Applied Linguistics and Language Teacher Education

Edited by
Nat Bartels

Applied Linguistics and Language Teacher Education

Educational Linguistics

Volume 4

The *Educational Linguistics* book series focuses on work that is: innovative, trans-disciplinary, contextualized and critical.

In our compartmentalized world of diverse academic fields and disciplines there is a constant tendency to specialize more and more. In academic institutions, at conferences, in journals, and in publications the crossing of disciplinary boundaries is often discouraged.

This series is based on the idea that there is a need for studies that break barriers. It is dedicated to innovative studies of language use and language learning in educational settings worldwide. It provides a forum for work that crosses traditional boundaries between theory and practice, between micro and macro, and between native, second and foreign language education. The series also promotes critical work that aims to challenge current practices and offers practical, substantive improvements.

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

Nat Bartels
Editor

Applied Linguistics and Language Teacher Education

and the Springer Global Website Online at: http://www.springeronline.com

Contents

questions on knowledge of classrooms and the teachers' classroom behavior (Attardo & Brown, chapter 5; Yaakobi & Sharan, 1985). Care needs to be taken when constructing questionnaire items and it is always a good idea to trial items, check if they are really testing what you want, and then revise items in the questionnaire (Brindley & Schneider, 2002, Yaakobi & Sharan, 1985). For example, the questionnaire used by MacDonald, Badger and White (2001) and Kerekes (2001) was not designed as a questionnaire tool and does not come from any data on teachers' beliefs, but was based on general ideas about language learning that Lightbown and Spada felt were important for teachers to explore in the context of SLA research (Lightbown & Spada, 1999). The items in the BALLI questionnaire developed by Horwitz (1985) were elicited from teachers. However, Horwitz only elicited general, context-less, espoused conceptions of language learning which are very different from the kinds of context-bound, in-action conceptions which shape teachers' plans and actions (Woods, 1996). One way of avoiding this problem is to use a questionnaire to provide information about a specific policy or document. For example, Allen (2002) investigated the extent to which teachers' conceptions of language teaching were similar to the standards for foreign language education. In this situation, revising the standards statements into questionnaire items is relatively easy. For more information on constructing questionnaire items see Converse & Presser (1986), Dörnyei (2003), or Fowler (1995). For more detail on the kind of knowledge questionnaires tap into and the influence of item construction on this see Tourangeau, Rips & Rasinki (2000) or Sudman, Bradburn & Schwarz (1996). The internet is also making questionnaires easier to distribute and fill out as well as to analyze the data. If you are interested in using a web-based questionnaire, Owen and Edwards (chapter 3) present and evaluate an example of a web-based questionnaire, while Dillman (1999) discusses ways of conducting survey research online.

Table 7: *Sample studies of teachers' knowledge and learning using Likert-scale questionnaire data.*

Questionaires: Likert		
Applied Linguistics	*Educational Research*	*This Book*
MacDonald, Badger & White (2001)	Brindley & Schneider (2002)	Attardo & Brown (Chapter 5)
Kerekes (2001)	Ferguson & Womack (1993)	Owen & Edwards (Chapter 3)
Peacock (1998; 2001)	Morris (1984)	*(Internet Questionnaire)*
Horwitz	Tillema (1998) c	
Pennington (1996)	Garet et al (2001)	
Johnson (1992)	Allen (2002)	
	Tatto, 1998	

A variation of the normal Likert scale questionnaires is the Q-Sort procedure or Q-Methodology (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The Q-Sort procedure begins with statements much like a questionnaire. However, instead of rating each statement independent of the other, participants are asked to rank the statements on a scale

'in order │ not to' <1> *'para no │ tener que hacerlo mañana'* │ 'inorder ¡ not to' <1> s o
instead of │ 'in order to' │ 'in order not to' <1> 's o as │ not to' <3> yes? <2> clear? good
<l> four<7>xxxx

'on thecontrary' │ that's it <1> *'al contrari'* │ 'on the contrary' │ 'I hate football' <6> 'I
hate football' │ mm │ most people_

From an interactional point of view, the second phase includes even fewer elicitations
than the first one since this type of move is already implicit in the activity: the students
know that when it is their turn they must suggest a possible connector for the sentence in
question. They use this move to realise a cognitive activity that we have identified as
producing samples according to a model or rule. Therefore, the most frequent types of
moves are *reply,* on the part of the students, and *accept, evaluate* and *comment,* on the
part of the instructor.

