DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 709 FL 025 207

TITLE	Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education, 1996.
INSTITUTION	Texas Univ., Austin. Foreign Language Studies Center.
ISSN	ISSN-0898-8471
PUB DATE	1996-00-00
NOTE	93p.; For individual papers, see FL 025 208-211.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education; v2 n2 Sum 1996
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cloze Procedure; *English (Second Language); Essays; Foreign Countries; Foreign Students; Higher Education; *Instructional Materials; Language Proficiency; Language Research; Language Teachers; Persuasive Discourse; Program Effectiveness; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Second Language Programs; Teacher Education; *Teaching Assistants; Test Validity; Videotape Recordings; *Writing Processes
IDENTIFIERS	Koreans; South Korea

ABSTRACT

Papers on foreign language education include: "The Message Is the Medium: Using Video Materials To Facilitate Foreign Language Performance" (Thomas J. Garza), which explores the use of this medium to enhance commonly-used non-communicative or text-bound teaching materials; "Product and Process Aspects of NES/EFL Students' Persuasive Writing in English: Differences Between Advanced and Basic Writers" (Jin-Wan Kim), which finds that writing quality depends on process, product, and proficiency level; "An Investigation of the Effectiveness of Foreign Language Training Programs for TAs: An Exploratory Study" (Zena T. Moore, Barbara Bresslau), an investigation of training for teaching assistants at one university; and "The Concurrent Validity of the Cloze Test with Essay Test Among Korean Students" (Soyoung Lee), reporting on results and practical and theoretical implication of a study in Korea. (MSE)

ISSN # 0898-8471

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 2 Number 2 Summer 1996

Articles

Research Review

Foreign Language Education Program

The University of Texas at Austin

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education
(TPFLE)

TPFLE is the official journal of the Foreign Language Education Program of the University of Texas at Austin.

Publication of TPFLE has been made possible by a grant from the **RGK Foundation** of Austin, Texas.

Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education

Volume 2 Number 2 Summer 1996

Articles

Research Review

Foreign Language Education Program

The University of Texas at Austin

Contributors

THOMAS J. GARZA is assistant professor of Slavic Languages and a member of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Foreign Language Education Program at the University of Texas at Austin. His primary research interests focus on the development of language proficiency through the use of technology interfaces.

JIN-WAN KIM completed his Ph.D. dissertation in Foreign Language Education at the University of Texas at Austin. His research interests include second language writing/reading and second language acquisition.

ZENA T. MOORE is assistant professor in the college of education at the University of Texas at Austin. Although her primary area is in foreign languages she moves beyond the traditional horizons by including in her research aspects of languages and cultures with special emphasis on popular cultures.

BARBARA BRESSLAU is a doctoral candidate in Foreign Language Education at the University of Texas at Austin. Her research interests include cultural learning and bilingualism.

SOYOUNG LEE completed her Ph.D. dissertation in Foreign Language Education at the University of Texas at Austin. Her research interests include foreign language testing.

MI-AE LEE completed her master's degree in Foreign Language Education at the University of Texas at Austin. Her research interests include issues on language learning strategies and the Vygotskian approach to second language acquisition.

The Message is the Medium:
Using Video Materials to Facilitate Foreign Language Performance

THOMAS J. GARZA

In connection with ongoing efforts to promote proficiency in communicative performance of language students, instructors of foreign languages and ESL/EFL continually seek to make maximum use of precious limited contact hours in the classroom to provide the learners with the most beneficial combination of language and culture in authentic situational contexts. This paper offers an overview of the past twenty years of research and practice in the application of video-based technology in foreign language teaching, and explores the video medium as a potential remedy to commonly used non-communicative or text-bound teaching materials. Practical recommendations for developing and incorporating video materials -- especially authentic media -- into the teaching of language and culture at all levels, from beginning to advanced.

Providing a Context for Communicative Performance

Well over two decades have passed since the foreign language teaching community was awakened to the potential of the theory and practice of "communicative competence" through the works of Hymes (1968, 1972) and Habermas (1970) who provided, respectively, sociolinguistic and structural linguistic interpretations of the term. Throughout the 1980s, pedagogical interpretations and adaptations of "communicative" methods and materials in foreign language teaching -- especially in English as a Second or Foreign Language -- have developed along the lines of Hymes' (1968) notion based on linguistic variability and the relationship between language and actual situational speech roles. He contends that communicative competence describes "what a speaker needs to know to communicate effectively in culturally significant settings" (p. 36).

Such notions of situationally and culturally appropriate "performance" in a foreign language were of paramount importance during the nascence of the proficiency movement and remain the foundation of many performance-based curricula and materials at present. In short, to address communicative competence in the classroom, foreign language teachers have become acutely aware of a universal observation: students require more than good grammar skills and broad vocabularies to make them proficient participants in authentic foreign language situations. Indeed, many students know the frustration of trying to master a foreign language to near-textbook perfection, memorizing interminable lists of lexicon and irregular verb conjugations, declensional paradigms, rules of syntax, and spending hours in the language lab repeating minimal pair drills, only to arrive finally in the foreign country to encounter a din of unintelligible utterances, an array of unfamiliar social situations, and be unable to report a problem to the hotel manager or to place long-distance phone call through an operator. Stevick (1983) offers the following amusing, yet accurate, example of a non-communicative exchange between a native speaker of English and an ESL student:

- You (with your arms full of books): *'Do you think you could open that door?'*
- Student (without moving to the door): *Yes, I do.'*

The student in Stevick's example clearly understands the individual linguistic elements of the utterance of the native speaker of English and, in turn, produces a grammatically correct response. Yet this level of understanding and response, while *linguistically* accurate, fails in terms of communicative performance.

For the purposes of this discussion, the term "communicative performance" describes the student's ability to comprehend and produce language appropriate for a given situation so that all utterances are understood by all participants in the exchange. Such a definition implies tenets of sociolinguistics and discourse analysis which run contrary to purely structural/grammatical approaches to language learning, sometimes even opting for a "nonstandard" (albeit correct!) usage of language in particular communicative situations. As students and teachers alike continue to voice the need to develop active listening and speaking skills -- the foundation of communicative performance -- the search of methods and materials of instruction to address this need continues to intensify.

Emerging quickly from this search was the realization that, even in the very best of the so-called "communicative" textbooks and materials of the 1980s, there was a serious dearth of authentic speech models with which the student could practice both aural comprehension and active oral production in the foreign language. "Authentic" speech models is understood here as examples of situational language use by native speakers as understood by other native speakers. Further, when trying to present authentic language situations for study, printed texts with still photographs and illustrations (the principal classroom interface for most of our students in secondary school- and university-level language programs), even with the addition of audio tape recordings, still lack the dynamic quality necessary to provide an active context to present and work through the various paralinguistic features of the language being used. These features, such as register, tone, gesture, proxemics, etc. are often as essential for the successful completion of the communicative act as is the use of the correct form of a verb.

Only since the introduction of video-based materials into the foreign language classroom in the mid-1970s (around the same time that the term "communicative competence" came into vogue!) have teachers and students had available to them the raw material necessary to simulate or replicate a real-life immersion experience in both the target language and the target culture. As Lonergan (1984) maintained in the early days of video use in the foreign language classroom:

> Video brings a slice of real life into the classroom. It presents the complete communicative situation. Language learners not only hear the dialogue, they also see the participants in the surroundings where the communication takes place. This visual information not only leads to a fuller comprehension of the spoken language, but can also benefit learners in a number of other ways.

Thus, with the entire communicative situation demonstrated within the context of the video segment, much of the linguistic material, such as lexical meaning and usage, is made clear to the student without a formal dictionary definition. Similarly, social relationships and inherent behavior are contextualized visually so as to clarify intangible concepts such as emotion, disposition, demeanor and tone.

Indeed, sociolinguistic elements permeate virtually all authentic video materials and carefully selected authentic video media offer not only contextualized situations of language use, but provide the added benefits of visually-conveyed information on both linguistic and cultural meaning. Vereshchagin and Kostomarov (1990), Russian specialists in language and culture contend:

> Facts perceived visually become the personal experience of the student, while verbal explanations reflect a detached foreign experience; not without reason is it said that it's better to see something once than to hear about it a hundred times. Besides, visual perception usually cannot be replaced by words. Therefore, the role of the visual mode remains unlimited, unique. Finally, the information input capability of the visual perception mode is almost ten times greater than the audio; therefore, the former is more economical than the latter.

Recently, researchers and specialists such as Kramsch (1993), not only concur with this Soviet perspective, but expand on it, indicating the unique suitability of selected authentic video materials as a foreign language teaching medium, citing the addition of the visual modality and "slice-of-real-life" quality of good video as a significant contributor to total holistic comprehension.

In discussing the teaching of lingua-culture in a foreign language, or the synthesis of foreign language and culture, the authentic nature of instructional materials -- especially video -- is of paramount importance. Materials prepared for native speakers of a language are by virtue of their intended audience saturated with imbedded cultural references that depend on the shared prior text of that audience. Standard television programming, feature films, commercials, documentaries, and news items can all serve as effective pedagogical source materials for teaching foreign linguoculture on all levels. Because video allows for both audio and visual modalities of information input, the language and cultural material is more readily contextualized and, thus, more accessible to the learner.

For purposes of exploiting the cultural as well as the linguistic material of the video segment, "good" foreign language video should be multi-layered, incorporating current and useful situational language, visually supported paralinguistic elements, and inherent cultural content. It is the presence of such culturally-bound material that, while self-evident to the native speaker of the target language, prevents the learner from enjoying complete, "native-like" comprehension of the segment, even when the language of the segment is fully understood.

As with audio tape recordings, videotapes can be stopped and reviewed at the instructor's or learner's discretion in order to review a certain part of the material. But, unlike audiotape, videotape also allows any single frame or moment of action to be "frozen" on-screen for analysis or commentary. Videotape can also be mechanically edited, altered or manipulated during its production to enhance or modify the content of a segment to make it more conducive to the more purpose-specific tasks of language instruction.

Today, the universal availability and modest cost of standard video playback equipment makes it a *sine qua non* for the proficiency and performance based language classroom. For around four hundred dollars, any language program can be equipped with a video player and monitor to allow for the incorporation of video materials into the basic curriculum and syllabus for instruction. Having made the decision, however, to utilize the rich and varied resources of video materials in foreign language instruction, a myriad of related issues and questions emerges on the most efficient and effective use of such materials, beginning with the issue of selecting the most appropriate materials from among the seemingly unlimited amount of television, documentary, film, and commercial material currently available in many languages on video.

Basic Criteria for Instructional Video

As with selecting all instructional materials, there is good video and bad video for language teaching purposes. The basic criteria for "good" or useful instructional video emerge after considering the inherent needs of the foreign language classroom. In selecting or adapting video materials for language teaching, it is essential that these pedagogical considerations are not subordinated to the medium. As Willis (1983) notes, "...in the excitement of experimenting with a relatively new medium there is a tendency for video viewers (both us, as teachers, and students themselves) to lose sight of language teaching objectives, and of students' own learning objectives, and to use video for insufficiently motivated purposes" (p. 43).

First, useful video must contain the desired linguistic material for instructional purposes. In most cases, for language courses attempting to develop communicative performance, this criterion means language that is current, useful and accurate in a corresponding situation. The video selector may find it useful to prepare in advance a comprehensive checklist of various linguistic features (specific lexicon, syntactic structures, etc.) and language functions (greetings, leave-takings, introductions, requests, instructions, etc.) which s/he plans to cover in the course and gauge the appropriateness and utility of various video segments by this list.

Second, the video segment should be thematically interesting. This point may seem obvious at first blush, but actually entails a good deal of consideration on the part of the video selector. S/he must consider a variety of relevant variables, such as the constituency of the target audience (breakdown of age, native language(s)), proficiency level, and goal of language study, before attempting to select interesting video segments for a given course. Taking into account such factors, the selector is able to establish general thematic parameters for a specific language program. The goal of this criterion is to produce video materials that deal with subjects in which the students can best identify with the characters and the situations depicted on the screen.

A related sub-point of the second criterion concerns the actual quality or production value of the video segment. The segment itself should present the viewer with some kind of discreet story, with an inherent beginning, middle and end, whether it is dramatic piece, a documentary, or an instructional "how-to" segment. Such a storyline is essential for maintaining student interest during the repeated viewings of the video segment and, thus, the successful treatment of the various topics covered in the video-based course. A natural storyline also allows for comprehension exercise potential based on the segment context as discussed below.

Third, good video materials for foreign language instruction are multi-layered; that is, they require (or at least encourage) repeated viewings in order for the student to comprehend fully the content of the segment. The various "layers" may include linguistic and paralinguistic material, dramatic elements, depictions of relationships, and cultural information. Each of these textual layers may be addressed individually or in combinations through exercises designed to present, review and practice (produce) the material in the video segment. Lonergan (1984) contends that this capacity for repeated viewing is essential for the successful use of instructional video (p. 32).

Fourth, the ideal video segment for the language classroom has a high audio/visual correlation. As mentioned above, the visual element should enhance and clarify the text by contextualizing the language nonverbally. Thus, the language video should provide visual images which closely parallel and support the text of the audio track. In this connection, interviews and other "talking head" commentaries, in spite of their often provocative and engaging thematics, usually make unsatisfactory video materials for language instruction, since they provide little more communicative information than an audio tape recording (Geddes, 1982).

Finally, there is the issue of length of the video segments themselves. Because techniques of using video in foreign language teaching are, for the most part, still in the test-teaching stages, data concerning the "ideal" length of video segments is still being gathered and analyzed. Still, existing research has provided some general parameters for determining segment length. One early study of video use in the EFL classroom documented teacher preferences for segments between two and ten minutes in length, stating that longer segments provided too much material to cover or handle in lesson format, whereas segments shorter than two minutes were too brief to establish any kind of meaningful storyline (MacKnight, 1981). More recent data collected at Harvard University indicate that useful discreet segments may be as brief as thirty seconds, but found that students' retention of detail -- even for advanced learners -- diminished significantly after approximately seven minutes of viewing, depending on the complexity of the video material. British video specialist Lavery (1984) is even more categorical in delineating the length of a useful video segment for language teaching: [for a one-hour class -- 3-4 minutes]. Basically, instructional video should be kept to concise and discreet segments which allow for thorough presentation and coverage of the linguistic and paralinguistic information in the footage. In some cases, a long segment may be divided into two or more segments for more complete classroom treatment of the material. Or, conversely, several short, thematically related segments may be combined into a useful montage. The amount of actual language and visual information in the segment should be the determining measure in editing down the final usable footage for the classroom.

