DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 133   FL 021 777

AUTHOR   Gladstein, Jill, Ed.; Silver, Rita Elaine
TITLE   Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, Volume 9,
                 Number 2.
INSTITUTION   Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia. Graduate School of
                 Education.
PUB DATE   93
NOTE   101p.; For individual papers, see FL 021 778-783.
PUB TYPE   Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT   Working Papers in Educational Linguistics; v9 n2 Fall
                 1993

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   English (Second Language); Language Planning;
                 *Language Research; Language Standardization; Peer
                 Evaluation; Portuguese; Second Language Instruction;
                 Second Language Learning; Socioeconomic Status;
                 *Sociolinguistics; Spelling; Student Attitudes;
                 Uncommonly Taught Languages; Written Language
IDENTIFIERS   Language Consciousness; Pennsylvania (Philadelphia);
                 Questions

ABSTRACT
                 This issue of a journal designed to present works in
progress by students and professors of linguistics contains the
following papers: "In Praise of My Language" (Joshua A. Fishman);
"How Does Social Status Affect the Sequencing Rules of
Other-Introductions?" (Fred J. Chen); "The Role of Ethno-Lingual
Relativity in Second Language Acquisition" (James L. Citron);
"Debating the 1990 Luso-Brazilian Orthographic Accord" (Pedro M.
Garcez); "Shared Writing: Students' Perceptions and Attitudes of Peer
Review" (Andrea M. Murau); and "So What Are You Talking About?': The
Importance of Student Questions in the ESL Classroom" (Ellen Skilton,
Thomas Meyer). (AB)

Working Papers
in Educational Linguistics

**STUDY
LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION
AT PENN**

EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTICS
TESOL
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION
READING / WRITING / LITERACY

COURSES INCLUDE:

Educational Linguistics/Sociolinguistics/Second Language
Acquisition/Teaching Reading to Second Language Learners/Language
Diversity and Education/Classroom Discourse and Interaction/Social and
Historical Perspectives on Literacy/Multicultural Issues in Education/Forming
and Reforming the Reading and Language Arts Curriculum/TESOL
Methodology/Language Planning and Language Policy/Structure of English

M.S. Ed., Ed.D., Ph.D.
Full and part-time
Scholarships and Fellowships

For detailed information, clip and mail to: Admissions Office, Graduate School of Education,
University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6216

Name _____

Address _____

_____

Please send information about _____

From the Editors:

The purpose of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)* is to present works in progress by students and professors on topics ranging from speech act analysis and classroom discourse to language planning and second language acquisition. Papers in *WPEL* are generally based on research carried out for courses offered in the Language in Education Division of the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania.

It is our intention that *WPEL* will continue to be a forum for the exchange of ideas among scholars in the field of educational linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania and at universities with similar programs in educational and applied linguistics around the world. *WPEL* is sent to nearly one hundred universities world-wide.

We hope that you will find this issue both useful and stimulating.

All correspondence should be addressed to:

Working Papers in Educational Linguistics
Language in Education Division, GSE
University of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA   19104

Contents

In praise of my language

Joshua A. Fishman
Professor Emeritus, Yeshiva University
Visiting Professor, Stanford University

This is the text of a talk presented at the 1992 Nessa Wolfson Memorial Colloquium at the University of Pennsylvania.

Language consciousness is by no means a new topic within the sociolinguistic enterprise, and certainly not within the social science enterprise as a whole. I first approached this topic in my 1966 *Language Loyalty in the United States* and returned to it again with more international focus in my 1972 *Language and Nationalism*. Both of these books are still in print, 26 and 22 years respectively after their initial publication, and I take that as testimony to their continued usefulness. However, I am now deeply involved in a new approach to this topic, an approach that I think of as more reflective of the manifold *internal* and *cognitive* perspectives surrounding it.

Via a healthy variety of methods and perspectives, we have managed to learn a good deal about language consciousness in connection with questions such as: *When* and *among whom* does such consciousness arise? When is it *stronger* and when is it *weaker? What* does it lead its adherents *to do* on behalf of their own beloved language and in opposition to competing languages? Typically, a few ethnocultural cases (often only one case) are studied in detail and over time, frequently via a variety of social science methods (such as survey techniques and ethnographies and even quasi-experiments), in order to answer questions such as the above and, hopefully, to arrive at theoretical formulations pertaining to language consciousness. From studies such as the foregoing we have already learned many things:

Language consciousness is usually a component of ethnic consciousness more generally. Like the latter, it is not always *in* consciousness–although, once developed, it is very easily elicited and further cultivated. The leaders and would-be leaders of ethnocultural aggregates play a major role in the cultivation of such consciousness,

although they commonly utilize and heighten previously available (and widely recognized and implemented) mctifs from folksongs, folktales. proverbs and ethnomoral texts and traditions as the building blocks of such consciousness, together with newly created imagery as well. Language consciousness waxes and wanes in intensity, the waxing coinciding with periods of stress and challenge, when common symbols are called upon to mobilize clienteles on behalf of proffered solutions to current problems. As the major symbol system of our species, particular languages naturally become symbolic of their respective speakers and of such language-encumbered verities as their respective histories, values, laws, lore, liturgies, customs and even their physical beings per se. Indeed, language consciousness is not merely a derivative of the common *symbolic* link between language and culture, but it is also an outgrowth of the fact that much of culture is itself linguistic and does not or cannot exist other than via a specific, traditionally-associated language.

As a result of the foregoing longstanding and interdependent association between languages and their traditional ethnocultures, languages are intricately related to the rivalries and altercations between ethnocultures. Once language consciousness has been widely developed (and intercultural rivalries cause such consciousness to spread quickly from urban intellectuals and proto-elites to all other segments of the population), it may recede in intensity and in salience, but it is rarely lost altogether. Even immigrant populations, often lacking in intellectual resources and most commonly lacking in resources for legal redress against economic, political and cultural discrimination, are long characterized by language consciousness and language advocacy within specific sub-networks of teachers, writers, clerics and community activists. The ethnic revival of the mid-70's was one such recent occasion of increased immigrant language conscious in the USA and in the Western world more generally. Since then, the mainstream reward system has become a dominant concern again and few immigrant cultures anywhere have been able to develop the diglossic arrangements that would permit participation in mainstream econopolitical processes, on the one hand, and the fostering of their own language and culture maintenance, on the other hand. For a variety of reasons (see Fishman 1991), such arrangements are difficult to attain and maintain even for indigenous ethnolinguistic minorities.

The Internal View

Notwithstanding all that prior inquiry has already enabled us to understand about ethnolinguistic consciousness, there is one approach that I find missing in this area of study, namely an approach that would enable us to capture and appreciate the *worldview*, the belief system, and the emotional or motivational readiness for overt behavior that language consciousness so frequently entails. *Consciousness* and *identity*—and even *belief*—can all be passive states, but in connection with language (and with ethnicity more generally) we are all aware that actions frequently follow, actions of support of the beloved language and actions in opposition to the rejected one (or ones). Both support and opposition can take on various forms and intensities, many of which clearly reveal that language consciousness can also be a powerful factor in the world of goal-directed social behavior. Thus, the internal view also has external consequences, some of them of an intra-group and others of them of an inter-group nature. Accordingly, it is all the more important for us to know exactly what is included within the total attitude-belief-action system which language consciousness incorporates.

Why have we not looked much at this area of inquiry before? Perhaps because some of us tend to move too quickly toward the abstract. Those who do, find it simple to subsume the internalized content of language consciousness within the externalized study of ideologies and elites, of political organization and intergroup tensions. However, this cannot be the entire reason, since many who have studied ethnolinguistic consciousness have guarded against reaching for abstractions prematurely. Perhaps part of the problem is that self-concepts are always difficult to study. They are so personal, private and even fragile that the very act of inquiry tends to change them or influence them in the very act of studying them. However, there is yet another reason I think—that many Western researchers (and sociocultural and ethnolinguistic research are both still very largely Western luxuries) are consciously or unconsciously negative toward particularistic ethnolinguistic views and loyalties. This negativism derives from the universalistic bias of the social sciences, on the one hand, and from roughly two centuries of right-wing capitalist and left-wing socialist thought, on the other hand. Accordingly, much social science interest gravitates either toward examining (and praising) the dissolution of parochialism or toward examining (and condemning) its excesses. Given my own background and my own studies, I would be the last to claim that ethnolinguistic particularism does not have many very negative

3

features and that there are occasions when we should all be relieved that certain ethnolinguistic manifestations have been transcended. However, these manifestations are only a very small part of the total ethnolinguistic identity and ethnolinguistic consciousness pie. As with every other sociocultural phenomenon that is investigated, we must try to see it more dispassionately, more fully, more sensitively, more situationally and contextually, not to mention more synchronically, than others are likely to do. The conflictual aberrations pertaining to ethnolinguistic identity and consciousness are not the whole story. Let us also remember that it is very hard to locate any form or basis of aggregative life that is not subject to conflictual aberrations of any kind or at any time whatsoever.

The Data of Language Consciousness

But setting aside the anti-ethnic biases of social researchers and theoreticians is not in itself a solution to the problem of how to study ethnolinguistic awareness. There are a variety of methodologies available and they will differ not only in their empirical operations but also in the degree to which individual researchers have an affinity for them and, finally, in the kind of data that they will yield. When I decided to study the cognitive content or mind-set of ethnolinguistic consciousness, I could have decided to do an ethnography of a network of language activists that I have long been aware of informally, or to do in-depth interviews of its members (individually or in small groups), or to do a survey of the larger organization of which the network is a part, or even to do a world wide study of various important quantitative characteristics of such organizations. Indeed, I may yet do all of the foregoing kinds of studies, but, to begin with, I started, as I frequently do, with the literature. Not just the literature *about* language consciousness but the literature *of* language consciousness per se.

All over the world, and for many, many years, language advocates, defenders, loyalists and activists have spoken out (and written down) their views, feelings and beliefs about "their" language. I am sure that if I went back to ancient times I would find some such statements there too: among the ancient Egyptians and the Chinese, the classical Hebrews and the Greeks, the Romans and the earliest Moslems, the Javanese and the Incas, the Aztecs and the Indic Sanskritists. However, since it is the last century or so that interests me most, I have restricted myself to the latter time period for the time being. I have gathered language advocacy statements by poets and by politicians, by teachers and by journalists, by scholars and by philosophers, by school children and by ordinary men and women. I have gathered such statements

i()

about languages all over the world, so that European languages and non-European languages are both well represented, as are minorities and majorities, immigrant-derived and native-of-native advocates, educated and uneducated, the famous and the unknown (even unknown to their own fellow-speakers). This is the first time I have reported even preliminary findings on this topic, a topic still very much in the process of being investigated and which I have tentatively titled "In Praise of My Language."

The Major Themes

There are a few themes that occur very commonly, across languages, across continents, and across time. There is a much larger number of themes which are rarer, that is to say: more language-specific. Most languages are characterized both on the widely shared and on the more unique themes, that is to say: in some respects they are viewed by their advocates very similarly to the ways in which almost all languages the world-over are viewed; in some ways they are viewed as possessing characteristics that only a certain number of other languages (between a third and a half) are viewed as having; and, finally, in some ways they are viewed in ways that are quite unique to them, and no (or hardly any) others are found who are viewed as possessing those particular characteristics. There is only time, here and now, for a few of these themes to be reviewed, so let us start with some of the most common ones. For the sake of variety, we will set aside Spanish, Afro-American, Jewish, or other examples that are already likely to be well known by some of you and concentrate on examples that may be more novel.

Essentiality of traditionally associated language for ethnocultural identity

The absolute essentiality of the traditionally associated language for ethnocultural identity and continuity is very commonly claimed. Sometimes this is stated in very general terms. The Alsatian claim that their *dialect* provides the "stability," "cultural specificity and uniqueness" to their lives "when all other things collapse," is of this kind {A2}[1], as is the Irish claim that the Irish language provides the "roots of the [Irish] tree {I3}" and the German claim that the "entire people [have built] the magnificent structure of the German language as a mirror image" of themselves {G1}. Non-European images of the identity of language and cultural identity also abound. A Caribbean French Creole example refers to Creole as the vehicle of "self acceptance, linked to our very existence and...authenticity....our collective unconscious [and] deep self {C1}" and a Guarani citation claims that the language is "the index...of the distinctive individuality of Paraguayans {G1}." A Mayan Kaqchikel citation renders

explicit what is implicit in much of the above, namely, that "once a people loses its own language, it loses its identity {MK1}," as does the Sumatran, "Without a language the nation disappears" {I/s1}. Many of the above citations claim that the historically associated language created or fashioned the cultural aggregate and its identity, while others claim exactly the opposite direction of causality, namely, that the language is a product of the people and its historical, spiritual and even physical characteristics. In either case, the "identity" claim delicately serves double semantic duty, implying both "ethnocultural definition" (that is, the language identifies the culture), on the one hand, and "isomorphism of language and ethnoculture" (i.e., the language and the culture are indivisibly one and the same), on the other hand.

A Basque citation sums up the latter view as follows: "[E]veryone who is *eskaldun* [ethnically Basque] must be Basque in language in order to deserve the name *eskaldun* {B1}." Basque is only one of several languages in which members of the ethnocultural collectivity are designated by a term which *necessarily* signifies being speakers of the normally associated ethnocultural tongue, i.e., speaking the historically associated ethnocultural language is *the* way in which membership is designated, indicated, and confirmed. The Romansch slogan, "Tanter rumanschs be rumanschs!" [=Among the Romansch, nothing but Romansch {R1}], also reveals this same lexico-cognitive equivalence, even when it is manifestly counter-factual. The typological reformulation that has been fostered in centers of mass immigration (Non-Spanish-speaking Hispanics, non-Yidddish-speaking Eastern European derived Jews, non-Italian-speaking Italo-Americans) is simply not acceptable everywhere in the world and the greater longevity of putative ethnocultural identity in comparison to language use would be considered an instance of "the operation was successful but the patient died," i.e., a totally unacceptable outcome.

Nation and Language

The same thematic category, or one so closely associated with it that it may not pay to differentiate the two, invokes the term *nation* in connection with language and identity claims. "Nation" is also a term that does double semantic duty, particularly in (American) English. On the one hand, *nation* implies *nationality*, i.e., an ethnocultural attachment. On the other hand, *nation* implies *polity*, i.e., an ethnopolitical attachment (such as in "...one nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all"). In either case, it implies a more salient or conscious attachment than does [Irish] tree, [German] stream, [Creole] collective unconscious, or even [Mayan] people, although frequently the latter, people, is used as synonymous with either "nation" or "nationality."

From Flanders comes the claim that Flemings and Dutchmen are "indeed the same nation" because they are "identical in language, character and costumes {D1}." From Finland, we learn that "[Its] language is any nations most precious possession, with which...it is born, grows [up] and disappears from the earth {F1}." A Polish citation claims that "As long as there is the [Polish] language there is also the Polish people {P1}." A Serbian example reveals another European setting in which "people" is used with strong implications of language consciousness: "As long as our language lives, as long as we love it and respect it, speak it and write it and purify it, augment it and beautify it, so long shall the Serbian people live too {S2}." Note the clearly specified *action responsibilities* which this citation specifies for those who aspire to be good Serbian patriots. We will return to action responsibilities in a moment.

The nation's dependence upon (and/or contribution to) its long and authentically associated language is also clearly evinced outside of Europe. A famous Philippine spokesperson opines that "Until we have that [=a nationwide Philippine language] we shall not be a people {Ph2}." A Quechua example is equally insistent: "In its [the Quecha people's] language one finds all of its greatness {Q2}." Similar claims are made for Hindi, Swahili, and Indonesian.

Status Planning

The obligation to engage in status planning (i.e., to advocate, propagate, protect and societally elevate the historically validated language) is a natural outgrowth of the conviction that language and ethnocultural/ ethnonational existence are inextricably linked (and, indeed, even identical desiderata). Status planning goals are exemplified by statements such as for Arabic in the Magreb:

> [Our goal must be] instruction and writing at all levels, science, math (not just poetry and literature), all levels of government and econotechnical administration. Only a language of administration can be worthy of being maintained as a language of modern cultured thought {A1}.

For Hausa the proud claim is made that "It is also employed by the mass media and by poets and performing artists {H2}." Maori advocates aspire to the time when "new ideas, thoughts and experiences [will] be expressed in and committed to the Maori language; otherwise our language will become dead and static {M1}." Similarly, the Philippine leadership commits itself "to take such steps as are necessary for the purpose of using Filipino...in official transactions, communications and correspondence {Ph3}." Literally identical "modern" status goals are now being expressed on behalf of Byelorussian, Norwegian Nynorsk, Rusyn, and Basque in

Europe, just as they were expressed several centuries ago for English, French, Spanish, German, and Italian. Of course, the utilization of all languages for one and the same set of modern, high-status econotechnical functions leads to endless political, economic and even military confrontations, although the equity of totally denying any such functions to the "latecomers" on various continents (including the European "latecomers", such as Rusyn, or Macedonian) is clearly questionable and can easily be seen as expressions of racist and colonialist/imperialist views.

<u>Corpus Planning</u>

Similarly obligatory in modern terms is the injunction to engage in corpus planning, i.e., to amplify, beautify, modernize, and standardize the language per se. A language which is lexically or orthographically deficient or which has no agreed upon norms for foreignisms and for different genres cannot successfully compete to be adopted for modern, higher econotechnical functions. If French once had to be "render[ed]..... not only elegant but capable of treating all the arts...and sciences (Fr2}," and if English had to defend itself against the charge that it had "foreignisms...more than the bravest tongues do {E2}" and had to be advocated as able "to record almost all the events and discoveries of ancient and modern times {E2}," is there any wonder that Third World latecomers are in even greater need of corpus planning today (when there are already scores of competitor languages that do fulfill many of these functions)? Clearly, when Malay advocates strive toward a "common spelling" as well as "scientific and technical terms {M1}," and Chinese authorities advocate "the simplification of Chinese characters and the promotion of the standard vernacular {C1}," they do so with the conviction that the nation as a whole, rather than just the language per se, will be strengthened and rendered more productive and functionally effective. The total interdependence of status and corpus planning is well exemplified by the Serbian call to "purify it, augment it and beautify it [the Serbian language]....so [that] the [Serbian] nation [may] live."

Some Less Frequent Themes

The foregoing quartet will have to do, for the moment, to indicate just how strongly languages are advocated and cultivated (and, of course, that implies how strongly competing languages are resisted and deprecated [and there usually are locally competing languages; indeed, the rejection of competitors is another very common theme everywhere]. Some of the less common (but far from uncommon) themes deal with aesthetic qualities of one's own language, the cognitive benefits of

the language for its speakers, the incomparable "inherent" suitability of the language for its traditionally associated culture, the kinship associations that are present in connection with one's own language (thus, the expression "mother tongue," e.g., is not an exceptional term but one of a whole family of terms that encompass all members of the primary family), the implications of freedom and equality that use of one's own language carries with it and fosters, the genius of the language, the religious overtones and memories associated with the language, the language's link to the total and ongoing history of the ethnoculture, the language's link with an honorable past and with a hopeful future, the intergenerational continuity contributions of the language (and, therefore, its assurance of triumph over personal death), life and death imagery more generally, the language's role in connection with attaining literacy and with great literary creativity, the model of the "good language" (e.g , just what is "good Bengali"?), the language's parallels to nature, the rejection of intragroup (i.e., within one's own group) negativity toward the language, bodily imagery in connection with the language, the acquisition of power via the language, resistance to language shift and ethnic assimilation, rurality associations with the language (former and current), language shift problems (ongoing and in the past), memories of childhood associated with the language, the language as the "soul" or "spirit" of the nation, the unity contributions of the language (past and future), the language in the expression and preservation of "national values," and so on and so on.

Then, of course, there are the even more uncommon themes, too numerous to mention now, but, naturally, of great importance in the more specific task of understanding the attachments expressed in connection with any one language or another. There are potentially an endless number of these, if we content-analyze in accord with very refined or narrowly worded categories, but there are still a fairly large number even when an attempt is made to establish somewhat broader and more generally useful categories. All in all, I have found it desirable to establish finer categories initially (in order not to leave out anything that might conceivably turn out to be interesting or important) and then to combine these subsequently, in order to avoid the proliferation of categories. A tentative combination of *ethnic group identity* and *national group identity* into a single category (in the discussion of the perceived identity of language and ethnicity, above), is an example of the possible assets and debits pertaining to setting overly broad and overly narrow content boundaries. Boundary problems are endemic, of course, both within and between the social sciences as a whole.

"In Praise of My Language": Good or Bad for Humanity?