4.1.3. Monica's Views of Language and Learning

In order to explore the views of language and learning that underlie Monica's practice,
we looked at the teaching process as well as at the views she expressed during the
interview. The lesson observed develops according to the Presentation-Practice-
Performance model, with a significant emphasis on declarative knowledge. Monica
adopts a deductive approach whereby declarative knowledge constitutes the basis for the
development of procedural knowledge. As for its orientation, the lesson seems to
fluctuate between the analyst and the user type of competence—with special emphasis
on the latter—while there are no references to the teacher type of competence.
According to this instructor, "giving" or "explaining the theory" consists of the
following aspects: (1) describing the form, (2) how it functions and (3) when it is used.
Thus, the definition she gives during the interview suggests an unsophisticated *analyst*
type of competence, oriented to language *use* rather than mere description.

> apart from explaining how a passive is formed, which in the end is nothing but a
> mathematical formula, because they are all done in the same way, one explains how it
> functions, when it is used. This is the difference maybe between a language school and
> what we try to do

This dual orientation towards the *analyst* and *user* type of competence becomes even
more evident when the instructor compares 'language' with 'linguistics' modules in the
ES degree programme. She establishes clear differences between the "practical" level of
analyst competence required in language courses, and the sophistication of the analytical
skills required in linguistics courses:

> (...) the language subjects, first, are much more practical and general. You deal with all
> the language. The goal is to reach a level of language to be able to use it. The linguistics
> subjects are obviously linguistics; **we are now talking of analysis.**

investigating population needs to include the idea of cultural issues not present in her classmate's metaphor: "Students come from different cultural backgrounds and the ESL writing teacher needs to investigate and know which they are."

Furthermore, as Ball (2000) indicates, internalization among teachers also implies the articulation of plans of action reflecting personal commitment (p. 253). In this case, internalization was evident as participants not only reconstructed or transformed their classmates' metaphors but also formulated plans of action based on newly adopted roles or insights. For example, adoption of the metaphor of teacher as *mountain climber coach* prompted Samuel to say: "Students need freedom to grow. I can see this in both climbing and writing. I would like to apply these concepts by allowing my students more freedom in their writing activities." Norma stated a series of classroom strategies to be implemented in the classroom based on the idea that writers, like mountain climbers and trumpet players, need to learn to write by writing and not just by being told how to do it.

To observe the participants' own views on the impact of metaphorical conceptualization on their understanding of writing and the teaching of writing in the L2 classroom, Entry 5 was analyzed. All students stated that the metaphor exercise had been insightful and beneficial. Most students elaborated and explained how the exercise had helped them. Conceptualizing and reflecting through metaphor moved students to concretize beliefs and make them explicit. In Norma's words, "writing metaphors and explaining them is like playing with abstract and concrete levels at the same time." As this participant "looked for the best metaphors," she reflected on the process of writing and on her daily practices. She also pondered whether her beliefs matched her practices. Metaphor conceptualization helped students "crystalize and condense thinking" (Samuel); it forced them to "look for exact words to say many things in one sentence" (Carmen). And, as Pat said, "by establishing a comparison to other elements, I acquired a perspective of what I was doing as a teacher." Interestingly, the process of conceptualizing through metaphor evoked visual images in the participants which helped them concretize and synthesize their thoughts. Several participants reported that using metaphors helped them "visualize" concepts. For instance, for Samuel, metaphors "help you to express your thoughts in visual pictures that everyone can understand and relate to."

