BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

NEWSLETTER

No. 12

July 1981

CONTENTS:

Page 1 From TESL to Immigrants towards a Multi-Cultural Education - A Changing View in Britain - Edie Garvie

Book Reviews:

Page 11 Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning - Stephen Krashen (Pergamon, 1981)

Page 16 Teacher Training - ed. Susan Holden (M.E.P)

Page 18 Language in Religious Practice - William J Samarin (Newbury House, 1976)

Page 20 Applied Linguistic Research In British Universities 1980-81

Page 21 Notices

From TESL to Immigrants towards Multi-Cultural Education A Changing View in Britain

Edie Garvie

In multi-cultural Britain there is now the beginning of an exciting new trend in education. It is to be hoped that this will gather momentum and indeed become the 'national policy'. There has been a gradual swing away from assimilationist educational policies to those which are based on an acceptance of pluralism. From the narrow concept of immigrant education in the 50's, synonymous as it was with the teaching of English as a Second Language, through the change to that of multi-racial education with, impinging upon it, the influence of various national enquiries, reports and innovations generally in the 60's and 70's, we can now conceive the truly multi-cultural school. I aim in this paper to demonstrate the way in which immigrant education as a 'fringe industry' could develop into a catalytic force for informing the whole and to suggest a possible blueprint for the 80's where the multi-cultural school will be seen as a challenge and indeed become the model for all education, offering the kind of milieu for bringing about a proper balance and useful rapprochements of various kinds.

1. THE BASIC PHILOSOPHY

Underlying any educational approach there must be a way of thinking about society generally. It is suggested that the way forward should be what might be described as pluralism with integration. This is the middle ground of a continuum with assimilation at one end and pluralism with separatism at the other. Assimilation assumes that there is a fixed and unchangeable 'host' culture and that the immigrant, if he wishes to survive, must change in order to fit the system. An important element in this, for some the only one that matters, is language. The immigrant who learns THE language has arrived. At the opposite extreme, pluralism with separatism, each does his own thing. No culture/language is standard or better than any other. There is separate development, 'apartheid', a multiplicity of mini-societies each with its mother-tongue and little communication across cultures except at a very instrumental level. Neither extreme, in my view, is acceptable in to-day's world. The first denies the richness of diversity and stifles growth; the second leads to confrontation and conflict.

Pluralism with integration, the middle way, would seem to offer the best framework for present-day society and for education as a microcosm of it. It suggests that there must be a mainstream of some kind which accepts diversity. There should be a two-way process. On the one hand the mainstream would be gradually but constantly changing as the minority cultures impinge upon it and on the other the minorities would adapt to some extent to the mainstream as it evolves, while at the same time retaining their own cultural identities. Culturally and linguistically society would move towards a situation where each member of it had a sense of belonging to both his own distinct group and to the wider commonalty, each accepting the other and learning to grow together. Bi/pluri-culturalism and bi/pluri-lingualism should be the norm for the 80's. It is suggested that education could be an important influence on society generally. We no longer have time to indulge in the old argument about how far education reflects society and how far it is instrumental in changing it. The world needs to be educated or perish. The multi-cultural school, which is also a community school with parental involvement, could be an extremely powerful educating force.

2. A RETROSPECTIVE VIEW

How has the concept of multi-cultural education in Britain developed? About twenty-five years ago some British schools in some areas began to be conscious of a growing number of pupils from overseas, mainly the New Commonwealth countries. Their life-styles and languages were different from anything the teachers had met before. With typical British stoicism the teachers strived to help the children to fit in. So long as they were quiet and did not cause trouble life could go on smoothly. Gradually the situation developed to 'crisis' proportions. Something would have to be done by the authorities. How could these children learn in British schools when they did not speak English? The hard-pressed classroom teachers were not trained for this work and even if they did understand how to teach their own language to foreigners how could they manage that besides everything else they had to do?

In the early 60's a whole new industry sprang into being. With some differences in practice amongst the various local authorities particularly involved, provision was made for the immigrant children to have special help with English. The work was done by withdrawing the children temporarily from the normal classroom either to a separate centre or to a special class within the school and the withdrawal could be part-time or full-time. It was envisaged that this 'injection' of intensive language work for anything up to twelve months would solve 'the problem'. Teachers of the special classes were given in-service training in language-training techniques, mainly those which had evolved in places overseas where English was being taught as a Foreign Language or as a Second Language to be used as a teaching medium. Eventually materials more suited to the situation in Britain such as SCOPE[1] were produced by a national project. Officers of the authorities were appointed to advise on the education of immigrants, i.e. on the use of the ESL-materials and the teachers in the special units formed themselves into an association for the teaching of English to Immigrants.

There was a new and growing excitement. Nothing like this had ever happened in Britain before, or so it was thought. The fact that Britain had absorbed waves of immigrants over the centuries, Jews, Irish, Poles and other Europeans and many people from other parts of the world, was forgotten. What was so different about this situation? Was it that these immigrants were in the main coloured? A careful look at history will show that coloured immigrants were no new phenomenon. Was it that Britain, having lost its empire, was grasping at an opportunity to find a new role? I suspect not, at least not at that time. The country was a whole was not yet involved, only some authorities and some schools within them. And perhaps this was the crux of the matter. Heavy concentrations of non-English-speaking pupils in the inner city areas were seen as compounding and adding to the already serious problems of deprivation and general malaise with which the schools in these areas had to cope. There was also, by that time, in comparison with educational approaches in the past, a greater sensitivity towards the needs of individuals generally and a desire on the part of educationists to cater for those needs. For whatever reason, we now had a 'new' problem and it was seen as mainly linguistic. Even the black West Indian children were not seen as part of this problem. At least they spoke English even if it was 'sub-standard'.