Currently, video materials for the foreign language classroom come from three primary sources: 1) off-air television broadcast (Maxwell, 1983), 2) commercially available tapes or disc (non-language related), and 3) specially produced foreign language materials including both commercial and teacher-made videos (Silva, 1984). Inherent to all three options is one of the most controversial issues currently surrounding the use of video-based materials: Is it better to use video materials that are specifically designed for language instruction, or to adapt authentic materials for classroom use? Both alternatives have pros and cons associated with their adoption in a program of foreign language study.

Interestingly, virtually all commercially-available British and American foreign language video programs for teaching ESL and EFL have opted for using specially produced footage. The advantages of producing all video footage oneself can be summarized in one word: control. The author of produced video materials has complete control over some of the most important aspects of a video language course, most notably the language itself. The author(s) of the video script may devise and design entire lessons which focus on specific lexicon, grammatical structures, or themes within the context of a planned and structure storyline. Similarly, self-produced video projects allow for complete control of character and situational development, and, as a result, are able to develop supporting text and exercise materials simultaneously with the video segments.

Paradoxically, the main disadvantage to producing new footage for a language program stems directly from the linguistic, situational, and production control of such a project. By entirely scripting the language, situations, and characters of a given segment, the authenticity of all three elements is threatened. This danger is heightened by attempts of the well-intentioned language teacher to address the particular needs of the audience -- all in one video segment! The frequent result is a video segment depicting unbelievable characters in an improbable situation using contrived and overly prescriptive language.

The alternative to producing new video segments for a language program is use authentic materials and existing video footage, which may be taken from feature films, documentaries, television programming (dramas, comedies, game shows, news, etc.), commercials, travelogues, animated segments, or any other video source and "repurposing" -- or adapting -- them for educational use. Such videotaped materials have the tremendous communicative benefit of having been originally produced for a native audience (Kerridge, 1982). Thus, even "scripted" texts, such as motion picture and television scripts, are written to convey relevant situations, depict believable characters, and use authentic language. Their original goal is to persuade, entertain, inform or evoke emotion in native speakers of the language; as such, these texts can provide students with engaging and functionally rich sources of authentic and highly contextualized language and cultural information.

The obvious disadvantage related to the choice of authentic video footage is the limited control of the linguistic content of the segments. In order to obtain footage that will cover the range of linguistic needs of a given language course, the teacher or curriculum developer may have to screen a sizable amount and variety of material. However, this is primarily a time and personnel consideration; virtually any country with video technology has no end to the amount of existing footage from which to select language teaching materials.

The ultimate *obtainability* of existing footage for a language program -- whether recorded off-air or purchased from a distributor -- depends on securing rights and clearances from the original producer to use the segment in an educational program. This consideration raises another disadvantage to using found footage. In the case of off-air recording for educational use, the law is still problematically vague and in a constant state of flux. In legal terms, teachers seem to fall into a gray area between the rights of a home-video user and a video pirate. As of this writing, it is generally agreed that educators may record television programming off-air and use that material in a classroom for up to a period of forty days from the program's air date, after which time the taped program must be destroyed (Altman, 1989). Such a practice precludes the assembly of a video library for long-term use in a foreign language program. Thus, the teacher must prepare each lesson anew and design materials to accompany new videos virtually every month of every year s/he uses them.

For materials developers or educators attempting to assemble and purchase authentic materials for a program, the denial of rights by many video sources may prove to be a significant obstacle in assembling a group of suitable segments. In addition, the securing of available rights can be relatively expensive, even compared to the average cost of producing good quality original footage specifically for the classroom. The apparent communicative advantages of authentic video materials must be weighed against the legal and cost issues of obtaining such footage for foreign language teaching.

Exploiting Video Materials for Language Teaching and Learning

Though the term sometimes seems to be read somewhat aggressively in the United States, "video exploitation" has been a part of the British research and literature on video in language teaching for the past decade. The term quite simply refers to the structuring of activities, tasks or exercises, which explain, develop, or expand the communicative information contained in a video segment. It is at the exploitation level that the potential of video as a means of addressing communicative performance in foreign language teaching is greatest. Since each piece of footage has its own particular "character" in terms of images and language, it is essential that appropriate kinds of exploitation be devised for each case.

The first requisite condition for successful implementation and exploitation of video-based materials in the foreign language classroom is to change the viewer's attitude toward watching visual media from predominately passively to overwhelmingly active. The term "active viewing" is essential to the metalanguage of video in language teaching. Active viewing can be encouraged at various levels of designing and using video materials . At the design/production level of assembling video materials, several exploitation techniques can be employed to facilitate active viewing of the segment.

- **Captioning** One of the most successful, yet seldom applied, of these processes is captioning of the video material. Captioning refers to the addition of subtitles -- in the same language as the audio track -- to a video segment (Parlatto, 1986). That is, a segment from a French film would have French subtitles, an American television would have English subtitles, etc. Captioned material appears to the viewer/learner on the screen simultaneously as s/he hears the words spoken.

Two types of captioning exist in broadcast television programming: closed and open. Closed captioning, familiar to most television viewers by the symbol "CC" or " " in program listings, is done by the National Captioning Institute for the hearing impaired or one of several private companies which is equipped to perform this service. A special decoding device must be attached to the television set in order to receive the printed text along the bottom of the screen. Televisions produced in the U.S. after 1991 often come with such a decoder already factory-installed. With a caption decoder and a VCR, closed-captioned programming can be recorded *with* captions onto a blank tape. Thus, captioned off-air television broadcasts can be prepared for use in the classroom at a later time and previously closed-captioned segments are converted into open-captioned materials.

Open captioning or "reverse subtitling" refers to the use of captions on the screen which appear as part of the original broadcast and, thus, require no special equipment to receive or decode them. In the U.S., very few programs are currently aired using open captioning, except for some public service announcements and educational programs produced by the PBS. However, in addition to the above-mentioned technique of recording off-air closed-captioned broadcasts, open captioning could certainly be employed in the production of either original educational videos or in the editing and assembly of authentic found footage.

Open captioning used as video exploitation can be adapted according to the nature of the segment and the goals of the related tasks. There are three options for open captions: 1) verbatim, 2) key words in context, and 3) cloze. Verbatim captioning is possible only when the amount and rate of speech allows for the transcription of each word to appear on the screen for an adequate amount of time. It is particularly useful for segments which aim to develop lexicon and expand grammatical structures. Key words or phrases captioning is recommended when the related segment task is to check for general comprehension of the language, or global meaning of the footage. Cloze captioning, in which certain elements of the script are eliminated from the captions and replaced with blanks, is used when the task of the viewer is to listen for specific information, such as proper names, numbers, certain phonemes or sounds, etc.

An early study conducted by Price (1983) at Harvard University demonstrated that ESL students using captioned and non-captioned video materials "benefited significantly from captioning even with only one viewing" (p. 1). More specifically, the Harvard study tested 450 EFL students in six language competency areas based on the viewing of four different video segments. Half of the group watched the segments with captions, half viewed them without. All of the segments used NCI "closed" captions, which frequently simplify lexically and syntactically difficult language; however, three of the four segments shown in this study maintained verbatim or near verbatim captioning. Over a series of variables controlling for factors such as fatigue, sequence of presentation, and interest value, the results across the various competency areas showed statistically higher scores for students viewing the segments with captions.

More recently, in a 1989 study conducted at the National Foreign Language Center, Garza (1991) demonstrates a significant level of generalizability of ESL results in captioning studies with other foreign languages, such as Russian. The most significant conclusion suggested by this study is that captioning may help teachers and students of a foreign language bridge the often sizable gap between the attainment of proficiency in reading comprehension and in listening comprehension, the latter usually lagging significantly behind the former. By providing students with a familiar (i.e., comprehensible) graphic representation of an utterance, they are empowered to begin to assign meaning to previously unintelligible aural entities, gradually building their aural comprehension in relation to their reading comprehension. For example, a student of ESL might view a video clip showing two students meeting after class. One says to the other (in the aural text), "Djeetjet?" to which the interlocutor replies, "No, dju?" The non-native student of English is at a loss to assign meaning to the utterances in this everyday conversation. But when the captions show, "Did you eat yet?" "No, did you?" as the underlying language of the spoken text, the ESL student quickly understands and makes the connection between the familiar printed text and the now comprehensible aural text. Like learning a new vocabulary item when reading, the student working with captions will likely not miss the aural cue of a captioned expression the next time s/he encounters it in speech. The data collected in this study all indicate that captions enhance the learning of a foreign language by: 1) increasing the accessibility of the salient language of authentic video materials, giving student the opportunity to understand and enjoy the same types of linguistic input understood by a native speaker of the language; 2) allowing the student to use multiple language processing strategies to accommodate the multiple modalities of input when captions are used; 3) increasing the memorability of the essential language and thus, 4) promoting the use of new lexicon and phrases in an appropriate context.

• **Colorization** Related to the addition of open captions to video-based materials is the use of color highlighting of various elements of the captioning on the screen, such as specific lexicon, idioms, grammatical forms, or phonemes. Such a technique focuses the viewer's attention on specific linguistic features and allows for interface with additional exercise material during the lesson. Throughout the 1980s, a popular PBS program entitled "ColorSounds®," used open captioning of contemporary music videos with color highlighting of both grammatical items and phonemes (Bell, 1984). This program was aimed at developing literacy among American minority youth, but was also used successfully in the EFL classroom to teach pronunciation and speaking skills (Garza, 1984). This video technique adds another "layer" to the instructional video to promote meaningful, repeated viewing.

• **Video Enhancement and Overlay** Another video exploitation technique which aids in making the visual medium more conducive to presenting and teaching language materials is video enhancement or overlay. Such enhancement encompasses a variety of video "tricks" such as highlighting or colorizing parts of the video image itself for emphasis, adding or deleting parts of the video image as part of an exercise, etc. Graphics, text or a combination of the two may be used similarly to exploit a communicative feature of the segment. For example, a speech balloon -- as in a comic strip -- can be superimposed on the video image to allow students to supply appropriate speech. Video enhancement, like most open captioning, is a production technique added to video footage as part of originally-produced footage, or is added to authentic footage during editing and assembling for classroom use.

• **Time Code** Finally, most commercially-available language video programs have some kind of on-screen reference code, such as a time clock or counter, which serves two main purposes: 1) to provide a kind of video bookmark which allows the viewer to stop the videotape in mid-segment and later return to the same place, and 2) to allow for an accurate interface with textbook or in-class exercises/activities and specific moments in the video segment.

• **Printed Materials** The need for an on-screen video reference code is essential when video exploitation includes a textbook or viewing guide, as most commercial language video programs do. Printed materials can help to organize and structure the student's viewing of any video materials, including off-air or other authentic video segments recorded by the teacher. Language video specialists agree on three basic categories for printed exercise materials to accompany a video segment: preview, task viewing, and follow-up (Stempleski, 1990).

Preview exercises make the video segment more accessible and less frustrating for the student by introducing and reviewing new or difficult material, such as lexicon, grammatical constructions, speech functions and general thematics. These exercises attempt to make the viewing process more immediately useful and enjoyable for the student. They should not, however, make the viewing of the segment superfluous by revealing the storyline, new information, or the humor/suspense in advance. Because the ultimate goal of such exercises is to prepare the student to *view* a segment, art, drawings, diagrams, realia (photographs of actual relevant items from the target culture, such as menus, newspapers, advertisements, tickets, etc.) or any other visual reference is extremely useful. Preview exercises may take a variety of forms: a brief reading passage, diagram fill-in, matching items, problem solving.

Regardless of form, it is important that the preview exercise still requires the learner to process and use the relevant language, not merely provide a list or chart of necessary information. Alternatively, a preview exercise may use a format that is related to the actual video segment, but does not actually occur as part of the segment.

Task viewing exercises are designed to focus the student's attention on each of the many layers -- linguistic, structural, functional, and cultural -- of the video segment. The activities of the task should, as much as possible, require the viewer to watch and listen for information that would be relevant in real-life situations. That is, we read movie schedules to find out what films are playing in which theaters, and times the showings are, or we listen to a weather report to find out if we need to take an umbrella to work or not. Similarly, task viewing exercises maintain the authentic listening and viewing purposes of the real-life situations depicted in the video. It is at this level of text interaction that the discrete storyline of a video segment may be exploited as a comprehension task. The tasks may progress from focusing on the gist of a segment to finer details as the student views and re-views it. The student provides the missing parts of the story -- beginning, middle, or end -- using contextual clues from the segment.

The term "task viewing" is not an arbitrary one for this kind of exercise. They are teaching devices, not testing devices. They are to aid the students' understanding, not test their memories. For example, a set of true/false statements given immediately after a viewing tests memory; the same exercise given before viewing can help students organize their viewing so that they listen for specific information. Thus, the relationship between the preview and task viewing exercises is essential to the guided viewing of the segment by the student. The task viewing exercise may utilize charts, lists, statements, etc. that help the student organize the material in the segment , or have the student relate or associate one level of material (specific language, gestures, facial expressions) in the segment with another (situation, emotion, attitude).

Follow-up exercises are intended to help the viewer see the broader application of what s/he has understood in the video segment. Thus, if the video segment presented an aerobics instructor using various imperative forms, the follow-up exercise could provide more work on the imperative in a different context, such as in a how-to cooking lesson. Follow-up exercises are also useful to show varying degrees of register or tone in conversational exchanges similar to those depicted in the video segment. Ideally, follow-up exercises add to the layers of information presented in the video segment by building on the same linguistic, thematic, and cultural lines.