Most of the participants indicated in their final entry the ways in which the metaphor exercise had contributed to a different view of writing in the ESL classroom. Maggie, for example, realized that her original metaphor of the writer as "particles of sand and dust that use the wind . . . to travel" portrayed the student as too passive and thus changed it [in Entry 3] to a more active image as "a photographer working on a photo shoot." Angie explained how her view of the writing process changed throughout the course:

> When we started the semester, I viewed the writing process as a train in a one-way rail
> or a one-way non-stop ticket to perfect writing. Now I know that writing is indeed a
> process but it may take a few stops before arriving to the final destination. Writing
> cannot be a one-way rail because the student should have the confidence that he/she may

would not mind being corrected in Pragmatics herself. The same idea was expressed by the second informant, who claimed that none of his learners who have received feedback at the pragmatic level have shown to be hurt, threatened or upset and added that he himself as a learner would welcome such type of correction. The data from my third informant do not shed much light on this question, since at times she said that her learners would not mind being corrected and at other times said that they could be offended and would need long explanations so that they could understand it.

CONCLUSION

L2 learners should have enough pragmatic competence to allow them to choose pragmatically-preferred forms. The data yielded by the three different methods employed in this study were analysed qualitatively to try to pinpoint the reasons why teachers' practice did not change after the awareness-raising programme was offered. None of the lessons observed lacked situations in which feedback in Pragmatics could have been provided. It is quite evident that the teacher-training programme used in this research did not bring about any sort of change in teachers' performance as far as CF in Pragmatics is concerned.

I hypothesise that such failure could be put down to three possible factors:

1) In order for the course to be effective in making teachers aware of Pragmatics, it must be longer, happen on a regular basis and get the teachers more involved with it.[viii] That way, teachers would be reminded of Pragmatics every so often and its importance would be less likely to be played down.

2) The classroom setting is too contrived and artificial to allow for genuinely communicative interaction to take place. As a result, the need for appropriate pragmatic knowledge is not realised by the teacher (no matter how much Pragmatics he/she actually knows).

3) Exposure might be a key point in the development of interlanguage Pragmatics. Thus, no matter how rich the course is, what teachers really need is not merely becoming aware of Pragmatics, but learning about the target culture by experiencing it (spending some time in an English-speaking country). Having said that, my foreign friends in Britain come back to my mind. Why did most of them not acquire the pragmatic knowledge they needed to function well in an English-speaking environment? If exposure is really the answer, how much exposure would be needed to guarantee improvement?

If I were to carry out this investigation again, I would first of all try to observe more informants over a longer period of time, during which awareness-raising programmes like the one in this study would be offered once a term. It would also be useful to have a control group whose programme did not single out CF as an instructional tool, as happened to the informants in this investigation, and a treatment group that was shown all the possible benefits of CF in Pragmatics to check whether the latter group would by the end of the programme provide more CF in Pragmatics than the former. It would also

probably be helpful to discuss with the participants the situations in which learners could have received CF but did not. This might help them (and us) to understand whether not providing CF is a conscious choice or the result of the errors going unnoticed. Finally, I would seek inter-rater reliability by having other raters go through the data as well, which was not possible in this study due to the limited funding this research received.

On a final note, I would like to add that the data obtained through the lesson observation have made me look into my own teaching practice. Surprisingly, I have found out that I also restrain at times from providing feedback in Pragmatics. Whenever I miss an opportunity for correcting learners in Pragmatics I try to identify the reasons why I myself am not offering CF in that specific situation. I believe that basically I do not always provide learners with this type of feedback firstly because I want to save the learners' face and secondly because no matter how communicative the classroom environment is, my learners and I share Portuguese as a mother tongue and do not need another set of Pragmatic rules to guide our interactions. If this explanation is right, no matter how well prepared the teachers are (whether through refresher courses or through exposure), CF in Pragmatics will only make sense in an ESL scenario, never in an EFL context. It would actually be interesting to examine how native teachers, who are pragmatically competent, would deal with this question in an ESL situation. Would they provide CF in Pragmatics since their learners would not share their backgrounds amongst themselves or with the teacher? Would they withhold it for face reasons? Or would they not provide it because the classroom is not a truly communicative setting?

