The Cambridge Guide to

Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

Edited by

Ronald Carter
David Nunan

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

edited by

Ronald Carter and David Nunan

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTRIBUTORS

Kathleen M. Bailey, Professor of Applied Linguistics, Graduate School of Languages and Educational Linguistics, Monterey Institute of International Studies, Monterey, California, USA

Michael P. Breen, Professor of Language Education, Centre for English Language Teaching, University of Stirling, UK

Geoff Brindley, Senior Lecturer in Linguistics, Department of Linguistics, and Research Co-ordinator, National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

Martin Bygate, Senior Lecturer in TESOL, School of Education, University of Leeds, UK

Ronald Carter, Professor of Modern English Language, School of English Studies, University of Nottingham, UK

Beverly Derewianka, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong, Australia

Tony Dudley-Evans, Reader in English for Specific Purposes, English for International Students Unit, University of Birmingham, UK

Donald Freeman, Professor of Second Language Education and Director of Center for Teacher Education, Training and Research, Department of Language Teacher Education, School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont, USA

Fred Genesee, Professor, Psychology Department, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

Jennifer Hammond, Senior lecturer, Faculty of Education, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Liz Hamp-Lyons, Chair Professor of English, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong SAR, China

Elizabeth Hanson-Smith, Educational Computing Consultant, and Professor Emeritus, TESOL Program, California State University, Sacramento, California, USA

Claire Kramsch, Professor of German and Foreign Language Education, German Department, University of California at Berkeley, USA

Agnes Lam, Associate Professor, English Centre, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

Diane Larsen-Freeman, Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of Language Teacher Education, School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont, USA

Alan Maley, Dean, Institute for English Language Education, Assumption University, Bangkok, Thailand

Michael McCarthy, Professor of Applied Linguistics, School of English Studies, University of Nottingham, UK

David Nunan, Professor of Applied Linguistics, English Centre, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

Rebecca Oxford, Director of Second Language Education, University of Maryland, College Park, USA

Joy Reid, Professor of English, Department of English, University of Wyoming, USA

Jack Richards, Adjunct Professor, South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization, Regional Language Centre (RELC), Singapore

Michael Rost, University of California at Berkeley, USA

Thomas Scovel, Professor of Applied Linguistics, College of Humanities, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, California, USA

Barbara Seidlhofer, Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English, University of Vienna, Austria

Sandra Silberstein, Professor of English, Department of English, University of Washington, Seattle, USA

Brian Tomlinson, Reader in Language Learning and Teaching, Centre for Language Study, Leeds Metropolitan University, UK

Amy B.M. Tsui, Professor, Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

Leo van Lier, Professor of Educational Linguistics, Graduate School of Language and Educational Linguistics, Monterey Institute of International Studies, Monterey, California, USA

Catherine Wallace, Senior Lecturer in Education, Languages in Education, Institute of Education, University of London, UK

Mark Warschauer, Director of Educational Technology, Integral English Language Program/ AMIDEAST, Cairo, Egypt

Ron White, former Director, Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Reading, UK

Dave Willis, Senior Lecturer, Centre for English Language Studies, Birmingham University, UK

Jane Willis, Teaching Fellow, Language Studies Unit, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

Introduction

The aim of this introductory chapter is to lay the ground for the book as a whole. It does this by looking at what we mean when we refer to the teaching of English to speakers of other languages (**TESOL**). In the course of the discussion, we offer definitions of terms and concepts that are subsumed within the concept of **TESOL**. The chapter includes a discussion of what we mean by the terms 'applied linguistics' as well as differences and distinctions between widely used acronyms in the field such as **ESOL**, **ELT**, **ESL**, **EFL**, **EAL**, **EWL**, **ESP**, **EAP** and **ESL** (for details of these terms, see below). As we provide definitions, we look at ways in which second language (L2) teaching is differentiated from foreign language teaching.

In addition to providing definition, description and exemplification of key terms, we look at the impact of economic and technological globalisation on English language teaching, as well as the standardisation of English in relation to different sociocultural contexts. In the final part of the chapter, we provide a rationale for the book and an outline of the organisation and sequencing of the chapters.

What is TESOL?

TESOL is an acronym which stands for **Teaching English to speakers of other languages** and is a 'blanket' term covering situations in which English is taught as an L2, as well as those in which it is taught as a foreign language. **ESOL (English for speakers of other languages)** is a term widely used throughout the world, especially in the United States. The field is also sometimes referred to as **English language teaching (ELT)**, although this wrongly suggests that only teachers of English as a second or foreign language and not teachers of **English as a mother tongue (EMT)** have an interest in developing the language of their students.

Some definitions

We begin this section with the term **applied linguistics**, because it is the most general of all the terms to be discussed here. Applied linguistics is a general term covering many aspects of language acquisition and use. It is an amorphous and heterogeneous field drawing on and interfacing with a range of other academic disciplines including linguistics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, cognitive science and information technology. Along with specialists from other disciplines, applied linguists generally aim to provide practical applications of theory and research to solving

problems in sub-disciplines. Applied linguists participate to a greater or lesser degree within the following sub-disciplines: second and foreign language learning, literacy, speech pathology, deafness education, interpreting and translating, communication practices, lexicography and first language (L1) acquisition. In this book, the focus is restricted to the teaching and learning of second and foreign languages.

In our introductory statement, we suggested a distinction between **ESL (English as a second language)** and **EFL (English as a foreign language)**. The term **ESL** is used to refer to situations in which English is being taught and learned in countries, contexts and cultures in which English is the predominant language of communication. The teaching of English to immigrants in countries such Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States typifies ESL. In these countries, individuals from non-English-speaking backgrounds may speak their L1 at home, but will be required to use English for communicating at work, in school and in the community in general. The term is also current in countries where English is widely used as a lingua franca. These include the Special Administrative Region of Hong Kong (where its usage reflects the Region's recent past as a colony of the United Kingdom), Singapore (a multilingual society with English as a lingua franca) and India (where the populations speak a range of other languages, and where English – as well as Hindi – enables communication between these diverse linguistic groups).

EFL is used in contexts where English is neither widely used for communication, nor used as the medium of instruction. Brazil, Japan, Korea, Thailand and Mexico are countries where English is taught as a foreign language, either as part of the elementary and high-school curriculum, or in private schools and other educational settings.

The ESL/EFL distinction has been an important one in language pedagogy for many years because, in each case, the context in which the teaching takes place is very different, requiring different materials, syllabuses and pedagogy. In most EFL settings there is limited exposure to the language outside of the classroom, and often limited opportunity to use it. The syllabus therefore needs to be carefully structured with extensive recycling of key target-language items. In addition, the burden for providing the cultural dimension to the curriculum very much rests with the teacher. Teaching is also complicated by the fact that teachers are usually non-native speakers of English who may lack opportunities to use the language, or lack confidence in using it. In such situations it is important for the materials to provide the sort of rich and diverse linguistic input that ESL learners encounter in the world beyond the classroom.