It is interesting to note that the staff of this new immigrant service were seldom people from the mainstream of education. They were recruited mainly from those who had served overseas as missionaries, colonial officers, young volunteers or from the immigrants themselves.[2] The exotic or the young enthusiast seemed to be the appropriate kind of teacher for this strange new situation. It was not the kind of work that the established teacher could risk his career for. Hopefully the problem would soon be solved and the country could settle down again to normality. It was not realised at that time how important it was for the mainstream to be involved and that even if the education of immigrants was conceived in terms of English language teaching, this could not be done in a vacuum. Many of the teachers had little experience of teaching per se or of the educational system in Britain or both. In the event it is little short of amazing that so much progress was made and so much expertise eventually available.

As the 60's moved into the 70's and this first generation of immigrant children, having received their initial language instruction, were more and more seen in the normal classes, it was realised by some at least that we were no longer dealing with a new emergency which would eventually come to an end. These children were here to stay and the main-stream teachers would have to become permanently involved. It was also found that a year or so in a special language unit was certainly not the end of the matter. The children needed on-going help. In addition, the West Indian children were beginning to make themselves felt. They were becoming a behaviour problem. Maybe their peculiar language forms had something to do with it. They seemed not to be achieving (except in sport!) as well as they might and certainly not as highly as their white peers. Finally there was a new concern for the very young children, most of them born in this country into non-English-speaking homes. More and more children were entering the infants schools with no English and a life-style as foreign as that of the first wave of older children. To many it was unthinkable that these little children should be taught English in special centres but something would have to be done.

It was about this time that the term 'multi-racial education' came to be used. The focus of attention for in-service education of teachers and the provision of teaching materials shifted more towards the class-room teacher. The original SCOPE project, for instance, produced language materials based on topics suitable for lower secondary children in the second phase of their English learning and capable of being used in the ordinary classroom.[3] The same project also produced a guide book for infant teachers with ideas for more structured language work through play and story.[4] A new project was set up to study the particular problems of West Indian children, later producing a kit of materials called Concept 7-9.[5] There was a markedly greater involvement of the teaching force generally but the assumed policy was still assimilationist and still concerned in the main with language. There were however a few voices heard defining multi-racial education in somewhat wider terms. The association of teachers which had been formed to support immigrant education and now called the Association for Multi-Racial Education, were beginning to question not only the exclusive concern with language but the whole assimilationist approach. Was it not possible that the immigrants with their differing life-styles had something to OFFER to the mainstream? Should this mainstream not be more prepared to adapt to their general needs in terms of culture as well as language? Did we not need to know more about these differing life-styles?

At this stage it might be useful to pause and look at some developments in the general field of education which have undoubtedly had a bearing on what followed. The decade 1960-1970 had seen the work of Bernstein, highlighting as it did the problems of educational disadvantage linked to the notion of language codes. Action/research giving rise to compensatory education projects was engendering a new interest in the connection between culture and language. In the United States the Headstart programmes were a parallel movement. In the early days of all this the thinking behind it was very much assimilationist. For children who were disadvantaged or deprived there was a gap to be filled and compensatory programmes were devised to do just that. However there were questioning voices here too as Labov exemplifies in this 'Logic of Non-Standard English' (1972). The implicit assumption that difference equals deficit was beginning to be untenable. A more careful look at the diversity seemed to be called for.

The 70's saw the publication in Britain of three major education Reports, the Bullock, the Taylor and the Warnock.[6] The issues upon which they centred respectively, language across the curriculum, greater involvement of parents in school management and special education as the business of all schools were matters which have had a profound effect on educational thinking generally and those concerned in particular with the education of minorities were caught up in the changing climate along with everyone else. The language across the curriculum movement raised questions about the nature of the special ESL content and methodology. Did this not suggest that there should be more emphasis on the USE of language? How far were we really facilitating the pupils' learning of other subjects and how closely were we working with the teachers in the subject fields generally? The implications of the Taylor Report (1977) gave rise to uneasy feelings about the non-participation in the educational process of immigrant parents. There was increasing concern about how to 'get through' to parents whose own English was minimal or non-existent. Lastly, and coming near to the present, the whole notion of what is meant by 'special' in education as debated in the Warnock Report (1978) brought questions about positive (or otherwise) discrimination and how this should be handled. It may be that the Rampton Enquiry[7] now in progress will in its Report throw more light on these problems in the context of multi-cultural education.

Another interesting and recent development has been the attempt by some to bring together teachers of mother-tongue English, those teaching foreign languages and teachers of ESL. The Bullock Report language across the curriculum, whilst it did have a chapter devoted to the needs of minority group children, still gave the impression of ESL as something peripheral. It also stopped short at Modern Languages. It is incredible that there had never been any attempt before to link up all these language interests. There is so much common ground and so much that each could give to the other. A strong case is now being made for language as a subject in schools, language per se.[8] Both teachers and pupils should be knowledgeable about the ways in which language functions in society apart altogether from the way it helps the learning process. It is the essence of man's link with others and lies at the heart of man's social being.

Over the whole of this period from 1960 to 1980 ideas about language itself have been changing. Matched by the swing in psychology from the behavourist tenets of the 50's to the cognitivist thinking of the 60's, Bloomfield gave way to Chomsky. The Chomsky revolution, though more of an academic than a pedagogic one, had some repercussions in the classroom both in mother-tongue and ESL fields. Gradually this too was superseded by the work of the sociolinguists such as Hymes and Fishman. The effects of environmental influence upon the learning and use of language, the importance of communicative as well as of grammatical competence, the place of dialect and diversity and the whole vast debate about the use of the mother-tongue in education and the merits of bilingualism, have now become the focus of attention. These are matters which no-one concerned with multi-cultural education can afford to ignore.

Finally in this consideration of factors impinging upon multi-cultural education, one cannot forget the changes over the years in classroom approach. Again, matching the changing notions about learning, schools have become less formal and less authoritarian, particularly the primary schools. The curriculum has been more concerned with process and less with facts, with the development of the individual child rather than class standards. Two questions amongst many others might be raised here. How does the traditional EFL/ESL approach fit into this wider learning ethos and secondly how do many of the immigrant children respond to a regime which may differ considerably from that of their native country or from their parents' expectations?