This research has been only the first step towards clarification of the issue. CF at the pragmatic level remains a very rich area for investigation. Longitudinal research, I believe, might be able to provide more answers than this study can. The more tangible answers are found to the questions raised here, the more SLA will be able to help teachers in the difficult task of preparing their learners to be communicatively competent speakers of an L2.

REFERENCES

Allwright, D., Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B. (1996). Input in an institutional setting. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 18, 171-188.

House, J. (1996). Pragmatic fluency in EFL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 18, 225-252.

Kasper, G. (1997). *Can Pragmatic Competence be Taught?*(NetWork # 6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved March 14, 2000 from: http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/NetWorks/NW6/.

Kasper, G., Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in Interlanguage Pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 18, 149-169.

Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics,* 15(3), 263-287.

Lyster, R., Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 19, 37-66.

Robinson, G. L. N. (1985). *Crosscultural Understanding. Processes and Approaches for Foreign Language, English as a Second Language and Bilingual Educators.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Shepherd, D., Shepherd, T. (1987). A lay attempt at designing and applying attitude questionnaires and structured interviews. *The ESP,* 16, 59-101.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction. An Introduction to Pragmatics.* Harlow: Longman.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

This questionnaire is part of research into Applied Linguistics. Your contribution is very important for our research. Please read the instructions carefully and answer the questions below as truthfully as possible. Thank you.

Name: _____

1) Number, in order of importance (1-least important – 4-most important), what you believe the focus of your lessons should mostly be on:
a) Pronunciation ( )
b) Structures ( )
c) Vocabulary and meaning ( )
d) Social practices and politeness ( )

2) Which, do you believe, are the areas where learners need the most emphasis in instruction? Please tick.
a) Pronunciation ( )
b) Structures ( )
c) Vocabulary and meaning ( )
d) Social practices and politeness ( )

3) Which are for you the areas where learners can acquire language naturally, without instruction? Please tick one or more boxes (do not tick any boxes if you believe instruction is always needed).
a) Pronunciation ( )
b) Structures ( )
c) Vocabulary and meaning ( )
d) Social practices and politeness ( )

4) Do you frequently correct your learners' production?

5) Number the boxes below according to the priority you would give to correcting the following learners' errors in bold type (1-top priority – 4-no priority).
a) A learner says 'I **must to** come to every class to learn English fast' ( )
b) A learner says 'She is simply /sImplaI/ in love with her neighbour' ( )
c) A learner says 'If I needed a day off, I would say to my boss "Give me a day off, OK?"' ( )
d) A learner says 'I have never cooked a cake' ( )

6) Number the areas below according to how often (1-never; 2-not very often; 3-quite often; 4-very often) you believe you correct your learners' production in each of the areas below.
a) Pronunciation ( )
b) Structures ( )
c) Vocabulary and meaning ( )
d) Social practices and politeness ( )

7) Consider question 6 again. Justify your procedure where you answered never and not very often.

8) Do learners, in your opinion, welcome correction in all of the areas above (i.e. Pronunciation; Structures; Vocabulary and meaning; Social practices and politeness)?
Yes. ( )

No.( )

9) Do learners react more favourably to correction in one area than another (Pronunciation; Structures; Vocabulary and meaning; Social practices and politeness)? If so, why, do you think, there is such preference?

10) Which area (Pronunciation; Structures; Vocabulary and meaning; Social practices and politeness) do you, as a teacher, feel most confident to correct your learners' production? Why?

11) Would you say that your style of teaching (your choice of what is most important to teach and how that is to be taught) reflects mostly the teacher training you received or how you learnt English (or another L2) yourself? Can you think of other possible influences on the way you teach?

12) Whenever instruction is beneficial, which are the most effective ways to provide it? Please number the boxes below according to the degree of effectiveness of each procedure (1-most effective – 4-least effective) and justify your choices in the lines that follow.
a) By means of explicit teaching ( )
b) By means of correction ( )
c) By means of task-based instruction ( )
d) By means of peer correction ( )

Thank you for answering this questionnaire.