A common American posture is to be negative toward most ethnolinguistic identity strivings that may have political and conflictual consequences. There is a widespread feeling that things were probably "better" during the time of the unified USSR and Yugoslavia, when "ethnic cleansing" and "ethnic strife" were held down or presumably non-existent due to the imposition of superior central force. Of course, the latter force led to much bitterly, if more silently, resented Russification and Serbianization, which, to a large extent, are the precursors to the current centrifugal and extra-punitive and even intra-punitive counter-reactions. Ultimately, however, problems such as these do not get settled by sweeping them under the rug. Any study of the cognitive map of ethnolinguistic self-perceptions will reveal as much or more chauvinism among the "greats" as among the "smalls," among the native born as among the immigrants. Only arrangements that lead toward more ethnocultural tolerance and power sharing will ultimately lead to the establishment of a new modus vivendi among super powers and small powers, among early modernizers and late modernizers, among old polities and new ones. In achieving that much desired state of affairs it is absolutely imperative that the "have nots" or "latecomers" be understood, respected and even admired for the fortitude that has maintained them and brought them to their current quest for greater recognition and support for the verities that they hold dear, among them: their languages and the delicate and intricate web of beliefs, attitudes and convictions with which these languages are so richly endowed.

As might be expected, dealing with the ethnolinguistic self-concepts of problematic languages and of languages in problematic circumstances, reveals a high proportion of self-congratulatory and self-centered views. Such views are predictable ingredients of mobilization for collective problem-solving. We should note, however, that not all of the views are characterizable in these terms and that not all of them are xeno- or exo-phobic by any means. Actually, they reveal a focus on the internal emotional and historical resources of the culture, at a time when these resources are being counted upon to help redress perceived disadvantages and misfortunes. Many of these emphases will subsequently be dropped or played down, as the problematic contexts that initially stimulated them recede. On the other hand, other emphases or particular themes may remain permanently salient and even the de-emphasized ones can be returned to consciousness by appeals that are resorted to when troubles reappear. Childhood traumas usually leave some traces which permits their reactivation. Our world is one in which few ethnolinguistic groups have suffered no

traumas and inflicted none themselves. Hopefully, new intra- and international arrangements and organizations will be able to bring about more therapeutic interethnic problem-solving in the future. Spain, Australia and the European Community (the so-called "EC") have already provided several good examples for the world to emulate.

In Closing: The Philadelphia Context of "In Praise of My Language"

Many of the languages represented in my "collection" are now represented within the population of Philadelphia, not to mention such languages as Spanish and Italian and Greek and Polish and Yiddish and Black English with which many of you are already intimately familiar. We have children in the Philadelphia schools who come from homes where they hear views of the kinds that I have mentioned. Their parents go to houses of worship and participate in choruses or choirs and listen to radio and television programs in which the praise of their languages (and the identitites and responsibilities which such praises foster and advocate) are implied, intimated, expressed, assumed, stressed, and re-iterated. If we seek to understand and respect, assist, serve, and honor these children and adults, as well we should, and not only in schools but in hospitals, social service agencies, job-training programs and citizenship training courses, we must become acquainted with the ethnolinguistic longings and leanings which these populations carry with them. More of them will hold and subscribe to the views that I have found and quoted here than you might think. These parents and children do not frequently express these views to us because they think we are not interested, wouldn't understand, and might even criticize or reject them for such views. We must know or suspect the existence of such views in order to encounter them, in order to be able to help others strive to implement them as a permissible part of their identity, and in order to foster the kind of Philadelphia, the kind of Everytown and the kind of USA where such identitites, and the language views that they subsume, are respected and understood.

---

[1] The letter-number combinations refer to data in the corpus by language (letter) and informant (number). Thus, all samples with "A" refer to the same language but "A1" and "A2" would refer to two different informants concerning that language.

Social status and
the sequencing rules of other-introductions

Fred J. Chen

University of Pennsylvania

Graduate School of Education

The study examines the speech act sequence of introductions among native speakers of American English from a wide variety of occupations, educational backgrounds, and role relationships. Specifically, the focus of the study is on the sequencing of other-introductions; namely, in an introduction that involves at least three participants, who gets introduced to whom? Three kinds of patterns are discussed based on collected data. First, four basic rules are formulated, each according to one distinct conditioning factor such as social status (when it is unequal), social distance, situational context, and the introducer's intent (when social status is equal). Next, four combined patterns with congruent factors are discussed. Finally, four overriding patterns that include two conflicting factors are suggested; however, only the pattern regarding social status and situational context is confirmed due to the limited data set.

Introduction

Recent research in the fields of sociolinguistics and TESOL has highlighted the need for ESL textbook writers and language teachers to incorporate sociolinguistic and situational factors into their language planning and teaching. It has been pointed out that effective communication in a speech community encompasses the processing of both social and linguistic knowledge (Hymes, 1964; Canale & Swain, 1980; Olsthtain & Cohen, 1983; Wolfson, 1989). Also, awareness of situational factors is said to be significant in reducing miscommunication or communication breakdown (Cazden, 1972; Gumperz, 1982; Olshtain & Cohen, 1990). Lacking necessary sociolinguistic knowledge and missing certain situational cues, learners of English might experience communication failure despite their level of linguistic proficiency. They need native speakers of English to inform them on how to produce and understand appropriate utterances in a given context (Billmyer, 1990). However, as Wolfson (1989) points out, native speakers of English often rely on their intuitions

when designing ESL textbooks and/or teaching language without knowing the underlying principles for when to use what. These intuitions have been shown to be inadequate and even contradictory to actual use. For instance, Pica (1983) contrasted the rules of article use of American English given in ESL textbooks with the use by native speakers. She found that article use by native speakers often contradicted the rules given in the ESL textbooks she examined and concluded that the varied use of articles is contingent upon the setting of interaction and various other contextual features. Researchers suggest studying and teaching speech acts, which can reveal the discrepancy between native speakers' attitudes/beliefs and patterns of actual use, thus enabling learners to become aware of the sociolinguistic rules of the target language and the situational factors in which speakers interact (Wolfson, 1989; Olshtain & Cohen, 1990).

Speech act sequences such as requesting, apologizing, refusing, and complimenting have been widely described in the literature. However, the speech act sequence of introductions has yet to be studied. Information on introductions in ESL textbooks often includes only linguistic patterns; few textbooks provide sociolinguistic rules. These *rules*, based largely on textbook writer's intuitions, are sometimes in conflict with each other. Despite the lack of empirical studies on introductions, they are extremely important and useful for learners to know in order to properly interact with native speakers: daily interactions often start with introductions. Learning necessary rules for introductions can also help learners achieve certain goals, such as asking for information. On the other hand, being unaware of the rules for introductions (or failing to make an introduction when one is expected) can cause social faux pas for learners. Empirical research is needed since rules given in ESL textbooks are largely intuitively based, rather than empirically tested.

Social Status and Speech Act Sequence

Studies on speech act sequences such as requesting, apologizing, refusing, and complimenting have indicated that social status is one of the most important variables that condition certain aspects of social rules. Some of the rules concerning social status in each speech act sequence are recapitulated below.

In Ervin-Tripp's study (1976), she divides requests into six categories—ranging from most direct to most implicit. Of these, status (rank) is the most salient social factor. In other words, the higher a speaker in status, the more direct form of requests was used.

14

19

In describing the apology speech act set, Olshtain and Cohen (1983) examined interaction between apologizer and the recipient in terms of social status. They found that social status affects speaker choice of semantic formula. That is, apologizers of a lower status tended to offer an apology of higher intensity (e.g., "I'm terribly sorry") to a higher status recipient but use one of low intensity (e.g., "I am sorry") to equal- or lower- status recipients.

Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1985) found that when refusing an invitation, speakers of American English offered a shorter and unelaborated response to unequal-status addressees (both superiors and subordinates) but made much longer and more elaborated response to status-equal addressees.

Wolfson (1989), in her study of compliments, points out that there is an implicit rule against complimenting one's superiors among middle-class speakers of American English. Billmyer (1990) illustrates this point by citing the following example: A male Malaysian student complimented his female teacher, "You are wearing a lovely dress. It fits you" (from Holmes & Brown, 1987). Billmyer explains that this compliment failed on pragmatic grounds because the speaker was unaware of the restrictions given by males to females and by lower status to higher status individuals.

Other-introductions

Given the great impact that social status has on the speech act sequences discussed above, it is likely that social status will also play a significant role in the speech act sequence of introductions. Hence, the research question of this study is: How does social status affect the sequencing rules of other-introductions? That is, in an introduction that involves three participants, who gets introduced to whom?

The participants for this study were all native speakers of American English. They were males and female adults (20+) of different ages and with a wide variety of occupations and educational backgrounds. Role relationship is also given attention in this study since it is crucial in determining social status. Role relationships encompass those of professors and students, employers and employees, classmates, co-workers, friends, family members, and so forth.

Audiocassette recordings and fieldnotes were used to collect spontaneous introductions in face-to-face interactions. A total of 96 tokens were collaboratively collected by 10 researchers. The research group included one professor and nine graduate students in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania.

In this study, introductions are defined as the speech act sequence which follows the dictionary definition found in the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, "To make known for the first time to each other or someone else, especially by telling 2 people each other's names" (1989:751).

Service encounters and formal introductions have been excluded. By definition, only 55 out of the total of 96 tokens collected were introductions. These were divided into *other-introductions* (at least 3 participants) and *self-introductions* (at least 2 participants). Self-introductions were further divided into *other-initiated* and *self-initiated* introductions. The distribution of introduction types is given below (Table 1)

Table 1: Introduction Types

Self-introductions			Other-introductions	Total
self-initiated	other-initiated	total		
20	5	25	30	55

Since introductions involving more than two participants are more likely to occur in spontaneous conversation, this paper will focus on other-introductions.

Discussion

<u>Basic Rules</u>

Based upon the 30 tokens of other-introductions, four basic rules can be found in terms of introducees. These rules are called *basic* because in each of them only one distinct factor appears to be involved in determining the sequencing rules of other-introductions. The factors that govern each rule are: social status (in status-unequal relationship), social distance, situational context, and the introducer's intent (in status-equal relationship). These four basic rules are described below.

(1) In situations of unequal status, a person of a lower status will first be introduced to a person of a higher status (and then vice versa).

(2) In situations of equal status, the person who has lower (closer) social distance to the introducer will first be introduced to the person who has greater social distance from the introducer (and then vice versa).

(3) In situations of equal status which involves a new person entering a conversation, the old participant will first be introduced to the new conversant (and then vice versa).

21

(4) In situations of equal status within a context where a speaker wishes to continue conversational flow without abrupt interruption, he/she introduces the silent third party beside him/her to the person who is talking or whom he/she is conversing with.

Basic Rule 1: Unequal status—low to high

Both Aaron[1] (the mayor) and Francis (the judge) were invited speakers in a seminar. A staff member, Pamela (of a lower status to both speakers) was the introducer.

Pamela: (to Aaron, with her arm pointing to Francis) Oh, this is Judge Francis. (And to Francis, with her arm pointing to Aaron) This is Major Aaron.
Aaron: Hello, how are you. Nice to meet you.
Francis: Nice to meet you. (To other students around) Hi, everybody!

In the above example, Pamela (relatively low in social status) first introduced Judge Francis (relatively high in social status) to Mayor Aaron (whose social status is highest among the three). In this case, the introducing sequence that the introducer (i.e., Pamela) used appeared to follow Basic Rule 1.

Near the front desk in the lobby of a Sheraton hotel, Ted (a security supervisor) introduced Neil (a new security guard) to Mr. Brown (the general manager).

Ted: Mr. Brown, I'd like you to meet Neil, our new security.
Mr. Brown: Hi, nice to meet you, good luck!
Neil smiles and shakes hand with Mr. Brown.

In the second example above, it is apparent that Ted was also following Basic Rule 1: the new security guard, Neil (lowest in social status) was introduced to the general manager, Mr. Brown (relatively high in social status).

Basic Rule 2: Social distance—close to distant

Sharon is a close friend of and pastor to Kim (the introducer). Kim and Tracy are neighbors in the same apartment complex. All participants interacted as equal.

Kim: Well, Hi (pleasantly surprised)
Tracy: Hi.
Kim: Tracy, this is Sharon, the associate pastor at my church.

Since participants in the above example were equal in social status, there must be another factor that conditioned Kim's introducing sequence. In this case, social

distance appeared to be the conditioning factor. Kim introduced Sharon (her close friend) to Tracy (her neighbor).

> In a room in the church 15 minutes before a wedding, Marcia, the bride introduced her good friend, Patricia, to Sharon, the associate pastor of the church.
>
> Marcia: Sharon, this is my good friend Patricia. (To Patricia) This is our other pastor.
> Patricia extends her hand; Sharon shakes it and smiles a greeting.

In the second example, Marcia obviously followed Basic Rule 2 by first introducing her good friend, Patricia (lower in social distance) to Sharon.

Basic Rule 3: Situational context—old participant to new conversant

> Daphne went to visit her friend, Angela (the introducer). They walked together to Angela's office and met her co-worker and friend, Mike in the office.
>
> Angela: Mike, this is my friend, Daphne. Daphne, this is Mike.
> Daphne and Mike: Hi.

In the above example, neither social status nor social distance was the relevant factor that conditioned Angela's introducing sequence since the three participants were all equal in social status, and both Daphne and Mike are rather close to Angela. It appeared that the situational context was the conditioning factor. That is, Mike in this case was the new conversant. Hence, Daphne (the old participant) was introduced to him.

> When Dr. Karen Morse (a professor) and Michelle (a graduate student of hers) were coming out the lecture hall, Tina (another graduate student) recognized Dr. Morse and greeted her. Dr. Morse did the introduction.
>
> Dr. Morse: (Standing in the middle of the two people, with her arm pointing to Michelle and Tina almost at the same time) This is Michelle; this is Tina.
> Michelle: Hello.
> Tina: How do you do.

In this case, Dr. Morse first introduced Michelle (the old participant) to Tina (the new conversant), following Basic Rule 3.

<u>Basic Rule 4: Introducer's intent to continue conversational flow</u>

The data also showed that the sequence of other-introduction is possibly conditioned by the introducer's intent to continue the conversation with the same speaker without interruption.

> Ken, Frank, and Jim were teachers attending a research forum. Ken made two introductions: one between Frank and Jim, the other between his son, Eric and the other two teachers. For the purpose of the present discussion, only the first introduction is provided.

> Ken: Hi, how are you?
> Frank: Fine, how are you?
> Ken: I'm fine. Frank, I'd like you to meet Jim from my school.
> Frank: Hi.
> Jim: Nice to meet you.

In the above example, social status and social distance did not appear to be relevant since the introducees, Frank and Jim, were both equal in status (teachers), and both Frank and Jim was close to Ken (the introducer). The remaining possible factor that determined the introduction sequence was Ken's intent to continue talking with the same person (i.e., Frank). Accordingly, after saying, "I'm fine" in response to Frank's previous greeting, "How are you?" Ken introduced Jim, the silent party beside him, to Frank with whom he was conversing. Using a different introduction sequence, namely, introducing Frank to Jim, would have interrupted the conversation between Ken and Frank.

> At the library, Sally was working at the desk, when two of her friends, Kathy (the introducer) and Debbie, came to the desk with another girl (Jane), whom Sally did not know.

> Kathy: I didn't know you were working tonight?
> Sally: I was covering for a friend.
> Debbie: Hey! Did you see this ad?
> Sally: What ad?
> Jane: Here!
> Sally: You must be kidding!
> Jane: I thought so too, but it's for real. Hey! You guys haven't introduced me.
> Kathy: Oh...yeah... right...sorry! Jane, this is Sally, Sally, this is Jane.

Following Basic Rule 4, Kathy continued Jane's conversational flow by introducing Sally (who was silent at that moment) to Jane (who was talking). If Kathy introduced

Jane to Sally instead, Jane's conversational flow would have been abruptly interrupted.

Combined Patterns with Congruent Conditioning Factors

The four patterns mentioned above are rather clear-cut. In each, one distinct factor (social status, social distance, situational context, or the introducer's intent to continue the conversational flow) determines the introduction sequence. However, examples with a single conditioning factor are rare in the data except for data supporting Basic Rule 3. Many tokens of other-introduction involve congruent conditioning factors that are hard to sort out. Two, and sometimes three variables (social status + social distance, social distance + situational context, social distance + the introducer's intent, or social status + social distance + the introducer's intent) are prevalent in the data.

Combined Pattern 1: Basic Rule 1 (status) and Basic Rule 2 (social distance)

Ruth went to a graduate class with her boyfriend, Richard, who introduced Ruth to his professor, Dr. Douglas.

Richard:	This is Ruth I wanted you to meet.
Dr. Douglas:	Hi.
Ruth:	Hi.
Dr. Douglas:	Yes, I've been looking forward to your coming.
Ruth:	Thank you. I've been looking forward to coming.

In the above example, Ruth, as a student, assumed a lower social status than the professor of the class, Dr. Douglas; Basic Rule 1 (social status) was met. Moreover, Ruth, as a girl friend of Richard, was closer to Richard than to professor Dr. Douglas; Basic Rule 2 was also met. Therefore, Ruth was introduced to Dr. Douglas first.

Combined Pattern 2: Basic Rule 2 (social distance) and Basic Rule 3 (situational context—the new conversant))

Kevin (the introducer) and Rosa went to the table where Susan was already sitting. Kevin and Rosa have been friends for four years (close social distance). Kevin and Susan have been friend for four months (medium social distance)

Kevin:	Susan, Rosa. (indicating "Susan, this is Rosa" by pointing)
	Rosa, Susan. (indicating "Rosa, this is Susan" by pointing)
Susan:	Hi.
Rosa:	Hi (almost simultaneously).

20

In this situation, Susan was the new conversant. Therefore, based upon Basic Rule 3 (the situational context), Rosa (the old participant) should be introduced to Susan. In addition, Rosa was a closer friend to Kevin and should also be introduced to Susan (less close to Kevin), according to Basic Rule 2 (social distance). Hence, the introducing sequence in this instance was attributed both to Basic Rule 2 and Basic Rule 3.

<u>Combined Pattern 3: Basic Rule 2 (social distance) and Basic Rule 4 (the introducer's intent to continue the conversational flow)</u>

During the break of a class, Carol was sitting in the row in front of Richard (the introducer) and his girl friend, Ruth.

Richard: Hey, Carol, did you bring that prospectus?
Carol: (turning around) No, I forgot it.
Richard: This is Ruth, by the way.
Ruth: Hi.
Carol: Hi. I'm sorry.
Richard: That's O.K.

In this instance, Richard seemed to follow Basic Rule 2 (social distance) in introducing Ruth (his girl friend) to Carol (his classmate). However, it was also natural for Richard to introduce Ruth to Carol since he was talking to Carol, following Basic Pule 4 (intent to continue the conversation). Introducing Carol to Ruth would interrupt the conversational flow between Richard and Carol. Hence, both Basic Rule 2 and Basic Rule 4 contributed to this introduction sequence.

<u>Combined Pattern 4: Basic Rule 1 (social status), Basic Rule 2 (social distance), and Basic Rule 4 (the introducer's intent)</u>

Ken, Frank, and Jim were teachers attending a research forum. Ken made two introductions: one between Frank and Jim, the other between his son, Eric and the other two teachers.

Ken: Hi, how are you?
Frank: Fine, how are you?
Ken: I'm fine. Frank, I'd like you to meet Jim from my school.
Frank: Hi.
Jim: Nice to meet you.
Ken: This is my son, Eric (to Frank and Jim).

The second introduction made by Ken between his son and the other two teachers seemed to involve three factors. In terms of social status, Ken's son was the

lowest among the four participants, so he was introduced to Frank and Jim, who were higher in status. In terms of social distance, Ken's son was closer to Ken and was therefore introduced by Ken to the other two teachers. However, it was also possible that such an introduction sequence was due to the fact that Ken wanted to continue the talk with Frank and Jim (Basic Rule 4). Hence, Basic Rule 1, Basic Rule 2, and Basic Rule 4 all contributed to this introduction sequence.

Overriding Patterns with Conflicting Conditioning Factors

The first section of the study deals with four Basic Rules having one distinct conditioning factor; the second section deals with four Combined Patterns having congruent conditioning factors. It would be interesting to know which are the overriding factors in patterns with conflicting variables.

Basic Rule 3 (situational context) overrides Basic Rule 2 (social distance)

(1) Richard (the introducer) and Ruth were sitting down, waiting for a class to begin when Mark, a friend of Richard's, came in and sat down next to Ruth.

Richard: Mark, this is Ruth. Ruth, this is Mark.
Ruth and Mark: Hi. (Shake hands.)

(2) During a class break, Richard (the introducer) was sitting with a friend, Paul, when Ruth came out of the bathroom.

Richard: Ruth, this is Paul.
Paul: How ya doin?
Ruth: Hi.

In both examples, Richard followed Basic Rule 3 (situational context) in introducing the old participant beside him to the new conversant. The new conversant in example (1) was Mark, so Ruth was introduced to him. The new conversant in example (2) was Ruth, so Paul was introduced to her. However, in example (1), Basic Rule 2 (social status) was also present since Ruth (lower social distance to Richard) was introduced to Mark (greater social distance to Richard). In example (1), it was unclear which of the two was the overriding factor since they were congruous with each other.