All three types of textbook interfaces with the video materials -- preview, task viewing, and follow-up -- serve to clarify and exploit the content of the segment and make it useful as a language and situational model for the student [See Appendix A for a summary presentation of all three types of activities]. Together, video and text comprise a potentially powerful team in the foreign language classroom, especially toward the goal of developing proficiency in communicative performance. With continued research, designing, and test teaching of such materials, video-based language programs may become the standard of proficiency-oriented instruction in our classrooms. In the meantime, it is essential that both teachers and materials developers examine carefully existing video programs for language teaching, as well as their own role in preparing and using such materials in order to asses where we can go from here. The video program does not yet exist that can bring a student from linguistic competence to communicative competence. The role of the instructor as viewing moderator is crucial to the success of all existing programs and must not be subordinated to the video medium itself.

Practical Considerations of Video in Today's Classroom

The most common issue raised by practitioners who are considering adopting the use of video materials in their own foreign language classes concerns the efficacy devoting additional time to select and edit the video materials themselves, and then to prepare useful materials for exploitation of the segments, both in class and out. Given the enormous demands on the instructor's time already cutting deep into any additional time for materials development, the use of video often appears to be more of a luxury or even a burden for many instructors. Such considerations, combined with the growing number of programs -- especially at the secondary school levels -- which require the teacher to prepare materials for and teach several levels of the same language in any given day, seem far to outweigh any possible benefits that could come as a result of using video. Simply stated, it often appears to be far too time consuming to create new video materials for teaching multiple levels of a language at once. And yet, the very flexible nature of the medium itself, together with the inherent richness of a good, well-selected segment, allows for an easy solution: one good video segment may be exploited for use at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of language training.

In order to discuss the multi-level exploitation of video materials, it is necessary to invoke the Proficiency Guidelines of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL, 1986). These Guidelines establish descriptors for assessing the proficiency level of learners in all four language skills. The question as to whether or not these Guidelines should have an impact on how or what we teach in the classroom has sparked debate since the adoption of the Provisional Guidelines in 1982. Some language assessment specialists, such as Higgs (1987), contend that the mere existence of criteria for proficiency assessment does not necessarily make any recommendation on either syllabus or methods, stating that the Guidelines themselves are explicitly pedagogy independent and inform neither methodology nor syllabus decisions. In spite of such objections, however, the vast majority of the foreign language teaching community at-large not only perceive the Guidelines as relevant to actual classroom instruction, but have accepted such terminology a "proficiency-based instruction" and "proficiency-oriented materials" in the profession as standard usage.

Germane to using video materials in foreign language teaching is the utilization of the ACTFL skill level descriptors to assist instructors in selecting or creating exploitation tasks that are appropriate for the particular level of the students. This approach reinforces the notion that most video materials -- especially from authentic sources -- are level independent as foreign language text; any good video text contains material that is accessible to learners at all levels, from novice to superior. Of course, more advanced learners are able to glean more meaning from the text more quickly than novice learners are, but even rank beginners possess the ability to identify cognates and make visual identifications. The key rule to producing video exploitation materials is to adjust the task, not the text.

To this end, the Generic Descriptions for Listening in the ACTFL Guidelines specify at the Novice-Mid level that the learner is:

> Able to understand some short, learned utterances, particularly where context strongly supports understanding and speech is clearly audible. Comprehends some words and phrases for simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae about topics that refer to basic personal information or the immediate physical setting. The listener requires long pauses for assimilation and periodically requests repetition and/or a slower rate of speech.

The video materials designer may now sketch out the types of tasks and activities that could be reasonably expected of a learner performing at the novice-mid level, such as:

1) Guess the [Russian, French, etc.] cognates for English words provided.
2) Identify these cognates in the actual video text.
3) Make assumptions about the story from visual clues.
4) Use L1 text to get background information about a new cultural entity.
5) Identify any questions asked in the video text.

Based on such an outline, appropriate Preview, Task Viewing and Follow-Up tasks can be devised to make the video material accessible to learners at their level of performance. Similar types of materials can be devised at all levels of proficiency.

Conclusion

Throughout the literature on video applications in foreign language learning and teaching, two tenets are consistently maintained: 1) the technological capabilities of video are well suited to provide a stimulating and highly engaging learning experience for language students, and 2) properly selected and/or produced video materials can present the necessary elements (authentic language and situations, native participants, cultural references, contextualized speech models, etc.) for effective proficiency-oriented instruction.

And yet, examples of effective video courseware and programs addressing communicative performance are relatively few and often exist only as parts or constituent elements of a larger, more traditionally text-based course. In the university setting, programs such as *Destinos* for Spanish instruction and *French in Action* for French are rare examples of successful video-based courses for foreign language. With so many specialists and practitioners in agreement on the *potential* of this technology, why has so little of this potential been put into service? Perhaps the shortcomings of existing video-based programs and the reluctance of the language teaching community to embrace them stem directly from a preoccupation of their developers on the motivational and stimulating capabilities of the medium, while subordinating the quality of the program content. While it is essential to realize the technological capabilities of the hardware that will execute the program, it is more important to remember that the video segments themselves contain the necessary linguistic and paralinguistic information for the student interested in attaining proficiency in the language and culture.

The last thirty years of foreign language instruction in this country have witnessed the initial popularization and eventual "demise" of two major instructional technologies: the audio-based language laboratory and computer-based language learning[1]. In both cases, the relevant technology was touted as possessing the *potential* for addressing serious issues in language teaching and learning that could not easily and/or effectively be handled in the traditional classroom. When neither innovation brought about the impressive improvements expected, both were quickly dismissed, leaving large numbers of tape carousels and personal computers sitting idle. Interestingly, though, the tape machines and the computers performed as promised throughout their use; the technology never failed to deliver what it had originally promised language teachers: potential. The technology had not failed, the materials had. The listen-

[1]Computer-based instruction here refers to the technology and materials that existed prior to the development of multimedia platforms for micro computers since 1990. Needless to say, the newer media-based machines are of great value to instructors wishing to incorporate video and other media into their teaching, especially on an individualized basis.

and-repeat sequences, the rote drill-and-practice exercises, and the electronic page-turners did not utilize the potential of their media.

The potential of the most recent technology, video, has understandably been viewed skeptically by some. To an even greater degree than the language lab or the computer, video offers an attractive, though somewhat deceptive, alternative to writing long lesson plans and conducting tedious conversation sections for language classes. The uninitiated teacher may choose simply to play a videotape and saturate the students with "comprehensible input" or "listening comprehension" practice. Such an approach exploits video as little more than a low-tech babysitter from which neither student nor teacher profits. Given the current state of video technology, instructors and materials developers need never resort to such measures. Unlike its technological predecessors in language teaching, video offers the instructor almost complete control in the selection, design, production and execution of the source materials. Instructors can create an instructional package of video and exploitation materials tailored to the needs, goals and constituency of any given class that actually exploits the potential of this powerful medium, particularly as a facilitator of communicative performance in a foreign language.

REFERENCES

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. (1986). Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: ACTFL Materials Center.

Allan, M. (1985). *Teaching English with Video.* Essex: Longman Group, Ltd.

Altman, R. (1989). *The Video Connection: Integrating Video into Language Teaching*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Bell, J. Michael. (1984). The ColorSounds story. *ColorSounds Monthly* 1(9):1-2, Austin: The ColorSounds Educational Foundation.

Dow, Anne R. (1985). *In America.* Reeves Corporate Services for International Horizons (Curaçao), N.V., A Learning Technologies Ltd. Company.

Garza, T. (1991). Evaluating the use of captioned video materials in advanced foreign language learning, *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 239-258.

Garza, T. (1984). On Michael Jackson and minimal pairs. In *MATSOL Newsletter*, 13(2).

Geddes, M. (1982). 'Talking heads' and study skills programmes. In M. Geddes and G. Sturtridge (Eds.),*Video in the Language Classroom.* London: Heinemann, 62-68.

Habermas, J. (1970). Towards a Theory of Communicative Competence. In *Inquiry*, vol. 13.

Higgs, T. (1987). A Response to the Role of Grammar in the Development of Communicative Ability. In A. Valdman (Ed.). *Proceedings of the*

Symposium on the Evaluation of Foreign Language Proficiency. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Hymes, D. (1968). The ethnography of speaking. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, ed. The Hague: Mouton, 99-138.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics.* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Kerridge, D. (1982). The use of video films. In M. Geddes and G. Sturtridge (Eds.). *Video in the Language Classroom.* London: Heineman, 107-112.

Kostomarov, V. and Vereshchagin. E. (1990). *Jazyk i kul'tura: linguostranovedenie v prepodavanii russkogo jazyka kak inostrannogo*, 4th ed. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.

Kramsch, Claire. (1993). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lavery, M. (1984). *Active Viewing Plus.* Oxford: Modern English Publications, Ltd.

Lonergan, Jack (1984). *Video in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacKnight, F. (1981). Review and analysis of present video use in EFL teaching. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Wales, Cardiff.

Maxwell, M. (1983). Off-air and commercial video recordings in ESL classrooms. In *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin*, 7(1).

McGovern, J. (1983). *Applications of Video in Language Teaching.* London: Pergamon Press.

Parlatto, S. (1986). *Watch Your Language: Captioned Media for Literacy.* Silver Spring, MD: T.J. Publishers, Inc.

Price, K. (1983). Closed-captioned TV: An untapped resource. In *MATSOL Newsletter*, 12(2).

Silva, T. (1984). Teacher-made videotape materials for the second-language classroom. In S.J. Savingnon and M.S. Berns (Eds.). *Initiatives in Communicative Language Teaching.* Reading, MD: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 137-153.

Stempleski, S. (1990). *Video in Action: Recipes for Using Video in Language Teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Publishers.

Stevick, E. (1982). *Teaching and Learning Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, J. (1983). 101 ways to use video. In J. McGovern (Ed.), *Video Applications in English Language Teaching.* Oxford: The British Council and Pergamon Press, 29-42.

APPENDIX A: Text Exploitation of Video Materials

1. *Preview*

   Makes the material (linguistic and non-linguistic) of the video segment more readily accessible to the learner by:
   - Introducing new concepts (lexical, grammatical, functional, cultural, etc.) *before* the first viewing of the segment;
   - Providing background information to help learner develop native-like schemata or "prior text" to understand video material (basis for cultural literacy);
   - Allowing learner to apply native language strategies to new material;
   - Preparing the learner to comprehend the material without giving away the "punch" of the segment.

2. *Task Viewing*

   Guides the learner in "peeling" away the various layers of the video segment and discover and master the linguistic, paralinguistic, and cultural material contained in it by:
   - Requiring the learner to view and re-view the video material in order to solve the assigned task;
   - Focusing the learner's attention on relevant elements in the segment;
   - Organizing and structuring the viewing to make the material memorable and relevant, not testing his/her memory;
   - Maintaining the integrity of the original segment.

3. *Follow-Up*

   Help the learner understand the broader application of the material covered in the segment by:
   - Adding to or building on the layers of information presented in the video;
   - Extending the frame of usage of the material already learned;
   - Providing additional material to complete or supplement the portrait created by the video material.

ADJUST THE TASK, NOT THE TEXT!

Product and Process Aspects of NES/EFL Students' Persuasive Writing in English: Differences between Advanced and Basic Writers

JIN-WAN KIM

This paper was designed to investigate quantitative and qualitative differences of "product" and "process" variables between native and non-native "advanced" writers, and between non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers. It was found that a number of "product" and "process" variables that significantly differentiated between "advanced" and "basic" writers were also good predictors of student writing quality, and that these variables were distributed across all three types of aspects (linguistic, rhetorical, and strategic). Thus, it confirms that writing quality depended on all three aspects measured. This balanced approach, focused on "product" and "process" and on "quantitative" and "qualitative" method, provides an interactive and comprehensive view of L2 writing, and contributes to L2 writing instruction using realistic writing process strategies that take into account L2 writers' products resources.

INTRODUCTION

In an exploration of the unique nature of L2 writing, several empirical studies have recently focused on a direct comparison of ESL and NES writers and/or the L1 and L2 writing of ESL students (Silva, 1993a). Studies looking at written texts ("product" variables) have outnumbered those dealing with composing processes ("process" variables) and, of these product studies, more have focused on rhetorical (discourse level) than on linguistic (sentence level and below) features (Silva, 1993a). In fact, no comprehensive studies that looked at both product and process variables at the same time were located.

At the linguistic level (product), Ferris (1994) reported that native speakers had a greater number of clauses in their essays than did non-native speakers, that this length variable might be a good predictor of the holistic scores assigned to the essays, and that more advanced writers had higher means for "word length" and "words per clause" variables than did basic writers. It was also reported that non-native English writers used discourse markers more frequently at the sentence beginning than did native English writers, and that the frequent use of discourse markers might be another predictor of holistic essay scores. In the study of cohesion devices, Reid (1992) found that native English writers used far fewer pronouns and coordinate conjunctions, and far more subordinate conjunctions and prepositions than did non-native English speakers.

At the rhetorical level (product), studies examining the quality of student writing showed that topical structure analysis is a good predictor of college students' writing quality (Witte, 1983; Connor & Farmer, 1990). A recent study of Ferris (1994) showed that native English writers had the lowest ratios of subtopics to sentences (showing a greater degree of topical focus: i.e., good writers elaborating on a few arguments, rather than introducing many different subpoints), thus this subtopics per sentence variable became a good predictor of the writing scores. Rhetorical variables obtained from the analysis of Patthey-Chavez (1988) included the categorization of the "openings" (statement of the writer's opinion on the topic) and "closings" (writer's conclusions) as being personal, impersonal, mixed, or nonexistent. In this point, Ferris (1994) found that null closings differed between basic and advanced writers, with the more advanced writers more frequently providing closings (i.e., conclusions) than did the basic writers. Further, Wong (1988) showed both a qualitative and a quantitative difference in English and in Chinese, in the use of two types of rhetorical questions: 1) an "interrogative" and 2) an "assertive". Finally, Ferris (1994) used two categories for the study: reader inclusion and counterarguments. Results showed that the more advanced native writers most frequently used counterarguments, followed by the advanced non-native writers.