6. NOTE

---

[i] To my knowledge the only study to focus on the effect of CF at the pragmatic level is that of Lyster (1994). Having said that, Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1996: 19), while examining input in academic settings, suggest that lack of CF at the pragmatic level in academic advising sessions could place students at a disadvantage, since they are misled to believe that their contributions are perfectly appropriate. Besides, research into the acquisition of L1 pragmatic competence has shown that children receive such feedback from parents (C.f. Gleason & Perlmann, 1985, cited in Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1996: 187); Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, cited in Kasper and Schmidt (1996: 160)).

[ii] Going on-record means taking responsibility for one's act, while going off-record means only hinting. Using a let-out means pretending one's act was misinterpreted.

[iii] Correction was only brought up, along with awareness-raising tasks and role-play activities, as one out of several possible ways to improve learners' pragmatic competence.

[iv] 'Socially desirable' responses are responses which are biased by what the informant believes to be right and appropriate.

[v] A Grand-tour question is a very broad question which addresses the subject under investigation only indirectly (C.f. Robinson, 1985).

[vi] It is important to mention that CF in Pragmatics can be provided by means of any of the eight categories mentioned.

[vii] I considered 10 pages per lesson to be quite significant, given that the lessons ranged from 17 to 44 pages in length.

[viii] The teachers in this study could possibly have been more involved if they had chosen to take part in the research (and attend the awareness-raising programme) rather being appointed by the school's head teacher.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 17

Teacher Trainees' Explcit Knowledge of Grammar and Primary Curriculum Requirements in England

Jane Hislam

University of Leicester, UK
jh62@leicester.ac.uk

Wasyl Cajkler

University of Leicester, UK
wc4@leicester.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on a specific first language situation, the literacy curriculum in England, and considers underlying tensions between grammar teaching to young children, applied linguistics and the planning of teacher education. It explores the experiences of trainee primary school teachers undertaking the one-year Post-graduate Certificate of Education programme (PGCE), in the Faculty of Education of an English university. We report our investigation of how trainees respond to the grammatical component of the National Literacy Strategy and discuss the implications for applied linguists in teacher education.

In 1998, the National Literacy Strategy Framework, NLS, (DfEE, 1998) for primary schools specified what to teach in a daily literacy hour, part of which is devoted to word level (phonics/spelling) or sentence level work (syntax and punctuation). Trainees are in a demanding situation, having to acquire explicit grammatical knowledge very quickly, with little time to internalise a thorough understanding, before explaining it to children during teaching practice. The trainees are not language specialists, but generalists, with degrees in a range of subjects, who train to teach the whole primary national curriculum. It is important to note that we, the authors, are teacher educators as much as applied linguists. We are responsible for the English component in the teacher education curriculum, but also for matters of pedagogy.

The chapter begins with a brief review of the challenge facing primary trainees and how this challenge has arisen, followed by a description of four case studies that we

conducted in 2001-02. The purpose of these case-studies is to investigate how trainees shared their knowledge of grammar with their pupils during teaching practice.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE NATIONAL LITERACY STRATEGY TO APPLIED LINGUISTS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Two-thirds of primary trainees entering the one-year PGCE programme have degrees in non-language disciplines so their explicit knowledge and understanding of grammar stems from limited experiences of grammar lessons at school. For many trainees, through no fault of their own, the NLS is their first formal encounter with a description of language. Teacher educators face a significant challenge because:

- they do not have time to offer a comprehensive course in contemporary English grammar but more detailed grammatical knowledge has been mandated;
- the PGCE programme involves preparation to teach ten subjects for the primary curriculum in 38 weeks.

Nevertheless, from 1998, simultaneous with the NLS, a national teacher-training curriculum (Teacher Training Agency, DfEE/TTA, 1998a) was introduced, within which the testing of subject knowledge, including grammar, had much greater prominence than before. Until then, we had trained graduates as generalists in ten subjects (maths, science, humanities, art, etc.), primary pedagogy and professional issues. There had always been an English component but now trainees who failed to show adequate grammatical understanding through a literacy skills test (DfEE/TTA, 2001) could be denied qualified teacher status.