For many years, the ESL/EFL distinction has been widely used and generally accepted and, as we have indicated above, it has provided a useful conceptual framework. (Note, however, that in some contexts the term **English as an additional language** or **EAL** is preferred.) Nonetheless, we find the distinction increasingly problematic, for a number of reasons. In the first place, the contexts in which L2s are taught and used differ considerably. Teaching English in Japan, for instance, is a very different experience from teaching it in Brazil. Also impinging on the distinction is the growth of **English as a world language (EWL)**. In fact, with globalisation and the rapid expansion of information technologies, there has been an explosion in the demand for English worldwide. This has led to greater diversification in the contexts and situations in which it is learned and used, as well as in the nature of the language itself. English no longer belongs to the United Kingdom, nor to the United States. It is an increasingly diverse and diversified resource for global communication.

In the 1970s, with the development of **communicative language teaching (CLT)**, the focus in syllabus design shifted from a focus on English as a system to be studied to a focus on English as a tool for communication. Syllabus designers, materials writers and teachers began to select content not because it was 'there' in the linguistic systems of the language, but because it matched learners' communicative needs. This shift of focus led to needs-based syllabus design and to the emergence of differentiated courses to match the differentiated needs of learners. Courses in which the goals, objectives and content are matched to the communicative needs are known as **ESP (English for**

specific purposes) courses. These are further differentiated into courses in **EAP (English for academic purposes)**, **EST (English for science and technology)** and so on.

A global language or languages

The rapid expansion in the use of English has also led to the questioning of the distinction between English as a first language (L1) and as a second language (L2). In his opening plenary at the 1999 TESOL Convention in New York, David Crystal gave an illustration of the growing uncertainty surrounding the terms 'first language' and 'second language'. Imagine a couple who meet and marry in Singapore, the male from a German first-language background and the woman from a Malaysian first-language background. The couple subsequently move to France for employment purposes. They have children and raise them through the medium of English. In which contexts and for whom is English a first, a second or a foreign language? What or who is a native speaker, and whose English do they use?

This situation is neither fanciful nor unusual. In becoming the medium for global communication, English is beginning to detach itself from its historical roots. In the course of doing so, it is also becoming increasingly diversified to the point where it is possible to question the term 'English'. The term 'world Englishes' has been used for quite a few years now, and it is conceivable that the plural form 'Englishes' will soon replace the singular 'English'.

ENGLISHES AND STANDARDS

The above descriptions and definitions of key terms and situations suggests that the uses of English in different contexts and for different purposes are neutral. However, the reality of day-to-day teaching and learning of English brings with it a series of interrelated social and political questions.

As is the case with other ex-imperial languages, such as Spanish and Arabic, native speakers of English throughout the world acquire and develop regional varieties of the language. These varieties are not especially marked in the written language but are often marked in speech. Thus, just as there are native speaker varieties of Mexican Spanish or Egyptian Arabic, so we speak of Australian English, South African English and Canadian English. Speakers of such varieties identify with their language and normally have no need to learn other Englishes. For purposes of international communication through English, their spoken variety does not normally lead to significant difficulties, and international varieties of the written language manifest in any case only minimal variations.

Non-native speaker varieties of English have also developed around the world, particularly in former colonial territories. Such varieties normally exist along a continuum which includes *standard* versions of the language which are taught and learned in school and which are recognised internationally to be of economic and political significance. Individual learners are also conscious that their own social mobility and economic power can be enhanced by access to a standard international variety of English. However, some of these varieties of the language may be deliberately spoken in ways which are markedly different from the standard native speaker versions. Speakers using such varieties may do so in order to identify themselves with a variety of the language which is perceived as theirs and not the property of others.

It may seem too that definitions of the terms **native speaker variety** and **non-native speaker varieties** of a language are also neutral and unproblematic. In some countries – e.g. the Republic of Singapore, a former British colony – English plays a major role as an L2 for the majority of the population. A continuum of varieties exists for communication through English as a lingua franca and through standard versions of English for international communication. In Singapore, however, English has furthermore been selected by the government as a medium of instruction in schools. It may even be chosen by some families as a main language spoken at home, although the

mother tongue of these speakers may be a Malay or Tamil or Chinese language. The choices may reflect recognition of the socio-economic power of the language, but such contexts and practices also raise questions about the status of a native speaker of a language. Learners of English as a foreign language often need English as a tool of communication; however, in some ESL territories differences and distinctions between standard and non-standard varieties and native and non-native speakers of a language become blurred.

Issues of personal identity come to the fore too where, for economic reasons, learners need an international standard version of English but, for more personal and social reasons, they need a variety through which they are more able to find an expression of their own identity, or even their national identity. In contexts of teaching and learning, their needs may not be entirely met either by a particular national variety because different national varieties carry with them political and ideological baggage. Some countries may, therefore, elect to teach American English because a British English variety was the language of a coloniser. Other countries may elect to teach British or Australian English for reasons ranging from geographical proximity to ideological opposition to aspects of the foreign policies of the United States. And individuals may make other decisions for purely personal reasons. There are, thus, immovable issues of cultural politics in all parts of the world from which discussions of the teaching and learning of English cannot be easily uncoupled.

MODELS OF ENGLISH AND PEDAGOGY

The teaching of standard varieties of a language cannot be divorced either from the role of the teacher or from the relationship between the teacher and the learner in this process. For example, is the language best taught by native speakers of one of the standard national varieties? Is their knowledge of their native language superior to that of non-native speaker teachers? Will they also necessarily possess an insider's understanding of the culture of the target language which renders them superior to non-native speaker teachers in helping learners towards such understanding? Alternatively, is the non-native speaker better positioned because of his or her insider's knowledge of the language of the learners and because – given the monolingual background of many native speakers of English – they (the non-native speakers) have understood first-hand the processes involved in the acquisition and uses of English? Additionally, does the native speaker bring to the classroom cultural assumptions about pedagogy which do not fit locally and which the non-native teacher may again be better positioned to mediate? And, as far as language is concerned, is an authentic native speaker version of the language preferable to one which is less 'real' but judged pedagogically to be more in the interests of learners (many of whom are likely in any case only to interact with other non-native speakers).

Again, these issues are political and impinge culturally and socially on the teaching and learning process because a government may decide to employ native speaker teachers in preference to or alongside non-native speakers; or it may have a narrow definition of what a native speaker is. Such decisions can materially affect the position of the non-native speaker economically, culturally and in the eyes of their students. This analysis suggests that there is no such thing as a neutral description of the teaching and learning of Englishes in the world.