Finally, at the strategic level, some studies on "process" variables have found that L2 writing was more difficult and less effective, and a closer look revealed some significant differences in the processes of planning, transcribing, and reviewing (Silva, 1993a,b/Forthcoming). With regard to planning, L2 writers did less planning at both the global and local levels (Campbell, 1990; Dennett, 1985; Jones & Tetroe, 1987). With regard to transcribing, it was more laborious, less fluent, and less productive for ESL writers, reflecting a greater concern and difficulty with vocabulary (Hall, 1990; Krapels, 1990; Moragne e Silva, 1991). There was also evidence of differences with regard to revising: ESL writers reread their texts less often (Dennett, 1985; Silva, 1990) and reflected less on their written texts (Hall, 1990; Silva, 1990), than the NES writers.

In a recent study by Hirose and Sasaki (1994), it was found that good EFL writers used writing strategies similar to those of good L1 and L2 writers: 1) planning content 2) paying attention to content and overall organization while writing, and 3) revising at the discourse level. In particular, the good writers were especially concerned with content, whereas the poor writers gave no special attention to content. These findings provided evidence for the existence of a universal writing strategy regardless of the language used (Krapels, 1990; Zamel, 1982). With regard to writing confidence, Hirose and Sasaki (1994) also reported that the good L2 writers had confidence in L2 writing because they had positive writing experiences. These researchers added that two factors (i.e., self-initiated writing experience and writing confidence) could be possible indicators of good L2 writers, although these two factors have not been identified as characteristics of good L2 writers in previous study. Crowhurst (1991) reported that knowledge of organizational structures of persuasive texts might contribute both to comprehension and to production of persuasive texts. This finding indicated that the use of discourse knowledge of persuasive/argumentative writing might improve the quality of L2 writing. Finally, with regard to audience awareness, Connor (1990) suggested that student writers composing persuasive/argumentative essays would need to identify the presumed audience, recognize its potential opposition, and be consistent in their appeals.

Because of the lack of studies that have included both "product" and "process" variables, there is a need for L2 writing research that is more evenly focused on "product" and "process" variables; on quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches; and on subjects of different levels of education, writing background or attitude, and writing process strategies. With this line, the present study attempted to identify the predictor (both product and process) variables significantly predicting the quality of English persuasive/ argumentative writing. Mainly, this study investigated quantitative and qualitative differences (in terms of linguistic, rhetorical, and strategic variables, and in terms of writing processes and background as well) between "advanced" and "basic" writers. The present study investigated the following research questions:

1. Which variables, among all variables (product and process variables), significantly predict the quality of English persuasive writing?

2. What are quantitative and qualitative differences between native and non-native "advanced" writers, and between non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers?

METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study consisted of 1) NES students (28 American students, majoring in liberal arts) and 2) EFL students (28 Korean students in America, majoring in liberal arts, and 90 Korean students in Korea, mostly majoring in English). There were 79 undergraduate and 67 graduate students (44 men and 102 women) among a total of 146 participants. Students of technology or natural sciences were excluded in this study because they are exposed to scientific discourse with a possibly different type of persuasive structure.

Instruments and Procedures

The instruments for student writers consisted of 1) persuasive writing tasks (Appendix 1), 2) follow-up retrospective questionnaires about the writing process (Appendix 2), and 3) writing background/attitude surveys (Appendix 3). For persuasive writing tasks, two structured prompts were chosen. These prompts had previously proven successful in L2 writing studies (Carson et al., 1990). The retrospective questionnaire and the writing background survey used in the study of Hirose and Sasaki (1994) were modified and adapted to the present study. The retrospective postwriting questionnaire included various questions about writing processes, writing strategies, the degree of attention to different components while writing, the degree of attention to writing processes, the degree of audience awareness, and the use of discourse knowledge. The writing background/attitude survey included questions about the writer's basic background, educational background in regard to composition or rhetoric, instructional background on persuasive writing, prior writing experiences both in high school and at the university, self-initiated writing experiences, and writing confidence.

For student writers, three tasks were conducted in the following sequence: 1) a persuasive writing task in English, 2) a follow-up survey on writing processes, 3) a writing background and attitude survey. These tasks were assigned at one time. Randomly, half of them were asked to write about the topic prompt A, and the other half were assigned to write about the topic prompt B. For the tasks, the participants were not be informed in advance about the topic. They were not allowed to use any reference book, not even a dictionary. A limit of 45 minutes was imposed on the writing task.

Design and Data Analysis

First, this study evaluated linguistic, rhetorical, and strategic variables of the three groups' writing products and processes, and used them as predictor variables for a multiple regression analysis. The dependent variable used in the multiple regression analysis was the score assigned by two English L2 writing specialists, who used the ESL Composition Profile (Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, & Hughey, 1981). Each writer's score was the average of the two raters' scores[1] and this score was taken as a measure of the overall quality of each piece of persuasive writing.

As predictor variables (a total of 35), the following 10 linguistic variables, 13 rhetorical variables, and 12 strategic variables were obtained from the tasks assigned to the students. Linguistic variables included "length" variables (number of words, number of clauses, word length, words per clause, and clauses per sentence), "cohesion" variables (pronouns, coordinate conjunctions, subordinate conjunctions, and prepositions), and "discourse marker." Rhetorical variables included "coherence" variables (parallel, sequential, and extended parallel progressions, subtopic per clause, and topical depth), "openings" (personal and impersonal), "closings" (personal and impersonal), "rhetorical questions" (type I and type II), "reader inclusion," and "counterarguments." Strategic variables included "outline" (written outline), "revision," "composing process" (planning, transcribing, and revising), "writing confidence," "writing attention" (grammar/spelling, content, overall organization, and vocabulary choice), "discourse knowledge use," and "audience awareness."

These predictor variables were quantified for the study, as follows. Length variables were counted and calculated for each writing through hand counts and through computer search functions (i.e., the "Tools" functions of Microsoft Word Version 6.0). Cohesion device variables (Reid, 1992) were also analyzed and calculated through hand counts. Percent of pronouns was obtained from the total number of personal and demonstrative pronouns, divided by the total number of words in a single essay; percent of coordinate conjunctions was obtained from the total number of simple coordinate conjunctions, divided by the total number of words in a single essay. Percent of subordinate conjunctions was obtained from the total number of subordinate conjunctions, divided by the total number of sentences in a single essay; percent of prepositions was obtained from the total number of prepositions, divided by the total number of words in a single essay. The number of discourse markers was obtained from the total number of sentences that began with discourse markers (e.g., "First, however, on the other hand, consequently, in conclusion," etc.), divided by the total number of clauses in a single essay.

Coherence variables were obtained through a topical structure analysis, developed by Lautamatti (1987) and followed by Connor (1990) and Ferris (1994). This analysis involved identifying the topical subject of each sentence and diagramming the relationships between sentences. These relationships were of three types: 1) parallel progressions (the topical subject was semantically identical to the topical subject of the previous sentence); 2) sequential progressions (the topical subject arose from the "comment" portion of the previous sentence); and 3) extended parallel progressions (the topical subject of a previous sentence was repeated following an intervening sequential progression). The values of these three types of progressions were obtained from the total number of relationships, divided by the total number of sentences in a single essay. Further, "subtopics per clause" was defined as the ratio of number of clauses to number of different subtopics in the writing, and "topical depth" was the longest string of sequential progressions in the writing. Openings (statement of the writer's opinion on the topic) and closings (writer's conclusions) described as being personal, impersonal, or null were obtained through an analysis based on Patthey-Chavez (1988). An example of a personal opening would be "I think..." or versus the impersonal "It seems..." Two types of rhetorical questions were counted: Type I, an "interrogative," the answer to which introduces new information; and Type II, an "assertive," a question to which a negative answer is implied (Wong, 1990). Finally, "reader inclusion" was calculated by counting the number of instances of use of first person plural pronouns (we/us) and second person pronouns (you), and "counterarguments" were obtained by counting the number of instances lexically tied to a hypothetical reader's concerns (Hays, Brandt, & Chantry, 1988).

Written outline and revision variables were identified from results of the retrospective questionnaire and writing samples. These variables were quantified as 0 or 1 according to absence or presence of written outlines and final revision after writing. Composing process variables (Silva, 1993a) were obtained from the results of the retrospective questionnaire, which used a 1 to 5 scale rating according to the degree of attention to each subprocess. Writing confidence variable was obtained from the writing background survey and calculated by Writing Self-Efficacy Scales (Shell, Murphy, & Brunning, 1989). In quantifying writing attention variables, the 1-5 rating scales were used according to the degree of writers' attention to each component. Finally, discourse knowledge (Carrell & Connor, 1991; Wright & Rosenberg, 1993) and audience (Johns, 1993) variables were obtained from the questionnaire. The use of discourse knowledge was quantified as 0 or 1 according to no use or use of that knowledge, and in quantifying audience awareness, the 0-2 rating scales were used according to the degree of awareness shown.

In the present study, a multiple regression analysis was used to determine how well the variables predicted the quality of English persuasive writings. In addition, one-way ANOVA was used to explore quantitative differences between "advanced" and "basic" writers. In particular, this study used the qualitative analysis to investigate the role of such factors as writing background, writing processes, and writing attitude, in more detail.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Relation of Product and Process Variables to Writing Quality

Group means of writing scores were as follows: American students = 94.71, Korean students in America = 73.63, and Korean students in Korea = 65.71. From the one-way ANOVA, the group difference in English writing scores was very significant ($F(2, 143) = 174.55$, $p < .00001$). Further, Tukey-HSD test showed significant differences among three groups.

Using SPSS, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was run with English writing score (total score) as the dependent variable and the 35 predictor variables as independent variables. Tables 1 and 2 show the results of this analysis: the stepwise multiple regression analysis and the ANOVA summary table for an overall multiple regression analysis.

In the product aspect, three significant linguistic variables were one length variable (number of words) and two cohesion variables (percent prepositions and percent subordinate conjunctions), and one significant rhetorical variable was a closing variable (impersonal closings). In the process aspect, two significant strategic variables were revision and writing confidence. In this analysis, it was found that these six variables strongly influenced the quality of English persuasive writing (the proportion of score variance accounted for by the six predictor variables was 72%).

Table 1. Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis

Step	R2	F(Eqn)	sig F	Variables	Beta In
1	.50	141.88	.000	In: Number of Words	.71
2	.59	101.50	.000	In: Writing Confidence	.35
3	.64	83.24	.000	In: Number of Clauses	-.39
4	.67	70.87	.000	In: Impersonal Closings	.19
5	.69	62.27	.000	In: Percent Prepositions	.16
6	.71	56.72	.000	In: Subordinate Conjunctions	.18
7	.70	67.64	.000	Out: Number of Clauses	
8	.72	59.42	.000	In: Revision	.12

Table 2. ANOVA Summary Table

Source	S	df	MS	F	sig F
Multiple regression	18243.69	6	3040.61		59.42
.0000					
Residual	7113.19	139	51.17		
Total	25356.88	145			

R^2 = .72 (the proportion of score variance accounted for by the six variables)

Differences between Advanced and Basic Writers

In order to examine how the native and non-native "advanced" (NA and NNA) writers differed, and also how the non-native "advanced" and "basic" (NNA and NNB) writers differed, native "advanced" writers (22 students), non-native "advanced" writers (17 students) and non-native "basic" writers (17 students) were chosen from the partiipants. The selection was made on the basis of their English writing scores[2].

Quantitative Differences

The results of one-way ANOVA's showed many significant linguistic differences between native and non-native "advanced" writers (see Table 3). Among 10 variables, eight variables were significantly different between two advanced writer groups. Interestingly, it was found that there were only two significant linguistic differences between non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers (see Table 4), both length variables (words per clause and number of words).

Table 3. Linguistic Differences between NA and NNA Writers

		Mean	
Variable	NA	NNA	F-ratio
Number of Discourse Markers	9.37	21.74	22.94*
Number of Words	607.86	416.94	14.75*
Percent Pronouns	6.54	10.35	14.00*
Percent Prepositions	0.01	8.03	13.95*
Clauses per Sentence	1.17	1.07	12.83*
Number of Clauses	35.27	24.59	10.62*
Word Length	4.81	4.53	9.95*
Percent Subordinate Conjunctions	28.63	20.89	5.21*

*$p < .05$

Table 4. Linguistic Differences between NNA and NNB Writers

		Mean	
Variable	NNA	NNB	F-ratio
-- Words per Clause	7.80	2.88	19.59*
Number of Words	416.94	294.94	9.42*

*$p < .05$

As shown in Table 3, native "advanced" writers wrote longer essays (as measured by the length variables), used more effective cohesion devices (i.e., more subordinate conjunctions, more prepositions, and fewer pronouns), and less frequently used discourse markers than did non-native "advanced" writers. In addition, Table 4 shows that non-native "advanced" writers produced more words and more words per clause than did non-native "basic" writers.

From the findings, it is confirmed that length is associated with the overall quality of writing (Crowhurst, 1991). Probably this is so because the longer an essay is, the more likely it is that the writer has done an adequate job of using significant variables of effective writing (Ferris, 1994). Further, it is supported that limited use of personal pronouns in native speakers' essays marks more informational, detached, formal, and written discourse (Grabe, 1987; Biber, 1985). Also, the greater use of prepositions and subordinate conjunctions in native speakers' essays indicated developmental writing maturity in English. In addition, it is confirmed that ESL writers tended to use more frequently the sentence beginning with a discourse marker than did native speakers who used a variety of ways to develop topical materials (Ferris, 1994).

In the rhetorical aspect, one-way ANOVA's showed that native and non-native "advanced" writers differed in terms of counterarguments, impersonal closings, personal closings, rhetorical question type II, topical depth, and personal openings (Table 5). Table 6 shows that there was just one rhetorical difference (rhetorical question type I) between NNA and NNB writers.