As a result, teacher educators are required to

- find out what trainees know about grammar (through individual audits mandated by the Teacher Training Agency and inspected by OFSTED, the body responsible for inspecting teacher education),
- increase trainees' knowledge about syntax and morphology in very quick time,
- enable them to teach grammar successfully to support children's writing.

The NLS has given primary teachers a very detailed literacy programme in the form of specific 'termly' objectives organised under three headings: text, sentence and word level. The sentence level objectives, the focus of our research, follow a traditional description, with a firm emphasis on the primacy of Standard English and are specified in linear fashion for particular age groups (table 1).

In recent decades, there has been much debate about what teachers should learn about language. Significant efforts were made to increase teachers' knowledge about language based on the work of Halliday and others, culminating in *Language in Use* by Doughty et al. (1971). Later, *Language in the National Curriculum,* the LINC project (Carter, 1990) accompanied a major curriculum reform of 1988. The Kingman report

interesting that she did not seem to differentiate between these techniques, one remembered from grade school, another suggested during her MA course work, and the last specifically discouraged in her courses.

> Jeff: "Finding word meanings, how do you teach them that?"
>
> Lilly: "I had them post words that are new...first decide on whether it's a noun. Is it a verb? What role does it play?...Just using the context. . . a word with, like, prefixes and suffixes we take it apart."
>
> Jeff: "What is 'word recognition'?"
>
> Lilly: "It's one of those exercises...one of those [professor's name] things!"
>
> Jeff: "Why do you do that?"
>
> Lilly: "To speed up their eye movement and help them recognize things."
>
> Jeff: (Referring to the lesson plan) "What's the difference between 'finding word meanings,' 'word recognition,' and 'building vocabulary' as a separate concept?"
>
> Lilly: "Did I write that?…We pulled out different words...we found their meanings using the word meanings, but then I did vocabulary quizzes with them."
>
> Jeff: "How do you do a quiz?"
>
> Lilly: "[the students] supply a definition and part of speech."

The following exchange indicates what appears to be a missed opportunity to apply KAL to a specific class activity. The use of translation dictionaries versus learner dictionaries was discussed in Lilly's methodology courses (Popko, 2003) but she never addressed that issue in the observed lesson. Moreover, when asked about learner dictionaries in the interview she stated that she had not used them with her ESL students. Her focus on having students do the work well meant, in the case of dictionary work, using a translation dictionary published in the US rather than one published in an EFL setting, despite the fact that her textbooks and her professor strongly recommended the use of learner dictionaries as a way to build vocabulary.

> Jeff: "On the test, you said...you didn't want them to define the words, but you wanted to write those in a sentence."
>
> Lilly: "Yes, because so many of them would just memorize exactly from the dictionaries. I couldn't tell if they knew it or not."
>
> Jeff: "But then you told them where (which dictionary) to get the sentences from...aren't you expecting them to come back having memorized those examples?"
>
> Lilly: "At least then they'll be useful definitions!"

 "A useful thing."
The following exchange seems to indicate that Lilly's primary focus is on techniques rather than underlying KAL. When Lilly discussed reading activities both in class and in the interview, she tended to give rather broad, macro–definitions rather than focused,

detailed discussions of language. While she discussed specific reading techniques, she never took the opportunity to explain how language works. Lilly had learned the concepts of main clause, embedded clause, discourse markers, and subject–verb–object constructions in English (Popko, 2003). However, during the observation she did not provide these tools to her students to help them in reading activities, nor did she refer to them to explain or support her teaching practices.

> Jeff: "You're doing timed readings every day? What would you normally do following the timed readings?"
>
> Lilly: "Then I'll have them practice skimming things...the skimming and scanning they can do, so the faster ones I'll have them practice that...Recognizing paragraphs is what we worked on recently just finding out if there's time ordered, listing, all that."
>
> Jeff: "Where does that come from?"
>
> Lilly: "In the book I've been using. I thought it was a useful thing."