3. THE PRESENT SCENE

It is my belief that in a sense we have now come full-circle. As a result of all these many influences and the questions they raise we can no longer afford to see the education of immigrants as a fringe industry. The children from minority groups must be in the mainstream of the school where they belong with equal rights but in very different circumstances from those prevailing at the start of this saga. The 'problem' sitting at the back of the class must be a thing of the past. Already things are beginning to change in this direction. The use of the term 'multi-cultural education' to replace 'multi-racial' education seems to be to be significant. The new name suggests something wider than ethnic differences. It subsumes race and colour and creed. It also embraces groups of other kinds, of regions, of classes, of generations, of dialects, etc. The old notion of a host community and immigrant minorities has been replaced by that of one pluralist society and the task for education is to cater appropriately for this multicultural mix. Unity in diversity is now the norm and many people in education are thinking this way though there is still a long road to travel.

I suggest that what we have now achieved is a way of looking at difference not as a deficit and a problem but as something to be welcomed and incorporated into the curriculum. There is a new openness and willingness to accept change in many schools and authorities generally. Further than that, this is seen, at least by some, as the right approach for all schools, not just the ones with high proportions of children from minority groups. An understanding of the multi-cultural nature of Britain to-day is essential for everyone.

It would be all too easy however to be complacent about the turn of events. There are many battles still to be won and the present economic situation casts gloom upon the future of teacher education and the building up of new resources. Nevertheless there is a sense in which the current cash crisis may be turned to some good effect. Already for instance in my own authority there have been high level discussions about 'core' curricula and priorities, about multi-cultural education as a pervading force and not an extra, about school-based in-service education of teachers which is initiated by Advisers of different disciplines working together and pooling resources with multi-cultural education as the central theme. In other words multi-cultural education is seen now not as education of immigrants, not as ESL only but as education per se. There are many, and not only those in the rural hinterland, still to be converted, but progress is being made. Nationally the scene is patchy but conferences and research projects over the past year or so indicate by their themes that there is a spearhead of right-minded people determined to bring about the necessary curriculum changes.

4. A POSSIBLE WAY FORWARD

Education for a society which aims at pluralism with integration would seem to be the over-riding aim. The implications for curriculum change both in content and organisation are many. And underlying all of this is the urgent need to spread the new thinking so that teachers' attitudes may change. At least equally important is the need for a change of attitudes amongst administrators and policy-makers, both centrally and locally. Without the political will very little progress can be made.

Within the school itself rapprochements of various kinds are now possible. The whole school and all teachers must be involved and the Educational Advisers must help them to see how this can best be done. There will be differing approaches according to the needs of the clientele. The kind of curriculum in a school with many cultures represented will be different from that of the mono-cultural school. Both should be educating ABOUT cultural difference and the richness of diversity but the first should also be educating FOR cultural difference and making use of its diversity, whilst at the same time coping with special needs. Many schools are now working an integrated curriculum especially in the primary sector but in secondary schools also there is a strong move towards this, the humanities subjects as a group being the favoured starting point. In such schools the potential for a pervasion of multl-cultural thinking is high. The new rapprochement of subject disciplines lends itself to this. In the schools where there are minority group children their special needs in language for instance could be so much better met where departments are coming together, English with Modern Languages, English (mother-tongue) with ESL, ESL with the Remedial Department etc.

Subjects such as Art, Music, Drama, Home Economics and Religious Education are obvious vehicles for diverse cultural input and much good work has already been done in many schools which have a high cultural mix. A point which should be stressed is the important social as well as educational value of this. To include in the curriculum the special things of a child's culture is to help him towards a self-identity, to show that he and what he brings are valued. This must contribute to his general motivation and increase the possibility of his achieving his true potential. It will also contribute to good community relations and harmony in general.

Still on the theme of community and race relations it is important that teachers examine their curricula for things which indicate prejudice. It is astonishing how many of the books for instance contain elements which could be offensive to one group or another. The British history teacher reading with his class an account of the Indian Mutiny must be prepared for questions from the Indian child whose community would have seen this as a war of independence. Many more examples could be given from stories about Little Black Sambo to subjects for 'A' level examinations which reflect the glories of the great British empire. This is not to suggest that we attempt to change the facts of history; simply that we help our pupils to see them in the context of present-day society.

The entire school should provide a field or curriculum which is appropriate in kind and degree for all its pupils, and within this field there must be focus of varying kinds on the special needs of groups and individuals. Where children come from non-English-speaking backgrounds some of this focusing must be on language. There is still a place for the ESL specialist but as an integral part of the school. Withdrawal may still be necessary for some children some of the time. What is done there however should relate closely to the mainstream curriculum. The specialist teacher must liaise with the rest of the staff and language help should be given in the context of its use. There are many new interesting materials now on the market relating to English for Special Purposes. English for Academic Purposes is an important part of this. The work of the industrial language units which have been in operation in Britain now for some time offers a useful prototype.[9] Also the Threshold Language produced by the Council of Europe with its study of function as well as structure suggests an approach which might well be studied with interest by teachers in Britain.[10]

The ESL specialist, it seems to me, has a very important role to play in a school. Indeed the whole of the former 'fringe industry' of immigrant/multi-racial education is now really coming into its own. It has served to highlight what education in general should be doing for all its children. What is needed now is the incorporation of this very real expertise in the handling of cultural and linguistic difference into the wider curriculum. All children need the language of the main-stream. For some this will be ESL; for others standard dialect; but for both there are cultural implications. It is essential that the mother-tongue/dialect is sensitively dealt with. Using and valuing what children come with is something which those accustomed to working with immigrant children can demonstrate.[11]

Another way in which the expertise of the former teacher of immigrants might be used is in the growing 'back to basics' movement. Mention has already been made of the 'core'curriculum. Recent debates relating to accountability have raised questions about what parents and employers expect of schools. There is a move towards more concentration on basic literacy and numeracy and perhaps a more structured approach. The teacher who has had to help an immigrant child find his or her way in a British school might have much to offer to this general debate. The careful step-by-step programme linked to language which is the tool of the trade of the teacher of immigrants might now be used with some profit by all teachers. In the aftermath of the three educational Reports referred to earlier and in the context of the present Rampton Enquiry which is concerned in the first place with the apparent under-achievement of West Indian children accountability is an important issue.