Table 5. Rhetorical Differences between NA and NNA Writers

	Mean		
Variable	NA	NNA	F-ratio
Counterarguments	1.27	.29	14.22*
Impersonal Closings	.68	.29	6.42*
Personal Closings	.14	.47	5.81*
Rhetorical Question Type II	.77	.00	5.60*
Topical Depth	8.59	6.94	5.13*
Personal Openings	.27	.59	4.16*

*$p < .05$

As shown in Table 5, the differences in counterarguments and closings showed that native "advanced" writers more frequently produced two important elements of academic persuasive writing, anticipation of a reader's counterarguments and the need for a closing, or conclusion, to an argument, than did non-native "advanced" writers. This finding confirms Crowhurst's (1991) result that the more advanced writers more frequently produced these two elements in persuasive writing. Further, native "advanced" writers showed much deeper topical depth than non-native writers. It seemed that this topical depth was closely related to a greater degree of topical focus (i.e., good writers elaborating deeply on a few arguments, rather than introducing many different subpoints just at surface level). In addition, native "advanced" writers almost always used rhetorical question type II, whereas non-native "advanced" writers never used it. Further, as shown in Table 6, all of the non-native "basic" writers used rhetorical question type I, whereas non-native "advanced" writers nearly never used it. This finding indicates that using rhetorical question type II was another writing strategy of advanced writers.

Table 6. Rhetorical Differences between NNA and NNB Writers

	Mean		
Variable	NNA	NNB	F-ratio
Rhetorical Question Type I	.18	1.00	4.80*

*$p < .05$

Finally, one-way ANOVA's showed the following strategic differences between native "advanced" and non-native "advanced" writers (Table 7). Further, non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers differed in terms of writing confidence and revision (Table 8).

Table 7. Strategic Differences between NA and NNA Writers

	Mean		
Variable	NA	NNA	F-ratio
Writing Confidence	95.72	76.71	34.28*
Vocabulary Choice	4.23	3.29	14.44*
Written Outline	.59	.24	5.36*
Overall Organization	4.32	3.76	4.56*
Revision	.68	.35	4.43*

*$p < .05$

These results confirm that writing confidence and revision were good predictors of the quality of writing, as already shown in Table 1. Further, native "advanced" writers used more written outlines, had more sensitivity of vocabulary choice, and paid more attention to overall organization while writing, than did non-native "advanced" writers.

Table 8. Strategic Differences between NNA and NNB Writers

	Mean		
Variable	NNA	NNB	F-ratio
Writing Confidence	76.71	65.19	5.51*
Revision	.35	.06	4.88*

*$p < .05$

Qualitative Differences

This qualitative analysis of the writing task and questionnaire showed that, before writing in English, a greater number of native "advanced" writers (59.1%) made their written outlines than did the non-native "advanced" writers (23.5%) and non-native "basic" writers (29.4%), and that the native "advanced" writers (68.2%) revised a little more than did the non-native "advanced" writers (35.3%), who revised much more than did the non-native "basic" writers (5.9%). It also showed that, whereas native "advanced" writers paid greater attention to their planning process, both non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers paid greater attention to their transcribing process. In terms of English writing confidence, native "advanced" writers (95.7% in the Writing Self-efficacy Scale) had more writing confidence than non-native "advanced" (76.7%) and non-native "basic" (65.2%) writers had.

Self-ratings of how much attention they paid to grammar/spelling, content, organization, and vocabulary choice while writing in English indicated that native "advanced" writers paid a little more attention to each of these components, particularly to content, than non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers. The native "advanced" writers were a little more concerned with content (4.6 in the 5-point Likert scale) than were both non-native "advanced" and non-native "basic" writers (4.3). Interestingly, the non-native "advanced" writers paid more attention to grammar/spelling (3.3) than did non-native "basic" writers (2.8). Thus, it seemed that non-native "basic" writers were not very concerned about grammar/spelling. However, all of them had the same priority order of these writing components: content > organization > vocabulary > grammar/spelling. In terms of discourse knowledge use, the native "advanced" writers (77.3%) reported keeping a little more what they know about the typical way of writing a persuasive text in mind, than did the non-native "advanced" writers (64.7%), who used much more of their discourse knowledge for writing than non-native "basic" writers did (47.1%). Finally, in terms of audience awareness, native "advanced" (45.5%) and non-native "advanced" (47.1%) writers tried more to write so that their specific readers could follow their argument easily, than did non-native "basic" writers (17.7%).

The questionnaire asked whether the participants planned before beginning to write. Results showed that, before writing in English, a greater number of native "advanced" writers (77.3%) planned than that both of non-native "advanced" (52.9%) and of non-native "basic" (52.9%) writers. All of the planners, whether "advanced" or "basic" writers, concerned themselves with content before the actual writing. Half of the native and non-native "advanced" writers who planned thought about the direction, position, or organization of the composition, whereas some of the non-native "basic" writers thought about the meaning of a given topic itself. Further, the questionnaire asked how the participants managed to continue writing, and how much attention they paid to such items as grammar/spelling, content, overall organization, and vocabulary choice while writing. From the results, non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers seemed to approach English writing differently in terms of use of translation, fluency, and coherence. Over half of non-native "advanced" writers (64.7%) wrote directly in English without mentally translating, and only 17.6% of them used translation. Very few non-native "basic" writers (17.6%) wrote directly in English. Instead, 58.8% of them initially generated their ideas in Korean and then translated them into English. Thus, it seemed that translation-free writing (i.e., direct writing) in L2 contributed to the quality of L2 writing. Over half of non-native "advanced" writers (58.8%) reported they wrote whatever came into their minds. Just a few of the non-native "basic" writers (35.3%) wrote whatever came into their minds, and most of them (94.1%) stopped and thought for a while, when they got stuck. Their low production rate (number of words per composition = 294.9) might have been due to their use of word-for-word or sentence-for-sentence translation, as well as frequent pauses while writing. Conversely, non-native "advanced" writers' translation-free writing and much greater fluency contributed to their fluent writing and high production rate (number of words per composition = 416.9). In terms of writing coherence, 70.6% of non-native "advanced" writers tried to write so that the sentences would flow smoothly, whereas only 35.3% of non-native "basic" writers reported doing so.

Almost all of the native "advanced" writers (95.5%) wrote in English with overall organization in mind, whereas just over half of non-native "advanced" and non-native "basic" writers (64.7%) did so. Also native "advanced" writers (81.8%) were more likely to focus on writing coherently than were non-native "advanced" writers (70.6%). Paying attention to the overall organization and focusing on writing coherence, therefore, were writing strategies that the advanced writers employed. Furthermore, a few of the native "advanced" writers specified their writing process as "Other." Some of these (13.6%) reported they had often referred to their initial outlines, and others (9.1%) reported they had kept a conversation in mind, as if they were speaking. Finally, the questionnaire asked what the participants did after writing. The analysis showed that over half of native "advanced" writers revised (68.2%) the compositions once written, whereas fewer non-native "advanced" writers revised (35.3%). Almost none of the non-native "basic" writers reported revising (i.e., just 5.9% of them revised). Further, when revising, native and non-native "advanced" writers went about the task in different ways: the native "advanced" writers dealt with various levels of revision (e.g., form and content at the discourse level: spelling, sentence, sentence transition, and organization), whereas most of the non-native "advanced" and "basic" revisers only concentrated on form at the sentence level.

From the writing background/attitude survey, the "advanced" (both NA and NNA) writers turned out to be older than the "basic" (NNB) writers. Interestingly, the "basic" writers consisted of a greater percentage of males (47.1%) than did the "advanced" writers (27.3% for NA or 29.4% for NNA). Also the "basic" writers consisted of a greater percentage of undergraduate students (82.4%) than did the native and non-native "advanced" writers (31.8% for NA or 29.4% for NNA). In terms of English composition instruction, over half of native "advanced" writers (59.1%) had taken some English composition course, whereas only a few of non-native "advanced" (17.7%) and non-native "basic" (5.9%) writers had taken those courses. In addition, most of the native "advanced" writers (81.8%) had been taught how to write persuasive/argumentative essays in English, compared to 23.5% of the non-native "advanced" writers and none of non-native "basic" writers. Another difference was that non-native "advanced" writers had received more years of formal English instruction (11.9 years) than had non-native "basic" writers (9.7 years). In addition, the non-native "advanced" writers had spent longer in an English speaking country (2.7 years) than had the non-native "basic" writers (0.7 years). Both groups of writers, however, did not seem to differ very much in the writing score they had received when writing in L1. Further, the non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers were slightly different in terms of the amount of required English writing in high school. A few of the non-native "advanced" writers (17.6%) wrote more than five pages per semester, whereas none of the non-native "basic" writers did so. In particular, in terms of the amount of self-initiated English writing, almost all of the native "advanced" writers (90.9%) and almost half of the non-native "advanced" writers (47.1%) wrote more than 5 pages per semester, whereas very few of the non-native "basic" writers (5.9%) did so.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

With the purpose of investigating quantitative and qualitative differences between native and non-native "advanced" writers, and between non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers, this study compared "product" and "process" variables involved in an analysis of the English persuasive writing of native English speakers and non-native English speakers. In this study, a number of "product" and "process" variables that significantly differentiated between native and non-native "advanced" writers, and also between non-native "advanced" and "basic" writers were also good predictors of student writing quality. Interestingly, these variables were distributed across all three types of aspects (linguistic, rhetorical, and strategic), as shown earlier. Thus, it confirms that writing quality depended on all three aspects measured (linguistic, rhetorical, and strategic aspects). Though "product" variables seemed to be prominent in this analysis, it would be a mistake to privilege "product" (linguistic and rhetorical) variables at the expense of neglecting important "process" (strategic) variables. Conversely, it would be an equal mistake to ignore the "product" variables. In fact, many ESL/EFL writing teachers today accept that process writing pedagogies are applicable to academic writing, and are concerned with final products as well as students' writing processes (Susser, 1994). Thus, this balanced approach provides the interactive and complementary effect of linguistic, rhetorical, and strategic variables on L2 writing.

On this point, this study provides a useful model of L2 writing instruction using such features as [± linguistic], [± rhetorical], and [± strategic]. It is possible to categorize essays that have the nature of the advanced writers as [+ linguistic, + rhetorical, + strategic] and essays that fail to have that nature as [- linguistic, - rhetorical, - strategic]. In this way, student writers fall into one of various combinations of these features based on the relative strength of their linguistic, rhetorical, and strategic skills. If student essays are evaluated based on such a separate but balanced consideration of their "product" and "process" skills, they could receive a workable sequence of writing instruction that would help them improve their areas of weakness and lead them to mastery over writing in general. The qualitative analysis of this study showed that fluent writing, translation-free writing, focusing on writing coherence, and self-initiated writing were good strategies that the advanced L2 writers employed. This analysis was used in order to capture important information that was not captured by the quantitative analysis alone. Thus, this study was more evenly distributed in its use of quantitative and qualitative designs.

The limitations of the present study suggest several directions for future research on L2 writing. Most of the Korean students in America in this study were international students, not ESL immigrant students. For more significant L2 writing research, studies examining writing products and processes of immigrant students should be added. Further, additional research should consider the effects of different types of writing tasks such as a comparison between "descriptive" or "expository" writing and "persuasive" or "argumentative" writing and the effects of different subject samples (various EFL students, not limited Korean students), in order to determine whether certain tasks are more problematic for non-native English writers and what sort of "product" and "process" variables are most effective in L2 (English) writing. Because this study dealt with just the first drafts of the students, rather than multiple-drafts, future research should cover and the analysis of multiple drafts (Ferris, 1995), to explore the developmental process of learning to write in English.

Finally, the present study has some implications for L2 writing pedagogy. Non-native English writers may come into L2 (English) writing situations with a different set of linguistic, rhetorical, and strategic expectations than do native English writers. Thus, certain elements of English persuasive writing such as cohesion devices, counterarguments, impersonal closings may be more problematic for non-native English writers than for NES writers, due to the non-native English writers relative lack of exposure to formal discourse in English. Accordingly, for non-native English writers, both modeling (especially self-initiated writing) and instruction in the writing structure of English persuasive texts may be effective in improving their L2 (English) writing quality (Crowhurst, 1991). In particular, as mentioned in the study of Silva (1993a), L2 writing instruction should devote more time and attention across the board to linguistic, rhetorical, and strategic concerns. L2 writing instruction needs to include more work on planning and revising processes, so that L2 writers may make the actual writing more manageable, and more effective. Ideally, L2 writing instruction needs to provide realistic writing "process" strategies for planning, transcribing, and revising that take into account L2 writers' "product" (linguistic and rhetorical) resources.

REFERENCES

Biber, D. (1985). Investigating macroscopic textual variation through multifeature/multidimensional analyses. *Linguistics, 23*, 155-178.

Campbell, C. (1990). Writing with other's words: Using background reading text in academic compositions. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 211-230). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Carrell, P. L. and Connor, U. (1991). Reading and writing descriptive and persuasive texts. *The Modern Language Journal, 75*, 314-324.

Carson, J. E., Carrell, P. L., Silberstein, S., Kroll, B., and Kuehn, P. (1990). Reading-writing relationship in first and second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 245-266.

Connor, U. (1990). Linguistic/rhetorical measures for international student persuasive writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 24* , 67-87.

Connor, U. and Farmer, M. (1990). The teaching of topical structure analysis as a revision strategy for ESL writers. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 126-139). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Crowhurst, M. (1991). Interrelationships between reading and writing persuasive discourse. *Research in the Teaching of English, 4*, 314-335.

Dennett, J. (1985). Writing technical English: A comparison of the process of native English and native Japanese speakers. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 46*(11), 3275A.

Ferris, D. (1994). Rhetorical strategies in student persuasive writing: Differences between native and non-native English speakers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 28*, 46-67.

Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 33-53.

Grabe, W. (1987). Contrastive rhetoric: Text-type research. In U. Connor & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 115-138). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 43-60.