The rationale for and organisation of this book

When we planned this book, we wanted to provide an introduction to the field of foreign and L2 teaching and learning written by top scholars in the field. We wanted to provide more background to key topics than is typically contained in dictionaries and encyclopedias yet, at the same time, to keep entries shorter than the typical book chapter. Although we wanted entries to be accessible to the non-specialist, we also wanted the topics to be dealt with in some depth. At the end of each chapter, we wanted the reader to know the history and evolution of the topic discussed, be

familiar with key issues and questions, be conversant with the research that has been carried out, and have some idea of future trends and directions. We hope these objectives have been met in each case.

The book is aimed at teachers, teachers in preparation, and undergraduate and graduate students of language education and applied linguistics. It is intended to provide a general background as well as to provide pointers for those who want a more detailed knowledge of any of the topics introduced here. The latter is given in references to the literature throughout each chapter and also in the list of **key readings** at the end of each chapter. Each list of key readings provides abbreviated details, with full publication details in the list of **references** at the end of the book. We are conscious that some will feel that topics have been left out and, of course, omissions and absences can be identified in any book due, in part at least, to the predilections and preferences of the authors and editors. For example, we are conscious that chapters could have been provided in the rapidly developing areas of **pragmatics** and **corpus linguistics**. We could have provided a chapter on **communicative language teaching** as the most well established of methodologies of the late twentieth century. We hope that these and related topics are treated and developed in other chapters in the book and that the **index** provided will help readers to navigate topics and themes which are not necessarily signalled in individual chapter headings. We also provide a glossary at the end of the book; this is not a comprehensive **glossary** of the terms used in TESOL but refers to the terms most frequently used in the chapters in this book. Key terms in the text are highlighted in bold, and many of these appear in the glossary.

There is no immutable logic to the order in which the chapters in the book have been arranged. We have placed chapters concerned with language organisation and basic skills at the beginning since, in part at least, many of the other chapters derive progressively from this base. There is, however, no reason why the chapters cannot be read in a different sequence. Similarly, there is the following basic structure to each chapter: **introduction, background**, overview of **research**, consideration of the relevance to **classroom practice**, reflection on **current and future trends and directions** and a **conclusion**. Although the structure does not apply equally to all topics, authors of chapters have followed this framework as far as possible.

Conclusion

One of the debates currently taking place within the field concerns the question of whether language teaching constitutes a profession. One of the characteristics of professions such as medicine and law is that they have a body of knowledge upon which there is relative agreement, as well as agreed-upon principles of procedure for generating and applying knowledge (although, of course, such knowledge can be and is disputed within the profession). While language pedagogy is nowhere near developing an agreed-upon set of 'rules of the game', there is a rapidly growing knowledge base. What we have tried to do here is provide a snapshot of that knowledge base. We hope that, in some small way, the volume contributes towards a more developed sense of professionalism.

Key readings

There are no obvious follow-ups to the issues covered in this short introduction. However, the following titles, all published in the 1990s, discuss further points on applied linguistics, the place of English in the world, the position of the native speaker and the sociocultural nature of the teaching and learning process. Many of the same titles also provide further definitions of terms in use in the field.

Canagarajah (1999) *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*
Crystal (1997) *English as a Global Language*

Holliday (1994) *Appropriate Methodology*
Kachru (1990) *The Alchemy of English*
Kramsch (1993) *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*
Medgyes (1994) *The Non-Native Teacher*
Pennycook (1994) *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*
Phillipson (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*
Richards *et al.* (1992) *A Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*
Tollefson (1995) *Power and Inequality in Language Education*
Widdowson (1990) *Aspects of Language Teaching*

Ronald Carter, University of Nottingham
and David Nunan, University of Hong Kong
March 2000

Listening

Michael Rost

Introduction

The term **listening** is used in language teaching to refer to a complex process that allows us to understand spoken language. Listening, the most widely used language skill, is often used in conjunction with the other skills of speaking, reading and writing. Listening is not only a skill area in language performance, but is also a critical means of acquiring a second language (L2). Listening is the channel in which we process language in real time – employing pacing, units of encoding and pausing that are unique to spoken language.

As a goal-oriented activity, listening involves 'bottom-up' processing (in which listeners attend to data in the incoming speech signals) and 'top-down' processing (in which listeners utilise prior knowledge and expectations to create meaning). Both bottom-up and top-down processing are assumed to take place at various levels of cognitive organisation: phonological, grammatical, lexical and propositional. This complex process is often described as a 'parallel processing model' of language understanding: representations at these various levels create activation at other levels. The entire network of interactions serves to produce a 'best match' that fits all of the levels (McClelland 1987; Cowan 1995).

Background

Listening in language teaching has undergone several important influences, as the result of developments in anthropology, education, linguistics, sociology, and even global politics. From the time foreign languages were formally taught until the late nineteenth century, language learning was presented primarily in a written mode, with the role of descriptive grammars, bilingual dictionaries and 'problem sentences' for correct translation occupying the central role. Listening began to assume an important role in language teaching during the late-nineteenth-century Reform Movement, when linguists sought to elaborate a psychological theory of child language acquisition and apply it to the teaching of foreign languages. Resulting from this movement, the spoken language became the definitive source for and means of foreign language learning. Accuracy of perception and clarity of auditory memory became focal language learning skills.

This focus on speech was given a boost in the 1930s and 1940s when anthropologists began to study and describe the world's spoken languages. Influenced by this anthropological movement, Bloomfield declared that 'one learns to understand and speak a language primarily by hearing and imitating native speakers' (Bloomfield 1942). In the 1940s American applied linguists formalised this

'oral approach' into the audiolingual method with an emphasis on intensive oral–aural drills and extensive use of the language laboratory. The underlying assumption of the method was that learners could be 'trained' through intensive, structured and graded input to change their hearing 'habits'.

In contrast to this behaviourist approach, there was a growing interest in the United Kingdom in situational approaches. Firth and his contemporaries (see, e.g., Firth 1957; Chomsky 1957) believed that 'the context of situation' – rather than linguistic units themselves – determined the meaning of utterances. This implied that meaning is a function of the situational and cultural context in which it occurs, and that language understanding involved an integration of linguistic comprehension and non-linguistic interpretation.

Other key background influences are associated with the work of Chomsky and Hymes. A gradual acceptance of Chomsky's innatist views (see Chomsky 1965) led to the notion of the meaning-seeking mind and the concept of a 'natural approach' to language learning. In a natural approach, the learner works from an internal syllabus and requires input data (not necessarily in a graded order) to construct the target language system. In response to Chomsky's notion of language competence, Hymes (1971 [1972, 1979]) proposed the notion of 'communicative competence', stating that what is crucial is not so much a better understanding of how language is structured internally, but a better understanding of how language is used.