Looking more closely at example (2) found that the factor of situational context (the new conversant) appeared to override that of social distance when these two were in conflict. In example (2), Paul (greater social distance from Richard) was introduced to Ruth (lower social distance from Richard). Here, it is clear that the factor

that conditioned this introduction sequence was situational context. Ruth was the new conversant and thus Paul was introduced to her.

> Sharon and Martha (the introducer) walked into an office in a church where Martha and Kelly were colleagues.
>
> Martha: Kelly, this is Sharon. Sharon, this is Kelly.
> Kelly: Oh, it's nice to meet you!
> Martha: Kellly's heard so much about you. She keeps saying that she wants to meet you.
> Kelly: I'm the one who called you up at your parents' house.
> Sharon: Oh, you're the one.

In this example, Sharon (greater social distance from Martha) was introduced to Kelly (lower social distance from Martha), which violated Basic Rule 2. However, in terms of Basic Rule 3 (situational context), Kelly was the new conversant and Sharon was the old participant; therefore, Sharon was introduced to Kelly. It appears that Basic Rule 3 overrides Basic Rule 2.

Does Basic Rule 3 (situational context) override Basic Rule 1 (status)?

Given the above finding (Basic Rule 3 overrides Basic Rule 2), it is natural to ask if Basic Rule 3 also overrides Basic Rule 1 (social status). However, due to the limited data set, the hypothesis could not be empirically tested. Native speaker intuitions indicated that this would not be possible. Imagine the following situation which involves social status and situational context in conflict with each other.

> Allan was sitting in the classroom, talking with his professor, Dr. Stone when his friend, Jessica walked in.

It is easy to imagine that Allan would say:

> Professor Stone, this is my friend, Jessica.

But it seems unlikely for him to utter:

> Jessica, this is my professor, Dr. Stone.

It seems that Basic Rule 3 (situational context) cannot override Basic Rule 1 (social status); but rather, Basic Rule 1 seems to override Basic Rule 3. Of course, as mentioned earlier, intuitions of native speakers are often inadequate and unfounded. Empirical data is needed to test this hypothesis.

23

Does Basic Rule 2 (social distance) override Basic Rule 1 (social status)?

Again, this question could not be fully answered. However, there was one example relevant to this discussion.

In a college alumni interview that took place at Tony's home, Tony (the introducer) and George were the two interviewers; Oscar was the interviewee.

Tony: Hi, Oscar. I'm Tony Mason.
Oscar: Nice to meet you. (They shake hands)
Tony: This is George Lestor, who is also a D graduate.
Oscar: Hi.
George: Hi, how are you?
Tony: Here. Take your coat off. (Takes his coat).
Oscar: Thank you.

In this case, both Tony and George acted as gatekeepers (Erickson & Shultz, 1982) in that they had the power to make decisions which would affect Oscar's future in terms of college admission. Basic Rule 1 (social status) obviously did not apply here since George (higher in social status) was introduced to Oscar's (lower in social status). Basic Rule 2 (social distance) seemed to apply between Tony and George in the sense that Tony first introduced George (lower social distance from Tony) to Oscar (greater social distance from Tony). However, social status also played a role in this interaction: the introducer (Tony) in the above example was also higher in social status. In other words, two persons of higher social status (e.g., Tony and George) when the social distance between them is less than the social distance of either to the lower status individual can introduce each other to a third person (e.g., Oscar) of a lower status. This is not necessarily true when the introducer is lower in social status. This again needs further investigation.

Does Basic Rule 4 (the introducer's intent) override Basic Rule 2 (social distance)?

Having seen the discussion of the combined pattern that included congruent conditioning factors of the introducer's intent and social distance, it would be interesting to know if the introducer's intent overrides social distance in situations where these two factors are in conflict. The case remains unclear because no situations where these two factors were incompatible were found in the data. Imagine the following hypothetical introduction sequence:

29

Ruth is sitting in the row in front of her boy friend, Richard, who is sitting next to Carol, a classmate and acquaintance.

Richard: Ruth, did you bring the prospectus?
Ruth: No, I forgot it.
Richard: This is Carol, by the way.

In this example, Richard introduced Carol (greater in social distance) to Ruth (lower in social distance). This would go against Basic Rule 2, but would be quite natural if a person intended to maintain a conversational flow with the same speaker. If such a situation did occur, then we would have evidence to support a hypothesis of conversational continuity overriding. However, the data does not show such an introduction sequence. We cannot, therefore, know which would over..de the other.

Conclusion

In response to the research question, "How does social status affect the sequencing rules of other-introductions?" Four Basic Rules involving only one conditioning factor were found.

(1)   In situations of unequal status, a person of a lower status will first be introduced to a person of a higher status (and then vice versa).

(2)   In situations of equal status, the person who has lower (closer) social distance to the introducer will first be introduced to the person who has greater social distance from the introducer (and then vice versa).

(3)   In situations of equal status which involves a new person entering a conversation, the old participant will first be introduced to the new conversant (and then vice versa).

(4)   In situations of equal status within a context where a speaker wishes to continue conversational flow without abrupt interruption, he/she introduces the silent third party beside him/her to the person who is talking or whom he/she is conversing with.

The examples of the Basic Rules and Combined Patterns in the data are quantified in Table 2 (by Basic Rule) and Table 3 (by Combined Patterns).

Moreover, one Overriding Rule was found, as described below:

When an introduction sequence involves Basic Rule 3 (situational context) and Basic Rule 2 (social status) that are in conflict, Basic Rule 3 will override Basic Rule 2.

25

Table 2: Distribution of Occurrences by Basic Rule

Basic Rule 1	Basic Rule 2	Basic Rule 3	Basic Rule 4
2/30 (7%*)	2/30 (7 %)	9/30 (30%)	3/30 (10%)

*Percentages have been rounded off.

Table 3: Distribution of Occurrences by Combined Patterns

Combined Pattern 1	Combined Pattern 2	Combined Pattern 3	Combined Pattern 4
2/30 (7%*)	8/30 (27%)	3/30 (10%)	1/30 (3 %)

*Percentages have been rounded off.

Except for the four Basic Rules, four Combined Patterns, and one Overriding Rule, other relations discussed in the study are, at best, hypotheses that are empirically untested. These include the relationship between Basic Rule 1 (social status) and Basic Rule 3 (situational context); and the relationship between Basic Rule 1 (social status) and Basic Rule 2 (social distance). Also, the relationship between Basic Rule 2 (social distance) and Basic Rule 4 (the introducer's intent) remains unclear.

It is impossible to generalize about the sequencing rules due to the limited data set.This study does not deal with gender and age, which might also lend insight into the sequencing rules of other-introductions. Moreover, research that includes who initiates the introductions for what purpose would be useful in finding sequencing rules.[2]

[1] All the names of the participants in this study are fictional.

[2] The original version of this paper was submitted to Dr. Billmyer in Spring, 1992 for ED 650: Cross Culture Variation in Language Use.

References

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T. & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1985). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. Paper presented at the second research Form, UCLA.

Billmyer, K. (1990a). I really like your lifestyles: ESL learners learning how to compliment in English. *WPEL: Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 6* (2):31-48. University of Pennsylvania.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1990). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 10* (1):1-47.

Cazden, C. B. (1972). The situation: A neglected source of social class difference in language use. In Pride & Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 294-313). Penguin.

Erickson, F. & Shultz, J. (1989). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interview.* New York: Academic Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of American English directives. *Language in Society, 5* (1):25-66.

Gummperz, J. J. (1982). *Language and social identify. (Studies in Interactional Linguistics, 1).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech-act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behavior. *TESOL Canada Journal, 7* (2):45-65.

Pica, T. (1983). The article in American English: What the textbooks don't tell us. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 222-233). Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

27

The role of ethno-lingual relativity in second language acquisition

James L. Citron

University of Pennsylvania

Graduate School of Education

The term *ethno-lingual relativity* is defined as a perspective that is not limited by one's own cultural and linguistic experiences, but rather is open to the contrasting cultural and linguistic patterns of other peoples. It is hypothesized that having an ethno-lingually relative perspective can facilitate one's ability to learn a new language. Support for this hypothesis–drawn from second language research in language aptitude, motivation, personality differences, social and psychological factors, acculturation theory, and pragmatic competence –is discussed.

Introduction

It is often argued that foreign languages should be emphasized in schools because learning new languages opens students' minds to the ways of other peoples and increases the opportunities for cross-cultural understanding. Fishman has acknowledged the widespread belief that multilingualism provides "greater insight, deeper appreciation, greater sensitivity..." for the speaker (1981:525). Fantini has noted that such behaviors as "empathy, flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity...all are furthered by the development of proficiency in a second language" (1993:18). The hypothesis discussed here is the converse of that argument–that having a mind that is open to other ways of looking at the world may facilitate one's ability to learn a new language. The term *ethno-lingual relativity* is defined as a perspective that is not limited by one's own cultural and linguistic experiences, but rather is open to the contrasting cultural and linguistic patterns of other peoples. It is hypothesized that having such a perspective can facilitate one's ability to learn a new language. In this paper, a role for ethno-lingual relativity in facilitating the second language acquisition process will be proposed. Some research findings that may support the hypothesis directly or indirectly are summarized and areas of inter-relatedness to other predictors of success in second language

acquisition are discussed. Finally, some directions for further research and their significance are suggested.

This hypothesis comes, in part, from my experiences teaching beginning and intermediate level Spanish to U.S. high school and college students in the United States and on six-week intensive language programs in Mexico. It has been my impression that some students have had greater difficulty than others stepping out of their own *culture cages* and understanding both that languages are not direct translations of each other and that languages reflect the cultures of their speakers. For example, when I played a song by contemporary Spanish singer José Luís Perales to an introductory Spanish class in the United States, I observed that some students needed to clarify whether the singer was a "Spanish Neil Diamond" or a "Spanish Billy Joel" or exactly who he compared to in the U.S. Others appeared better able to accept him as someone uniquely Spanish and did not seem to require a U.S. counterpart or an English translation in order to process him. Similarly, some students have appeared to have more or less trouble stepping out of their *language cages* to grasp the idea that languages do not necessarily express the same ideas in the same ways, lexically or syntactically.

The hypothesis is also partially based on the work of Kellerman (1979) in which eighty-one Dutch-speaking adults were asked to make judgments about the translatability into English of the Dutch word, *breken*, ("break") in seventeen different sentences. The pu;oose of Kellerman's study was to determine why speakers may ascribe varying degrees of translatability to different uses of the word. Kellerman argued that native speakers of a language recognize a core function of a word as well as peripheral functions that may be less translatable to other languages. While it was not Kellerman's primary purpose, his study suggests that one skill of mastering a second language may be the ability to look objectively at features of one's native language. By doing so, one can determine which of its uses are related to its core function and are likely to be shared with another language and which are more peripheral and therefore more apt to be idiosyncratic to the native language.

Ethno-lingual Relativity

There appear to be two sub-components to an ethno-lingually relative perspective. The first is the ability to recognize that languages are not direct translations of each other and, furthermore, that the way one's first language expresses a thought is arbitrary. For example, in the English sentence, "I like that joke," *I* is the subject of the

sentence and is acting on the environment. When the Spanish language expresses the thought, "Me gusta ese chiste," it is the *joke* that is having its effect on me. The first sub-component of ethno-lingual relativity, then, is understanding that this same thought is expressed in different ways syntactically in each language and neither way is more correct than the other.

The idea that languages are not direct translations of each other can be illustrated lexically as well. While two languages may have words with the same dictionary definition, the images that the two words evoke in the minds of native speakers of each language may differ. Research in cognitive psychology (e.g. Rosch, in Pease, Berko Gleason, & Pan, 1993:120-1) suggests that vocabulary words are classified in one's mind by prototypes; the more similar a word is to the prototype for that class, the more quickly that word can be recognized as belonging to its class. For example, for most native speakers of American English, a robin has more typical characteristics of the English word *bird* than does an ostrich. Therefore, native speakers of American English can classify robins faster when asked if they are birds. Yet languages differ in the ways they categorize words. Although a dictionary might include *carro* as a Hispanic American definition of the English word *car*, the range of objects to which these terms refer can differ significantly for speakers of the two languages. For example, one native speaker of American English may see a Ford Taurus as a prototypical car and may include such objects as Pontiacs, Saabs, Volkswagens, racing cars, Model T's, and solar-powered cars within this conceptual category. A native speaker of Mexican Spanish may hold a Volkswagen Bug as the prototype for the word *carro* and his or her word class for this category may include Renaults, Chevrolets, busses, trucks, shopping carts and wagons. According to the ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis, a language learner who is less bound by his or her first language's way of classifying words and can recognize that the boundaries of conceptual categories may differ across languages may be better able to learn a second language.

The second sub-component of an ethno-lingually relative perspective is the ability to recognize how much of one's own language is culture-bound. On a concrete level, the culture-boundedness of a language can be illustrated by the existence in its vocabulary of a term for a word that does not exist in another language because the object is unknown to its speakers. This can be common with fruits and vegetables that are native to one region of the world. According to the hypothesis, a language learner who can empathize with his or her interlocutors and recognize the culture-boundedness of each language would be better able to learn the new language than one who cannot. A native English-speaking college student from the U.S. was once observed in a conversation

with a Mexican native in Mexico City. Failing to express a thought to her interlocutor, the student sought a dictionary for assistance. When she could not find the word stooge (as in the "Three Stooges") in the dictionary, the student became frustrated and unsure how to proceed with the conversation. According to the ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis, this student's inability to recognize the culture-boundedness of the term stooge would put her at a disadvantage in learning of the Spanish language.

On a more abstract level the culture-boundedness of language can be illustrated by the value differences that are reflected in languages. For example, in sharp contrast are the widespread beliefs in the United States that one exercises control over his or her environment and destiny, while fatalism is more prevalent in many other countries (Kohls, 1984). These value differences appear to be reflected in the Spanish and English languages: To earn money and to win money, for example, are expressed with different verbs in English, but with one verb, ganar, in Spanish. It is not clear whether the culture is reflecting the language differences, whether the culture is dictating the language's needs, or whether the two are correlated by mere chance. The importance for our purposes is that, according to this hypothesis, a native Spanish speaker learning the divergent English forms who is able to recognize, accept, and adapt to the presence of such cultural differences will have an advantage when learning English.

In the next section, the ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis will be discussed within the context of existing literature in sociolinguistics and second language acquisition.

Related Research

The Whorf Hypothesis

Whorf [1967 (1956)] received widespread attention when he first suggested that there might be traceable affinities between cultural and behavioral norms and large-scale linguistic patterns. While his writings do not address second language learning, they provide support for the hypothesis of ethno-lingual relativity. One could argue that if languages reflect the cultural patterns of their speakers, a language learner who is open to understanding these cultural patterns should have an advantage when learning a new language.

Individual Differences

Peter Skehan's (1991) review article of individual differences in second language learners acknowledges the limited number of studies of such differences, but identifies several areas where learner differences have been shown to be important. While the extent to which learners have an ethno-lingually relative perspective has never been

32

addressed as a continuum on which learners differ, two other differences—language aptitude and motivation—may be related to ethno-lingual relativity and deserve discussion.

Language Aptitude

Studies of language aptitude have tended to focus on a very narrowly-defined set of variables such as phonemic coding ability, grammatical sensitivity, associative memory, and inductive language learning ability (e.g., in Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991:167). The last of these abilities, which Carroll defines as "the ability to infer or induce the rules governing a set of language materials, given samples of language materials that permit such inference" (in Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991:167), may very well be related to ethno-lingual relativity since they deal with the recognition of patterns in languages that may differ from those of one's first language.

Of special interest would be which stages of language learning ethno-lingual relativity would most affect. Spolsky (1989) has postulated that aptitude, as currently defined, is more applicable to the early stages of language learning. It seems plausible that ethno-lingual relativity might actually be an aid to both early and later stages of learning, for, unlike the traditionally-defined skills, this perspective could also enable the learner to progress beyond basic communication levels to a stage of fuller mastery of the intricacies of the new language. One could argue that at the beginning stages, second language learners use universal principles and strategies, but at advanced levels, they use second language-based strategies that could be more influenced by ethno-lingual relativity.

Motivation

On the surface, motivation might not appear to be directly related to ethno-lingual relativity; however, it might actually be highly correlated with it and difficult to separate from it. Integrative motivation, as originally defined by Gardner and Lambert (1959) is linked to positive attitudes toward the target language group and the potential for integrating into that group or interacting with its members. Gardner's newer socio-educational model (in Crookes & Schmidt, 1991:472) recognizes that language learning involves learning aspects of behavior typical of another cultural group so that attitudes toward the target language community will play a role in language learning success. It also recognizes the role of cultural beliefs in the learning process. All of these associations with cultural relevance for the learner seem related to the ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis to the extent that having a positive attitude toward members of

33

another group and a desire to learn about their cultural attitudes could correlate with an openness to the contrasting cultural and linguistic patterns of other peoples.

Crookes and Schmidt (1991) have attempted to apply theories of motivation from other areas of education to second language learning. They lend credibility to the possibility of a relationship between motivation and ethno-lingual relativity when they note that the "failure to distinguish between social attitude and motivation [in traditional second language motivation studies] has made it difficult to make direct links from motivation to psychological mechanisms of SL learning" (1991:501-2). The social attitude referred to here may be linked to ethno-lingual relativity as students without such an open perspective may be less motivated to learn a new language, since it would seem less relevant to them. In their call for further research on motivation, Crookes and Schmidt ask, "What types of individuals are motivated, under what conditions?" (p. 497) and call for more hypothesis testing in the area.

Social and Psychological Factors

Schumann (1978) identifies many social and psychological factors that can contribute to second and foreign language learning. One personality factor, tolerance for ambiguity, and one affective factor, culture shock, are especially relevant to the hypothesis of ethno-lingual relativity. Anyone who has tried to learn a new language can attest to the fact that one often must perform in ambiguous situations where topics of conversation and ways of responding are unclear. Some have theorized that learners with a low tolerance for such ambiguity might react to such situations with depression, dislike, or avoidance. Naiman, Frölich, and Stern (in Schumann, 1987:169) found tolerance for ambiguity to be significantly correlated with listening comprehension, but not with an imitation task. Cohen (in Schumann, 1987:169) has suggested that these results indicate that learners with a high tolerance for such ambiguity may be able to listen more attentively and get more comprehensible input, while those with a lower tolerance may become confused by the linguistic input and attend to it less efficiently. One could argue that much of one's tolerance for such ambiguity is related to how structured and limited his or her world view is or how open he or she is to new ways of looking at the world.

Acculturation Theory

Sociological research on acculturation has identified four stages of cultural adjustment that people pass through while adapting to a new culture: the euphoric or honeymoon stage; the culture shock stage; the culture stress stage; and the recovery

stage. Brown (1980) has proposed an "optimal distance model," hypothesizing that this research, along with research in anomie, social distance, and perceived social distance, helps to define a critical period for successful second language acquisition within the second culture. Anomie is described as the feeling of homelessness that one feels at the third stage of acculturation: feeling neither bound firmly to a native culture nor fully adapted to a second culture. Lambert's research (in Brown, 1980:159) showed this stage of adjustment to correlate with the stage when English-speaking Canadians became so skilled in French that they began to think and dream in French. This work directly supports the ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis by showing that when the ethno-lingual ties to one's own culture are weakened—and one is, presumably most open to other cultural perspectives—his or her second language skills show the most improvement.

Schumann (in Brown, 1980:159) has hypothesized that the greater the social distance between two cultures, the greater the difficulty the learner will have in learning the new language; the less social distance, the less difficulty the learner will have. Later he summarized his views: "The degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language" (in Brown, 1980:160). As Schumann's hypothesis is based on a measure of social distance that is hard to quantify, Acton (in Brown, 1980:160) proposed a solution: That it is the perceived social distance between cultures, that determines learners' language acquisition. The ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis is consistent with Acton's to the extent that perceived distance between cultures corresponds to an inability to accept the cultural and linguistic patterns of the new culture. Acton devised a measure of perceived social distance, the Professed Difference in Attitude Questionnaire that asked learners to quantify what they perceived to be 1) the differences in attitudes toward concepts on distance between themselves and their countrymen in general; 2) the difference between themselves and members of the target culture in general; and 3) the difference between their countrymen and members of the target culture. Acton's hypothesis is not consistent with the ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis in that he believed that if learners perceived themselves as either too close to, or too distant from either the target culture or the native culture, they would have difficulty learning the new language. His belief was that successful language learners see themselves as maintaining some distance between themselves and both cultures. But, unfortunately, the tests he used did not predict success in language learning, so further research may very well support the simpler hypothesis of ethno-lingual relativity.