Hays, J.N., Brandt, K.M., Chantry, K.H. (1988). The impact of friendly and hostile audiences on the argumentative writing of high school and college students. *Research in he Teaching of English, 22*, 391-416.

Hirose, K., and Sasaki, M. (1994). Explanatory variables for Japanese students' expository writing in English: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(3), 203-229.

Jacobs, H.L., Zinkgraf, S.A., Wormuth, D.R., Hartfiel, V.F., and Hughey, J.B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Johns, A. (1993). Writing argumentation for real audiences: Suggestions for teacher research and classroom practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 75-90.

Jones, S., and Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time: Modeling production processes* (pp. 34-57). New York: Longman.

Krapels, A. (1990). The interaction of first and second language composing: Processes and rhetorics. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*(12), 4045A.

Lautamatti, L. (1987). Observations on the development of topic in simplified discourse. In U. Connor and R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts.* (pp. 87-114). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Moragne e Silva, M. (1991). Cognitive, affective, social, and cultural aspects of composing in a first and second language: A case study of one adult writer. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52*, 4249A.

Patthey-Chavez, G.G. (1988). *Writing options in high school: A comparison of Anglo and Latino students' texts.* Paper presented at the 11th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, New Orleans, LA.

Reid, J. (1992). A computer text analysis of four cohesion devices in English discourse by native and non-native writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1,* 79-107.
Shell, D., Murphy, C., and Brunning, R. (1989). Self-efficacy and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*, 91-100.
Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Silva, T. (1993a). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27,* 657-677.
Silva, T. (1993b) *Writing in two languages: Differences in ESL and L1 writing*. Manuscript submitted for *RELC* .
Silva, T. (Forthcoming). Differences in ESL and native English speaker writing: The research and its implications. In J. Butler, J. Guerra, and C. Severino (Eds.), *Writing in multicultural settings*. New York, NJ: MLA.
Witte, S.P. (1983). Topical structure and writing quality: Some possible text-based explanations of readers' judgments of students' writing. *Visible Language, 17*, 177-205.
Wong, H. (1988). *The use of rhetorical questions in written argumentative discourse*. Unpublished manuscript, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.
Wong, H. (1990). The use of rhetorical questions in written argumentative discourse. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, 1,* 187-208.
Wright, R.E. and Rosenberg, S. (1993). Knowledge of text coherence and expository writing: A developmental study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*, 152-158
Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*, 195-209.

APPENDIX 1. Writing Prompts

Writing Task (Prompt A)
Time--45 minutes

[Instruction]
Write a persuasive/argumentative essay in English for the following topic.
[Topic]
Imagine that you are with a group of friends and the following topic comes up in discussion: "Some people believe that it is important for them to be part of a

group in order to achieve their goals. Others believe that they should try to be unique individuals in order to reach their objectives."

Which position do you prefer? In writing your composition, imagine trying to persuade your friends to take on your own position. Support your position with specific reasons and/or examples from your own experience, observations, or reading.

Writing Task (Prompt B)
Time--45 minutes

[Instruction]
Write a persuasive/argumentative essay in English for the following topic.
[Topic]
Imagine that you are with a group of friends and the following topic comes up in discussion: "As certain professions become more crowded, students of today are faced with a difficult choice. Some students choose a field they wish to enter even though job prospects are limited. Others choose a field in which they are less interested but which offers more job opportunities."

Which position do you prefer? In writing your composition, imagine trying to persuade your friends to take on your own position. Support your position with specific reasons and/or examples from your own experience, observations, or reading.

APPENDIX 2. Retrospective Postwriting Questionnaire for Writing in English

1. Before writing
1) Did you start writing right away? Yes____ No____
2) If your answer to 1) is "No," what did you do first? Write the kind of things you do specifically. (e.g., I wrote down the outline. I thought about what I was going to write. etc.)

2. In writing
1) How did you manage to continue writing? Check as many as apply. If you did other than what is listed below, please specify.
a. I generated ideas in L1 first, then translated them into L2. (omitted for NES)
b. I wrote directly in L2. (Omitted for NES)
c. I wrote whatever came to my mind.
d. I wrote with the overall organization in mind.
e. I tried to write as much as possible.
f. I tried to write so that the sentences would flow smoothly.

g. When I got stuck, I stopped and thought for a while.
h. When I got stuck, I continued writing without stopping, and later went back to where I got stuck.
i. Other (Please specify)____________________________________

2) When you were writing, how much attention did you pay to the following items?

	Not at all		Little		Fairly	Very
a. grammar	1	2	3	4		5
b. spelling	1	2	3	4		5
c. content	1	2	3	4		5
d. overall organization	1	2	3	4		5
e. vocabulary choice	1	2	3	4		5

3. After writing
What did you do after writing? Please specify. (e.g., I did nothing once I finished writing. I reread to check whether the organization was appropriate or not and revised. I added to the first version where insufficient. etc.)

4. In the whole writing process, how much attention did you pay to the following process?

	Not at all		Little	Fairly	Very
1) planning (before writing)	1	2	3	4	5
2) transcribing (in writing)	1	2	3	4	5
3) revising (after writing)	1	2	3	4	5

5. Which of the following items did you do in your writing process. (Check only one)

a. I developed my argument freely without considering my specific readers.
b. I developed my argument with a slight consideration of my specific readers.
c. I tried to write so that my specific readers can follow my argument easily.

6. 1) In your writing process, did you keep what you know about the typical ways of writing an English persuasive/argumentative text in mind?
Yes______ No______

2) If your answer is "Yes," list as many of the characteristics as you can think of that describes English persuasive/argumentative writing.

APPENDIX 3. L1/L2 Writing Background/Attitude Survey

1. Age_____ Sex_____

2. Native Language_______ 3. Major______

4. Educational Level (Undergraduate, MA, or Ph.D. students)__________

5. About studying English (Omitted for NES):
i) How long have you studied English at school?
ii) Have you studied in an English speaking country? If so, where and how long?

6. About taking composition or rhetoric courses:
i) Have you taken any composition or rhetoric courses in an American university?
ii) If yes, write the name of the course__________

7. About the instruction of a persuasive/argumentative writing: Have you been taught how to write a persuasive essay in English?

8. About writing in English

i) Which of the following writing types have you done so far?
(Check as many as apply)

a. diary
b. personal expressions on reading materials
c. literary work (stories, poems, etc.)
d. summaries or paraphrases of reading materials
e. short papers or term papers
f. research reports
g. research proposal
h. research articles
i. other (Please specify)_______________

ii) Please estimate the amount of required writing you did while in high school.
(Check only one)

a. more than 20 pages per semester
b. 11-20 pages per semester
c. 5-10 pages per semester
d. less than 5 pages per semester
e. none

iii) Please estimate the amount of required writing you did while in the university. (Check only one)

a. more than 20 pages per semester
b. 11-20 pages per semester
c. 5-10 pages per semester
d. less than 5 pages per semester
e. none

iv) Which of the following kinds of writing have you done on your own (not connected to school work, that is, self-initiated writing)?

a. diary
b. personal expressions on reading materials
c. literary work (stories, poems, etc.)
d. summaries or paraphrases of reading materials
e. short papers or term papers
f. research reports
g. research proposal
h. research articles
i. other (Please specify)__________

v) Please estimate the amount of self-initiated writing you do. (Check only one)

a. more than 20 pages per semester
b. 11-20 pages per semester
c. 5-10 pages per semester
d. less than 5 pages per semester
e. none

9. About English writing confidence
[On a scale from 0 (no chance) to 100 (completely certain), how confident are you that you can perform each of the following items? You may use any number between 0 and 100.]

1. Correctly spell all words in a one page passage __________
2. Correctly punctuate a one page passage __________
3. Correctly use parts of speech (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.) __________
4. Write a simple sentence with proper punctuation and grammatical structure __________
5. Correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes __________
6. Write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure __________
7. Organize sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express a topic __________

8. Write a paper with good overall organization (e.g., ideas in order, effective transition, etc.) ______
9. Write something for personal purposes (e.g., writing a personal letter) ______
10. Write something for academic purposes (e.g., writing a term paper) ______

---

[1] Interrater reliability was high:the Pearson correlation coefficient was .89.

[2] Native "advanced" writers had scores more than one standard deviation above the mean of the whole writing samples. Non-native "advanced" writers had scores more than one standard deviation above the mean of non-native speakers' writing samples, whereas non-native "basic" writers were one standard deviation below that mean.

An Investigation of the Effectiveness of Foreign Language Training Programs for TAs: An Exploratory Study

ZENA T. MOORE and BARBARA BRESSLAU

Training programs for Teaching Assistants have been in operation for over thirty years in many large state universities. Notwithstanding this fact, there is very little documented information on the effectiveness of the programs from the point of view of the TAs. The present study attempts to fill this gap by investigating what happens in foreign language department training programs at one large state university. Responses to a survey questionnaire by TAs revealed interdepartmental differences in effectiveness of training programs and suggestions as to their improvement. Specifically TAs believe that the programs should focus on practical pedagogical issues rather than on theoretical concerns and that the programs be ongoing rather than concentrated at the beginning of the semesters. Other needs include meaningful feedback on their teaching, skills for integrating material for classroom use, hands-on experience in audio-visual equipment, and more expertise on designing and scoring tests.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF TASHIP

TAship, as a university phenomenon, has been traced back to the late 19th century when Johns Hopkins University created what was to be the first graduate school in the country. Johns Hopkins' first TA was a special instructor in foreign languages employed to provide undergraduate instruction in Latin and Greek, (Rudolph, 1962). The early TAships at Johns Hopkins, as well as at other major universities, were created principally as a way of attracting students to graduate schools by providing financial incentives. Interestingly, many of these early beneficiaries were not expected to render any services in return.

Half a century was to pass during which period TAs enjoyed this service-free financial support. By 1956, however, with the passing of the GI Bill, thousands of returning soldiers swelled the ranks of undergraduate enrollments in universities, especially in state universities. The increase in enrollment was so unprecedented that it was virtually impossible to hire assistant professors quickly enough to meet the expanding undergraduate population. This was particularly true in foreign language departments of large state institutions.

As a consequence of the increasingly large enrollments at the undergraduate level a corresponding need for teaching staff mushroomed. A group of students whose eventual goal was to become part of the collegiate environment provided an expedient and quick solution. Many titles described members of this new body of students/teachers. They were assistant lecturers, assistant instructors, readers, proctors and teaching fellows among others. Regardless of the title, large institutions wooed these graduate students to provide a much demanded undergraduate instruction, a demand that continues unabated even to the present date, for according to the results of a recent survey, (Huber, 1992), foreign language departments have steadily increased the number of their TAs to match the increasing enrollments.

This nation-wide situation was described as a unique phenomenon of the modern research university, because the TA was simultaneously a teacher and a student. For a short while the efforts of TAs went uncriticised. Most universities operated on the assumption that TAs were just as qualified to teach as were certified teachers since both groups were holders of Bachelors' degrees with a major in a language. However, TAs generally qualified for employment based solely on their academic qualifications and enrollment in graduate school. That they had no training in pedagogy and did not have opportunities for pre-service and/or on the job training, as did student teachers with a Bachelors' degree, appeared to be insignificant.

The seeming insignificance attached to pedagogical skills as an essential requirement for teaching continued through the sixties. According to findings in the MLA 1963 survey conducted among 52 foreign language departments, 60% of the departments surveyed did not offer any type of training for TAs (Hagiwara, 1976). Challenges to and criticism of the lack of importance placed on the pedagogic qualifications came from several quarters.

The most vociferous complaints came from undergraduates across campuses about ineffective teaching assistants who lacked teaching skills, who could hardly speak English, and who were largely ignorant of the culture of the American schooling system. Large universities subsequently responded by instituting training programs designed to better equip the TAs with pedagogical skills, along with techniques and strategies for more effective teaching. The major challenge was to create programs that produced effective teachers in a minimum of time while maintaining the quality of instruction in lower level courses, (Hagiwara, 1976).

TRAINING PROGRAMS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENTS

For the following four decades program planners presented their course outlines and program details for public perusal, criticism and modeling For example, in 1957 Remak outlined the course for German TAs that was successfully implemented in his institute. Three years later, Winkelman (1960), described the Nebraska model also for German TAs. Natchman's 1963 program used in the French Department in an Illinois university followed, (Natchman, 1963), and in 1967 Dalbor having taken what he called a realistic look at the training of Spanish TAs in Penn State presented his recommendations for designing more effective training programs, (Dalbor, 1967). There was a lull in the literature for the next nine years. Then in 1976 Hagiwara broke the silence with the publication of the program which the French Department used for TA training in Michigan, (Hagiwara, 1976). In that same year, Azevedo, (1976) described the benefits and vigorousness of the pre-service orientation program used to prepare Spanish TAs in Urbana.

Two major concerns guided training programs for TAs. One concern grew out of the widespread criticism of ineffective instruction, mentioned before. Undergraduates complained that their TAs were simply not good teachers. The second concern was for the TAs as students themselves (Azevedo, 1976, Remak 1957). University professors were troubled by the likelihood that the incoming MA and Ph. D. students might enter the professoriate without any systematic preparation in pedagogy. They felt that the institutions had to respond to the needs of the graduate students as well.

The following decade saw an increased awareness of the need to develop training programs of one sort or the other, notwithstanding some programmatic and administrative restrictions. Time was one of major structural restrictions. TAs generally came from other countries and could not be expected to be at the university long before the beginning of the semester without financial assistance. TA training, therefore, had to be conducted prior to the start of the semester, usually the week before classes commenced. and had to be ongoing for it to be effective. This was not always easy to achieve, for, although many universities recognized the need and importance of training programs for TAs, not many provided such training, (Hagiwara, 1976).