This sociological approach – eventually formalised as the discipline of 'conversation analysis' (CA) – had an eventual influence on language teaching syllabus design. The Council of Europe proposed defining a 'common core' of communicative language which all learners would be expected to acquire at the early stages of language learning (Council of Europe 1971). The communicative language teaching (CLT) movement, which had its roots in the 'threshold syllabus' of van Ek (1973), began to view listening as an integral part of communicative competence. Listening for meaning became the primary focus and finding relevant input for the learner assumed greater importance.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, applied linguists recognised that listening was the primary channel by which the learner gains access to L2 'data', and that it therefore serves as the trigger for acquisition. Subsequent work in applied linguistics (see especially Long 1985b; Chaudron 1988; Pica 1994) has helped to define the role of listening input and interaction in second language acquisition. Since 1980, listening has been viewed as a primary vehicle for language learning (Richards 1985; Richards and Rodgers 1986; Rost 1990).

Research

Four areas affecting how listening is integrated into L2 pedagogy are reviewed here; these are: listening in SLA, speech processing, listening in interactive settings and strategy use.

LISTENING IN SLA

In second language acquisition (SLA) research, it is the 'linguistic environment' that serves as the stage for SLA. This environment – the speakers of the target language and their speech to the L2 learners – provides linguistic input in the form of listening opportunities embedded in social and academic situations. In order to acquire the language, learners must come to understand the language in these situations. This accessibility is made possible in part through accommodations made by native speakers to make language comprehension possible and in part through strategies the learner enacts to make the speech comprehensible.

Building on the research that showed a relationship between input adjustments and message comprehension, Krashen (1982) claimed that 'comprehensible input' was a necessary condition for language learning. In his 'input hypothesis', Krashen says further development from the learner's current stage of language knowledge can only be achieved by the learner 'comprehending' language that contains linguistic items (lexis, syntax, morphology) at a level slightly above the

learner's current knowledge ($i + 1$). Krashen claimed that comprehension is necessary in order for input to become 'intake', i.e. language data that is assimilated and used to promote further development. The ability to understand new language, Krashen maintained, is made possible by speech adjustments made to learners, in addition to the learner's use of shared knowledge of the context (Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991).

Although Krashen does not refer to strategic adjustments made by the learner to understand new language, the work of Pica *et al.* (1996) examines the role of adjustments in great detail. Their research has helped delineate how different task types (e.g. one-way vs. two-way information gap exchanges), interaction demands of tasks and interaction adjustments made by speaker and listener address the L2 learner's needs and boost subsequent development. This research outlines the dimensions of activity and strategy use required for successful listening development.

SPEECH PROCESSING

Speech-processing research provides important insights into L2 learning. Several factors are activated in speech perception (phonetic quality, prosodic patterns, pausing and speed of input), all of which influence the comprehensibility of input. While it is generally accepted that there is a common store of semantic information (single coding) in memory that is used in both first language (L1) and L2 speech comprehension, research shows that there are separate stores of phonological information (dual coding) for speech (Soares and Grosjean 1984; Sharwood Smith 1994). Semantic knowledge required for language understanding (scripts and schemata related to real world people, places and actions) is accessed through phonological tagging of the language that is heard. As such, facility with the phonological code of the L2 – and with the parallel cognitive processes of grammatical parsing and word recognition – is proposed as the basis for keeping up with the speed of spoken language (Magiste 1985).

Research in spoken-language recognition shows that each language has its own 'preferred strategies' for aural decoding, which are readily acquired by the L1 child, but often only partially acquired by the L2 learner. Preferred strategies involve four fundamental properties of spoken language:

1. the phonological system: the phonemes used in a particular language, typically only 30 or 40 out of hundreds of possible phonemes;
2. phonotactic rules: the sound sequences that a language allows to make up syllables; i.e. variations of what sounds can start or end syllables, whether the 'peak' of the syllable can be a simple or complex or lengthened vowel and whether the ending of the syllable can be a vowel or a consonant;
3. tone melodies: the characteristic variations in high, low, rising and falling tones to indicate lexical or discourse meanings;
4. the stress system: the way in which lexical stress is fixed within an utterance.

In 'bounded' (or 'syllable-timed') languages – such as Spanish and Japanese – stress is located at fixed distances from the boundaries of words. In 'unbounded' (or 'stress-timed') languages – such as English and Arabic – the main stress is pulled towards an utterance's focal syllable. Bounded languages consist of binary rhythmic units (or feet) and listeners tend to hear the language in a binary fashion, as pairs of equally strong syllables. Unbounded languages have no limit on the size of a foot, and listeners tend to hear the language in clusters of syllables organised by either trochaic (strong–weak) rhythm or iambic (weak–strong) rhythm. Stress-timing produces numerous linked or assimilated consonants and reduced (or weakened) vowels so that the pronunciation of words often seems slurred.

Differences in a learner's L1 and L2 with respect to any of these possible distinctions – phonology system, phonotactic rules, use of tone and use of stress – are likely to cause difficulties

in spoken-word recognition, at least initially and until ample attention is devoted to learning new strategies. Similarities in a learner's L1 and L2 with respect to one or more of these distinctions are likely to allow the learner greater ease and success with listening, and with word recognition in particular. For example, Japanese learners often have difficulty identifying key words in spoken English, due in part to the different stress systems; on the other hand, Danish learners of English typically have little difficulty learning to follow colloquial conversation, due in part to the similarities of stress, tone, phonology and phonotactic rules in English and Danish.

Of these four components in word recognition, stress is often reported to be the most problematic in L2 listening. In English, L2 listeners must come to use a metrical segmentation strategy that allows them to assume that a strong syllable is the onset of a new content word and that each 'pause unit' of speech contains one prominent content word (Cutler 1997).

Another research area related to speech perception is the effect of variable speech rate on comprehension. Findings clearly show that there is not an isomorphic relationship between speed of speech and comprehension (for a summary, see Flowerdew 1994b). One consistent finding is that the best aid to comprehension is to use normal speaking speed with extra pauses inserted.

LISTENING IN INTERACTIVE SETTINGS

Studies of L2 listening in conversational settings help explain the dynamics of interactive listening and the ways in which L2 speakers participate (or, conversely, are denied participation) in conversations. Such issues have been researched at the discourse analysis level, looking at how control and distribution of power is routinely employed through the structure (i.e. implicit rules) of interactions.

Research in cross-cultural pragmatics is relevant in understanding the dynamics of L2 listening in conversation. In general, cultures differ in their use of key conversation features, such as when to talk, how much to say, pacing and pausing in and between speaking turns, intonational emphasis, use of formulaic expressions, and indirectness (Tannen 1984b). The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP; Blum-Kulka *et al.* 1989) documents examples of cultural differences in directness–indirectness in several languages and for a number of speech acts (notably apologies, requests and promises). Clearly, knowledge of speakers' cultural norms influences listening success.