Circumstantial Evidence From Study Abroad

The ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis would gain significant support if research on students studying abroad were to show that gains in language skills corresponded with gains in cross-cultural understanding. In the introduction to this paper, I alluded to experiences teaching Spanish to U.S. college students studying in Mexico. While I have no documentation to support my perceptions, I was left with the distinct impression that the periods during which the students' minds seemed to open up to new ways of perceiving the world seemed to coincide with the periods during which their language skills made great leaps. Other studies have shown students studying abroad to have had their traditional understanding of their own culture challenged. Abrams' study (in Kauffman, Martin, Weaver, & Weaver, 1992:178) of Antioch College undergraduates found that they reported that their perceptions of themselves as Americans were challenged, and Koester's study (in Kauffman, Martin, Weaver, & Weaver, 1992:182) of 2900 students who had studied abroad found that the students reported greater interest in international events and in learning, and greater understanding of the U.S. Other studies have found students who study a language abroad to make significant language gains when compared to students studying on their college campuses. Terrell (in Kauffman, Martin, Weaver, & Weaver, 1992:184-5), for example, found the average oral and written test scores for college students who had studied Spanish for one year in Mexico to exceed the scores of students with two years of study on their home campus. Clearly, the fact that both cross-cultural understanding and language skills improve during study abroad does not imply causation in either direction. Language gains can easily be explained by the increased exposure to target language input abroad; the fact that these gains correlate with increased cross-cultural understanding—another by-product of studying abroad—could be mere coincidence. Yet, when considered along with the acculturation studies discussed above which show increased language proficiency to correlate with the specific stage of cultural adjustment during which one's own world perspective is most challenged, a connection between increased cross-cultural understanding and second language gains seems plausible. Research of study abroad students that examines the correlation between gains in cross-cultural understanding and language acquisition could provide significant insights into the ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis.

Pragmatic Failure

One final area of sociolinguistic research supports the hypothesis of ethno-lingual relativity. Thomas (in Wolfson, 1989:15-18) has identified two areas of pragmatic failure

where second language learners can fail to communicate their intentions because they do not understand the differences between communicative conventions. The first area– *pragmalinguistic failure*–comes when, for example, a native speaker of English tries to translate the patterns of the English request, "Can you pass the salt?" directly into Russian. A Russian addressee would not interpret the utterance as a request and would instead hear it as a question. The second area of pragmatic failure identified by Thomas is *sociopragmatic failure* and has to do with knowing "what to say and whom to say it to" and can be caused by differences in evaluations of "'size of imposition,' 'tabus', 'cross-culturally different assessments of relative power or social distance,' and 'value judgements'" (Wolfson, 1989:17). This reasoning supports the ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis as it attributes second language communication difficulties to a failure to recognize that linguistic and cultural patterns in one's second language differ from those of one's first language.

Conclusion

The hypothesis of this paper has been that having a perspective that is not limited by one's own cultural and linguistic experiences, but rather is open to the contrasting cultural and linguistic patterns of other peoples can aid one in acquiring a second language. Several areas of research lend support to the hypothesis. Language aptitude studies have isolated an ability to induce linguistic rules which seems related to ethno-lingual relativity. The ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis receives more support from theories of motivation which associate motivation with cultural beliefs and attitudes toward the target language community. Studies of personality differences have isolated tolerance for ambiguity, which appears related to the open perspective characterized by ethno-lingual relativity. Studies of acculturation and optimal distance lend substantial support to the hypothesis in that they show a relationship between gains in acceptance of new cultural patterns and gains in second language skills. Studies of pragmatic failure support the hypothesis as they attribute second language communication difficulties to failure to understand the extent to which linguistic and cultural patterns may differ from one's own.

Further research is needed to determine whether there is a direct link between an openness to other cultural and linguistic patterns and an ability to learn a second language. Such a link could take on special significance at a time when the nature of intercultural competence is receiving widespread international attention.(e.g. Fantini, 1993) If such a connection were found, research would also be needed to determine the

range and variation in ethno-lingual relativity in the general population and what other factors could be correlated with this "openness". Furthermore, research would be necessary to discover which, if any, language skills an ethno-lingually relative perspective could facilitate. For example, could reading, writing, listening comprehension, and/or speaking skills be affected differently by having an ethno-lingually relative perspective? Could pronunciation, vocabulary acquisition, or rates of interlanguage development be more or less sensitive to such a quality—perhaps because it would cause a learner to seek more comprehensible input, or want to work more at pronunciation? As the pragmatic failure study above might suggest, would an ethno-lingually relative perspective facilitate the acquisition of communicative competence?

Depending on the answers to these questions, relevant implications might be drawn for teaching approaches appropriate for learners with different degrees of ethno-lingual relativity. If one were to determine that ethno-lingual relativity is open to change by classroom teaching, then a major implication of the hypothesis would be that foreign language teachers could increase their students' abilities to master the new language if they could find a way to open their students' minds to new perspectives. In one study, Clavijo (1984) found that teaching cultural information about South America did significantly increase students' acceptance of closer social ties with the people from South American countries. Another study in progress (Gillette, 1992) is attempting to support explicit culture teaching and empathy training as a means to raise attitudes and motivation. Both of these studies would take on even more significance if their success in increasing students' acceptance of other perspectives could be directly linked to improved second language learning abilities.

The ethno-lingual relativity hypothesis has additional intuitive appeal for those who have observed that those who succeed in learning a second language, even if it is difficult at first, often report greater ease in learning a third or fourth language. This perception raises the broader question of whether having an ethno-lingually relative perspective is more prevalent in those who have had the opportunity to come into contact with other languages and/or people from other backgrounds. If that were true, what might be some implications for teaching foreign languages to students who do not have the opportunities to study abroad or to be otherwise exposed to people of other backgrounds? What would be the demographic and socio-cultural implications of such findings? While such questions are certainly premature and beyond the scope of this paper, they are offered to illustrate some important issues that could be illuminated by further research. Given the high percentage of foreign language learners who fail to

38

master languages despite years of study in school, such investigative research might provide significant insights.

43

References

Brown, H. D. (1980). The Optimal distance model of second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 14*(2), 157-164.

Clavijo, F. J. (1984). Effects of teaching culture on attitude change. *Hispania, 67,* 88-91.

Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning , 41*(4), 469-512.

Fantini, A. E. (1993). Becoming better global citizens: The promise of intercultural competence. *Odyssey,* Fall, 1993, 17-19.

Fishman, J. (1981). Language policy: Past, present and future. In C.A. Ferguson & S. Brice Heath (Eds.), *Languages in the USA* (pp. 516-526). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13,* 266-272.

Gillette, B. (1992, October). Improving student attitudes through explicit culture teaching. Paper presented at the Penn TESOL East Fall Conference, West Chester, PA.

Kauffman, N. L., Martin, J. N., Weaver, H. D., & Weaver, J. (1992). *Students abroad: Strangers at home.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Kellerman, E. (1979). Transfer and non-transfer: Where are we now? *SSLA, 2,* 37-57.

Kohls, L.R. (1984). *The values Americans live by.* Washington, D.C.: Meridian House International.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research.* New York: Longman.

Pease, D. M., Berko Gleason, J., & Pan, B.A. (1993). Learning the meaning of words: Semantic development and beyond. In J. Berko Gleason (Ed.), *The development of language* (pp.115-149). New York: Macmillan.

44

Schumann, J. H. (1978). Social and psychological factors in second language acquisition. In J. C. Richards, (Ed.), *Understanding second and foreign language learning issues and approaches* (pp.163-178). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. *SSLA, 12* (2), 275-98.

Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whorf, B.L. [1967 (1956)]. *Language, thought, and reality.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL.* New York: Harper & Row.

45

Debating the 1990 Luso-Brazilian Orthographic Accord

Pedro M. Garcez
Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania
Bolsista CNPq, Brasília, Brazil

A case of corpus cultivation language planning is reported here: the 1990 Luso-Brazilian Orthographic Accord for the seven Portuguese-speaking countries discussed here, signed by representatives of all seven countries that have Portuguese as their official language. Socio-historical background is provided about Portuguese standardization and spread, the distribution of the language in the world today, and the development of its spelling norms. Discussion of the Accord and the ensuing debate is carried out through an analysis of the positions taken and of the arguments used by authors in a selection of scholarly and journalistic articles. These arguments are contrasted with Geerts, van den Broeck and Verdoodt (1977) who reported on a similar case. The author concludes that while most of the debate revolves around issues of linguistic efficiency, the Accord and its proponents are primarily concerned with political and diplomatic efficiency.

Brasil e Portugal travam uma guerra surda em torno de um idioma que o mundo ignora, mesmo em suas melhores manifestações literárias (Nelson Ascher, *Folha de São Paulo*, January 23, 1993).

Introduction

Language planning involves "deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes" (Cooper, 1989:45). In the present case, these efforts concentrate on the structure of the code, more specifically on the written code of the language. This is a case of *corpus planning*, in Kloss' terms (in Cooper, 1989), and of *cultivation* in Neustupny's....further discrimination of different language planning efforts (1974:35). It has to do with "the creation of new forms, the modification of old ones, [and/] or the selection from alternative forms in a...written code" (Cooper, 1989:31). In fact this is a case of what Cooper calls "*renovation* for the object of corpus planning" (1989:154). Cooper defines the term renovation as "an effort to change an already developed code,

whether in the name of efficiency, aesthetics, or national or political ideology " (p. 154, emphasis added).

The main concern here is to examine the present state of the Lusophone orthographic quest–the implementation of the 1990 Orthographic Accord that unifies the two official orthographies of Portuguese currently in effect in Brazil and in Portugal. As a speaker of Brazilian Portuguese, I have not attempted to be neutral but have tried to write an unbiased report–in spite of Gundersen's warning that "it is probably impossible for a native writer to be completely unbiased on the language question" (1977:248).

Spelling reforms seem to awaken people's language attitudes and inevitably generate heated debates: see reports for Norwegian (Gundersen, 1977), Hebrew (Rabin, 1977), and Irish (Murchú, 1977). As Rabin explains, orthographic planning affects the whole population of users of the language, and spelling changes "cannot be introduced gradually, but require an immediate willingness to change habits" (1977:172). Thus the debate, though "intended to be objective,...becomes partisan and often polemic as it goes along" (Gundersen, 1977:247). The Luso-Brazilian case is not original in this regard.

The debate around the Orthographic Accord occurs within a complex context. I provide some background on the code it modifies, and on the community of users whose language behavior it aims to influence. The following sections describe the historical development of Portuguese standardization. A sketch of the distribution of the language in the world today offers a glimpse at the socio-economic features of the nations involved, while a brief history of the development of Portuguese spelling norms locates the 1990 Orthographic Accord across time. In the presentation of the Luso-Brazilian debate, I introduce the different positions held and then discuss the various types of arguments.

The Portuguese Language and the Lusophone Community

With its earliest records traced back to the 12th century, Portuguese has been a standardized language since the 15th century. With Camões' 1572 epic, *Os Lusíadas*, modern Portuguese acquired full citizenship as a literary language. However, the first grammars and dictionaries appeared only in the 16th and 17th centuries (Spina, 1987).

The discoveries of the Portuguese navigators spread their language to America, Africa, and Asia. Today there are at least 160 million people whose native language is Portuguese, most of them in Brazil and Portugal. Five African countries have Portuguese as their official language: Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau,

44

Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe. (These are the so-called PALOP countries–
Países Africanos de Língua Oficial Portuguesa.)

Brazilian sociolinguist Elia (1989) distinguishes five stages of Portuguese
geolinguistic spread: Old (Portugal), new (Brazil), very new (the PALOP), lost (Goa,
Macao, and East Timor), and dispersed (immigrant communities). The taxonomy points
to the diversity of the Lusophone world, disallowing a definition of *speech community*
that would suit all five areas. For the present purposes, the seven countries that have
Portuguese as their official language shall be considered as the Portuguese *language
community*.

The status of Portuguese within this community varies tremendously. Elia (1989)
adapts a set of language planning concepts as labels to draw distinctions for the status
of Portuguese in the different nations: indigenous or transplanted language (i or t),
mother language or lingua franca (m or f), official language (l), national language (i.e.,
spoken throughout the country [n]), and standard language of culture (language used in
education, mass media, and literature [c]). The table below reproduces Elia's
classification, lists the main languages in each country, and offers a glance at the socio-
economic features of the seven Lusophone countries through figures for population (in
millions), Gross National Product (in billions of $US), and literacy rate (as percentage of
population over 7).

	Status (Elia, 1989)	Main language(s) spoken	Pop. 1991†	GNP 1990†	Literacy rate†
Portugal	i, m, o, n, c	Portuguese	10.42	50.7	86.0
Brazil	t, m, o, n, c	Portuguese	146.15	450.5	82.2
Angola	t, f, o, c	Portuguese & African Lgs.	10.28	5.9	41.7
Mozambique	t, f**, o, c	Portuguese & African Lgs.	14.63	1.14***	32.9
Guinea-Bissau	t, o, c	GB Creole & African Lgs.	0.94	0.176	36.5
Cape Verde	t, o, c	Cape Verdean Creole	0.34	0.281	65.5
São Tomé & Príncipe	t, o, c	Creoles	0.12	0.047	57.4

*PALOP, **added to Elia's (1989) classification, ***1991, †*Almanaque Abril* 1993

As the table above indicates, having Portuguese as the official language is
perhaps the only factor that applies equally to all seven countries. Politically speaking,

45

Brazil looms large, with a population and an economy a number of times bigger than all of the other Lusophone countries combined. Portugal, besides its tradition as a former colonial power and as the country where the language came into being, has a most important economic strength in its EEC membership. The PALOP are obviously at a political disadvantage, since they are peripheral states with minute economies, so it is not difficult to surmise what leads them to have little interest in the debate over the Accord.

We can establish three groups of countries based on two criteria: size of population and economy, and, status of Portuguese in relation to other languages. On the one hand we have Portugal and Brazil—long established nations with relatively large populations and economies, where Portuguese is universally spoken and widely written and read. On the other hand, we have the recently independent PALOP countries—where Portuguese is the only official language of government and education but has limited currency. The PALOP can in turn be grouped in two different sets: the larger mainland countries of Angola and Mozambique, where Portuguese is challenged in most domains by various African languages; and the tiny island-states of Cape Verde, and São Tomé and Príncipe, where it is challenged by the local Creole languages. Guinea-Bissau is a borderline case in terms of size and of the status of Portuguese, since it shares much of the macrosociolinguistic situation of Angola and Mozambique, while also having its own local Creole.

The existence of an indigenous language variety belonging to no ethnic group creates an unstable diglossic situation in Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe, and Guinea-Bissau. Despite the governments' positions of maintaining Portuguese as the sole official language, the prominence of the Creoles is unquestionable (Elia, 1989:39), and their standardization for official adoption is seen as a necessary step by some.[1] The following segment of the talk given by the representative of Guinea-Bissau, M. A. Henriques, at a 1983 meeting to assess the state of the language in the world, quoted in Elia, summarizes the attitude of Portuguese speakers in the three small African countries:

> Portuguese is seen as the official language, it is seen as the language of scientific knowledge, it is seen as the language for international communication....we have a profound interest in Portuguese, not only for the historic relations we have with Portugal, but also with the privileged relations that we have with Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde and S. Tomé and Príncipe, and also because, in fact, Portuguese is one of the most widely spoken languages in the world.[2] (1989:41)

In civil-war ravaged Angola and Mozambique, Portuguese is the language of the government and of schooling as well as the language of wider communication, since there are no common local creole languages. Standard Portuguese is spoken mainly in urban centers, and as a lingua franca among the different ethnic groups.[3] The sociolinguistic situation of both these countries is rather complex, and the status of Portuguese is unstable.

The numbers reported vary, but we can assume that around 25% of the population of Mozambique routinely use the language of the former colonial power, though no more than 1.2% consider it their mother-tongue ("Português é," 1993; Passanisi & Wolfe, 1991; Elia, 1989). Passanisi and Wolfe present an ethnographic account of what they term "the identity crises" of educated Mozambicans toward their language resources. They state that "a combination of national languages and Portuguese is needed as a survival tactic" (1991:33), and add that "being fluent in Portuguese has been and continues to be a primary route to general information about Mozambique, to continued state-supported educational opportunities, and to vocational access" (30).

The situation in Angola might be roughly the same, but there are reasons to believe that Portuguese has a larger currency there, since a sizable group takes it as their mother-tongue. According to Cristóvão (in Elia, 1989:32-3), 60% of the residents of the province of Luanda, which includes the capital city, declared Portuguese as their native language in a 1983 census. In the hinterland however, Portuguese has but a marginal role.

This brief sketch of the Lusophone community sheds light on the attitude of the PALOP countries to accept whatever is decided by Brazil and Portugal in respect to the future of the Orthographic Accord. Their position is consistent with Neustupny's claim (1974) that less developed speech communities are concerned with issues of language policy, and not so much with issues of cultivation such as the ones tackled by a spelling unification. PALOP language planners cannot prioritize Portuguese corpus planning when they are still struggling with status planning issues in a scenario of extremely limited economic resources. After all, Portuguese was chosen as the official language because of its advantages as a fully standardized language.

In a report on the opinions of PALOP intellectuals about the Accord, São Tomé and Príncipe journalist Conceição Lima warns:

> In a country where basic problems are yet to be solved–lack of classrooms, chairs, glass on the windows–talking about an orthographic agreement has a vaguely surrealist resonance....An Accord for a

47

population that is 60% to 70% illiterate or for people who have no reading habits, for whom orality is fundamental, and where the teachers of Portuguese have huge difficulties relating to the language they teach?! (Neves, 1991)

Despite the rhetoric implicit in the title of the 1990 Orthographic Accord, i.e. that it is an aspiration of the larger Lusophone world, it is a fact that the PALOP can hardly afford to get involved in this debate. The Accord is therefore a Luso-Brazilian enterprise.

Portuguese Spelling Norms[4]

Portuguese has a long orthographic history. Historians of the language agree about the existence of three distinct phases in the development of its spelling norms (Williams, 1938; Cuesta & Luz, 1971:335-41, in I. Castro, Duarte & Leiria, 1987:117; Houaiss, 1991).

In the early stages of codification, there was no centralized spelling rule, no orthography to speak of, since the few writers at the time used the Latin alphabet as best they could in writing down the sounds of Galician-Portuguese. The initial spelling criterion was essentially phonetic, with a few "etymological tendencies from the pen of some scribes who were used to copying and drafting documents in Medieval Latin" (Hauy, 1989:32). This "phonetic phase" lasted until the 16th century.

The influence of classical Latin and Greek during the Renaissance brought a variety of philological spellings. Pinto (1988) describes the work of 17th and 18th century grammarians as extremely concerned with orthographic norms, but yet unable to escape the contradictions of their two masters (i.e., traditional Portuguese phonetic spelling, and the contemporary cult of classic traditions which favored etymological spelling). Houaiss calls this second phase the "pseudo-etymological phase," adding that at this point "spelling becomes more difficult, and pseudo-experts who advocate the use of old-fashioned or mistaken spellings determine the history of words" (1991:11). Bueno (1967) refers to a "mixed norm," regulated by dictionary makers and independent "orthographers," which developed in Brazil as a result of the etymological tendencies active until the 19th century.

The third phase can rightly be called an orthography, since the power of the "experts" and of the law is added to the enforcement of new directions toward a simplified spelling system. As Bueno puts it, "the orthography of the Portuguese language developed all the way to 1911 without any [successful] official interference, either from the government or from the Academies" (1967:277). Houaiss (1991) calls

this the "simplified phase." More realistically perhaps, the Portuguese grammarians Cuesta and Luz call it "the period of orthographic reforms" (in R. Castro 1987:117).

20th Century Orthographies

Like other Romance-language-speaking countries, Portugal has its own language academy–the Academy of Sciences of Lisbon (ACL)–founded in 1779. The Brazilian Academy of Language and Literature (ABL) was created in the late 19th century. ACL and ABL have been the main institutions dealing with the regulation of Portuguese orthography.

Starting 1885, Gonçalves Viana, a Portuguese language scholar, devised a plan for a spelling reform, which he concluded in 1904 with the publication of his *Ortografia Nacional*. In 1911 the newly installed republican government promulgated a slightly revised version of Viana's proposal known as "the New Orthography." However, no attempt was made to consult the Brazilian government or ABL. I. Castro (1987:XI) refers to the 1911 Reform as "magnificent, but unilateral"; in other words, linguistically efficient but diplomatically inadequate.