A number of supplementary schools have been established by the minority groups in various parts of the country. Mainstream education must be concerned about the implication of this. Why do these groups consider it necessary to set up their own schools? It is essential that teachers should know about the supplementary schools in their own areas and should be prepared at least to support and work with them.

A related issue is the employment (or lack of it!) of teachers from the minority groups in the ordinary schools. For several reasons the employment of such teachers would be a good thing. In schools where there are many children from minority groups they would help towards giving the children a sense of identity. It is right that young people should see adults from their own communities in positions of status. The teachers could also act as representatives on governing bodies of schools along with immigrant parents, thus helping in the policy-making. But they should also be in schools which have few or no children from their own communities, their very presence making the point that Britain is a multi-cultural society.

There is a need for the involvement of all parents of whatever community in order that the curriculum will be made really appropriate and there is a need for the whole school to be concerned with its 'special' problems. The new curricula which should emerge must cater for every kind of diversity. The truly comprehensive school has the potential for serving every need in this decade and the future.

One final issue should be mentioned. There is now a movement towards what is known as Development Education, concerned with looking at the entire world and the trends in terms of economic and political matters. The West versus the East as political blocks, and the North versus the South as economic groupings have both become points of interest in the curricula of some schools, very often the monocultural schools with no involvement as yet in multi-cultural education. Education for International Living might well be the new way forward but this must incorporate all that education for the multi-cultural society is presently working towards. In other words we have the outside world within our bounds as well as impinging upon us from outside. There are all the ingredients here for a vital new and highly appropriate education involving all children and reaching out through the schools to the entire community. What more important aim could schools have in 1980?

References

van Ek J A — 1975, Systems Development in Adult Language Learning, The Threshold Level, Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe

Hawkins E W — 1979, "Language as a curriculum study", in: The Mother Tongue and Other Languages in Education, NCLE Papers and Reports 2, pp. 61-70

References

Labov W	1972,"The Logic of Non-Standard English", in: P.P. Giglioli (ed.), Language and Social Context, Penguin, pp. 179-215

Footnotes

1 Schools Council Project in English for Immigrant Children (1969) SCOPE Stage 1, Longman

2 Certain emergency schemes for helping immigrant teachers to obtain British qualifications were initiated but, in my view, not enough effort was made either then or later (see below)

3 Schools Council Project in English for Immigrant Children (1971) SCOPE Stage 2, Longman

4 Schools Council Project in English for Immigrant Children (1976)

SCOPE Handbook 3: English for Immigrant Children in the Infant School, Longman (N.B. All the SCOPE materials have recently been revised by Marcel Leclerc, Immigrant Education Resource Centre, Bradford, West Yorkshire, England (1978).)

5 Concept 7-9, E J Arnold & Sons (1972)

6 (a) Committee for Inquiry into Reading and the Use of English, A language for Life, HMSO (1975: The Bullock Report)

(b) Committee for Inquiry into the arrangements for the Management and Government of Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools in England and Wales, A New Partnership for our Schools, HMSO (1977; The Taylor Report)

(c) Committee for Inquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People, Special Educational Needs, HMSO (1978; The Warnock Report)

7 Committee for Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups. This committee is still meeting under the chairmanship of Mr Anthony Rampton

8 See e.g. Hawkins (1979: 61-70)

9 See Industrial Language Training, A Progress Report 1980, The National Centre for Industrial Language Training, Havelock Campus, Southall, Middlesex, England; Heinemann Educational, 1979, reprinted 1978.

Footnotes (Continued)

10 See J A van Ek (1975)

11 The provision for mother-tongue development is a growing concern in Britain. It cannot be elaborated upon here. Suffice it to say that a limited amount of work is ongoing, some of it supported by the EEC.

(Reprinted with permission from Grazer Linguistiche Studien 13, Autumn 1980)

BOOK REVIEWS

Stephen Krashen - Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning; Pergamon, 1981 - vii + 151pp - ISBN 0-08-025338-5

Stephen Krashen's book does not break new ground, nor is it intended to do so. In it Krashen has gathered together the ideas and research previously published in a series of articles over the last eight years. The book is more than a collection of articles, however. Krashen has provided an introduction which serves as an overview of the principal aspects of the Monitor Theory and the key theoretical areas about which it informs. Subsequent chapters then treat in depth each of these areas. The book is important because it makes available under one cover Krashen's theoretical 'position' with regard to second language acquisition (SLA).

Krashen's key distinction between 'acquisition' and 'learning' is not a new one. For instance, Corder (1973) distinguished 'acquisition', which he saw as taking place in the infant along with other kinds of mental development, from 'learning', which occurs when physical and mental maturation is more or less complete. Krashen, however, offers a rather different definition of these terms. 'Acquired' knowledge arises as a product of meaningful interaction in communicative situations; it takes place subconsciously. 'Learnt' knowledge is the product of deliberate study of the formal properties of the language. Krashen claims that 'acquisition' occurs irrespective of the language user's age; that is both the young child and the adult is capable of 'acquiring' a second language (L2). 'Learning', however, is only available to the adult who has reached the Piagetian stage of formal operations.

The main tenets of the Monitor Theory are now well known. They refer to the process by which a L2 is internalised (which is as described above), to how linguistic knowledge is stored and also to the means by which performance in the L2 takes place. Krashen claims that 'acquired' and 'learnt' knowledge are stored separately and (more contentiously) that there is no transfer of knowledge from one to the other. Thus according to Krashen the 'learner' builds up a store of knowledge about the L2 which has different neurological correlates to the store of 'acquired' knowledge that is assimilated through natural contact situations. In performance the user can only initiate utterances by means of 'acquired' knowledge; 'learnt' knowledge is used in certain circumstances to inspect and alter (i.e. monitor) output generated from 'acquired' knowledge. It needs to be emphasised, therefore, that the Monitor Theory is very comprehensive; it purports to account for internalisation, storage and performance. It should also be evident that, if it is a valid account of SLA, the theory has important implications for L2 teaching.