Conversational analysis is used to explore problems that L2 listeners experience. Comprehension difficulties in conversation arise not only at the levels of phonological processing, grammatical parsing and word recognition, but also at the levels of informational packaging and conceptual representation of the content. Other comprehension problems include those triggered by elliptical utterances (in which an item is omitted because it is assumed to be understood) and difficulty in assessing the point of an utterance (speaker's intent). In any interaction such problems can be cumulative, leading to misunderstandings and breakdowns in communication.

Bremer *et al.* (1996) document many of the social procedures that L2 listeners must come to use as they become more successful listeners and participants in conversations. These procedures include identification of topic shifts, providing backchannelling or listenership cues, participating in conversational routines (providing obligatory responses), shifting to topic initiator role, and initiating queries and repair of communication problems. Much research on L2 listening in conversation clearly concludes that, in order to become successful participants in target-language conversation, listeners need to employ a great deal of 'interactional work' (including using clarification strategies) in addition to linguistic processing.

STRATEGY USE

Listening strategies are conscious plans to deal with incoming speech, particularly when the listener knows that he or she must compensate for incomplete input or partial understanding. For representative studies in this area, see Rost and Ross 1991; Kasper 1984; Vandergrift 1996.

Rost and Ross's (1991) study of paused texts found that more proficient listeners tend to use more 'hypothesis testing' (asking about specific information in the story) rather than 'lexical push-downs' (asking about word meanings) and 'global reprises' (asking for general repetition). They also report that, following training sessions, listeners at all levels could ask more hypothesis testing questions. Their comprehension, measured by written summaries, also improved as a result.

Kasper's (1984) study using 'think aloud' protocols found that L2 listeners tend to form an initial interpretation of a topic (a 'frame') and then stick to it, trying to fit incoming words and propositions into that frame. L1 listeners were better at recognising when they had made a mistake about the topic and were prepared to initiate a new frame.

Vandergrift's (1996) study involving retrospective self-report validated O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) strategy classifications. He found explicit examples of learner use of both meta-cognitive strategies (such as planning and monitoring), cognitive strategies (such as linguistic inferencing and elaborating) and socio-affective strategies (such as questioning and self-encouragement). He also found a greater (reported) use of metacognitive strategies at higher proficiency levels. Based on his findings, Vandergrift proposes a pedagogic plan for encouraging the use of metacognitive strategies at all proficiency levels.

Practice

The teaching of listening involves the selection of input sources (which may be live, or be recorded on audio or video), the chunking of input into segments for presentation, and an activity cycle for learners to engage in. Effective teaching involves:

- careful selection of input sources (appropriately authentic, interesting, varied and challenging);
- creative design of tasks (well-structured, with opportunities for learners to activate their own knowledge and experience and to monitor what they are doing);
- assistance to help learners enact effective listening strategies (metacognitive, cognitive, and social); and
- integration of listening with other learning purposes (with appropriate links to speaking, reading and writing).

This section reviews some of the key recommendations that have been made by language educators concerning the teaching of listening. The notion of listening for meaning, in contrast to listening for language practice, became a standard in teaching by the mid-1980s. Since then, many practitioners have proposed systems for teaching listening that have influenced the language teaching profession. These can be summarised as follows:

- Morley (1984) offers an array of examples of selective listening materials, using authentic information and information-focused activities (e.g. notional–informational listening practice, situation–functional listening practice, discrimination-oriented practice, sound–spelling listening practice).
- Ur (1984) emphasises the importance of having listening instruction resemble 'real-life listening' in which the listener has built a sense of purpose and expectation for listening and in which there is a necessity for a listener response.
- Anderson and Lynch (1988) provide helpful means for grading input types and organising tasks to maximise learner interaction.
- Underwood (1989) describes listening activities in terms of three phases: pre-, while- and post-listening activities. She demonstrates the utility of using 'authentic' conversations (many of which were surreptitiously recorded).
- Richards (1990) provides an accessible guide for teachers in constructing exercises promoting

'top-down' or 'bottom-up' processing and focusing on transactional or interactional layers of discourse.

- Rost (1991) formalises elements of listening pedagogy into four classes of 'active listening': global listening to focus on meaning, intensive listening to focus on form, selective listening to focus on specific outcomes and interactive listening to focus on strategy development.

- Nunan (1995c) provides a compendium of recipes for exercises for listening classes, organised in four parts: developing cognitive strategies (listening for the main idea, listening for details, predicting), developing listening with other skills, listening to authentic material and using technology.

- Lynch (1996) outlines the types of negotiation tasks that can be used with recorded and 'live' inputs in order to require learners to focus on clarification processes. Lynch also elaborates upon Brown's (1994) guidelines for grading listening materials.

- White (1998) presents a series of principles for activities in which learners progress through repeated listenings of texts. She indicates the need to focus listening instruction on 'what went wrong' when learners do not understand and the value of having instructional links between listening and speaking.

Another area of focus in the practice of teaching listening is learner training. Rubin (1994) and Mendelsohn and Rubin (1995) discuss the importance of strategy training in classroom teaching. Mendelsohn (1998) notes that commercially available materials increasingly include strategy training, particularly 'activation of schemata' prior to listening. Rost (1994) presents a framework for incorporating five types of listening strategies into classroom instruction: predicting, monitoring, inferencing, clarifying and responding.

Numerous published materials incorporate principles that have been gleaned from research and practice. Many coursebooks treat development of listening in interesting and innovative ways. Among them are *Headway* (Soars and Soars 1993), *New Interchange* (Richards *et al.* 1998) and *English Firsthand* (Helgesen *et al.* 1999).

Another aspect of listening pedagogy is the use of the target language for instruction. From simpler notions like 'teaching English through English' (J. Willis 1981), through teaching 'sheltered content' courses in the target language (Brinton *et al.* 1989) to full-scale immersion programmes (Genesee 1984), the benefits for learning content through listening are far-reaching. Not only do the learners have an ongoing demonstration of the importance of listening, but they also have continuous opportunities for integrating listening with other language and academic learning skills, and for using listening for authentic purposes. For a review of issues in assessment, see Brindley (1998b) and Chapter 20 of this volume.

Current and future trends and directions

LISTENING PEDAGOGY

One important trend is the study of individual learners' listening processes, both in specific tasks and longitudinally. Lynch (1996) provides insightful studies of individual listeners, particularly ones experiencing difficulties in making progress. He documents learner changes in product (how much the learner understands), process (the strategies the learner uses to gain understanding) and perception (how the learner views or experiences his or her own difficulties and progress). Similarly, Robbins (1997) tracks several ESL learners, observing how their listening strategies with native-speaker conversation partners develop over time.

The role of phonology in L2 listening is beginning to receive attention. Studies such as Kim (1995), Ross (1997) and Quinn (1998) examine spoken word and phrase recognition by L2 learners, in native speaker–non-native speaker interactions and in fixed-input tasks. Such studies

help show the kind of specific phonological strategies needed to adjust to an L2, and the kind of compensatory strategies needed when listeners experience gaps in input.