There was domestic disagreement in Brazil concerning Portugal's "linguistic imperialism." ABL's choice to adopt the New Orthography in 1915, and the subsequent move four years later to revoke its own decision reflect that. In any case, the prevailing Brazilian opinion was that Portugal had created a schism between the two countries (Castro, et al., 1987:209). Despite the Portuguese government's optimism in a 1920 official addendum to the 1911 decree, which referred to the "enthusiastic acceptance of the New Orthography in Brazil" (Freeman, 1965:108), there was great oscillation in orthographic use in Brazil, with the press and intellectuals mostly against the New Orthography of 1911.[5]

In 1923, diplomatic efforts were started for a Luso-Brazilian dialogue, and the subsequent changes in the Brazilian political scene prompted ABL to sign a minor agreement with ACL in 1931 (Houaiss, in Augusto, 1992b; Bueno, 1967). Even though the 1931 Agreement was turned into law in both countries, "nobody seems to have taken it very seriously" (I. Castro, 1987:XI). In Portugal, it did not include items suppressing the silent consonants (see section below). In Brazil, the Agreement was promulgated twice (1931 and 1933), suspended in 1934, and reestablished in 1938 (Castro, et al., 1987).

The 1940s brought the "editorial war between the *Vocabulários Ortográficos*" (I. Castro, 1987:XI), when the two Academies published their two independent and slightly

discrepant orthographic manuals (ACL's *Vocabulário Ortográfico* in 1940; ABL's *Pequeno Vocabulário Ortográfico* in 1943). According to Bueno, in Brazil "neither the government offices nor the press took any notice of these documents" (1967:278). However, the orthographic debate soon resumed. It was fueled initially by the Brazilian government's mandate that all official documents be written according to the 1931 Agreement, and later by the ABL attempt to produce a joint *Vocabulário Ortográfico* with the Portuguese Academy, which resulted in the new (and to this date controversial) Spelling Reform of 1945.

This Bilateral Agreement of 1945 is the crux of the present call for the unification. Drafted in Lisbon by representatives from the two Academies, it was promulgated by the Portuguese government after some debate. In Brazil, the public outcry against it was such that it was never approved by the legislative body at the time. Apparently the main reason for the negative reaction was the unilateral rules on the use of accents based on European Portuguese pronunciation (Freeman, 1965:115; Castro, et al., 1987:213).

The 1943 Norm set by ABL's *Pequeno Vocabulário Ortográfico* became the Brazilian orthographic norm, in effect to this day. In Portugal, the official orthography in effect has been the one set by the 1945 Reform, ironically called the Bilateral Agreement. Thus Portuguese had two official standard orthographies. The Brazilian norm was simplified in a law of 1971, and has remained unchanged since then. The Portuguese norm was also slightly altered in 1973 (I. Castro, 1987:XIII).

Reunification efforts have periodically been made. In 1967, a group of Portuguese and Brazilian scholars met in vain to draft a project for unification. In another attempt in 1975, a proposal was drawn up but it was short-lived due to the political scenario: Brazil had a rightist military government; Portugal had just gotten rid of its fascist dictatorship through a leftist revolution in 1974. 1975 was also the year the PALOP became independent.

In 1986, representatives of all seven Lusophone countries were called for a meeting at ABL in Rio de Janeiro to reform and unify the orthographic standards of the community. The resulting document–"Analytical Bases of the Simplified Orthography of the Portuguese Language in 1945, Renegotiated in 1975 and Consolidated in 1986"– came to be known as the Orthographic Accord (R. Castro, 1987).

The 1986 Project was polemic in Portugal. The generally negative evaluation called for a revision of a number of its items. According to Houaiss, it "was considered too extreme....The strong opposition that it generated, especially in Portugal, was responsible for the failure of this agreement" (1991:14). Evaluating the 1986 Project, I.

Castro says it is both extremely conservative, since it kept the outdated bases of 1945, and revolutionary for its radical, amateurish simplifications (1987:XIII).

In 1988, ACL produced a revised version of the 1986 Project. By then the Portuguese government had set up its own counseling body of language experts, the National Council for the Portuguese Language (CNALP), which was officially called upon to analyze the 1988 Project. In June 1989, the committee issued a report pointing out shortcomings in the 1988 Project and recommending that it be accepted only after changes (CNALP, 1990). The negative report was not well received by the government, which then excluded its own CNALP from the debate (Guerreiro, 1991c).

In October 1990, the same group of representatives that drafted the 1986 Project met again to agree on a revised version of the 1986 and 1988 Projects, incorporating some of the suggestions in the CNALP report. The resulting document is the 1990 Accord–the focus of the present debate. Despite strong opposition from some groups, the Portuguese government approved the Accord, which has yet to be voted upon by the Brazilian Congress.

Political and economic instability in Brazil has prevented Congress from examining the Accord so far. In fact, it is reported that its defenders prefer that the agreement be examined after public outrage against the recent diplomatic problems between Brazil and Portugal over immigration[6] dies down (Hidalgo, 1993). In April 1993, a national conference of teachers and media professionals was held to discuss the Accord (A unificação em debate, 1993), but in general the orthographic debate seems to be muffled.

The 1990 Orthographic Accord

The Accord was signed on December 16, 1990, by representatives of the governments of all seven Portuguese-speaking countries and observers from Galicia. It is organized in 21 *bases*, or sections. Despite all the debate about the agreement (to be discussed below), the changes it proposes are relatively few, so that it qualifies as a minor spelling reform.

Some have ventured to actually quantify the extent of innovation that the 1990 Orthographic Accord wants to bring to the two official standards it aims at superseding. Couri (1992) says it affects "fewer than three thousand, or 1.98% of the 110 thousand most usual words of the Portuguese language." According to her sources, fewer than 600 words would have two spellings according to the unified orthography. Rattner (1992), citing sources from the Portuguese Academy (ACL), reports that the

51

Orthographic Accord would affect 1.6% of the words spelled in the Portuguese norm, 0.45 of the words in the Brazilian norm. Finally, Augusto (1992a) cites Houaiss as saying that Brazilians would have to spell 3% of their words differently according to the 1990 Accord—the Portuguese, 4%. As can be seen, the numbers vary and the criteria are never explicit, reflecting the emotional tone of the debate.

The Accord has three types of concerns. It regulates certain aspects already in use but which had not been specifically mentioned in previous orthographies. It introduces a series of "double orthographic standards," i.e., it makes it a rule that two spellings are acceptable for the same word depending on which "cultivated spoken norm" is represented (Portuguese or Brazilian). Finally, it introduces a few actual changes in spelling.[7]

The main spelling changes introduced have to do with the use of diacritics, or accents, the hyphen, and the silent consonants still spelled in European Portuguese (but deleted in Brazilian Portuguese).

In terms of the accents, there are two types of changes. On the one hand, the Accord eliminates the accents in three different types of vowel clusters presently used only in the Brazilian orthography, and reduces the number of obligatory differential accents to only one (*pode*, *pôde*). On the other hand, it sets optional spellings for words which are pronounced differently in Brazil and in Portugal (*gênero/género*, *Antônio/António*), or distinguished only in Portugal (*amámos*, past/*amamos*, present).

The use of the hyphen is regulated in a rather convoluted way, so that words that are presently hyphenated drop their hyphens, and vice-versa. These rules involve potential subjectivities such as not using a hyphen in compound words in which the notion of composition has been lost. There are also a number of exceptions.

The rules regarding the postvocalic silent consonants are the ones that affect the Portuguese the most. The Accord makes pronunciation a rule. The Brazilian official orthography (1943) does not have silent postvocalic consonants, so it does not have to change. However, the Portuguese presently spell a number of consonants which are not pronounced (the first in these clusters: cc, cç, ct, pc, pç, and pt). To make things more interesting, Brazilians do pronounce a few of these consonants where the Portuguese do not. This turns out to be an important issue for the debaters of the Orthographic Accord, especially in Portugal, and is discussed in further detailed below.

In addition to these, there are a few other minute changes limited to a few unusual contexts. Perhaps the most important of these is the elimination of one of the seven diacritics used in the Brazilian orthography, the umlaut or dieresis (ü).[8]

The Debate over the Orthographic Accord

In this section, I describe the arguments used by those who favor or oppose the Accord in various articles published in the Brazilian and in the Portuguese press. I do not claim this to be a comprehensive report, but rather a description of the range of arguments found in a small but hopefully representative sample of the debate. Most of the texts examined come from two series of articles published by the Portuguese newspaper *Expresso* in its magazine on June 1, 1991, and by the Brazilian newspaper *Folha de São Paulo* in a special section about the Accord published on January 24, 1993. A few other articles were also examined, most of them published in the Brazilian press in 1992.

The debate involves various groups: government agencies; educational associations; writers and journalists; language academies; the mass media; other specific groups; and public opinion (Geerts, van den Broeck & Verdoodt, 1977). The main identifiable government agency involved is the Portuguese CNALP, created in 1989 as a consulting body of language experts. The two language academies, ACL and ABL, figure prominently in the debate as the sponsors of unification. In addition to these groups, a few individuals are especially important.

The main proponent of the Accord in Brazil is Antônio Houaiss, a renowned scholar known primarily as a philologist and translator. His commitment to language planning issues is not new. Besides being a champion of the Accord, he has written on the need for standardization and renovation of scientific terminology as necessary steps for Portuguese to maintain its status as a language of culture. An ABL "immortal," Houaiss is also a member of the Brazilian Socialist Party, having run for vice-president in the near-winning ticket in 1989. In 1991, Houaiss was nominated as the Minister of Culture, and in 1993 he left the ministry to represent Brazil in a U.N. organ.

The support of such high ranking officials for the Orthographic Accord in Brazil cannot be disregarded. In addition to Houaiss, supporters of the 1990 Accord include former President, José Sarney, and José Aparecido de Oliveira, former Minister of Culture and ambassador to Portugal. They are also the proponents of the creation of an Institute for the Portuguese Language, seen by some Portuguese as an effort to promote Brazilian linguistic hegemony in the Lusophone community. The importance of these sponsors of the Accord is indicated by the headlines of the Portuguese newspaper *O Semanário* when announcing the nominations of Houaiss as Minister of Culture, "The Orthographic Accord is in Power," and of Aparecido de Oliveira as

ambassador in Portugal, "And the Institute for the Portuguese Language comes to Lisbon" (reported by Couri, 1992).

On the Portuguese side, the main supporter of the Accord seems to be the Minister of Culture, Pedro Santana Lopes, accused of neglecting CNALP's urging for further studies and modifications before the 1988 Project was approved and also of promoting a rush for the approval of the 1990 Accord in the Portuguese parliament (Guerreiro, 1991c). In addition to Lopes, the Portuguese President, Mário Soares, also favors the Accord.

These powerful debaters favor the Accord and back up the official discourse in its text. Critics of the Accord argue that they have personal interests in the implementation of the orthographic unification. Both positions are discussed in the next section.

The Positions in the General Debate

The opinions about the Accord can roughly be divided into two main camps: those who feel a unification accord is not necessary, and those who feel it is desirable.

According to the view that a single orthographic standard is unnecessary, there is no good reason to worry about changing or unifying the orthographies of Portuguese. Most of those in this camp do not question the official objectives of the Accord. Some (such as A. Renault, an ABL member, cited in Piza, 1992) call the whole thing nonsense. Others, however, highlight what they believe are more important issues, such as education of the people, literacy campaigns, or the standardization of technical vocabulary. Santos (1993) states that the allocation of resources to the Accord diverts attention from the true pressing needs of Brazil in terms of culture and education.

Roberto Cardoso Alves, the Brazilian representative who heads the committee examining the issue in Congress, is one of the few critics of the Accord who actually refers to the official objectives of the unification (Nogueira, 1992). Alves does not think that "an agreement is essential to promote the culture and the language." However, he adds that, despite his personal opinion against the Accord, he would recommend it for approval "in deference to" his friend José Aparecido de Oliveira.

Another group of debaters in this camp points to the uselessness of the Accord because, as they argue, the fact of the matter is that there are two languages involved, and that no unification reform or agreement can change this fact. They are not saying the Accord is not desirable, but that it is impossible.

In the other camp, there is a much more visible contingent of debaters. The common thread among them is the desire to have one single spelling for the entire

Lusophone community. Their views of the ways to attain this ideal differ substantially. Those concerned with reaching some unification agreement once and for all defend the Accord as it is. Others argue the 1990 Accord is too defective to qualify as a definitive solution to the orthographic quest, a position summarized in the title of an article in the Portuguese press (Guerreiro, 1991a:76-R): "From desired accord to the undesirable Accord."

Both these views are supported by various arguments discussed below. Meanwhile, a few take a position without discussing the merits or shortcomings of the Accord. José Saramago, probably the most widely read Portuguese writer in Brazil, simply says an Accord is necessary (Couri, 1992). His position is symptomatic of the entire debate, especially in light of his request that his books be published in Brazil in the Portuguese orthography. Another case in point—now from those who oppose the Accord because of its political rather than theoretical or scientific criteria—is that of University of Lisbon linguist Maria H. Mira Mateus, who refused to make further comments on the matter after the Portuguese government disregarded the recommendations made by its own body of language experts (CNALP, 1990; Guerreiro 1991c).

A common charge against the format of the Accord is that the drafting of the document was authoritarian and unprofessional (Belard, 1991; Prieto, 1992; Piza, 1992; Cagliari, 1993). Some resent the limited debate before its approval by the Portuguese government; others call for further debate in Brazil before Congress votes the Accord bill.

Finally, some opponents of the Accord suggest that a reasonable solution to the "orthographic quest" would be the mutual official recognition of both standards. This suggestion is never addressed by the proponents of the Accord in the documents examined.

The Official Discourse and the Voices of Opposition

The official discourse regarding the Accord, namely that of the drafters of the text, the two language Academies and the Portuguese government, is that a unified standard for Portuguese orthography would bring more prestige to the language and to the Lusophone community internationally (Houaiss, 1991; Riding, 1991; Couri, 1992; Houaiss, 1993). Silva and Gunnewiek summarize the strong version:

> The orthographic unification which is being pursued attempts among other things to facilitate the use of the Portuguese language in international organizations such as OAU, OAS, etc., and to liberate them from the

diplomatically painful choice between the two official orthographies presently used (1992:75).

Less grandiose versions of the argument claim that Portuguese is the only language of culture with two official orthographies,[9] and that this must be corrected "to strengthen the Portuguese language" (Málaca Casteleiro, Portuguese philologist, in Couri, 1992), and "to avoid the disintegration of the language" (Houaiss, 1991:15).

Most opponents do not question these arguments and only criticize the Accord as a bad solution to the unification question. The 1989 report issued by Portuguese language experts on the 1988 Project (CNALP, 1990) rejected it as was, but echoed the present Accord's premises that "the coexistence of two official orthographies hurt the intercontinental unity of Portuguese and its prestige in the world" (CNALP, 1990:69).

Among the opinions examined, a rare example of a critic who does refer specifically to the official discourse supporting the Accord is a Portuguese journalist (Belard, 1991). He does not question that grand objective, but reinforces it by asserting that the Portuguese norm should be the one used by the UN, since in his view,

> what makes Portuguese deserve a new status in international organizations is not the fact that there are another 20 or 50 million Brazilians, but the emergence in 1975 of five new sovereign states that have it as their official language.

While most of these critics do not embrace the cause of unification openly either, there is hardly any questioning of the official agenda, and there seems to be a tacit (perhaps unconscious) agreement among debaters that Portuguese really needs a unified orthography. Exceptions are found in the latest opinions collected. Brazilian grammarian Gama Kury, arguing against the Accord said: "It would be a merely political agreement, not a linguistic one" (in Hidalgo, 1993). A Brazilian professor of Portuguese also refers to the Accord as "above all else, a political question" (Santos, 1993).

Thus the ensuing debate involves two different frames of reference: The drafters of the Accord and most of those who favor it have the necessity of a unification as their primary concern. The ones who would like an Accord on particular grounds—linguistic, scientific, educational, or editorial efficiency—have those particular grounds as their primary concerns. Most language experts take this stance. The debaters therefore have incompatible agendas. Portuguese linguist Mira Mateus' decision to withdraw from the debate makes sense in this context since she sees no role for her purely scientific expertise in discussions with powerholders concerned with political efficiency.

Arguments

A Similar Debate

Geerts, et al.'s (1977) analysis of a similar debate over the Spelling Reform of Dutch-Flemish that unified the orthographies used in the Netherlands and Belgium guided my initial analysis of the arguments used in the Luso-Brazilian case. In fact, a remarkable similarity can be found between the types of arguments used in the two cases. The fact that both situations involve polycentric standard languages (Stewart, 1968), i.e., two variants of the same standard language,[10] seems to account for the similarity of arguments displayed.

There are, however, three great differences between the two cases. First, the Dutch-Flemish case involves two nations with contiguous territory, whereas in the Luso-Brazilian case the two nations are located in different continents and hemispheres. The second difference has to do with the status of the polycentric standard: In the Dutch-Flemish case, the orthographic norms codify the literary standard superimposed on the speakers' regional dialects, with little concern for the role of one of the centers in the unified standard. In the Luso-Brazilian debate, however, there are no regional dialects to speak of, and the concern for not letting "the other" standard prevail is great. A third difference is that the relationship between Belgium and the Netherlands involves no colonial history.

These differences are reflected in my discussion of the debate. Issues and arguments were similar in both cases, but did not always coincide, as the table below illustrates (Figure 1).

The Habituation Argument.

According to Geerts, et al., those who use this argument say that "one is accustomed to a certain spelling and, however inconsequent this may be, it will always take some time to get used to a reform and hence one would rather stick to the status quo" (1977:202). In opposition, there are those who say: "It is simply a matter of time. After a while one gets used to the new spelling and soon forgets the old" (Geerts, et al., 1977: 202). In the Luso-Brazilian debate, we find a synthetic version of the argument, expressed by the Portuguese President, Mário Soares: "We must evolve" (in Couri, 1992).

6)

Figure 1

	Arguments listed in Geerts, et al. (1977) in the debate of the Dutch Spelling Reform	Similar arguments in the Luso-Brazilian debate of the 1990 Orthographic Accord
1	Habituation	Habituation
2	Esthetic	Esthetic
3	Corruption	(insignificant)
4	Laziness	(non-existent)
5	Frequent change	Frequent change
6	Surrounding cultures	Tradition
7	Older culture	Tradition
8	Homograph	Tradition
9	Financial	Editorial
10	Etymological	Tradition
11	Word image	Instruction/Habituation
12	Instruction	Instruction
13	Social	(non-existent)
14	Revolution	(non-existent)
15	Dialect	(non-existent)
16	Prestige	Official
17	Encouragement/Discouragement	Instruction

The Esthetic Argument

Geerts, et al.'s *esthetic argument* (1977) appears in a subdued form within the Luso-Brazilian context, but it seems to have been a prominent one in the debate that rejected the 1986 Project. In fact, many of the opinions quoted in the press resound from that earlier debate, and refer to items which have been dropped in the 1990 Accord. Two examples of words "made ugly," *super-homem* and *bem-me-quer* becoming *superomem* and *bemequer*, are often cited, even though the words are no longer affected by the 1990 Accord.

The Frequent Change Argument

This is a recurring argument in the Luso-Brazilian debate, with a more comprehensive reach than described for the Dutch-Flemish discussion. Geerts, et al. gloss it as: "This is the hundredth change in a relatively short time. Can't we finally stop

making fools of ourselves" (1977:203). Although this is said often unreflectedly by those who dismiss the Accord as unnecessary, some critics also come up with theoretical support for it. A Brazilian applied linguist (Cagliari, 1993) argues that in terms of literacy the less an orthography is changed, the more valuable it is. Some Portuguese critics refer to the fact that the Accord will "reinforce the orthographic instability" of the language (Belard, 1991). Aguiar e Silva, the former coordinator of the Portuguese government's counseling commission on language (CNALP), is quoted as saying the Accord will disrupt the accepted Portuguese norm in the EEC and in the PALOP.

Of course, the counter arguement is that unification must come now, or it will be impossible in the future. Also, some say that there have been so many changes in the past without casualties, that this time it won't be worse. This is an implicit argument in the discourse of those whose concern is that there be an orthographic unification.

The Financial/editorial Argument

The *financial argument* as presented by Geerts, et al. (1977) is a major one in the Luso-Brazilian debate. It states: "Each spelling reform requires respelling and reprinting of many books and this is too expensive" (p. 204). In the Luso-Brazilian debate the argument takes various forms, and it might be better to refer to it as the *editorial argument*.

Houaiss (in Couri, 1992) sees the Accord as beneficial to the global Lusophone readership because it will enable the circulation of books which, according to him, are currently restricted to a single orthographic jurisdiction. Inês Duarte, a linguist at the University of Lisbon, argues that it is exactly "this fallacy" that makes the Accord "something similar to the emperor's new clothes." According to her, co-editions will not be possible because the Accord, by allowing for optional spellings, is in fact keeping the problem which prevented co-editions from being produced: the two standard orthographies.

In more clearly financial terms, there are critics who say that the Accord is the result of special-interest groups and individuals intending to reap profits from the publication of dictionaries, grammarbooks and manuals, since all present materials will be made obsolete. This opinion is expressed most directly by a professor at the University of Lisbon, president of the Movement Against the Orthographic Accord (Prieto, 1992). The Brazilian deputy in charge of examining the Accord in Congress has said "there are many commercial interests [behind the Accord], interests in new editions of grammarbooks, dictionaries, elementary school textbooks" (Nogueira, 1992).