Furthermore it was found that TAs performed a wide range of duties that included, providing feedback, giving advice, acting as counselor, functioning as a tutor, preparing and administering tests, grading students' work, keeping students' records and providing instructional media services. The over-demanding range of duties expected of the TAs evoked resistance and complaints on the part of TAs and attracted the attention of supporters who saw TAs as objects of abuse and as sources of "cheap labor" (Sammons, 1976; Sykes, 1988), for while enrollment figures grew, faculty size did not. According to Huber, (1995), 67% of institutions with 50% increase in enrollment figures increased their part-time faculty by only 31% compared to the 50% increase of TAs. To date a strong correlation still exists between increased enrollments at the undergraduate level and increased numbers of TAs used for instruction (Azevedo, 1990).

Regardless of the reasons, be they to cut salary costs, or to provide real incentives through financial aid, the number of TAs continue to increase and TA training programs have become an institutionalized offering (Azevedo, 1990). During the 70s and the 80s heads of departments and TA supervisors evaluated their training programs and did indeed make recommendations and modifications (Schulz, 1980; Bennet, 1983; Di Donato, 1983; Azevedo, 1990; Magnan, 1993). Missing from the literature, however, is the lack of information on the effectiveness of these training programs from the TAs perspective. The work of

Ervin and Muyskens (1982), and more recently that of Gray and Buerkel-Rothfuss (1991) are among the few exceptions.

THE STUDY

The present study attempts to fill the gap in information about the effectiveness of training programs for TAs from the point of view of the TAs themselves. It is exploratory in nature since it focuses only on one large institute and on three main questions. The questions are:

1. What do TAs think of their training programs?
2. What do they perceive to be effective teaching?
3. Is there a fit between what is offered and what is needed?

The University of Texas at Austin responded to the needs of its TAs by instituting training programs, commonly referred to as 398T courses, in the departments of French and Italian, Germanic Languages, Spanish and Portuguese. The 389T course are designed to: 1) introduce the teaching assistant to the most important teaching methodologies and 2) provide opportunities for gaining teaching experience under the close supervision of the course instructor.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

A survey questionnaire, presented in Appendix A, sought to elicit information in three categories: biographical information, responses to the training program and perceptions of the characteristics of an effective teacher. Most of the questions were intentionally open-ended to obtain insights into the topic. For purposes of this paper only data pertaining to the effectiveness of the training programs vis-a-vis the TAs' perceived needs will be discussed. Despite the shortcomings of the study, the information collected should give some insights to TAs' perceptions of their training programs.

A total number of 110 surveys were distributed among the departments of French and Italian (24), Germanic Languages (36) and Spanish and Portuguese (50). A total of 56 surveys were returned constituting a response rate of approximately 51%. Data from the completed questionnaires formed the base for analysis.

SURVEY FINDINGS

A. Effectiveness of the Training Programs: Interdepartmental comparison

Of the 56 informants who responded to the survey 33 did the training program. The remaining 23 indicated that they had taken a similar course at another institution or had prior teaching experience, and thus were exempted from attending the training programs. While this number is admittedly small it may well be representative of the TA situation across foreign language departments.

Table 1 shows that of the 33 respondents, 24 (72%) said that the 398T course prepared them to teach at UT. Approximately 98% felt that it did present various approaches to language teaching, and approximately 91% stated that it helped them adjust to the teaching approach adopted by their department. Eighty-four percent believed that the course allowed for discussion of problems related to the classroom. Approximately 91% thought that the course helped them to understand language teaching better, and 84% felt that the course helped them to understand their departments' pedagogic approaches better.

Table 1. Responses of TAs in all Departments on Effectiveness of the 398T Course (In percentages. N=33)

Summary of Questions	YES	NO
Did the course prepare you for teaching at U.T.?	72	28
Did it discuss various approaches to teaching?	98	02
Did it allow for discussion of classroom problems?	84	16
Did it provide for a better understanding of teaching in general?	91	09
Did it allow for an understanding of the approaches adopted by the department?	91	09

Interdepartmental Comparisons

Table 2 reveals that in the Departments of French and Italian only ten (59%) of the 17 TAs took the 398T course, a very low figure compared to the 90% of TAs in the Department of Germanic Languages, and to the 75% in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. While 90% mentioned that the training course helped them to understand language teaching better, only 60% thought that it helped them to understand the teaching mission of their department, indicating an unclear departmental mission and/or the lack of articulation between objectives of the course and classroom practices. The relatively low responses of 60% to the question of an understanding of various approaches to language teaching and 59% to preparedness to teach in the department suggested that there was significant need for improvement in the course.

Table 2. Responses from the French and Italian TAs on Effectiveness of the 398T Course (In percentages N=17)

Summary of Questions	YES	NO
Did the course prepare you for teaching in the department?	59	41
Did it discuss various approaches to teaching?	60	40
Did it allow for discussion of classroom problems?	90	10
Did it provide for a better understanding of teaching in general?	90	10
Did it allow for an understanding of the approaches adopted by the department?	60	40

German Department

Table 3 shows consensus among the TAs in the German department. They all felt that the course discussed the various approaches to language teaching as well as the approach adopted by the department. They also all agreed that the course discussed classroom problems and that it gave them a better understanding of language teaching in general and of their department al approaches in particular and the majority of them, (90%), felt that it prepared them for teaching in the department.

Table 3. Responses from German TAs on Effectiveness of the 398T Course (In percentage N=20)

Summary of Questions	YES	NO
Did the course prepare you for teaching in the department?	90	10
Did you learn various approaches to teaching?	100	0
Did it allow for discussion of classroom problems?	100	0
Did it provide for a better understanding of teaching in general?	100	0
Did it allow for an understanding of language teaching in your department ?	100	0

Spanish and Portuguese Departments

Table 4 shows less consensus in responses of the Spanish and Portuguese departments. Seventy-seven percent believed that the 398T course prepared them for teaching in the department, and offered a better understanding of teaching in general. Eighty-five percent understood the departments' approaches to teaching and 92% indicated that they learnt various approaches to teaching. On the less positive side, 46% felt that the course did not allow for discussions of problems arising in the classroom.

Table 4. Responses of TAs in Spanish and Portuguese Effectiveness of the 398T Course (In percentages N=13)

Summary of Questions	YES	NO
Did the course prepare you for teaching in the department?	77	23
Did you learn various approaches to teaching?	92	08
Did it allow for discussion of classroom problems?	54	46
Did it provide for a better understanding of teaching in general?	77	23
Did it allow for an understanding of language teaching in your department ?	85	15

Responses to Open-ended Question

Responses to the open-ended question in this section revealed complaints about the overly theoretical nature of the course. Almost all TAs expressed strong feelings that actual classroom experience should be more emphasized and that the course was helpful only to beginners, to prospective instructors with no experience at all. Almost all TAs in the Spanish and Portuguese felt that there should be separate courses for Spanish and Portuguese TAs since their individual concerns were not being addressed. TAs also criticized the overly strict supervision. Another major criticism was leveled at the types of tests administered by the department.

B. Characteristics of an Effective teacher

Responses to this section of the questionnaire fell into categories dealing with professional competencies, personal competencies and perceived needs of the TAs.

(a) Professional

The majority of TAs felt that language competence and cultural competence were the two most important qualifications for effective teaching. They felt that knowledge of the literature, a background in linguistics and a background in applied linguistics were helpful but were not as important as linguistic and cultural skills. They also indicated that knowledge about theories of second language acquisition, or of language teaching/learning were not essential for effective teaching.

The responses reflected similar concern about the overly theoretical nature of the training programs. On the one hand they expressed the need for hands-on experience and more practical experiences yet on the other they felt that active participation in workshops and training sessions were not their primary needs. Since most of the TAs were superior level speakers who had spent time in the target culture, it was not surprising that they would rate these skills in the way they did. At the same time, their responses to the effectiveness of the training programs appear to be contradictory to the responses to their professional competencies.

(b) Personal

Most respondents felt that maturity and a sense of responsibility were the two most important personal qualities of a good teacher. They also believed that teachers should have a commitment to teaching and be enthusiastic about their work in order to make language learning a positive and pleasant experience.

C. Needs

Most respondents stated that their greatest need was actual teaching practice. They felt that teacher training is a never-ending process, and although they believed that training did not necessarily make a good teacher, most of them believed in the importance of training, and more precisely in practical training. Again these responses were consistent with their criticisms of the departmental programs.

The second most commonly expressed need was for feedback on their teaching. Once again, this expressed need seemed to be directly connected to the need for more practical experiences. Respondents made several suggestions by which they could be given feedback. The use of videotaping for observation and evaluation was the most frequently recommended strategy. Peer evaluation was another.

Although the respondents did feel that they were qualified to teach, in that they felt they were proficient linguistically and culturally, they admitted that they needed pedagogic skills in at least four major areas of teaching. First, although they did have access to instructional supplementary material, they said that they lacked the skills necessary to effectively integrate the material into their lessons. Second, they said that they needed skills in teaching culture. Third, they felt that they would benefit if they had some insight into instructional psychology and fourth they needed training in conducting and grading tests in general and oral tests in particular.

In the final category of the questionnaire which sought open comments in general, the most frequently cited complaint was overworked. The informants felt that teaching up to ten hours per semester and having large classes only made their teaching less effective. Fewer and smaller classes would provide them with the opportunity to introduce a more communicative approach and could even be more effective than additional training. Another complaint was about the university's policy regarding TAs. The third most frequently cited complaint was the low salary. TAs felt that they were performing a vital role and financial remuneration should reflect the university's recognition of their important service. Finally, TAs expressed the need for counseling services that would allow them opportunities to discuss students' problems professionally and confidentially.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION: THE FIT

The responses to the survey indicated an overall awareness of the importance of teacher training. The majority of the informants agreed that the 398T courses do achieve the objectives by providing them with some training and in giving them the necessary theoretical background and tools to understand their assignment within their respective departments. At the same time, however, an impressive number of respondents wanted a more practical approach to teacher training, perhaps indicating that the short course undertaken before the classes commenced should be an orientation and an introduction, but that the training will be more effective and applicable if it is ongoing with direct connections between classroom practice and methodology.

The TAs felt that there was not enough observation and especially not enough feedback on the observation. Several types of observation were suggested: observation of their own classes by supervisors and peers, observation of peers, watching videos of classes taught by other instructors, and watching videos of their own performance. Suggestions from fellow instructors and the feedback given by their students seemed to be more valuable than theoretical knowledge of approaches to teaching. This implies that more effective teacher training should turn more towards the classroom and utilize observations and discussions of videotaped classes as useful training devices.

Some instructors also mentioned that the 398T courses might be too content specific, and that they would appreciate training that went beyond first semester courses and the institution. The concern with the quality of the instruction was further demonstrated in the solicitation of extra-materials, such as videos, pictures, realia to make instruction more interesting and meaningful. Nevertheless, they recognized that having instructional material was not enough. They needed to know how to use the material effectively and how to make instruction meaningful to the students.

While the respondents acknowledged the importance of the theoretical component of the courses, they expressed the belief that they would benefit from more emphasis on the practical component. They did see themselves as involved in an ongoing process with the training course as a part of this process and not the ultimate answer to it. In certain departments excessive workload and large numbers of students per class were linked to ineffective teaching .

Overall, the results of the survey demonstrated that the informants believed that they had the academic qualifications to teach, that they were personally committed to their teaching, that they were aware of their responsibilities as teachers, knowledgeable about various approaches to language teaching, but they were not fully satisfied that the training programs were catering to their major needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

If the present trends continue, TAs will assume even greater responsibility for the task of preparing our language majors and consequently our future language teachers (Azevedo, 1990). Almost three decades ago, Freeman (1966) suggested that Foreign Language departments might want to consider creating special institutes for the preparation of their TAs if they hoped to improve the quality of foreign language. At that time the suggestion appeared too unrealistic.

Given the fact that in over 70% of the nation's school districts teachers are presently charged with teaching students a foreign language, (Schrier 1994), foreign language departments must ask themselves whether they should be concerned with their influence on the development of these teachers. The findings from this exploratory study suggest that it is imperative that we give as much attention and prestige to pedagogy as we do to studies in literature, since the status has not changed much over the last two decades. Although there has been an increase in the level of academic qualifications of those directly involved with TA training and supervision (Schulz, 1983), they are still underpaid, overworked, non-tenure track instructors and/or lecturers, (Azevedo, 1990). The findings from the study show that our language majors, who most likely will be the future teachers, are being taught by TAs. If it is accepted that teachers teach as they were taught then a strong case must be made for more effective teaching at the university level by TAs.

Prior to 1963 relatively little was done to train and supervise TAs, (Di Donato, 1983). To date there has been a slow but noticeable change, (Shulz, 1979; Gibaldi and Mirollo, 1981). Universities, nevertheless, must continue their efforts to provide proper incentives for the supervisors and trainers of TAs. But more importantly, they have to develop training programs that are more effective. The traditional single course, like the 389T course in this study, accompanied by a one-week an orientation program is totally inadequate, since most of the time is spent on administrative rather than pedagogic concerns, (Magnan, 1993). An effective training program must include the following:

i) A pre-service workshop to orient TAs

ii) An inservice program with a methods course either offered by the foreign language department or by the education department,
iii) Regular classroom observation with feedback,
iv) Practice teaching with feedback,
v) Video-taped classes to provide for self evaluation and reflection,
vi) Team- teaching,
vii) Classroom observation of their peers
viii) Training in designing, administering and scoring classroom tests.

Finally; foreign language departments should employ only the best to teach lower level courses. The best will be linguistically competent, have superior knowledge of the culture, know how to integrate language and culture and know how to effectively use technology in instruction, (Rivers, 1983; Hancock 1981; Lafayette, 1983; Stein, 1966). Training programs for TAs must be redesigned to expose the future teachers to "teaching as a problem-solving skill", not just to prepare them to deliver departmental courses. TAs as future language teachers must have opportunities to develop "decision-making skills" (Strasheim, 1984; Stern, 1983b), in addition to pedagogic skills. Training programs must produce teachers who are "reflective practitioners" and should shift towards a "more socially oriented knowledge base", exposing them to a more critical perspective that would permit them to analyze and critique current teaching practices (Hudelson and Faltis 1993). Such training programs have the potential not only to produce highly motivated teachers but also to reduce attribution rates and to increase student enrollment, (Henderson, 1985). Universities should also make it mandatory that their training programs be evaluated externally and internally. All these changes call for greater collaboration between colleges of education and colleges of humanities.