A promising area of SLA work that affects listening pedagogy is 'input enhancement' (R. Ellis 1994); this is the notion of marking or flooding listening input with the same set of grammatical, lexical or pragmatic features in order to facilitate students' noticing of those features. As the notion of 'awareness-triggering learning' takes hold, the role of listening instruction in this regard will become even more important.

Another trend is renewed interest in 'academic listening', or extended listening for specific purposes. An edited volume by Flowerdew (1994b) reviews several lines of research on lecturing styles, speech perception, text-structure analysis, note-taking and aural memory. As the information revolution progresses, the need for the 'traditional' skills of selective and evaluative listening will become more important.

LISTENING TECHNOLOGY

The widespread availability of audiotape, videotape, CD-ROMs, DVDs and internet downloads of sound and video files has vastly increased potential input material for language learning. Consequently, selection of the most appropriate input, chunking the input into manageable and useful segments, developing support material (particularly for self-access learning) and training of learners in the best uses of this input is ever more important (Benson and Voller 1997).

The development of computerised speech synthesis, speech enhancement and speech-recognition technology has also enabled learners to 'interact' with computers in ways that simulate human interaction. Here also, the use of intelligent methodology that helps students focus on key listening skills and strategies is vital so that 'use of the technology' is not falsely equated with instruction.

Conclusion

Listening has rightly assumed a central role in language learning. The skills underlying listening have become more clearly defined. Strategies contributing to effective listening are now better understood. Teaching methodology in the mainstream has not yet caught up with theory. In many language curriculums, listening is still often considered a mysterious 'black box', for which the best approach seems to be simply 'more practice'. Specific skill instruction as well as strategy development still need greater attention in order to demystify the listening process. Similarly, materials design lags behind current theory, particularly in the areas of input selection and strategy development. Also, the assessment of listening, especially, remains far behind current views of listening. Although there have been marked advances, still in many areas (e.g. curriculum design, teaching methodology, materials design, learner training and testing) much work remains to be done to modernise the teaching of listening.

Key readings

Bremer *et al.* (1996) *Achieving Understanding*
Brindley (1998b) Assessing listening abilities
Flowerdew (1994b) Research related to second language lecture comprehension
Mendelsohn and Rubin (1995) *A Guide for the Teaching of Second Language Listening*
Nunan (1995c) *New Ways in Teaching Listening*
Rost (1990) *Listening in Language Learning*
White (1998) *Listening*

Speaking

Martin Bygate

Introduction

Speaking in a second language (L2) involves the development of a particular type of communication skill. Oral language, because of its circumstances of production, tends to differ from written language in its typical grammatical, lexical and discourse patterns. In addition, some of the processing skills needed in speaking differ from those involved in reading and writing. This chapter outlines the place of speaking in oral methodology, the conceptual issues involved in oral language pedagogy, and it reviews relevant research and pedagogical implications.

Background

Speaking in an L2 has occupied a peculiar position throughout much of the history of language teaching, and only in the last two decades has it begun to emerge as a branch of teaching, learning and testing in its own right, rarely focusing on the production of spoken discourse. There are three main reasons for this. The first is tradition: grammar–translation approaches to language teaching still have a huge influence in language teaching, marginalising the teaching of communication skills. The second is technology: only since the mid-1970s has tape-recording been sufficiently cheap and practical to enable the widespread study of talk – whether native speaker talk (Carter and McCarthy 1997: 7) or learner talk – and use of tape recorders in the language classroom. Due to the difficulty of studying talk, it was easier for teachers, methodologists, applied linguists and linguists to focus on written language than spoken language (for nearly 20 years the TESOL convention has run annual colloquia on the teaching of reading and writing, but not on speaking or listening).

The third reason for its peculiar development might be termed 'exploitation': most approaches to language teaching other than grammar–translation (the direct method, the audiolingual approach) as well as more marginal approaches (such as the Silent Way, Community Language Learning and Suggestopedia) exploited oral communication centrally as part of their methodology: not as a discourse skill in its own right, but rather as a special medium for providing language input, memorisation practice and habit-formation (see, e.g., Howatt 1984: 192–208). Most of the focus in teaching oral skills was limited to pronunciation. As Howatt comments of the late-nineteenth-century Reform Movement, 'it was essential that the learner's pronunciation should be correct before moving on to texts' (Howatt 1984: 172). Even for those such as Sweet, for whom pronunciation was crucial at the beginning, 'spoken interaction, or conversation, was the

end-point of classroom instruction, not its point of departure' (1984: 187). Hence, speaking was mainly associated with pronunciation, and with getting new language noticed and integrated into the learner's competence. Oral discourse was only possible at the end. This confusion of speaking as a skill in its own right with speaking as a central medium for learning continues in current developments. Recently, however, speaking has increasingly emerged as a special area in language pedagogy.

Within existing approaches to the teaching of language, one of the first to offer a clear perspective on the teaching of oral skills was audiolingualism. Audiolingualism appreciated the importance of input before output. And with oral skills preceding written, the four phase cycle of listening–speaking–reading–writing was applied in sequence for each structure (rather than as an argument for providing extensive listening input as in other approaches). More centrally, audiolingualism was based on behaviourist theories of learning and assumed that language was little more than overt, observable behaviour. Its proponents believed that repetition was central to learning, since this has been shown to help memorisation, automaticity and the formation of associations between different elements of language, and between language and contexts of use. Hence, teaching oral language was thought to require no more than engineering the repeated oral production of structures in the target language, concentrating on the development of grammatical and phonological accuracy, combined with fluency; representative examples of materials include Fries 1952; English Language Services 1964; Alexander 1967; O'Neill *et al.* 1971. When tape recorders and language laboratories gradually came into existence in the 1950s, they were mainly used for pronunciation, grammar and translation practice, often in the context of courses named as such.

In the 1970s, language teaching became increasingly influenced by cognitive and socio-linguistic theories of language and learning. Specialists realised that audiolingual approaches omitted to take account of two aspects of language in communication: first, it neglected the relationship between language and meaning; and, second, it failed to provide a social context within which the formal features of language could be associated with functional aspects, such as politeness. A communicative approach developed in two ways. First, a notional–functional approach attempted to extend the teaching of grammar to include the teaching of interactional notions (paying attention to factors of formality and functions, such as making requests, apologies, invitations and introductions). Second, a learner-centred approach emerged which emphasised the importance for learning of starting from the meanings learners wanted to communicate, and working out how to express them.

Nonetheless, at best these approaches were based on the identification of speech acts; in contrast with the teaching of reading and writing, none were anchored in the study of naturally occurring oral interactive discourse, or in the study of the development of oral L2 skills. More recently, skills-based models have been used to study oral L2 use, within the context of a task-based approach.