Another twist of this argument is that the Brazilian publishing houses, believed to be more aggressive than the Portuguese, are interested in expanding their markets to Portugal and into the potentially lucrative PALOP school textbook business (Riding, 1991; Neves, 1991; Santos, 1993). As Cooper points out, "variability in written forms also imposes a problem upon printers and publishers, who seek as broad a market as possible for their texts . The larger the population that shares a linguistic norm, the larger the publisher's market."(1989:137) At least one Brazilian publisher, Arthur Nestrovski, validates this view, in spite of his position against the Accord (Piza, 1992). The editorial director of the largest Brazilian publishing house specializing in didactic materials, José B. Duarte, who favors the Accord, denies the charges on the basis that the Portuguese editorial market is very solid (Piza, 1992).

Interestingly enough, some critics of the Accord are the publishers who use the same *financial argument* to say that the cost of having to redo the typesetting of their collections would be huge and would jeopardize the publication of important titles now available (Piza, 1992). This turn of the argument is mentioned in Portugal as well (Neves, 1991; Pedrosa, 1991). The CNALP report against the 1988 Project also discusses the editorial argument at some length (CNALP, 1990:75-76).

The strong version of this argument develops into concerns for the real interests of some of the champions of the Unification Accord. Prieto, for instance, actually accuses Houaiss, the main proponent of the Accord in Brazil, of being interested in turning his own dictionary (under preparation) into a best-seller (Rattner, 1992).

This raises questions about the role of the language planner in the implementation of the orthographic unification. Cooper observes that in standardization efforts, language is often used as "a rallying point for the formation of national consciousness, but those who promote the language also promote themselves as a protoelite who will come to power with the political apparatus they create" (1989:69). In the light of these words, we can find some resonance to Prieto's otherwise unfounded accusations, especially when the official agenda of supranational integration and the positions held by its champions come to mind.

The Instruction Argument

Whereas in the Dutch-Flemish spelling reform this argument had to do with the dis/advantages of a simplified orthography for the children who must learn it, in the Luso-Brazilian debate the instructional consequences of the Accord are referred to within the discussion of other arguments. It is present in the *editorial argument*, since it is said that the Brazilian publishers want to dominate the PALOP textbook market, which

would mean that those countries would actually witness a spelling reform (going from the Portuguese to the Brazilian norms within the "optional norms" in the Accord). There is also concern for the state of confusion that might result from these "optional norms."

Geerts, et al. also refer to an *encouragement/discouragement argument* used mainly by Belgians in the case of Dutch-Flemish unification. According to the critics, changes in the spelling would discourage non-native speakers from learning the language. Those defending the changes argue that the simplifications would actually encourage them to learn it. This two-way argument seems to be part of the larger *instruction argument* in the Luso-Brazilian debate, the non-native speakers being mainly the PALOP populations.

Another issue (treated separately by Geerts, et al. [1977] but which seems to fall under the *instruction argument* in the present debate) is the *word-image argument*, or the different views regarding the connection of language and spelling and the consequences of that to literacy practices (Cagliari, 1993; Guerreiro, 1991b:76-R). Geerts, et al. (1977) point out that this is also a part of the *habituation argument*.

The Portuguese "Silent Consonants" Issue

As was said above, one of the reformations of the spelling proposed in the Accord is the suppression of some post-vocalic consonant letters spelled but not pronounced in Portugal. To the Brazilians, who spell only the ones they actually pronounce, this seems straightforward enough as a positive simplification for the Portuguese. For the Portuguese, however, these consonant letters are important for a number of reasons, mainly that they mark the quality of the preceding vowel as a full-vowel and not a schwa (e.g., *recepção, recessão*, the *p* is never pronounced, but the second *e* will be pronounced /e/ and /ə/ respectively; in Brazil both *e*'s are pronounced /e/ and the *p* , in this particular word, is pronounced). This issue is not new,[11] and it lies at the base of the next arguments.

The Tradition Argument

Here I consolidate three arguments treated separately in the discussion of the Dutch-Flemish debate into one. The *surrounding cultures argument* and the *older culture argument* say that the more phonetic and less etymological spelling breaks the links with the spellings of other European languages (namely French and German) and with the culture of the past (the [pseudo-]etymological phase of Portuguese spelling). Both are voiced often in Portugal but rarely heard in Brazil. The head of the Portuguese Literary Circle (cited in Riding, 1991) calls the Accord "an offense to history." The

Portuguese philologist Lindley Cintra, one of the drafters of the Accord, concedes to this argument but explains that Portugal lacks the political clout to be able to produce a unified orthography for the Lusophone world and still keep the etymological spellings.

A third facet is the *homograph argument* in Geerts, et al. (1977). It maintains that the spelling reform will produce homographs, increasing the potential of misunderstandings. This is occasionally heard in the discussion of the consonants to be suppressed in Portugal.

The Pronunciation Argument

This argument also follows from the silent consonant issue in Portugal, and its logic will not be clear to a Brazilian without explanation. According to some Portuguese purists, the new spelling will affect the pronunciation of the vowel preceding the consonant to be eliminated. They fear that people will soon mispronounce those words, since they will miss the vowel-quality indicator. This is perhaps the most outlandish of the arguments in terms of modern linguistic and sociolinguistic theory. In his analysis of the debate of the 1986 Project, R. Castro discusses similar veins of "linguistic myths" (1987:119).

Ferguson refers to "the folk belief that the written language is the 'real' language and that the speech is a corruption of it." He points out that the currency of this belief plays a role in limiting "the conscious intervention in the form of language planning that the community will conceive of or accept" (1968:30).

What seems to be at stake, however, is an emotional attachment to these spellings on the part of the Portuguese, revealing an embedded argument not found in the Dutch-Flemish debate, where there is no concern regarding the prevalence of one standard over the other. I call this the *rejection of the Brazilianization argument*. This strong argument has been in the making in Portugal for some time, and actually develops into a number of corollaries. The Portuguese linguist R. Castro (1987:118), writing about the disclosure of the 1986 Project, identified four different types of reactions to the Project among educated Portuguese writing in the press. These reactions voice concerns other than those specifically linguistic. The geopolitical type of reaction focused on the consequences of the Accord to the definition of the areas of political and economic influence of Brazil and Portugal. The geocultural reactions were concerned with the policies of cultural influence within and without the Lusophone community. Ideological reactions were marked by nationalistic and xenophobic components. Finally, those of a methodological type were concerned with the management of the process that led to the Accord.

Rejection of the Brazilianization Argument

Few of the Portuguese critics of the Accord go on record, but the journalists writing about the debate, Riding (1991), Couri (1992) and Ascher (1993) refer to the Portuguese fear of the preponderance of Brazilian norms. C. F. Alves, a Portuguese journalist cited in an article by a Brazilian correspondent in Lisbon, is explicit: "We, the Portuguese, react because we are the most harmed: now we'll have a Portuguese that is badly written and badly spoken as the one in the *novelas*" (Couri, 1992), referring to the popular Brazilian programs broadcast on Portuguese television.

As a rare PALOP voice in the debate, Cape Verdean linguist Manuel Veiga (in Neves, 1991) sees no preference for either standard in the Accord. The official CNALP report (CNALP, 1990:77) refers to the Brazilian hegemonic interests in the creation of a Portuguese Language Institute headed by Brazilian senior politicians.

The Optionality Issue

This issue is generated by the very text of the Accord, which allows words to have (optionally) variant spellings in Brazil or Portugal. Most of these words are affected by the silent consonant issue, or are to be spelled optionally with the acute or circumflex accents (é, ó or ê, ô) according to the different national pronunciation. Critics charge that this will create an orthographic chaos, especially in the few cases where regional pronunciations would trigger two optional spellings for the same word within the same country.

The real point of this argument seems to be that the predicted optionality issue raises doubts about what an orthography is. If an orthography is a set of rules, and if the problem that the Accord tries to solve is the double official orthographic standard, producing rules stating optional spellings is a serious internal contradiction. One again is reminded of the suggestion of mutual official recognition of the two orthographies.

This issue is indicative of the incompatible frames of reference which guide the different debaters. Those who defend the Accord as it is, and who implicitly espouse the view that a unification must be reached now, argue that the 1990 Accord is the only possible political compromise at this point. Those who would prefer a more careful unification agreement want a unification that is scientifically sound as well as politically possible.

Conclusion

The debate over the orthographic unification Accord for the Lusophone world reveals a community that is ambivalent about its status, oscillating between a nostalgic

and self-aggrandizing drive to unity, and a more realistic concern with conflicting interests over limited resources that restricts integration. The latest diplomatic clashes between Portugal and Brazil over immigration, for example, expose the ugly aspect of the preponderance of pragmatic considerations of a political and economic sort over the emotional considerations about cultural or linguistic commonalty. Italo Zappa, a retired Brazilian diplomat, referring to the immigration matter, could well be warning about the orthographic debate: "Portugal is a foreign country and not an extension of Brazil in Europe, as some people tend to believe on the basis of sentimentalism. It has its own interests and it is only natural that it should try to defend them" (Gryzinski, 1993).

As the post-modern world loses its single hegemonic centers, and nations rearrange their alliances, it is inevitable that the Luso-Brazilian "special relation" (Riding, 1991) also change. The debate fails to discuss this directly, either because debaters do not want to face facts (sentimentalism), or because it is ideologically less complex to refer to "cultural integration" than it is to address issues in terms of politics and economics.

In addition, the general discourse of the debate has two different referents, depending on the purposes attached to the Accord by the debaters. The fact that the debate goes on as if the participants were all referring to the same purposes gives it a certain psychotic air that is at times ridiculous and at times irritating.

Cooper points out that the language resulting from corpus renovation "fulfills no new communicative functions (1989:154). But if the new forms carry out old communicative functions, they also contribute to the nonlinguistic goals which motivated the linguistic renovation." It is thus both comprehensible and perfectly legitimate that the Accord should be driven by the political wishes of the two Lusophone nations to have a unified orthography that will allow them to claim a more tangible (economic and political) status for their (variety of the) language. Yet, if we look at the official discourse candidly, it looks as if the fuel moving the unification impetus is the obstinate idealism of those who believe that the double orthographic standard prevents Portuguese from assuming the more prestigious role in international communication and in Western culture that it righteously deserves. This, however, is hard to maintain after a careful analysis of the debate, as it is also hard to ignore that the unification would naturally yield personal and political prestige to those who help achieve it.

In spite of that, the Accord merits recognition as a successful political and diplomatic achievement. It manages to unify the orthography in two countries that shared a common past, but that inevitably have different futures. In another vein, we can say, tongue in cheek, that the Accord has a noble diplomatic goal supported by powerful

67

sponsors and interests both in Brazil and in Portugal. The 1990 Accord is thus a success if taken on the terms of its official discourse, but it attains this success at the expense of linguistic efficiency. To the chagrin of those who would like to see an orthographic unification based on linguistic criteria, it seems that the 1990 Accord is the only possible unification document that can be drafted by the two Lusophone nations at this point.

As Portugal reacted chauvinistically to defend its tradition, its nostalgic past, against carelessly sprawling Brazil, the urge to produce a unification Accord at all costs overruled most concerns with linguistic efficiency. The result is that the official argument is weak in the face of the needs of the community of users of the language, as there are few objective linguistic reasons to favor the Accord as it is. Unfortunately, it is issues of linguistic efficiency—not high on the sponsors' agenda—that the most earnest opponents of the orthographic unification cling to.

Among the various testimonies and opinions reviewed in this report, two seem to be especially telling summaries. The first is the paradoxical statement by the Brazilian congressman who heads the committee examining the Accord, who sees no real purpose in it, but who nevertheless says he will recommend it since his friend, the present Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs, wants it. The other is the statement by a Brazilian journalist at the opening of this paper: "Portugal and Brazil are staging a deaf war over a language that the world ignores even in its best literary forms" (Ascher, 1993).

Finally, the case of corpus renovation discussed here is indicative of the extent to which language planning is a political and ideological practice rather than a purely linguistic enterprise. The Luso-Brazilian Orthographic Accord for the Lusophone Community and the debate around it exemplify both the complexity of the forces that operate in language planning and the lack of clarity among language experts and users regarding what the activity is all about. It thus renders the academic knowledge about language planning an invaluable asset for language experts, which at present (at least in the Luso-Brazilian context) is not made use of in a systematic way.[12]

---

[1] Macedo (1983) and Freire & Macedo(1987) advocate the use of Creole as essential for the success of literacy campaigns in Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, and São Tomé and Príncipe.

[2] The quotations from original Portuguese language sources appearing in this paper were translated into English by the author

[3] Four main African languages are spoken in Angola, eight in Mozambique.

65

[4] I refer to spelling norms in opposition to orthography to make clear that an orthography is a set of spelling regulations that has been officially agreed upon.

5 The 1920's witnessed great transformations in Brazil, especially in the arts, emphasizing the definition of what was genuinely Brazilian and not simply transplanted European.

6 Reciprocal laws grant Brazilian and Portuguese citizens special immigration status. Due to Portugal's EEC membership and the increasing number of Brazilians entering the country to work, callings for revisions of such reciprocities have been heard in both countries.

7 For the complete official text of the 1990 Accord, see Houaiss, 1991:58-93.

8 In a recent example of the role of the press in the implementation of spelling changes, the Brazilian newspaper Folha de São Paulo quietly stopped using this diacritic.

9 To those who point out the case of English as a counter-example, Houaiss (1993) explains that the English "graphic variants" do not constitute separate orthographies. The CNALP report on the 1988 Project also dismisses the English counterexample (CNALP, 1990:70). Though it is true that the Portuguese orthographies, unlike British and American spelling conventions, are official standards based on laws, the differences can be argued to be equivalent. In fact, Cagliari (1993) argues that the differences between the Brazilian and the Portuguese orthographies are negligible as far as reading is concerned.

10 Stewart refers to the case of European and Brazilian Portuguese as an example of polycentric standardization, and to Dutch as an example of monocentric standardization. However, it is clear that in terms of orthography, Dutch (in the Netherlands) and Flemish (in Belgium) did have "a different set of norms exist[ing] simultaneously," as the call for a Spelling Reform to unify the two standards seems to prove (1967:534).

[11] The 1931 Luso-Brazilian Orthographic Agreement suppressed those consonants, but the Portuguese law promulgating the Agreement "suppressed" that item.

12 This is a revised version of a paper written in Dr. Nancy Hornberger's Spring 1993 course Research Seminar on Education and Language Planning (Educ 927). I'd like to thank the following people for their contribution in helping me gather the materials on which the present work is based: Susanne Buchweitz, Antônio Houaiss, Maria H. Mira Mateus, Anthony Naro, Marcela B. Pereira, Márcia D. Rech, Mauro S. Villar, and Branca T. Ribeiro. I am also grateful to Nancy Hornberger and Donna S. Monheit for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.

69

References

Almanaque Abril. [Abril Almanac]. (1993). São Paulo: Abril.

Ascher, N. (1993, January 24). A língua perdida. *Folha de São Paulo*, p. 4-6.

Augusto, S. (1992a, October 26). Português quer ficar mais 'culto' e 'belo'. *Folha de São Paulo*, p. 1-4.

Augusto, S. (1992b, October 26). Para Antônio Houaiss, Portugal está à frente do Brasil. *Folha de São Paulo*, p. 1-4.

Belard, F. (1991, June 1). A língua a duas velocidades. *Expresso*.

Bueno, F. S. (1967). *A formação histórica da língua portuguesa* [History of the formation of the Portuguese Language]. São Paulo: Edição Saraiva.

Cagliari, L. C. (1993, January 24). Por que não. *Folha de São Paulo*, p. 5-6.

Castro, I. (1987). Apresentação. In Castro, I., Duarte, I. & Leiria, I. (Eds.). (1987). *A demanda ortográfica portuguesa–Comentário do Acordo Ortográfico de 1986 e subsídios para a compreensão da Questão que se lhe seguiu* [The Portuguese orthographic pursuit–Commentary on the 1986 Orthographic Accord and the Debate that followed it] (pp. IX-XIX). Lisbon: João Sá da Costa.

Castro, I., Duarte, I. & Leiria, I. (Eds.). (1987). *A demanda ortográfica portuguesa–Comentário do Acordo Ortográfico de 1986 e subsídios para a compreensão da Questão que se lhe seguiu* [The Portuguese orthographic question–Commentary on the 1986 Orthographic Accord and the Debate that followed it]. Lisbon: João Sá da Costa.

Castro, R. V. (1987). A questão ortográfica e a lingüística como argumento. In Castro, I., Duarte, I. & Leiria, I. (Eds.), *A demanda ortográfica portuguesa– Comentário do Acordo Ortográfico de 1986 e subsídios para a compreensão da Questão que se lhe seguiu* [The Portuguese orthographic question–Commentary on the 1986 Orthographic Accord and the Debate that followed it] (pp. 117-128) . Lisbon: João Sá da Costa.

67

CNALP–Comissão Nacional da Língua Portuguesa. (1990). *Boletim 1989* [1989 Report]. Braga, Portugal.

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Couri, N. (1992, October 28). A nova 'flor do Lácio.' *Jornal do Brasil*.

Elia, Sílvio. (1989). *A língua portuguesa no mundo* [The Portuguese language in the world]. São Paulo. Ática.

Freeman, L. C. (1965). A history of Portuguese orthography since 1500. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. P. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word & the world*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.

Geerts, G., van den Broeck , J. & Verdoodt, A. (1977). Successes and failures in Dutch spelling reform. In Fishman, J. (Ed.) *Advances in the creation and revision of writing systems* (pp. 179-245). The Hague: Mouton.

Guerreiro, A. (1991, June 1). Do acordo desejável ao indesejável Acordo. *Expresso*, pp. 76-R, 77-R.

Guerreiro, A. (1991, June 1). A instância da letra. *Expresso*, p. 76-R, 77-R.

Guerreiro, A. (1991, June 1). A razão e a legitimidade. *Expresso*, p. 80-R, 82-R.

Gundersen, D. (1977). Successes and failures in the reformation of Norwegian orthography. In Fishman, J. (Ed.) *Advances in the creation and revision of writing systems*. (pp. 247-265). The Hague: Mouton.

Gryzinski, V. (1993, March 3). Entrevista: Italo Zappa. *Veja*, p. 9.

Hauy, A. B. (1989). *História da língua portuguesa I. Séculos XII, XIII e IV* [History of the Portuguese language I, 12, 13 and 14 centuries]. São Paulo: Ática.

Hidalgo, L. (1993, February 28). A unificação da ortografia: um tema polêmico. *Jornal do Brasil*.

68

Houaiss, A. (1993, January 24). Por que sim. *Folha de São Paulo*, p. 5-6.

Houaiss, A. (1991). *A nova ortografia da língua portuguesa*. [The new orthography of the Portuguese language]. São Paulo: Ática.

Macedo, D. (1983). The politics of emancipatory literacy in Cape Verde. *Journal of Education, 165*(1) 99-112.

Murchú, M. O. (1977). Successes and failures in the modernization of Irish spelling. In Fishman. J. (Ed.) *Advances in the creation and revision of writing systems* (pp. 267-289). The Hague: Mouton.

Neustupny, J.V. (1974). Basic types of treatment of language problems. In Fishman, J. (Ed.) *Advances in language planning*, (pp. 37-48). The Hague: Mouton.

Neves, A. L. (1991, June 1). Outros combates. *Expresso*, p. 82-R.

Nogueira, R. (1992, November 17). Acordo ortográfico aguarda votação. *Folha de São Paulo*. p. 4-1.

Passanisi, D. J. & Wolf, W. C., Jr. (1991). The social and political consequences of language planning in Mozambique. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization. 13*(1), 17-35.

Pedrosa, I. (1991, June 1). 1994. *Expresso*, p. 80-R.

Pinto, R. M. (1988). *História da língua portuguesa IV. Século XVII* [History of the Portuguese language IV, 17 century]. São Paulo: Ática.

Piza, D. (1992, November 17). Acordo ortográfico não obtém consenso entre os intelectuais. *Folha de São Paulo*. p. 3-4.

Português é a sétima língua mais falada. (1993, January 24). *Folha de São Paulo*. p. 4-6.

Prieto, M. H. (1992, November 15). De acordo com o caos. *Folha de São Paulo*, p. 3-6.

Rabin, C. (1977). Spelling reform—Israel 1968. In Fishman, J. (Ed.) *Advances in the creation and revision of writing systems* (pp. 149-176). The Hague: Mouton.

69

Rattner, J. (1992, November 17). Portugal aprova acordo, mas opiniões se dividem. *Folha de São Paulo*. p. 1-4.

Riding, A. (1991, February 15). From the pure of tongue, catcalls in Portuguese. *The New York Times*.