This review will be concerned with primarily examining the validity of the Monitor Theory in the light of the three requirements that Hjelmslev (1943) laid down for a linguistic theory (and which are equally applicable to a pyscholinguistic theory). These are: (1) the theory should be non-self-contradictory; (2) it should be exhaustive in the sense that it covers all the known empirical facts and (3) it should be simple.

With regard to (1) a major problem which I think emerges from Krashen's account of the theory is that the distinctions involving internalisation, storage and performance are not always rigorously adhered to, with the result that they sometimes become conflated. One clear example of this concerns the Monitor itself. This operates in performance by drawing upon the store of 'learnt' knowledge and thus has, as a precondition for its use, that the user knows the relevant rule(s) (see page 3). It follows from this that failure to monitor in appropriate contexts may be the result of (1) inadequate 'learnt' knowledge or (2) a disinclination to use available 'learnt' knowledge to monitor output from the 'acquired' store. In other words the failure may derive from (1) inadequate internalisation and storage or (2) inadequate performance (or, of course, both together). Krashen's discussion of monitor 'under-users', however, does not take account of these two potential explanations for failure to monitor. He assumes that language users who fail to monitor do so because they prefer to rely on 'acquired' knowledge, i.e. he sees it as a problem of inadequate performance rather than potentially inadequate internalisation. His discussion of Monitor ' under-users' is therefore highly speculative, as without establishing what 'rules' each user has internalised as part of his 'learned' store it is not possible to determine whether failure to monitor is the result of lack of knowledge or a disinclination to use it. This problem with the account provided of Monitor use is reflected more generally in a relative poverty of information about the nature of 'learnt' knowledge or the processes by which it is internalised.

A more serious problem also derives from the same failure to distinguish internalisation,storage and performance. It is one thing to argue that L2 performance differs with regard to various formal constraints such as the availability of time, whether the focus is on form and a knowledge of 'rules' (a performance difference, incidentally, that can be accounted for in terms of Labovian variable rules) but quite another to argue that these differences are evidence of either separate processes of internalisation or of separate storage for 'acquisition' and 'learning'. McLaughlin (1978) has drawn attention to the same problem by pointing out that the distinction between 'conscious' and 'subconscious' is unsatisfactory because these are not open to empirical investigation. He also argues that 'learning' processes can take place with varying degrees of consciousness (as language teaching methodologies which have encouraged students to induce 'rules' have always taken for granted). McLaughlin also criticises the idea of separate storage for "acquired" and 'learnt' knowledge, preferring instead the more familiar distinction between 'short-term' and 'long-term' memory since this provides for a flow of information from the former to the latter. These serious criticisms of his theory are not considered by Krashen, although it would seem imperative, at the very least, to discuss the relationship between 'acquisition/learning' and memory store.

I am also intuitively doubtful about the validity of a simple dichotomy in SLA, given the acknowledged complexity of the process. Is it not possible that 'acquired' knowledge (or long term memory of L2 items) and 'learnt' knowledge (or short term memory of L2 items) exist as poles on a continuum with the availability of different items in store varying as a product of both contextual constraints in performance (e.g. Dickerson, 1975) and/or the 'depth' at which items have been acquired and the consequent 'restrictions' in applicational contexts that occur (Pienemann, 1980)?

It is now axiomatic that performance in a (second) language is variable. What Krashen's theory offers is an explanation of this variability in terms of the distinction between 'acquisition' and 'learning'. Krashen has opted for a pycholinguistic explanation and has chosen to ignore alternative sociolinguistic areas of enquiry. But the difference that has been observed in the morpheme acquisition studies between performance on 'Monitor-free' tasks and performance on the 'very special kind of task' (page 53) that encourages use of the Monitor is surely also explicable within the framework of a model of communicative competence where the language user draws on his total knowledge of the L2 to fulfil the various social roles and expectations with which he is faced. This is not to suggest (in a brief review) that a theory of communicative competence is to be preferred to the Monitor Theory; it might be suggested, however, that there is a need for such a viable, alternative theory to be considered in a book that purports to account for SLA in all aspects.

The last few comments lead into a consideration of Hjelmslev's second requirement. To what extent does Krashen cover all the known empirical facts? One of the major strengths of the theory (and of the book) is the breadth of coverage of SLA research that is reported. Krashen reviews the research into attitude and aptitude, the morpheme acquisition studies (dealing convincingly with some of the major criticisms levelled at these), neurological correlates, simple codes and prefabricated routines and patterns with an admirable thoroughness. In general the research he reports provides convincing support for many of the tenets of the theory, although, interestingly, Krashen is unable to find any clear neurological correlates for the 'acquisition/learning' distinction.[1] However there are areas of SLA research which Krashen neglects.

SLA empirical research may be classified under the following headings:

(1) Cross-sectional research (e.g. morpheme acquisition studies; socio-pyschological studies of determinants in SLA)

(2) Introspective studies (e.g. the journal studies - Schumann and Schumann, 1977)

(3) Longitudinal research (e.g. case studies - Hatch, 1978)

(4) Studies in communication processes in a L2 (e.g. Larsen-Freeman, 1978)

It is quite clear that Krashen relies extensively on (1) and to a lesser extent on (2); in contrast (3) and (4) are largely neglected. There must be some doubt as to the extent to which SLA performance can be successfully accounted for without reference to (4) and SLA internalisation processes without reference to (3) and (4) together.

The problem which faces SLA research is that of inferring from performance in what way internalisation takes place. I am inclined to believe that research that throws light on SLA as a process is more likely to afford valid insights than research that examines SLA as a product (i.e. (1)). Even when Krashen turns to an examination of the role of input (Chapter 9) he appears to conceive of input as a 'product' that can be defined in terms of such categories as 'rate', 'lexicon', 'well-formedness' etc. No reference is made to any of the ongoing work in discourse analysis (e.g. Hatch, 1978, for SLA; Wells and Montgomery, 1981, for L1 acquisition) in which input is conceived of within an interactive framework as a dynamic process.

