 92
technology-mediated TBLT, 336
weak TBLT, 329
Task-based syllabus, 429–430, 435
Task-related factors, 433
Task-supported language teaching, 329
TA supervision, 389
TBLT-based approach, 436
Teacher(s) belief, 432, 433
Teacher-driven factors, 433
Teacher education, 93, 386, 390
Teacher effectiveness, 362
Teacher preparation, 387
Teacher professional development, 185
Teachers' decisions, task modification, 430
Teachers implementing TBLT, 430
Teacher training, 392, 401, 434
Teaching, 270, 271, 274, 278
assistant, 386, 388, 390, 445
of English, 374
Technology, 199, 201, 204, 206
Technology-mediated TBLT, 336
Textbooks, 443
Transfer, 46, 47
Translingual and transcultural, 172
competence, 145
Transnational companies, 105

U
University teachers, 382

V
VALUE rubrics, 163
Vygotsky, L.S., 58, 59, 62, 66

W
Weinreich, Uriel, 45
Western provinces, 380
Willingness to communicate, 336
Work plan, 430, 434
Workplace interaction, 104
World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages, 146
Writing, 139

Z
Zone of proximal development (ZPD), 59, 60, 62, 65