Santos, V. (1993, March 6). O acordo ortográfico é uma questãc secunda'ria. *Zero Hora, Segundo Caderno*. p. 7.

Silva, J. F. da & Gunnewiek, L. K. (1992). Portuguese and Brazilian efforts to spread Portuguese. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 95*, 71-92.

Spina, Segismundo. (1987). *História da língua portuguesa III. Segunda metade do século XVI e século XVII* [History of the Portuguese language III. Second half of the 16th century and 17th centuries]. São Paulo: Ática.

Stewart, William. (1968). A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language*. (pp. 531-545). The Hague: Mouton.

A unificação em debate. (1993, March 6). *Zero Hora, Segundo Caderno*. p. 7.

Williams, E. B. (1938). *From Latin to Portuguese*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Shared writing:
Students' perceptions and attitudes of
peer review

Andrea M. Mürau

Graduate School of Education

University of Pennsylvania

The purpose of this study is to consider the effect of the peer review process on writing anxiety. Does peer review foster a feeling of equality between the writer and reader and thereby reduce the writer's apprehension, or does it actually have the reverse effect—increasing anxiety due to the tension created by showing a paper to someone other than the teacher?

Introduction

Much has been written regarding writing anxiety (Raimes, 1984; Gungle & Taylor, 1989) and its effect on the writing process. Similarly, peer review has garnered its share of attention (Fox, 1980; Holt, 1992; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Mittan, 1989). Much of the research has indicated the positive effect of peer review on the writing process and ultimately, the writer's product. In Fox's study (1980) of first-language (L1) writers, he noticed a substantial reduction of writing apprehension as a result of student-centered writing instruction. Mittan (1989) notes peer review's impact on students' confidence in their writing. By working together, students realize the similar problems and difficulties that their peers share and feel less isolated. In Mangelsdorf's study of peer review in the ESL composition classroom (1992), she explores its value from the students' viewpoint. Her data revealed that most of the students viewed the process as beneficial, specifically to content and organization. However, 77% of the negative reactions were concerned with the limitations of their peers and lack of trust in their peers' abilities to critique the papers. She suggests careful organization and preparation of the review session by the teacher might prove helpful.

There is very little research, however, regarding the possible negative effect of peer review on writing anxiety. In a diary study done by Winer (1992) on graduate students in a teacher training program for ESL writing, we see a number of comments indicating a sense of apprehension at the idea of sharing writing with peers:

> I for one didn't take too kindly to the idea of some 'stranger' looking and making comments at my work....It's one thing to be labeled stupid by the teacher...and quite another to be ridiculed by a fellow classmate. (65)

> I despise having other people (peers) critique [my work]... (69)

Winer notes the students' "fear of exposure of one's work to peers" (65), but also the sense of unease at having to give criticism. George notes that peer pressure establishes an "unwritten code based on mutual protection [which] will inhibit honest, productive evaluation" (in Harris, 1992:48). Considering these aspects, (i.e. concern about being embarrassed and the subsequent pressure to keep back negative evaluation so as not to embarrass), it seems important to study students' perceptions of peer review.

The Study

The study was conducted at a weekly writing workshop. The three-hour workshop began with a one-hour writing seminar. The seminar dealt with a particular aspect of writing each week, such as doing research, organization, brainstorming and editing. The students were then divided into two groups. One group consisted of those students who had brought outside work with which they needed one-on-one help. These students met with a tutor for a one-on-one writing counseling session. The other students, meanwhile, worked through writing a draft on a topic of their choice. Usually these students brought the essay back to the workshop on following weeks and continued working through the various stages of writing: choosing a topic, free writing, developing a draft, and so on.

The workshop consisted of, on average, five to ten non-native English speakers, most of whom were graduate students or professionals. The number of students varied as the same students did not come all the time; perhaps two to three of the same students were consistently present. The workshop was run by a facilitator who conducted the seminar as well as led the free-writing and conferencing sessions. Occasionally a guest lecturer would present the seminar. An average of two to three native English speaking tutors were on hand for specific questions during the free-writing or for individual conferencing sessions.

Methodology

In order to elicit student views on peer review and writing conferencing, a questionnaire (Appendix) about student opinions and feelings was given. Over the course of two weeks, 29 questionnaires were handed out to all present: participants, tutors, lecturers, and the facilitator. Though they were filled out at the workshop, only 19 of these questionnaires were returned. The responses came from twelve NNS participants, two NS participants, three NS tutors, one NS lecturer, and one NS facilitator. The NNS participants included four Japanese, four Brazilians, two Chinese, one Mexican, and one Israeli.

Results

Questionnaire

The responses to the questionnaire showed some interesting patterns. When rating comfort level in writing in first and second language, 79% of the students ranged from comfortable to very comfortable in their first language; and, 74% ranged from middle to uncomfortable in their second language.

Table 1: Comfort Level in Writing

	very comfortable			very uncomfortable			
	1	2	3	4	5	NA	Total
L1	8	7	2	1	1	0	19
L2	0	1	8	6	1	3	19

It would seem that most students are comfortable when writing in their first language, yet this comfort level decreases noticeably when writing in the second language.

When asked which aspects of writing were easier and which more difficult, "getting started" was listed by 53% of the participants as the most difficult. Forty-seven percent of the participants listed "organization" as the easiest task, while 38% listed it as the second most difficult aspect of writing. While there was no difference between NS and NNS writers in the ranking of "organization" and "getting started," the 21% of the participants that chose "conclusion" as the second easiest aspect were all NNS.

Other difficulties listed were doing research, discussion sections, spelling and grammar, and for one student "everything" was difficult. A total of 25 comments were listed under the question of difficulty, as opposed to the 17 responses for the question

73

of ease. In general, students were aware of more areas of difficulty than of ease in both L1 and L2 writing. Through the wide range of responses to the question, it is clear that writing is a very individual process where areas of ease and difficulty vary greatly.

Table 2: Aspects of Writing

	EASY			DIFFICULT		
	L1	L2	Total	L1	L2	Total
organization	5	4	9	2	4	6
getting started	1	0	1	5	5	10
conclusion	0	4	4	0	2	2
other	2	1	3	3	4	7

With regard to peer review, 44% of the L1 writers asked peers to check their papers, and even then, most felt anxious or embarrassed, but found it helpful and necessary to get someone else's feedback. Those who did not use peer review cited a lack of confidence in their own writing as the reason. Ninety-two percent of the L2 writers used peer review, but noted more negative feelings about it than positive: "I feel depressed since I am confident in my own language"; "I feel anxious, embarrassed and delicate"; "not comfortable, really"; "even though it's corrected, I don't feel that's the best description of my idea." One student expressed decidedly positive feelings toward peer review: "English is no problem. Since my English is not my mother tongue, I can make excuse even if I make grammatical mistakes or I write awkward expressions. So, I feel relaxed."

Those NNS writers who did not use peer review, listed a lack of confidence as their reason. As one writer said, "Absolutely not, for I am little confident in writing." This echoes the sentiments of the NS writers whose lack of confidence in their own writing was the reason for not using peer review. This lack of confidence defeats the purpose of peer review: to encourage a writer's development in the relative security of one's peers. It would seem that the problem here might not be the lack of confidence in writing, but the fear of being ridiculed by peers.

When asked if participants found peer review to be helpful, 100% of both NS and NNS writers answered in the positive, even those who vehemently refused to use peer review. Each participant seemed to understand the value of the process, citing grammar and vocabulary as specific areas where it could be helpful:

> A second person can catch some minor mistakes (grammar, vocabulary) that I may have skipped. (L2 writer)

...because of my weak grammar knowledge... (L2)

...to catch surface errors... (L1)

I always need spelling correction. (L2)

...they help me regarding the specifics of English...(L2)

Participants also expressed the benefits of different perspectives and objectivity that peer review provides as well as help with clarity:

...different perspective to consider... (L1)

...they can see it from my side, but be more objective than I am...(L2)

...helpful to clarify overall organization...(L2)

Finally, discussing a piece of writing with a peer was seen to help in the development of new ideas:

...to further my ideas... (L1)

...it is helpful to get a second opinion, new idea, a start when I'm blocked... (L1)

Similar to the wide range of perceived difficulties in L1 and L2 writing expressed earlier, the uses and benefits of peer review are interpreted very differently. While some saw it as a more technical tool to aid spelling or grammar, others saw peer review as a joint process in the understanding of content.

The final question asked whether they would rather review their writing with a peer or with a tutor or teacher. This question elicited a wide range of answers. Twenty percent said they would rather review with a peer. They listed a variety of reasons. One L2 participant felt that "a tutor/teacher might not be able to see the sort of problems that a peer would." An L1 writer noted that her peers were fellow "professionals" who would be experienced in the field. The trust of a good friend also seemed to be a factor when choosing a reviewer for L1 and L2 writers. Another 20% would prefer to review a paper with a tutor or teacher because they "respect [the teacher's] knowledge of language better than with a peer" (L1 writer) or because "he can explain me in technical grounds" (L2 writer). Forty percent said either peer or tutor/teacher was acceptable:

if the peer or tutor are knowledgeable on the topic and have an interest in reading my paper, then I'm happy to have them read it. Expertise and

interest are more important to me than whether it's a prof or a tutor/peer. (L1 writer)

Both would be fine, if they are willing to comment on my writing. (L2 writer)

The final 20% noted that they would not review their writing with anyone. One L1 participant explained, "I like to do my own reviewing. I occasionally will discuss my paper topic but I never have anyone review it once the writing has begun." Another L1 writer expressed her discomfort: "I hate reviewing my papers with anyone—I am extremely self-conscious about writing. Writing is extremely painful for me—to the point of physical illness."

In analyzing the varied responses to the questionnaire, it seems all participants were aware of the benefits of peer review, whether or not they used it, but each approached it with different expectations, with varying levels of comfort, and with distinct opinions as to its applications. The responses to the questionnaire showed that while all students recognized the value of peer review, most felt nervous about sharing their writing. Considering the level of anxiety expressed in this small survey, writing teachers might want to conduct a survey of their own students before implementing peer review.

This topic is open for a great deal of further research. This study involved only graduate students who all were in different fields and for whom we can assume a certain level of writing proficiency both in L1 and L2. Also the writing workshop was a voluntary situation. The students *chose* to come; this already suggests a certain willingness to work with others on writing. The tutors were interested volunteers. As one student noted, expertise and "an interest in reading my paper" were important factors when deciding a reviewer. It would be interesting to see a similar, and more detailed study done on high school students where the competition among the students might be higher. A study where peer review is obligatory for the writer and the reader would also be interesting.

I also would suggest a further distinction be made between L1 and L2 writers and the anxiety involved in their writing. A study on whether L2 writers used a native speaker or a non-native speaker to review their papers, might shed some light on the reviewer selection process. Is a NS friend considered removed from the peer circle as a result of his/her language knowledge? Does a NNS choose a NNS reviewer because of the empathy a fellow L2 writer might feel? Does the purpose of peer review differ between L1 and L2 writers? Additional research into which aspects of peer

review create the most anxiety for L1 and L2 writers would be helpful for ESL writing teachers.

In this study, techniques such as audio tape of peer reviews and observations might have been more suitable, but were not employed because the facilitator never used peer review in the workshop during the three months I attended. Further research into peer interaction (additional interviews, observations and audio or video taping) during the review process might prove valuable.

Appendix

Questionnaire

First Language: _____

1)   How do you feel about the writing process?

	Very comfortable			Very uncomfortable	
In your first language	1	2	3	4	5
In your second language	1	2	3	4	5

2)   What part of the writing process do you find the easiest (e.g. getting started, organization, introduction, conclusion, editing, etc.)?

_____

_____

The most difficult?

_____

_____

3)   Do you ever ask a friend/peer to read or check your writing?

First Language:_____   Second Language:_____

If yes, how do you feel about it?   _____

_____

If no, why not? _____

_____

4)   So you find this process helpful? Why or why not? _____ _____

_____

_____

_____

5)   Would you rather review your paper with a teacher/tutor or with a peer? Why?

_____

_____

_____

81

References

Fox, R. F. (1980). Treatment of writing apprehension and its effects on composition. *Research in the Teaching of English, 14*, 39-49.

Gungle, B. W. & Taylor, V. (1989). Writing Apprehension and second language writers. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.) *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 235-248). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Harris, M. (1992). Collaboration is not collaboration is not collaboration: Writing center tutorials vs. peer-response groups. *College Composition and Communication, 43*, 369-383.

Holt, M. (1992). The value of written peer criticism. *College Composition and Communication, 43*, 384-392.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer review in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journal, 46*(3): 274-284.

Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.) *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 207-219. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Raimes, A. (1984). Anguish as a second language: Remedies for composition teachers. In S. McKay (Ed.) *Composing in a second language* (pp. 81-86). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Winer, L. (1992). "Spinach to chocolate": Changing awareness and attitudes in ESL writing teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*, 57-79.

79

"So what are you talking about?": The importance of student questions in the ESL classroom

Ellen Skilton and Thomas Meyer
University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

Although recent classroom research on second language acquisition has begun to focus on student discourse, there are still few studies which examine student questions and their influence in the classroom. Based on multiple observations of four classrooms in an intensive English program, the researchers investigate the factors which work together to shape question/response behavior among adult ESL learners. The coding and analysis of question types shows that in addition to sex, nationality, and proficiency, participation structures and task types greatly influence the quantity and range of communication in the classroom.

Much of previous research on teacher questions in the second language classroom has shown that they do not necessarily provide opportunities for negotiation; however, some research has shown that specific types of questions can promote communication in the classroom (Pica & Long, 1986; Long & Sato, 1983). Few studies have examined student questions and their influence on classroom discourse, specifically on the negotiation of meaning.

The study of student questions is important both to the understanding of classroom discourse and second language acquisition. If it can be shown that some types of questions lead to interaction and negotiation toward meaning, questioning behavior could be an important factor in the process of learning a second language. These findings would be particularly important for the field of ESL because teachers could create an environment which would best promote those student questions which lead to communication.

This study examines classroom questions, with a particular emphasis on student questioning behavior and the factors which influence it. There are five main influencing factors included in the study. Three are related to the students in each

class: sex, nationality, and proficiency level. Two are concerned with classroom organization and practices: participation structure and task type.

Within the field of classroom discourse, viewing questions and responses as topics of research is not new. For example, Mishler (1975) found that questions contribute substantially to power and authority relationships in first grade classrooms. He proposed the idea of an interrogative unit, or IU, which is a three–part sequence initiated by a question. For example, Mishler described a sample IU as a "question/response/confirmation sequence" in which the person in power (often a teacher) initiated a question, got a response, and confirmed the response in the form of another question. This, in turn, sustained the power hierarchy, giving the "subordinates" (most often students) less control over the conversation, and fewer opportunities to ask their own questions.

In another study concerning questions, Long, Brock,Crookes, Deike, Potter, and Zhang (1984) examined in depth the questioning patterns of teachers, wait–time, and student responses in high school ESL classrooms. In their investigation, several classrooms were studied to determine the main types of questions teachers asked, as well as the influence of teacher question types on the length, complexity and number of student responses. They found that the types of questions teachers asked (open/closed referential, display) affected student responses, but not in as dramatic a way as they had originally hypothesized. Long, et al. found that referential questions can offer more opportunities for language practice in the LEP classroom, which, they argued, may affect second language acquisition.

Whereas Long, et al. (1984) and Mishler (1975) examined teacher questions/student responses exclusively, we examined teacher questions, student questions and student responses. Although some research has focused on student initiation in the classroom (Seliger, 1977), little, if any, research has focused specifically on student questions. Long, et al.'s exploration of the relationship between teacher question type and student response was particularly useful in our analysis. In addition, Mishler's concept of questions as "interrogative units" provided one explanation for why there are so many more teacher questions than student questions.

With regard to sex differences in classroom questioning practices, we discovered little in the literature that specifically addresses this aspect of women's and men's speech. Duff (1986) found that although NNS men asked slightly more questions in her study, NNS women used somewhat longer utterances. Some studies have examined sex differences in terms of classroom participation. Pica, Holliday, Lewis, Berducci, and Newman (1991) have suggested that women and men may

exhibit different patterns of negotiation in same-sex vs. cross-sex dyads: "Results showed that negotiation was significantly greater among same gender dyads for Female NNSs and about equal in both same and cross gender dyads for Male NNSs" (Pica, et al., 1991:357). In addition, Tannen (1991) found that among her native English speaking college students, women who didn't speak often during class discussions tended to participate more in small groups.

Research on sex differences in conversation outside of the classroom context is more abundant. Some have investigated women's speech (Lakoff, 1973; Fishman, 1978), suggesting that women use more tag questions than men. Other studies have suggested that it is powerless people, and not just women, who do this (O'Barr & Atkins, 1980). In addition, several studies have investigated sex differences in terms of amount of talk (Strodtbeck & Mann, 1956; Eakins & Eakins, 1976; Swacker, 1975), demonstrating overall that men talk more than women in specific situations. Finally, Zimmerman and West (1975) found that almost 96% of interruptions in mixed-sex conversations are made by men (in Wolfson, 1989). It seems clear that male and female roles shape communication patterns. However, more research is needed to determine how sex differences affect classroom question/response behavior.

Next, we see nationality as an index of cultural/ethnic background; therefore, we refer to the nationality of the students as a variable in this study. We explore how the cultural backgrounds and expectations of students influence student questioning behavior. Heath (1982) looked at question/response behavior in elementary school, focusing her attention on the cultural mismatch between student and teacher expectations concerning questions in the classroom. Her findings showed that questioning practices in the home culture of students often differed substantially from the typical questioning practices of the "school culture." Heath criticized educators who see the solution to this problem as forcing students to adopt the norms of the "school culture", most often based on white middle-class norms. She proposed a "two-way intervention" which would require teachers to learn about and build on their students' cultural norms, while at the same time introducing the expected norms of the school.

In another study concerning cultural expectations and practices in the classroom, Sato (1982) discovered a relationship between students' ethnic backgrounds and patterns of participation in adult ESL classes. She found that Asian students, in particular, were hindered from participating fully because they felt a stronger need than non-Asian students to obtain permission from the teacher before speaking. Sato attributed the limited participation of Asian students to the mismatch between the norms of their cultures and the norms of the American ESL classroom.

The Asian students did not fully understand when it was appropriate to participate, and the teacher often perceived this misunderstanding as reluctance to participate. This, in turn, induced the teacher to "protect" the Asian students by calling on them less often.

Duff's study (1986) compared the behavior of Japanese and Chinese students in the classroom. She found that Chinese students used longer utterances, took more turns, asked more questions and interrupted more than their Japanese peers.

Proficiency level has also been investigated as a factor influencing amount of student talk in the ESL classroom. Findings suggest that students of higher proficiency may participate more (Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, & Todesco 1978). Not only do higher proficiency students participate more, they may also participate differently: Brock (1985) and Rulon and McCreary (1986) have found that these students made fewer clarification requests. It has also been suggested that higher proficiency students may get more from input in the classroom (Strong, 1983).

With respect to classroom organization and practices, there have been several studies done on participation structure and task type and how these factors affect classroom talk. For example, some studies have investigated how participation structure (i.e. teacher-fronted vs. small-group work) and task type (i.e. jigsaw, debate) can influence negotiation and interaction in the classroom. Although questions were mentioned in these analyses, questioning behavior was not the primary focus of these studies. Long, Adams, McLean, and Castaños (1976) compared the amount of participation in peer groups with teacher-directed classrooms, and found substantially more interaction during group work. Others (Rulon & McCreary, 1986; Gaies, 1983) have also focused on the role of participation structure in fostering meaningful communication in the classroom and have confirmed the positive benefits of peer group interaction.

Task type has also been investigated as a variable in ESL classroom practices. Duff (1986) pointed out that different task types and the roles students play in completing them greatly influence turn-taking and language production. In her comparison of interaction during a problem solving task and a debate, she found that nearly twice as many questions were asked during the problem solving task. However, slightly more comprehension checks and clarification requests were asked during the debate. Pica and Doughty (1985) and Doughty and Pica (1986) investigated the difference between required and optional information exchanges and found that students participate more (and ask more questions) when the task requires an exchange of information. In addition, they found that participation structure also influenced interaction, finding that students in small groups interacted more than they

did in teacher-fronted classrooms. Their analysis is of particular importance because they investigated how both participation structure and task type influence classroom communication patterns. Building on their work, we are specifically interested in the ways that participation structure and task type influence student question-response behavior.

The Study

The data for this study came from observations of four ESL classrooms. We observed two intensive English program intermediate level classes; one taught by an African-American male (Classroom 3), and the other by a Caucasian female (Classroom 2). In addition, we observed two advanced classes: one intensive English class taught by a Caucasian female (Classroom 1), and a freshman writing class taught by a Latino male (Classroom 4).[1]

Classroom 1 had 8 men and 2 women (for a total of 10 students), from Japan, Taiwan, Venezuela, and Mali. Classroom 2 had 7 men and 3 women (10 students), from Japan, Korea, Cyprus, Peru and Brazil. Classroom 3 had 3 men and 4 women (7 students), from Japan, Mali, Spain, Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. Classroom 4 had 8 men and 5 women (13 students), from Senegal, Vietnam, China, and Hong Kong.