Hjelmslev's third requirement is that the theory should be simple. In this respect the Monitor Theory is on strong ground. The basic dichotomy between acquisition and learning needs to be extended in only two respects: (1) the user can employ his L1 as a substitute for 'acquisition' in performance and (2) similarly prefabricated patterns and routines can substitute for 'acquisition'. Other aspects of the theory deal with internalisation. 'Attitude' is more important than 'aptitude' for acquisition, which also requires a 'comprehensible input'. This latter can be found in both 'formal' and 'informal' environments.

The simplicity of a theory, however, needs to be measured against its internal logic and its ability to account for the known facts. As I have pointed out there are doubts as to what extent the Monitor Theory meets Hjelmslev's first two requirements. Stevick (1980) has proposed a number of extensions of the Monitor Theory. These greatly increase the complexity of the model, but they meet a number of the criticisms that have been levelled against Krashen's theory. In particular, Stevick proposes a 'rheostat' which governs the extent to which the acquisition store is switched on (i.e. it can be swtiched on in variable degrees) and "seepage' from 'learning' to 'acquisition' and vice versa. Stevick is very speculative and it is likely that his'Levertov Machine' is unnecessarily complex but it is able to account more thoroughly for both the known facts and our intuitions about SLA as a process.

Krashen also suggests a number of applications of his theory to language teaching (Chapter 8). I find his suggestion that L2 teaching programmes be constructed around an 'acquisition' and a 'learning' nodule an interesting one. It is also one that conforms to current language teaching theory (e.g. Brumfit's, 1978, distinction between 'fluency' and 'accuracy'). Krashen is able to describe the classroom conditions required for 'acquisition' very clearly but his suggestions for activities that he thinks will promote it are disappointing. I am not at all clear, for instance, how contextualisation of formal language items can provide an 'intake' where the focus is on meaning rather than on form. I also think that the 'learning' node requires further development, particularly with regard to those areas of language use that require an ability to communicate decontextualised meanings with a high level of explicitness. Also there will need to be a separate node for 'monitoring', if, as I have argued, the process of 'learning' (= internalisation) is separate from that of 'monitoring' (= performance). More importantly, if there is transfer from the 'learnt' to the 'acquired' store, classroom activities that promote 'learning' will need to be afforded greater priority than in Krashen's approach; it may be that certain kinds of classroom activity will be required to facilitate this transfer. Nevertheless, with these reservations, Krashen's theory seems to be extremely promising as a framekwork for devising L2 teaching programmes.

I may appear to have been very critical of Krashen's Monitor Theory. It must be said, however, that it is one of the most comprehensive and persuasive theories that has been devised to account for SLA. Krashen is to be congratulated for the manner in which it is presented in the book; the book is commendably short, coherent and readable. The theory itself may well provide a useful basis for the kinds of theoretical compromises that the language teaching profession often needs to make. Its usefulness in SLA research, however, is perhaps less certain. If Hatch (1980) is right:

> The basic question that second language acquisition research addresses is: how can we describe the process of second language acquisition?
>
> (p. 177)

then the Monitor Theory may be of limited value as it offers little in the way of 'description' and conceives of SLA more as a product than as a process.

Rod Ellis
St Mary's College, Twickenham

Bibliography

Brumfit, C, "Communicative language teaching: an assessment" in Strevens, P (ed) In honour of A S Hornby, O U P, 1978

Corder, S P, Introducing applied linguistics, Penguin, 1973

Dickerson, L, "The learner's interlanguage as a system of variable rules", TESOL Quarterly, 9, 4, 1975

Hatch, E (ed), Second language acquisition, Newbury House, 1978

Hatch, E, "Discourse analysis and second language acquisition," in Hatch, E (ed), 1978

Hatch, E, "Second language acquisition - avoiding the question," in Felix, S (ed) Second language development, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1980

Hjelmslev, L Prolegomena to a theory of language, trans. Whitfield F, University of Wisconsin Press, 1969

Larsen-Freeman, D, (ed) Discourse analysis and second language research, Newbury House, 1980

McLaughlin, B, "The monitor model: some methodological considerations," Language Learning, 28, 2, 1978

Pienemann, M, "The second language acquisition of immigrant children", in Felix, S (ed) Second language development, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1980

Schumann, F and Schumann, J, "Diary of a language learner; an introspective study of second language learning", in Brown, H, Yorio, C and Crymes, R (eds) in TESOL 77, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1977

Stevick, E, Teaching languages: a way and ways, Newbury House, 1980

Wells, G and Montgomery, M, "Adult-child interaction at home and at schools in French", P and McLure, M (eds) Adult-child conversation, Croom Helm, 1981

Teacher Training ed. Susan Holden (M.E.P.) 106 pp ISBN 0-906-149-05-3

In attempting to evaluate this publication I was driven to seek out similar collections, for the purposes of comparison. Apart from the early collection Teachers of English as a Second Language - their training and preparation edited by G Perren (CUP 1968) which is now of historical interest only, I consulted the following:

ELT Documents 104 - Developments in the Training of Teachers of English (British Council 1979), Symposium Proceedings: Teacher Training - The Neglected Aspect of Second Language Pedagogy (Journal 19 - University of Ottawa 1979) and Recherches et Echanges (Tome 6. No.1. Janvier 1981).

Before passing to comparison, however, a brief description of Teacher Training is called for. After an introductory article full of exemplary commonsense by Christopher Brumfit on the integration of theory and practice, there are five major sections:

> Aspects of Teacher Training; Microteaching; Planning a Course; Measuring Success and Self-Access Teacher Training. There is also an Appendix on teacher training in Italy.

My impression on reading through the collection was that, while many of the articles are undoubtedly of interest when taken individually, taken together they do not add up to a coherent whole. Perhaps it is unfair to expect this, given the wide range of topics dealt with. But a more tightly structured collection might have had a more decisive impact on the profession. As it is, one is struck by the uneven quality of the contributions, which range from the highly thought-provoking, to the trivial.

It seems a pity that, having made the plea for an integration of theory and practice in the introductory article, the collection concerns itself almost exclusively with practical techniques, unrelated in many cases even to a broad theoretical frame.