Lilly grounded her teaching in methodologies and specific techniques which struck her as potentially useful. In a sense, it is the application of theory as presented to her in ESL textbooks and methodology courses that had an impact on her daily teaching. In other words, in order for KAL to have an impact on her classroom, her teaching practices suggested that KAL first needed to be filtered through specific techniques and textbooks. Though she had studied semantics and vocabulary teaching theory, she drew upon techniques presented in textbooks rather than on her theoretical knowledge to explain her pedagogical choices.

Pako: "I guess I just have to go on teacher intuition."

Pako was observed in a "core" class, which emphasized integrated skills for academic purposes. In the lesson she showed a video, discussed a reading, and played a game based on the theme of the travel and tourism industry. Pako exhibited KAL during the observed class, but during the interview, she downplayed its role in her teaching.

Pako's background (teaching high school Spanish) provided her with alternatives to standard ESL classroom routines, and points of comparison between a variety of techniques that the other participants did not have. Like Lilly, Pako chose to focus on vocabulary learning in the observed lesson. However while Lilly was focused on individual word recognition and definitions, Pako chose a more holistic approach, focusing not only on pre-, during-, and post-activities, but on the four skills.

> Jeff: "Could you explain to me how you put the lesson together?"
>
> Pako: "I always try to review a lot...multiple exposures...pre-, during-, and post-...That's something I've learned from my methodology classes...I try to look at 'Are they getting speaking practice? Are they getting listening practice? Are they getting some note taking? Are they getting some reading? Are they getting some writing?' And I try to look at every day and see how can I get all five of those things in."

Conscious choices

It is interesting that Pako seemed to have a clear sense of what she had done in Spanish classes. Yet, in her current ELI job, she also seemed to have rejected that type of linguistically based, grammar focused teaching. It appeared that her MA–TESL courses provided her with an alternative way to conceptualize the classroom. The curriculum at the ELI also provided her with flexibility to explore those alternatives without worrying about exit exams.

> Jeff: "Was there any difference in what you would have done back when you were teaching high-school and what you did today?"

> Pako: "I don't think I was as good in doing the pre-, during-, and post-...It had to be grammar based because...that's how you decided that you had the student ready to move to Spanish two or Spanish three...I had to get them to, you know, whatever, to pluperfect before they could go to Spanish four...The assessment was definitely done on grammar, a lot of explicit grammar."

The ELI where the participants taught has a tradition of designing syllabi from a content–based instruction (CBI) model. However, Pako actively rejects CBI as a model, claiming instead to use task–based instruction (TBI) to write her syllabi. There is some justification for her claim, in that she chose activities for her students (e.g., writing a report, summarizing a video) prior to choosing the topic of each exercise. Examples of "tasks" observed in the lesson included taking notes while watching a video and playing a board game that focused on the language of travel.

One of the themes raised by Pako was the difference between being a classroom Spanish teacher, largely controlled by curricular objectives not chosen by her, and being an ESL teacher trained in the areas of syllabus and curriculum design. She expressed a feeling of autonomy to design and carry out her own course that provided validation to her as a teacher. In moving from a grammar driven curriculum with exit tests at every level to a curriculum chosen by the teacher, Pako had lost her sense that needing to meet outside standards was the driving force for her teaching. This allowed her to implement her own "task–based" approach, not based on "the linguistic perspective."

> Jeff: "Can you name the curriculum style that you think you prefer?"

> Pako: "I like to think I'm task based...I try to find things that I think that the students will be asked to do in the regular university classes such as taking notes, lectures, and that task and I try to provide practice in that...I try to find things that I think that the students will be asked to do in the regular university classes such as taking notes, lectures...I try to provide practice in that...I have approached it as task based as my guiding principle."

Approach to grammar

Pako, unlike Lilly, did use one example of explicit grammar teaching in her lesson: a chart to explain comparative and superlative forms of the adjective. However, she did

not seem to see this type of explicit grammar instruction as a key element in her teaching.

> Jeff: "You did that fill–in chart with the adjective, the comparative, and the superlative, do you use charts quite often?"
>
> Pako: "To be totally honest with you...I haven't done explicit grammar a lot."