From the videotapes, audiotapes, and fieldnotes, we transcribed the questions and responses of teachers and students. Due to the complex nature of the classroom as well as the limitations of video and audio equipment, it was impossible to isolate every question and response, particularly during small-group work. As a result, there were some questions we were unable to transcribe fully; these questions were discarded. We were able to collect and analyze a majority of the questions and responses which occurred in the classroom.

The categories employed by Long and Sato (1983) were used to code the different question types. For the purposes of this paper it was necessary to use six of their seven: 1) expressive, 2) display, 3) referential [open/closed], 4) confirmation check, 5) comprehension check, and 6) clarification request. We did not include the seventh type, rhetorical questions, because this type was not represented in our data. In order to establish intercoder reliability, we first looked at a transcript and collaborated in assigning each question to a category. Then, independent categorizing of another section of the transcript and a comparision of the codings was done to see if there were discrepancies. Finally, we categorized the remaining

questions independently, discussing those that did not fit easily into a category. Questions on which we could not agree were discarded.

Because form does not always imply function, it was necessary to pay close attention to the context in which each question was asked, and the response which was given. As a result, we found that many utterances which appeared to be questions actually functioned in other ways (i.e. expressives). Furthermore, some questions had the exact same form, but were placed in different categories (e.g. confirmation checks, clarification requests). In conjunction with the coding of question types, we kept careful records of who asked each question (i.e. teacher, student), the sex and nationality of the speaker, what the participation structure was at that time (e.g. teacher-fronted, small-group), and the type of task which the participants were engaged in (i.e. student-student interviews, audio listening comprehension activity).

In addition to the collection of teacher and student questions/responses, we also collected data from student questionnaires (Appendix) and teacher interviews to gain insights into perceptions concerning the use of questions in the classroom. Finally, we used data collected from student proficiency reports completed by the teachers at the end of each term. We wanted to investigate the connection between English proficiency and questioning behavior and felt that the level in which the student was placed might not accurately reflect the students' proficiency in English.

Findings

An overview of the data shows, not surprisingly, that teachers asked a larger total number of questions than the students (Table 1). Teachers asked a total of 669 questions while students asked 327. The majority of student questions occurred during small-group activities (206 or 63%), while teacher questions were more common during teacher-fronted activities (570 or 85.2%). Teachers also showed a wider range of questions asked; they used questions from all six categories with frequency. Students mainly used questions from three of the six categories (referential, confirmation check, clarification request). We did not find any student display questions. Instead, students asked closed referential questions (115 or 35.2% of total student questions asked), open referential questions (47 or 14.4%), confirmation checks (107 or 32.7%), clarification requests (53 or 16.2%), expressives (3 or .9%), and comprehension checks (2 or .6%). Only 29 of the 40 students in the study asked questions.

Table 1: Question Types

	Classroom 1		Classroom 2		Classroom 3		Classroom 4	
	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	Student
Expressive								
teacher-fronted	5	1	18	1	20	0	9	0
small-group	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0
Display								
teacher-fronted	11	0	34	0	22	0	3	0
small-group	3	0	1	0	4	0	0	0
O. Referential								
teacher-fronted	52	5	18	0	28	0	29	5
small-group	9	15	4	19	13	3	0	0
C. Referential								
teacher-fronted	53	23	14	8	24	5	37	14
small-group	17	27	6	35	13	3	0	0
Comp. Check								
teacher-fronted	6	0	31	0	27	0	9	0
small-group	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Conf. Check								
teacher-fronted	23	10	19	15	21	8	34	10
small-group	2	37	1	21	16	6	0	0
Clarification								
teacher-fronted	10	4	7	1	1	2	5	9
small-group	0	24	0	10	7	3	0	0
TOTAL	191	14?	153	112	199	30	126	38

Furthermore, contrary to previous research (Early, 1985; Long & Sato, 1983; Pica & Long, 1986) which reported comprehension checks as the most common teacher question type, we found very few (only 73 or 10.9% of total teacher questions asked). One teacher was quite surprised that she had not asked any comprehension checks, because she thought she used them frequently. We were also surprised by the relatively low percentage of teacher display questions in the data, as these are often cited as a common teacher question type (Long & Sato, 1983). Teachers asked closed referential questions (164 or 24.5%), open referential questions (153 or 22.9%),

confirmation checks (116 or 17.3%), clarification requests (30 or 4.5%), expressives (55 or 8.2%), and displays (78 or 11.7%).

Sex

Based on previous research we expected to find significant differences where sex was concerned. We expected that men would ask more questions than women and that men and women would ask different types of questions. The teachers had differing opinions concerning sex and questioning practices in the classroom. All of the teachers expressed the belief that the sex of a student has some influence on question behavior, but only one thought that sex was particularly influential. Our data shows that the 20 men and 20 women in the study asked different amounts of questions depending on the participation structure: men asked more questions than women during teacher-fronted activities and women asked more questions than men during small-group activities. In fact, in one class (Classroom 2), women didn't ask any questions at all during the teacher-fronted activities. Furthermore, in this class there were only three women, which may indicate that in classes where there are fewer women than men, women ask less questions. In two other classrooms, where there was a larger number of women than men, women asked more questions. Overall, it is interesting to note that male students asked twice as many closed referential questions, and women used somewhat more clarification requests (Table 2).

Table 2: Question Type and Sex*

	Men	Women
Expressive	2	0
Display	0	0
Open Referential	23	24
Closed Referential	75	40
Comprehension Check	2	0
Confirmation Check	54	54
Clarification Request	32	21
Total	188	139

*Observation 1, 20 men/20 women; Observation 2, 20 men/16 women

Nationality

We also believed that nationality would be a major variable in terms of questioning behavior in the classroom: we thought that people from some countries would ask different amounts and types of questions than those from others. It was also thought that there might be a mismatch of assumptions brought to the classroom by the teachers and students. We did not find substantial support for any of these

assumptions, but we did find some data which indicates that nationality could affect question behavior. For example, supporting what two of the teachers stated, some of our findings showed that Japanese and Korean women tend to ask fewer questions than women of other cultures during teacher-fronted activities (Table 3).

Table 3: Question Types by Nationality

	Expressive	Display	Open Referential	Closed Referntial	Comp. Check	Conf. Check	Clar. Request
Japan (9)	1	0	5	22	0	26	6
Korea (5)	1	0	13	21	2	22	7
Taiwan (4)	0	0	10	14	0	19	10
S. Am. (3)	0	0	8	26	0	21	6
Viet. (2)	0	0	3	4	0	5	3
Africa (2)	1	0	3	14	0	11	16
China (2)	0	0	6	18	0	12	5
H. K. (1)	0	0	2	6	0	3	2
Spain (1)	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
USSR (1)	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

In addition, we found evidence which contradicted our beliefs that teachers and students have different assumptions about what student questioning behavior should be in the classroom. All of the teachers and 91% of the students surveyed agreed that students should ask questions in class. However, in terms of behavior, many students did not ask questions in class. We found that there were many students who reported similar questioning behavior in their own country and in the United States. These students tended to accurately describe their questioning behavior. However, there were many other students who inaccurately described their behavior, asking fewer questions than they reported they did. Furthermore, many of these students reported asking few questions in classrooms in their home country. Many of these ESL students believed that they should adjust their behavior to meet the norms of the American classroom and/or thought that they adjusted their norms, but in reality did not.

Student Proficiency Level

Another factor influencing student questions is the English proficiency level of the students within a classroom. We organized this study in such a way that we could compare the questioning behavior of intermediate and advanced students in the program to see if differences in language proficiency seemed to influence questioning behavior. We found, however, that there was no obvious correlation between level and questioning behavior: Classroom 1 (advanced) and Classroom 2 (intermediate) had a

higher number of student questions than Classroom 3 (intermediate) or Classroom 4 (advanced) (Table 1).

Because individual student proficiency varies within classrooms of a particular level, we decided to look at other measures. Upon examining teacher reports on student proficiency and performance, we made two interesting discoveries. First, proficiency level did not seem to effect the number of questions students asked, but rather the *types* of questions they asked. The students who had a lower proficiency as reported by the teachers asked more confirmation checks and clarification requests, thus confirming earlier findings (Brock, 1985; Rulon & McCreary, 1986). Second, students who asked more questions did not necessarily receive a higher performance evaluation than others and vice versa, even though teachers reported that it was desirable for students to ask questions. In fact, one writing teacher explained that her best writers asked very few questions. In addition, the teachers we interviewed felt that student questions were important for a variety of reasons: 1) they serve as signals to teachers about the level of students' understanding; 2) they enable students to check their understanding; and, 3) they allow students to direct their learning.

Participation Structures

We found two main types of participation structures in these classrooms: teacher-fronted and small-group. Classrooms varied in the amount of time spent within each participation structure (Table 4). In addition to influencing who asked questions, these structures also seemed to greatly influence the number of questions asked (Table 1). In the teacher-fronted activities, students asked far fewer questions than during small-group work (18.6% of student questions were asked during teacher-fronted activities as opposed to 81.4% during small-group activities).

Table 4: Classtime and Participant Structures
Observation 1

	Classroom 1	Classroom 2	Classroom 3	Classroom 4
Teacher-fronted	25 min.	45 min	35 min	45 min
Small-group	65 min	35 min	40 min	0 min

Observation 2

	Classroom 1	Classroom 2	Classroom 3	Classroom 4
Teacher-fronted	81 min	65 min	55 min	40 min
Small-group	5 min	25 min	25 min	0 min

In addition, we found overall that students asked far more open referential questions, confirmation checks and clarification requests during small-group activities than during teacher-fronted activities. For example, this selection from an advanced writing class (Classroom 1) shows the use of clarification requests and confirmation checks in small-group work.

Student 1	Student 2
Easy reading? You mean that?	*Yeah*
Wait a minute, you mean easy reading, or you means reading?	*Whatever you want.*
Please, what did you say? It's your opinion so what did you say?	*I say reading.*
So what do you mean?	*Somebody reading.*
Read a lot, right?	*Yeah.*
So this is a quality of a good writer?	*Yeah*

Extended negotiation of meaning of this type was found only during small-group work. This example further supports the notion that confirmation checks and clarification requests serve as "indicators of interaction" (Chaudron, 1988:131), promote communication, and potentially enhance acquisition. This is not to say that all small-group structures promote student questions. In one case the teacher moved from group to group and when present asked most of the questions (Classroom 3). Therefore, it is important for teachers to be aware of their influence on small-group work so that activities which are meant to be student directed do not become teacher-fronted, thus inhibiting student questions.

Task Type

A factor related to participation structure is task type. It is important to see the connection between these two factors because they are often covariables and can both influence opportunities for communication in the classroom. We cannot assume that a particular task type or participation structure will always generate student questions. For example, in one class (Classroom 3), the teacher placed the students in groups and had them report on their answers to two questions. Although one might expect much student-student negotiation and interaction in this context, our findings do not support this assumption, as the following excerpt shows.

Teacher	Student
Eva, how about you/	I thought it would be rich.
Have you been to many places besides Philadelphia?	Just a little bit.
When you say rich, do you mean that you thought everyone would be rich?	Uh huh.
So there were no poor people?	Uh huh.
OK, I understand. How about something else people thought?	

Although the participation structure might lead one to expect many student questions, the task type did not require the students to negotiate meaning or seek information: two authentic reasons for asking questions. That is to say, although the students were arranged in small groups, the task was such that the students reported information in response to teacher questions. They therefore did not have the opportunity or the need to ask questions of their own.

Task type does appear to significantly affect the number and type of questions asked. For example, in Classroom 1, a task was to complete a questionnaire as a group:

S3:   (reads question from paper) What qualities does a good writer have?
S2:   Clear, clear thinking.
S3:   Clear thinking. Clear thinking, what? Uh, and grammar, knowledge.
S2:   Yeah, something like that.
S3:   Something like that.
S2:   (laughs) You are so clever, you can think about that.
S3:   Oh. Thank you very much (Ss laugh).
S2:   You're welcome.
S3:   Grammar, knowledge. I dunno, uh, knowledge...
S2:   Asako just mentioned about logical.
S1:   Logical.
S3:   Logical?
S1:   Logical.
S2:   Is this the same as clear thinking?
S3:   Yeah, uh, ask Ms. B. Ms. B., is logical the same thing as, uh, what?
S1 & S2: Clear thinking.
S3:   Clear thinking?
T: Clear thinking and logical thinking. They're extremely similar.
S3:   Similar?
T: Similar, yeah.

In this example, the teacher acted as a resource as the students attempted to communicate their opinions concerning good or bad writing. This activity created a fairly equal distribution of referential questions, confirmation checks and clarification requests among the students as a whole. Furthermore, this activity generated a larger number of clarification requests and confirmation checks than did any of the other tasks.

In another of the classes we observed (Classroom 2), students were placed in two groups. In each group, one student (S2) played a character from the text, and the other students interviewed him/her.

S1- *How old are you?*
S2- *Forty-five.*
S3- *Why do you come here?*
S2- *Me?*
S3- *How old is your son?*
S2- *My son is sixteen.*
S3- *Is he a high school student? Is there any problem with your son study?*
S2- *I want him to be a white collar worker, like maybe a doctor or lawyer...*
S4- *You change when you come here?*
S5- *You have the same.... you have a house, a car, you have the same thing?*
S3- *You were a translator. His job was a translator (to group).*
S2- *I am worrying about my son so I go to America.*
S3- *Where you live here?*
S2- *In New York.*

We found that in this class, there were far more student-asked referential questions than clarification requests and confirmation checks (Table 5).

Discussion

Our findings support the role of confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and clarification requests in the negotiation of meaning (Long & Sato, 1983; Pica & Long, 1986). If this kind of negotiation is an aid in acquisition, it is encouraging to see that these question types made up approximately 49.5 % of student questions and approximately 32.7% of teacher questions.

Our findings also suggest that teachers play an important role in creating classroom environments that are conducive to student questions. We believe that although it is important for teachers to understand the affect of their students' sex, nationality and proficiency on their questioning behavior, it is just as important to have a clear understanding of how task type and participation structure affect questioning

Table 5: Task and Student Question Type

	Expres.	Display	O. Ref.	C. Ref.	Comp. Check	Conf. Check	Clar. Request	Total
S-S Interview 40 min	0	0	14	32	1	14	9	70
Group Quest. 65 min	0	0	14	27	0	37	24	102
Audio Listening Compre 115 min..	0	0	0	9	0	14	2	25
S-S Report. 40 min	0	0	3	2	0	5	3	13
S-T Report. 45 min	0	0	5	5	0	5	5	20
Teacher-led Disc. 80 min	0	0	3	15	0	7	1	26
S-T Conf. 65 min.	1	0	2	16	0	4	7	30
S-S Role Play 20 min	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	5
Info. Exchang 25 min	0	0	6	3	1	7	2	19

behavior. These are factors which the teacher can control, thereby enabling their students to participate more in the classroom.

In addition, we found that particular combinations of factors influence each other in affecting questioning behavior. For example, it was often difficult to examine participation structure without taking task type into consideration. This became evident as we saw "group work" generating different types and amounts of questions based on the task. In Classroom 1, students were placed in a group activity which necessitated student clarification requests and confirmation checks, whereas in Classroom 2, the group activity generated student referential questions, and in Classroom 3, the small-group activity included only a few student questions.

Futhermore, it may be possible that there is a hierarchy such that some factors are more important than others. For example, our data indicated a tendency for Japanese and Korean women to ask more questions in small groups than in teacher-

fronted participation structures. Here, sex, nationality, and participation structure all seem to influence question/response behavior, but the relative importance of the factors is not evident.

In conclusion, student questions are important to study not only because of the lack of research on their role in classroom discourse, but also because of their potential in promoting negotiation and interaction, and possibly enhancing language acquisition. We began this project assuming that we would limit our study to sex and nationality; however, we found that there were additional factors that needed to be considered in our examination of student questions. Future research should investigate how sex, nationality, proficiency, task type and participation stucture all interact to influence students' communication in the ESL classroom.[2]

---

[1] In this intensive English program, there are five levels, with "1" indicating beginning level and "5" indicating the most advanced level. Students are placed according to performance on an oral interview and a holistic writing test. There are also freshman-level composition courses for non-native speakers. Students are also placed in these courses based on a holistic writing sample. For this study, we collected data from two Level 3 classes (intermediate), one Level 5 class (advanced), and one NNS freshman composition class (advanced).

[2] A version of this paper was presented at Penn TESOL East Fall Conference, October 31, 1992 at West Chester University, PA.

Appendix
Questionnaire

Name: Level:

Age: Teacher:

Country of Origin: Gender:

Languages Spoken:

How long have you been in this country:

1. In the American ESL classroom, how often do you ask questions? (Circle one)
    never   hardly ever   sometimes   often   very often

2. In the American ESL classroom, how often does your teacher ask questions?
    never   hardly ever   sometimes   often   very often

3. In a classroom in your country, how often do you ask questions?
    never   hardly ever   sometimes   often   very often

4. In a classroom in your country, how often does a teacher ask questions?
    never   hardly ever   sometimes   often   very often

5. Do you think students should ask questions in class? Why or why not?

6. Do you think a teacher should ask questions in a class? Why or why not?

7. Do you think it is a good idea for teachers to call on students by name during class? Why or why not?

8. During class, what do you do when you don't understand something?

References

Brock, C. A. (1985). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *Occasional Papers I*. University of Hawaii, Honolulu: Department of English as a Second Language.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. & Pica, T. (1986). Information gap tasks: Do they facilitate second language acqusition? *TESOL Quarterly, 20*. 305-325.

Duff, P. (1986). Another look at interlanguage talk: Taking task to task. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*, pp. 147-181. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Eakins, B., & Eakins, G. (1976). Verbal turn-taking and exchanges in faculty dialogue. In B. B. Dubois & I. Crouch (Eds.), *The sociology of the languages of American women*. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University.

Early, M. (1985). *Input and interaction in content classrooms: Foreigner talk and teacher talk in classroom discourse*. Unpublished Ph.L dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.

Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Fishman, P.M. (1978). Interaction: The work women do. In *Social Problems, 25* 397-406. Reprinted in B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, Gender, and Society,* 1983, pp.89-101. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gaies, S. J. (1983). Learner feedback: An exploratory study of its role in the second language classroom. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*, pp. 190-212. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Heath, S. (1982). Questioning at home at at school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and women's place. *Language in Society* 2(1) 45-80. Reprinted in *Language and women's place*, 1975, pp. 3-50. New York: Harper Colphon Books.

Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics 4*: 126-141.

Long, M., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castaños, S. (1976). Doing things with words: Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In J. S. Fanselow & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '76*, pp.268-285. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M. & Sato C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition*, pp. 268-285. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M., Brock, C., Crookes, G., Deike, C., Potter, L., & Zhang, S. (1984). Effects of teachers questioning patterns and wait-time on pupil participation in public high school classes in Hawaii for students of limited English proficiency. Technical Report No. 1, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu.

Mishler, E. (1975). Studies in dialogue and discourse: Types of discourse initiated by and sustained through questioning. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research 4*(2): 99-121.

Naiman, N., M. Fröhlich, Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

O'Barr, W. M. & Atkins, B. K. (1980). "Women's language" or "powerless speech"? In

Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparision of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input and Second Language Acqusition*, pp. 115-132. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., Berducci, D. & Newman, J. (1991). Language learning through interaction: What role does gender play? *SSLA, 13* (3): 343-376.

1ა9

Pica, T. & Long, M. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*, pp. 85-98. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Rulon, K. & McCreary, J. (1986). Negotiation of content: Teacher-fronted and small group interaction. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*, pp. 182-199. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sato, C. (1982). Ethnic differences in ESL classroom interaction. In W. Rutherford & M. Hines (Eds.), *On TESOL '81*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Seliger, H. W. (1977). Does practice make perfect? A study of interaction patterns and L2 competence. *Language Learning* 27: 263-278.

Strodbeck, F. L., & Mann, R. D. (1956). Sex role differentiation in jury deliberations. *Sociometry* 19:3-11.

Strong, M. (1983). Social styles and the second language acquisition of Spanish-speaking kindergartners. *TESOL Quarterly 17*: 241-258.

Swacker, M. (1975). The sex of the speaker as a sociolinguistic variable. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.),*Language and sex: Difference and dominance,* pp. 76-83. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Tannen, D. (1991). How men and women use language differently in their lives and in the classroom. *The Chronicle of Higher Education 37*: B1-B3.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. New York: Newbury House.

Zimmerman, D. H. & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversations. In B.Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*, pp. 105-129. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.