The section on Planning a Course turns out to be somewhat disappointing, containing as it does only three articles - only one of which really touches on the fundamental issues involved in course design for teacher training.

It is likewise disapointing to note the dearth of articles on classroom interaction and the training of teachers in self-evaluation. (Freudenstein's article excepted).

It would also have been useful to include a section on the psychological imponderables involved in teaching and teacher training. Cripwell's interesting article on 'pace' is the nearest approach to this complex of problems - grappled with, if not solved, by writers like Stevick (Earl W Stevick, A Way and Ways (Newbury House, 1980)).

This said, however, the collection does contain some interesting and useful articles and is well worth reading on their account alone. It is invidious to select from such a large number of articles but I found the articles by Christine Nuttall on bringing trainees to participate actively in their own training process, by Ron White on training teachers to teach writing and by Alan Cunningsworth on the evaluation of course materials, especially valuable.

Having perhaps been overly critical of this collection, it is only fair to see how it stands comparison with other collections.

ELT documents 104 seems to me equally unsatisfactory, being a mixture of articles describing specific teacher training courses on offer at British Universities and elsewhere, and articles both on more specific and more theoretical aspects of teacher training.

The University of Ottawa publication reflects the preoccupations peculiar to the Canadian scene, and is also uneven in quality. I singled out the article by Raymond Le Blanc "La Formation des Maitres: besoins généraux et besoins spécifiques", and H H Stern "Issues and Options in Language Teacher Training" as being of especial interest.

Finally the recent number of Recherches et Echanges also falls short on the score of coherence. It does, however, delve more deeply into one of the aspects neglected by Teacher Training, namely the 'psychological imponderables'. Of particular interest are the articles by Patrick Early/Rod Bolitho on "Reasons to be Cheerful" or Helping Teachers to get Problems into Perspective - a group counselling approach to the in-service teacher-training of Foreign Teachers of English": by Mario Rinvolueri on "Resistance to Change on in-service teacher training courses", and by Lou Spaventa on "An Alternative Model for Teacher Training", which for all its polemical quality contains matter for reflection. In the same issue the article on course design based on a systems approach by Walter V Tuman and Leonard Brisley is well worth reading ("The Development of an Exportable Foreign Language Teacher Training Course").

In spite of the criticisms I have made of Teacher Training, it clearly fulfils a much felt need, and I hope we can look forward to a second publication in the same series in due course.

Alan Maley

Language in Religious Practice, ed. William J Samarin, Newbury House, 1976, pp xi, 176 ISBN 0-88377-059-8

William J Samarin's name as editor of Language in Religious Practice (Newbury House 1976) might lead one to expect a heavy emphasis on that esoteric corner of linguistics, glossolalia, and on the social context in which it is found, the charismatic churches. In fact, this topic and context are barely mentioned.

One's first uncertainty having been dispelled in this regard, the second obvious expectation must surely be what the title promises: a discussion of the use of language in religious practice. This is confirmed when Samarin claims in his introduction that sociolinguistic studies of religion "seek to determine the way in which language is exploited for religious ends" (p.5). There is much that has been written, over millenia, about religious language from a philosophical or theological point of view; one of the virtues of this book is the attempt to see things from a different perspective. Samarin's introduction and choice of articles in the volume is an exemplification of what light linguistics, sociology and anthropology in particular can throw on the already well known. Ferguson ('The collect as a form of discourse') and Long ('Divination as model for literary form' - which suggests that divinatory ritual and its accompanying formalised language have provided a model for constructing conventional literary patterns in the Old Testament, if not a literary genre) come within this category.

Equally interesting is the use of language in less familiar religious practices such as the annual office-changing ceremonies of the Mexican Chamulas, the prayers of the northern borderland Igbo of Nigeria and the prayers of the Zuni Indians. These studies, and others in the book, certainly demonstrate a good deal about the nature of religious practice, particularly how it is structured and how it relates to other aspects of a culture. They provide some evidence to allow us, in Samarin's words (p.5) to refine our generalisations about universal religious practice.'

The problem is, however, that the evidence is thin. So many themes are presented in 165 pages of text: 'This present collection ... deals with Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism, and three different traditional or folk religions; with praying,preaching and the reading of religious texts; with private and public events; with social relations in religious settings; with history and change.' As with so many collections, there is little cohesion between the papers and no coherence of argument. The editor attempts what linking he can. His three general categories (Performance, Form, Tradition) are helpful to a point - the first section deals with verbal religious events and their meaning, the second with the discourse produced by oral or written prayer, the third with macrosociolinguistic aspects of 'religious language planning'. More helpful are his linking introductory commentaries to each section, in which certain common threads, where they exist, are brought out. Clearest of all is his useful, but brief - indeed, somewhat abrupt in its style and ending - introduction to the book.

So the 'religious ends' Samarin refers to are widely treated and wrapped up as neatly as disparate material will allow. The religious specialist, certainly, can generalise about 'universal religious practice'. But most readers - given that the book forms part of Newbury House's Series in Sociolinguistics, edited by Roger Shuy - I suspect that the main interest in the volume is rather different. It is not what language can tell us about religious practice, but what religious practice can tell us about language - for example, about the importance of prosodic features, a theme dealt with in papers by Tedlock and by Christian as well as in Crystal's 'Nonsegmental phonology in religious modalities.' Here Crystal demonstrates by analysing unison prayer, individual liturgical prayer, biblical reading and sermons the considerable explanatory power of a nonsegmental analysis: most importantly, the claims 'such analysis could also be shown to apply to other categories of speech' (p.24). Ravenhill's 'Religious utterances and the theory of speech acts' similarly has implications and applications extending far beyond the religious sphere. He faces the problems of inter-relationships existing between successive speech acts and whether successive speech acts constitute larger units which also must be analysed.

The main appeal of this book lies in papers such as these, where the use of language in religious practice serves as a test case for generalisations applicable in a wider sphere.