Approach to vocabulary

Like Lilly, Pako used explicit teaching of vocabulary learning techniques as a primary focus of the observed lesson. Yet she seemed to downplay the importance of this aspect of the lesson. Unlike her detailed discussions of recycling, task–based curriculum, and balanced skills, her responses to questions about vocabulary instruction were sparse.

> Jeff: "I noticed that there were three techniques which you used for giving vocabulary: One was to give the antonym, right, one was to give a definition, and then one was to give an example...Are there any other vocabulary learning tools that you use?"
>
> Pako: "I use synonyms a lot...I have them come up with sentences...vocabulary lists. That's all I can think about right now."

Approach to language

In general, Pako seemed more comfortable discussing methodology than language. During the observed lesson, her ability to draw on KAL to teach was demonstrated several times. Some of that knowledge either originated in or was reinforced by linguistics courses she had taken (e.g., the adjective chart; in her Grammar course, the ability to create a comparative is presented as one test to prove that a word is an adjective [Popko, 2003]). However, she did not credit these courses with having any influence on her teaching.

> Jeff: "Was there anything that you did in class today that you think was either implemented or encouraged by what you consider to be the linguistics courses of this program?"
>
> Pako: "You mean not in the methodology classes?...I seriously doubt that there was anything from the linguistic perspective."
>
> Jeff: "On what do you base (ELI student) grades?"
>
> Pako: "I give them a point breakdown...I give assignment points based on...is their writing...persuasive, and is it correct, is it grammatically correct?"
>
> Jeff: "How do you make a decision that one is at an A–level of correctness, and another is at a B–level of correctness?"
>
> Pako: "I guess I just have to go on teacher intuition."

Although she has gained KAL in her courses, Pako separates linguistic concepts, KAL, from pedagogical practice. While she might have chosen to consciously ground her ESL teaching in KAL in fact she did not appear to do so. Rather, she moved to holistic

teaching methods, grading student success based on what she calls her "teacher's intuition." This separation is perhaps not unexpected, given the way courses were structured in her MA–TESL program, with discrete classes labeled "Linguistics" and others labeled "Methodology."

Daisy: "Actually, it just kind of came to me."
Daisy's observation took place in a core class, with an integrated skills lesson around the theme of national parks. Students had brought in some paragraphs they had written, did a mapping activity, and had a reading activity based on a travel brochure. In the lesson, the language focus included both grammar and vocabulary, with an emphasis on learning and mnemonic strategies. During the interview, I was particularly interested in finding out the source of the rules and pointers Daisy provided for her students.

Several questions were designed to elicit comments about Daisy's course work. It seemed that she was resisting this attempt by focusing on her own prior language learning experiences rather than on KAL recently gained in MA courses. Daisy had taken Sociolinguistics, a course in which the linguistic concept of register variation is extensively discussed. Therefore, her attempts to separate spoken from written registers through teaching of specific grammatical markers during the observed class seemed to show a direct link to the KAL she had acquired during her MA–TESL coursework. However, while the following exchange seems to show that Daisy connected her pedagogy to ideas learned in her MA courses, she does not make those connections explicit. When the interview finally brought up a point that required an explicit grammar rule, Daisy could provide one, but she downplayed its importance, and when teaching, she "didn't want to go into it."

> Jeff: "Do you remember...where you learned that 'and,' 'but,' and 'so' don't go at the front of a sentence?"
>
> Daisy: "From grade school."
>
> Jeff: "Not abbreviating, was that something also that you – it was a long term thing?"
>
> Daisy: "Yes, I can't remember where I learned that"
>
> Jeff: "When did you decide that written English was different from spoken English?"
>
> Daisy: "Just from my own use in papers and it not working."
>
> Jeff: "Do you remember studying that construction at all?" (On Daisy's correction of 'I think I wanna' to 'I think that I want to.']
>
> Daisy: "Yes, that clauses, it's like the object of think. It's the that clause D.O."
>
> Jeff: "Do you remember the deletion rules at all for that clauses?"
>
> Daisy: "Well, I mean it can be deleted...in written it sounds better with it. I don't know, what are they?...I didn't remember it, and I didn't want to go into it."