To some extent this has been influenced by developments in the study of oral discourse in a first language (L1). Conversation analysts (see Yule 1996) and discourse analysts (see Cook 1989; Hoey 1991; Carter and McCarthy 1997) have revealed features of oral discourse which differ from written discourse and across languages; they illustrate the kinds of features learners need to learn. Studies of L2 use have shown the kinds of problems L2 learners face – and the skills they need to overcome them – to communicate in an L2 (e.g. Bialystok 1990). Finally, studies of oral L2 performance within task-based contexts have identified the problems of using more accurate, fluent and complex language, and have started to explore the ways in which learners' communicative performance can be influenced through communication practice.

Research

CHARACTERISTICS OF SPEECH

To understand what is involved in developing oral L2 skills, it is useful to consider the nature and conditions of speech. Most current approaches draw on a psycholinguistic skills- (or 'information-')processing model. Levelt (1989) proposed that speech production involves four major processes: **conceptualisation, formulation, articulation** and **self-monitoring** (for an accessible account, see Scovel 1998). **Conceptualisation** is concerned with planning the message content. It draws on background knowledge, knowledge about the topic, about the speech situation and on knowledge of patterns of discourse. The conceptualiser includes a 'monitor', which checks everything that occurs in the interaction to ensure that the communication goes to plan. This enables speakers to self-correct for expression, grammar and pronunciation. After conceptualisation, the **formulator** finds the words and phrases to express the meanings, sequencing them and putting in appropriate grammatical markers (such as inflections, auxiliaries, articles). It also prepares the sound patterns of the words to be used: L1 errors of pronunciation very commonly involve switching sounds between words that are separated from each other; such switches suggest that the pronunciation of words must be prepared in batches prior to pronunciation. The third process is **articulation**. This involves the motor control of the articulatory organs; in English: the lips, tongue, teeth, alveolar palate, velum, glottis, mouth cavity and breath. **Self-monitoring** is concerned with language users being able to identify and self-correct mistakes.

All this happens very fast and, to be successful, depends on automation: to some degree in conceptualisation, to a considerable extent in formulation and almost entirely in articulation. Automation is necessary since humans do not have enough attention capacity consciously to control the three types of process. Hence, for an elementary L2 speaker it will be difficult to manage this speech fluently and accurately, since they lack automation and/or accuracy, and it is difficult for them to pay attention to all these processes simultaneously under pressure of time.

The skills are also affected by the context. Speaking is typically **reciprocal**: any interlocutors are normally all able to contribute simultaneously to the discourse, and to respond immediately to each other's contributions. Further, in oral communication many people can participate in the same interaction, making it somewhat less predictable than written interaction. Oral interaction varies widely in terms of whether participants have equal speaking rights, or whether one of the speakers adopts or is accorded special rights, such as in doctor–patient, teacher–pupil, professor–student, examiner–examinee, parent–offspring, adult–child interactions. Symmetry affects the freedom of speakers to develop or initiate topics, ask for clarification or close the interaction. Further, speaking is **physically situated face-to-face** interaction: usually speakers can see each other and so can refer to the physical context and use a number of physical signals to indicate, for instance, attention to the interaction, their intention to contribute and their attitude towards what is being said. Hence, speech can tolerate more implicit reference.

Finally, in most speech situations speech is produced 'on line'. Speakers have to decide on their message and communicate it without taking time to check it over and correct it: any interlocutors cannot be expected to wait long for the opportunity to speak themselves. Hence, time pressure means that the process of conceptualisation, formulation and articulation may not be well planned or implemented, and may need pauses and corrections.

These conditions and processes affect the language that is typically produced. For instance, speech more often than writing refers to the interlocutors and the physical time and place of the communication. In addition, speech typically expresses politeness so as to protect the **face** of the interlocutors (Scollon and Scollon 1983), and to structure the dialogue in stages (see Widdowson 1983). The discourse typically results in patterns which are distinct from those normally found in writing (such as the beginnings, endings and intervening phases of a doctor–patient or teacher–student interaction). Selinker and Douglas (1985), Zuengler and Bent (1991) and Bardovi-Harlig

and Hartford (1993) showed that familiarity with interlocutor, content and type of speech act could impact on non-native speaker talk.

Further, the on-line processing conditions produce language that is grammatically more 'fragmented', uses more formulaic ('pre-fabricated') phrases, and tolerates more easily the repetition of words and phrases within the same extract of discourse. Finally, the inevitable adjustments that occur in speech are overt and public. These include:

- changing the message or its formulation before it is expressed ('communication strategies'), whether or not interactively negotiated (Yule and Tarone 1991);
- self-correction after the message has been expressed; and
- various kinds of hesitation, introduced to slow down output and create planning time.

Hence, oral language differs from written language both in process and product (although of course spoken language can resemble written language, and written language can simulate spoken patterns). The implication for teaching is that oral skills and oral language should be practised and assessed under different conditions from written skills, and that, unlike the various traditional approaches to providing oral practice, a distinct methodology and syllabus may be needed. We return to this issue below.

DEVELOPMENT IN L2 SPEECH

Given that the limit to a speaker's attention capacity requires automation, how can attention be shifted and automation developed? Skehan (1998) suggests that speakers' fluency, accuracy and complexity of speech demand capacity, and that there is likely to be a trade-off between these aspects of the skill. Increasing attention to one would limit one's capacity for the others, with developmental implications (Skehan 1998). Getting learners to focus on accuracy is likely to encourage a less exploratory or fluent use of the language. Pushing them to develop fluency, on the other hand, might encourage greater use of formulaic chunks of language, discouraging attention to accuracy and reducing speakers' capacity for processing complex language. Leading them to experiment with new expressions or new combinations of words and phrases might jeopardise their accuracy or fluency. Hence, the task focus could affect learners' development.

Skehan and Foster (1997) and Foster and Skehan (1996) showed that different task types can differ in their impact: some led to more accurate and fluent but less complex language, others produced more complex and accurate language, while yet others generated more complex but less accurate language. Linguistic complexity seemed affected by the cognitive complexity of the tasks.

It remains to be seen whether the use of such tasks has long term effects on learners' oral language development. However, task repetition has been shown to have effects on subsequent performance. A student repeating a task carried out two days earlier without any warning on the second occasion produced significantly more accurate vocabulary, improved a number of collocations and produced more accurate grammar. Bygate (1999) confirmed this effect for complexity and fluency, although this time not for accuracy. Students who repeated two tasks, having first performed them ten weeks earlier, completed them more fluently and with greater complexity on the second occasion when compared with their performance of a new task of the same kind on the same day.

The implications emerging from these studies are, first, that task selection is likely to affect learners' language and language processing. Second, some form of task repetition can enable learners to shift their attention from the problem of conceptualisation towards that of formulation. Task recycling seems to provide the basis for learners to integrate their fluency, accuracy and complexity of formulation around what becomes a familiar conceptual base. This research is ongoing, but suggests interesting implications for the teaching of oral skills.