Roger H Flavell
University of London Institute of
Education

APPLIED LINGUISTIC RESEARCH IN BRITISH UNIVERSITIES 1980-81

On a number of occasions it has been remarked to BAAL members overseas that a brief summary of current research activity in Britain would be useful. Accordingly, in February 1981 all British departments of applied linguistics were circulated and asked to give a very brief report of the major areas in which research was taking place. Unfortunately a number of prominent centres did not reply, so there are some conspicuous absences. Nonetheless, it is hoped that the summary below will be of general interest. Anyone who wishes to copy this summary for wider distribution to interested people is welcome to do so.

1. GENERAL TRENDS

As might be expected, these were difficult to perceive. A number of universities were looking into aspects of EFL methodology (Birkbeck College, London; Birmingham University; University of Kent; Exeter University; London University Institute of Education). Discourse analysis was popular (Birmingham, Kent, Exeter and London Institute of Education), and so was lexicography (Birmingham; University College of North Wales, Bangor; Exeter). Otherwise there was a wide range of areas being investigated.

2. MAJOR RESEARCH INTERESTS OF PARTICULAR DEPARTMENTS

(a) Department of Linguistics, University College of North Wales, Bangor

Design of learners' dictionaries, including ESP dictionaries; theory and pedagogical implications of contrastive analysis; error analysis.

(b) Birkbeck College, London University, Department of Applied Linguistics

Sociolinguistics (continuation of Orleans Survey in association with Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium); bilingualism (French-English in UK, France and Canada); first and second language learning, especially vocabulary, language teaching and testing methodology.

(c) English Language Research, University of Birmingham

EFL, including self-access materials, computer-aided learning, testing, applications of discourse analysis; ESP; discourse analysis, applied to literary stylistics, intonation systems of monologues and reading aloud, interaction of schizophrenic speakers, development of a feminist theory of language; lexicography, including needs of EFL users, and computer storage of lexical facts.

(d) The Language Centre, University of Exeter

Aspects of language teaching; lexicography; communicative-textual analysis.

(e) Institute of Languages and Linguistics, University of Kent

Discourse analysis; reading skills; a range of descriptive and contrastive studies; translation theory; language teaching.

(f) University of London Institute of Education, Department of English for Speakers of Other Languages

Discourse analysis, pedagogy, and with reference to literature; syllabus design; affective factors in language learning; reading. readability and simplification.

C J Brumfit

NOTICES

From the next issue, the English Language Teaching Journal (Oxford University Press) will be appearing with a new format and under a new editor, Richard Rossner. There will be a new Board of Management: Matt Macmillan, Henry Widdowson, Peter Strevens and Simon Murison-Bowie, and the editor will be assisted by an editorial board drawn from all sectors of the profession.

Volume V of the Exeter Linguistic Studies Series is 'On Idiom' by Chitra Fernando and Roger Flavell. This useful examination of the problems of idiomaticity has been published with the aid of a grant from BAAL. It is available from the Language Centre, University of Exeter, at £1.50.

One of the most interesting current projects on language teaching methodology is the Communicational Teaching Project, based on schools in Bangalore and Madras. This project aims to teach English through a syllabus consisting of a series of problem-solving tasks which are conducted in English, but without any explicit teaching of English. It has now been progressing for two years and is expected to continue for another two, investigating in more or less normal conditions the hypothesis that language structure can be learnt effectively through a concentration on language-using tasks without overt teaching. Details of the tasks, and reports of lessons are available in various Bulletins of the Regional Institute of English, Bangalore, and the Director of the project is Dr N S Prabhu of the British Council in Madras.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH FOR SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

MA in Language and Literature in Education: ESOL

(Course Co-ordinators: Professor Henry Widdowson and C J Brumfit)

Applications are invited for 1982-3 for the one year, full time MA course from experienced graduates or trained teachers. The course integrates theoretical studies of language and education with a direct concern for problems of application. There is a taught course of up to 10 hours a week, and a dissertation in which students explore, with guidance, an area of major personal interest.

Details from: The Deputy Academic Registrar (Advanced Studies), University of London Institute of Education, 20 Bedford Way, LONDON WC1H OAL.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Applications are invited from qualified teachers with at least three years relevant experience for the courses leading to the

ADVANCED PRACTICAL CERTIFICATES

in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
and the Diploma in TESOL
in the Department of English for Speakers of Other Languages
(formerly the EFL Department)

Each certificate is a one term full-time course of study. Three separate certificates may accumulate as credits towards the award of the Diploma.

1. Advanced Practical Certificate in Contemporary Approaches to ESOL teaching·
2. Advanced Practical Certificate in one of the following: Classroom Management in TESOL, Teacher Training for TESOL, Inspection in TESOL, Teaching English for Specific Purposes to speakers of other Languages, Materials Development for TESOL, Literature Teaching to Speakers of Languages other than English, Media in TESOL, Testing ESOL, Second Language Teaching in Britain.
3. Advanced Practical Certificate in ESOL Theory.

Further information and application forms from the Academic Registrar (ELTJ22) University of London Institute of Education, 20 Bedford Way, London WC1H OAL. Tel. 01-636-1500.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Department of English Language and Literature

MA

APPLIED ENGLISH LINGUISTICS

A two-year sandwich course for experienced teachers of EFL (and in particular ESP), combining work in-post with one term's intensive study at Birmingham each year. Ideal for those able to obtain short-term release from EFL institutions at home and abroad.

B PHIL (ED)

TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

A one-year full-time post-experience advanced degree course in Applied Linguistics. Open to both graduate and non-graduate certificated teachers of EFL.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE RESEARCH JOURNAL

The Journal is concerned with English Language teaching, learning and research, and covers a wide variety of topics including ESP, discourse analysis, language planning and syllabus/materials design. Articles, reviews, research reports and news items are invited.

Further information on courses, and Journal subscription details from:
Mrs Anne Preston, Secretary, English Language Research, University of Burmingham, PO Box 363, Birmingham B15 2TT.

Please send correspondence and contributions for future issues to

C J Brumfit
University of London Institute of Education,
20 Bedford Way,
London WC1H 2BN