Practice

In terms of language teaching methodology, the communicative approach proposes that tasks should provide the opportunity for learners to use language in order to communicate meanings without focusing on accuracy. This would encourage fluency (Brumfit 1984a) and lead learners to explore creatively ways of expressing themselves using their knowledge of the language. This view led to the publication of a range of materials aimed to set learners talking (e.g. Geddes and Sturtridge 1979; Ur 1981, 1988). However, two problems lurked behind this approach: first, how can accuracy and fluency be brought together and, second, what range of discourse skills should be practised within an 'oral language' syllabus. Although offering stimulating substantial interaction, materials were unsystematic, with no clear relationship between one task and another, or between a speaking task and other aspects of the teaching programme.

Major implications of the work reviewed in the early part of this chapter are the following:

- A range of different types of interaction need practising.
- The conditions of oral tasks need to differ from those for written skills.
- Improvised speech needs practice, but around some content familiarity.
- Overt oral editing skills need to be encouraged, including the use of communication strategies.
- Oral language processing requires integration of accuracy, complexity and fluency.
- For learners' oral abilities to develop, courses need to vary the emphasis on fluency, accuracy and complexity.

Integrated coursebooks began to respond to the need to provide different types of interaction. Whereas hitherto such materials had used oral interaction principally to practise grammatical structures, gradually new generations of coursebooks included a distinct oral syllabus, largely organised around functions (e.g. Richards *et al.* 1998; Swan and Walter 1992; Nunan 1995a). However, on the whole such materials did not offer an explicit syllabus of oral discourse types. Of the exceptions, one is Dörnyei and Thurrell (1992), which consists of tasks specifically targeting the development of communication strategies. Lynch and Anderson (1992) is unusual in focusing exclusively on spoken skills.

In terms of integrating fluency and accuracy, Bygate (1987) suggested that learners can usefully practise different patterns of discourse, in terms of 'interaction routines', or 'information routines'. An early example of this approach, although largely structured around topics, was the use by Abbs and Sexton (1978) of thematically linked 'chains' of tasks to structure parts of units. Similarly Geddes (1986) uses the topics of units to generate genuine oral activities. In a related approach, J. Willis (1996) proposed the use of a cycle of activities around a central task, involving an 'input phase', a 'rehearsal phase' and a 'performance phase': learners first hear a recording of native speakers undertaking a similar task to the one they are to do, providing them with a rough model; they then perform the task in small groups, during which students express themselves without worrying about errors; the teacher observes and provides feedback; finally, students perform the task before the class, with the focus on all-round performance. This approach is built into the course materials written by Willis and Willis (1988). Yule and Gregory (1989) provide a worked example of an oral task type which can be exploited in this way.

Repetition is central to this cycle, but with the assumption that fluency, accuracy and complexity will only be integrated towards the end of the cycle. This view is supported by evidence from studies by Bygate (1996, 1999), which demonstrated a potentially valuable effect for repetition. The notions of rehearsal, repetition and recycling pose interesting challenges to materials writers, since they imply organising tasks to give pedagogically useful connections between them. Central is the opportunity for learners to become familiar with the meaning content, and materials increasingly use the notion of content recycling to facilitate the integration of work within a familiar conceptual frame.

Current and future trends and directions

A basic issue concerns whether or not tasks can involve learners in working with particular kinds of language feature, or whether use of tasks is a kind of 'blind' pedagogy, whereby allowing learners to express themselves in whatever way they wish is believed to lead to development. There are conflicting views on this point. Brumfit (1984a) stressed that fluency activities should provide learners with the freedom to improvise their own expression. Duff (1993) reports that the tasks she used to elicit speech from a learner did not consistently elicit the same kinds of speech. J. Willis (1996) and Skehan (1998) share the view that tasks cannot target specific features, but only provide conditions which are capable of influencing the level of complexity, accuracy or fluency that learners will produce. Skehan believes that tasks can only influence attention to accuracy, fluency or complexity.

In contrast, Loschky and Bley-Vroman (1993) argue that tasks can target language features in terms of whether targeted features are likely, useful or necessary to complete a task. Yule (1997) provides a systematic review of tasks from this perspective. Some empirical studies have shown how the language used on tasks can be traced back to features of the input or task design, and occur with statistical significance (Samuda and Rounds 1992; Bygate 1999; Samuda 2001). The implication is that patterning does take place, and that therefore tasks can influence the complexity, accuracy or fluency of particular language features. It is, however, unclear how far or consistently this occurs. Given the widespread belief that discourse patterns are pervasive in L1 talk, it would be a profound inconsistency within the discipline to discover that patterning does not occur within the context of tasks. This is in need of wider study.

Meanwhile, studies into the impact of tasks on students' processing skills are in their infancy, and far more are needed into the longitudinal effects of task type and task conditions. A key issue is how tasks operate within classroom contexts, and how they affect perceptions of learners and teachers. In this area professional understanding will only gradually emerge.

Finally, the oral language syllabus deserves fuller study. Few materials include an oral language syllabus, and this is a major direction for future developments. Study into the discourse patterns generated by different task types (such as convergent and divergent, or collaborative and competitive task types identified by Pica *et al.* 1993) is an area for further study. An encouraging step forwards is provided by Riggenbach (1999). This offers an extensive background to the teaching of oral abilities, offering 14 activities for teachers to use as a basis for generating their own activities to practise macro-skills, such as turn-taking, aspects of exchange structure and oral discourse types; and a further 12 activities as a basis for developing original activities to practise micro-skills (pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary). (For further illustration, see Riggenbach and Samuda 1997; this is, ironically, a textbook concerned with grammar practice.)

A second key direction for development is to explore further how fluency, accuracy and complexity can be integrated, in particular through the use of different combinations and sequences of activity types. One sequence would start with complexity and accuracy activities and move to fluency activities, putting students under increased time pressure to formulate and attempting to force them to 'automatise' (Johnson 1988, 1996b); an alternative would be to engage learners' fluent processing to begin with and only subsequently lead them to integrate accurate language features into that fluent 'base'. A third route might involve encouraging learners to move from fluent and accurate performance to include more complex language. Finally, there is considerable scope for exploring the role of routines in developing discourse skills.

Key readings

Brumfit (1984a) *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching*
Bygate (1987) *Speaking*
Carter and McCarthy (1997) *Exploring Spoken English*

Cook (1989) *Discourse*
Riggenbach (1999) *Discourse Analysis in the Language Classroom, Vol. 1: The Spoken Language*
Scovel (1998) *Psycholinguistics*
Skehan (1998) *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*
Willis and Willis (1996) *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*
Yule (1996) *Pragmatics*
Yule (1997) *Referential Communication Tasks*