More detailed research on training programs offered in universities for the TAs is obviously needed but there should be no doubt about the necessity of instituting teacher preparation courses at the graduate level as recommended by Oksenholt in 1963 and as obtained in many universities. As Rivers argued, preparation should be considered "a necessity, not a luxury", (1983b, 330). With the implementation of the National Standards (ACFTL 1995), we can expect that the need for TAs will probably be on the increase. The consequent demand will be to develop a more progressive approach to how we view pedagogy and an even more revolutionary way of how we define foreign language teacher education.

REFERENCES

Azevedo, Milton. (1976). Pre-Service Training for Graduate TAs. *Modern Language Journal*, 60, 244-257.

---. (1990). Professional Development of Teaching Assistants: Training versus Education. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages. Bulletin. 22. (1), 24-28.*

Bennet, Marva. (1983). Peer Observation and Analyses: Improving Teaching and Training TAs. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages. Bulletin,* 15, (10, 30-33.

Dalbor, John. (1967). A Realistic Look at the Training of College F. L. Teachers. *Modern Language Journal,* 51, 209-214.

Di Donato, Robert. (1983). TA Training and Supervision: A Checklist for effective Program." *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages.Bulletin, 15 (1), 34-36.*

Ervin Gerard and Judith Muyskens. (1982). On Training TAs: Do we know what they want and need? *Foreign Language Annals,* 15, 335-344.

Freed Barbara F. (1975). Why Train Teaching Assistants?: Foreign Language and Communications at the University. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin,* 7,(11), 9-14.

Gray, Pamela and Nancy Buerkel-Rothfuss. (1991). Teaching Assistant Training: The View from the Trenches. pp. 40-51. In Jody Nyquist, et al. (Eds.). *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach.* Dubuque, IO: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.

Hagiwara, Michio. (1976). The Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants, Past, Present and Future. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin,* 7 (3), 7-12.

Hancock, Charles R. (1981). Modest Proposals for Second and Foreign Language Teacher Education in the 1980s, (pp. 179-94).

Phillips, (Ed.). *Action for the '80s. A Political, Professional, and Public Program for Foreign Language Education.* The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company.

Henderson, Ingerborg. (1985). Training Teaching Assistants in the Yearlong Methods Course. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languagess Bulletin,* 16, (2), 31-34

Huber, Bettina. (1995). Changes in Faculty Size from 1990-1994: A survey of Ph.D. Granting Modern Language Departments. *Modern Language Journal* , 79, 55-60.

Hudelson, Sarah and Christian Faltis. (1993). Redefining Basic Teacher Gail Guntermann. (Ed.) *Developing Language Teachers for a Changing World.* The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company

Jarvis, Gilbert A. (1983). Pedagogical Knowledge for the Second Language Teacher. (pp. 234-41). In Gail Guntermann. (Ed.). *Developing Language Teachers for a Changing World.* The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Lafayette, Robert C. (1993). Subject-Matter Content: What Every Foreign Language Teacher Needs to Know. (pp 124-58). In Gail Guntermann. (Ed.). *Developing Language Teachers for a Changing World.* The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Mueller, Marlies. (1983). Leadership Development Therapy: The Courses Head's Problems and Pleasures. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin* 14, (3), 31-36.

Natchman, Francis. (1963). Practical Training for College Language Teachers. *Modern Language Journal,* 48, 11-13.

Oksenholt, Svein. (1963). The Training of the F.L. Teaching Assistant. *Modern Language Journal,* 47 (8), 368-371.

Remak, Henry. (1957). The Training and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in German. *Modern Language Journal,* 44, (5), 212-214.

Rivers, Wilga M. (1983). Preparing College and University Instructors for a Lifetime of Teaching: A Luxury or a Necessity? (pp. 327-41). In

Alatis, James E., H. H. Stern, and Peter Strevens. (Eds.) *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers: Towards a Rationale.* Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Rudolph, Frederick. (1962). *The American College and University.* New York: Vintage Books.

Sammons, Jeffrey. (1976). Teacher Training Once More: Some Respectful Objectives*Association of Departments of Foreign Languages. Bulletin,* 8 (2), 8-9.

Schrier, Leslie. (1994). Preparing Teachers of Critical Languages for the Precollegiate Environment. *Theory and Practice* , 33, (1), 52-59.

Schulz, Renate. (1980). TA Training, Supervision and Evaluation: Reports of a Survey. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages,* 12 (1), 1-8.

Sieloff-Magnan, Sally. (1993). Assigning New TAs to Second-Year Courses: Are the TA Development Programs Adequate. *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages. Bulletin,* 24 (3), 36-43.

Stein, Jack M. (1966). Closing the Circle: Training the Teacher's Teachers. In G. Mathieu. (Ed.). *Advances in the Teaching of Modern Languages.* Vol. 2. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Stern, H. H. (1983b). Language Teacher Education: An Approach to the Issues and a Framework for Discussion. (pp. 342-60). In Alatis, James E., H. H. Stern, and Peter Strevens. (Eds.) *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers: Towards a Rationale.* Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Stern, Jack. (1961). Preparation of College and University Language Teachers. *Publication of the Modern Language Association*, 75, 12-14.

Loraine Strasheim. (1991). Priority: Teacher Education: Preservice and Inservice Teacher Education in the nineties: The issue is Instructional validity. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24 (2), 101-112.

Strozer, Judith. (1991). The Training Program in Spanish at the University of Washington. (pp. 205-209). In Jody Nyquist, et al. (Eds.). *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach*. Dubuque, IO: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.

Sykes, Charles. (1988). *Profscam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education*. Washington D.C. Regency Gateway.

The University of Texas at Austin. (1993). *The Graduate Catalog: 1993-1995*. Austin: Office of the Registrar, The University of Texas at Austin.

---. (1982). *Handbook for TAs and AIs*. Austin: Board of Regents of The University of Texas.

Winkelman, John. (1960). Training College Language Teachers. *Modern Language Journal*, 44, 210-216.

APPENDIX A

This survey is meant to gather information about the Training Programs for Foreign Language TAs.

Please take some time to answer the questionnaire.

A . General Info

1. Please describe your status: ____________
2. What language do you teach: ___________________
3. Please describe your duties and responsibilities in your department.
   a.____
   b.____
   c.____
   d.____

B. Teaching experience:

1. How many semesters have you taught in your department?_________
2. Which courses have you taught / are you teaching?_______________
3. How many times have you taught each course?________________
4. Did you have any teaching experience prior to UT? YES NO
   If yes, where, for how long, and what type of courses did you teach?
   ____

C. The 398T Course

1. Have you taken the 398T course that your department offers? YES NO

If yes, please check the appropriate answer:

- the course prepares the TAs for teaching in your department	YES	NO
- the course discusses various approaches to language teaching.	YES	NO
- the course discusses the teaching approach of the department	YES	NO
- the course discusses problems that arise in the classroom	YES	NO
- the course helps in a better understanding of language teaching	YES	NO

-other,describe: ________________________________

2. If you answered NO to any of the above, please explain why.

____

D. Characteristics of a Good Teacher

1. What, in your opinion, are the characteristics of a good teacher. Please rank the items below, starting with 1 for the item you consider most important.

(a) Competencies: Professional

____ mastery of the language
____ knowledge of the culture(s) in which the language is used
____ knowledge of the literature(s) written in the language
____ solid background in linguistics
____ solid background in applied linguistics
____ solid background in second language acquisition
____ awareness of the current discussions on language teaching/learning
____ active participation in workshops, training sessions, conferences
____ other, describe:

(b) Personal

____ self-confidence	____ leadership	____ objectivity
____ kindness	____ humor	____ organization
____ strictness	____ authority	____ ability to listen
____ friendliness	____ humility	____ punctuality
____ neatness	____ confidence	____ enthusiasm
____ patience	____ availability to students	
____ other, describe:		

E. Needs

1. What, in your opinion, are the needs of a TA. Please rank the items below, starting with 1 for the item you consider most important.

____ pre-service training
____ in-service training
____ possibilities for continuous language training
____ offerings in methodology courses
____ active assistance from coordinator

____ good teaching materials
____ well designed courses / syllabi
____ well equipped classrooms (tape recorder, VCR, etc.)
____ financial assistance to attend training workshops and courses
____ financial assistance to attend language courses abroad
____ other, describe:

F. Any other comments:

Many Thanks for your Cooperation!

The Concurrent Validity of Cloze Test with Essay Test among Korean Students

SOYOUNG LEE

This study investigated the concurrent validity of the cloze test with the essay test among Korean university students. A total of 129 students enrolled in freshmen English courses in Seoul, Korea, participated in this study. A seventh-word deleted cloze test and a descriptive essay test were administered to the students. A significant correlation between the two tests (r=.67 by the exact-word method and .64 by the acceptable-word method) was found. This result confirms the finding of two previous studies (Fotos, 1991; Hanania and Shikhani, 1986) that cloze tests can be an alternative to essay tests. This study has both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, the finding of this study seems to be an answer to the question of the construct of the cloze test. Practically, it suggests the use of the cloze procedure as a teaching device in classroom situations in Korea.

INTRODUCTION

Discrete-point tests have been widely used in evaluating students' English language proficiency in Korea. The advantages of discrete-point tests such as machine grading that enables to control massive number of examinees have been appealing. However, important concerns have been expressed in the second and foreign language literature that performance on a discrete-point test may indicate not overall language ability but intensive learning of isolated grammatical rules (Hanania and Shikhani, 1986). The same concerns have been also a critical issue in the English education field in Korea. The situation has been worrisome; six years of English learning during the period of middle to high schools results in only some reading ability but little ability of speaking, listening, and writing for most students. It is understandable considering that most English teachers in Korea are nonnative speakers and that, unlike listening and reading tests, it is difficult to develop objective scoring formats for speaking and writing tests. However, the disadvantages of a discrete-point test for the evaluation of the productive ability merit serious concern; such a test tells a great deal more about learners' ability to recognize correct elements of the language than about their ability to use their knowledge effectively with a listener or a reader.

Accordingly, the use of an integrative test for the evaluation of speaking and writing ability deserves attention. In particular, if there is an integrative test that is easy to prepare, administer, and score in evaluating the productive skills of speaking and writing, it will be very useful for English teachers in Korea who experience difficulties in dealing with the productive ability on tests. In this respect, cloze tests seem to be a promising approach. In fact, the usefulness of cloze tests has been recognized by some researchers. Hanania and Shikhani (1986) found significant correlations among a cloze, an essay, and a standard

ESL tests. Fotos (1991) reported that with careful preparation the use of cloze test as a writing proficiency measure can yield high validity and reliability estimates.

This study has a purpose of confirming the concurrent validity of the cloze test with the essay test among Korean students. So far, many studies have attempted to validate cloze tests with various discrete-point tests (Bachman, 1985; Brown, 1980, 1983) and shown a significant correlation between cloze tests and discrete-point tests. However, there has been little research on the validation of cloze tests with integrative tests to which cloze tests belong. Shohamy's (1983) study investigating the relationship between an oral interview and the cloze procedure, and Fotos's (1991) and Hanania and Shikhani's (1986) studies demonstrating high validity of cloze tests with compositions are a few studies. Thus, this study is to see whether cloze tests can measure the ability that essay tests measure among Korean students.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects in this study were 129 college first-year Korean students who were native speakers of Korean studying in two private universities in Seoul, Korea in March, 1995. Their majors were electronics, child and family, sport and leisure studies, Russian language and literature, chemical engineering, and management. Eighty-five students were male and forty-four students were female. They were enrolled in freshmen English classes that are required for all freshmen in the universities.

The subjects in this study were a homogeneous group with regard to nationality, language background, age, and educational level. The students ranged in age from 18 to 20. While no measure of overall English language proficiency was available for the students, it can be said that all of the students had taken six years of formal English courses in middle and high schools prior to this study. Their 1995 college entrance English test scores indicated they were in the top 10% group of those who took the test.

Material

This study needed two kinds of material: a cloze test and an essay test. The cloze test was prepared according to the procedures of Hanania and Shikhani (1986) and Fotos (1991). First, the students' reading ability level that would guide the choice of cloze texts was decided by Dale and Chall's (1948) readability formula using two college entrance English tests. Then, three different texts were picked from two textbooks designed for seventh or eighth graders in the U.S.A. Finally, three passages of about three hundred words for the rate of fifth word deletion were prepared to yield fifty blanks from the texts. From the passages, three different cloze tests were constructed. A pilot study led to revised cloze tests with seventh deletion rate, thirty blanks, and more contextual information. As a pretest, the revised versions of the three cloze tests were tried out to 100 college first-year students. The form that showed the highest K-R 21 reliability estimate was selected for the final use, which is shown in Appendix A.

The essay topic, "Plans for College Life," was chosen since it was related to the students' general experience, motivated the students to write about, and was likely to elicit a variety of linguistic structures within the students' previously learned lexical and syntactical knowledge. The topic did not require argumentation or definition of abstract concepts. The students were expected to write about one page on the given topic.

Procedure

The cloze and essay tests were administered to four English classes of 129 students in March, 1995 with the cooperation of the English instructors. The cloze test was timed to take twenty minutes and the essay test was timed to take twenty-five minutes. The direction for taking the cloze test and scoring method were read aloud to the students as they read them silently. A sample test was used to orient the students to the testing format. The direction and sample test are shown in Appendix B.

After the collection of all cloze tests, the essay test was administered. The instruction, topic, and scoring criteria of the essay test were also read aloud to the students as they read them silently. The students were given a blank page of paper to write the essay on. The instructions for taking the essay test and criteria by which the essays were graded are shown in Appendix C.

Scoring of the tests

The cloze tests were scored twice by both exact-word method, which counts only the same words as in the original passage as correct, and acceptable-word method, which counts any contextually appropriate words as correct as well as the words in the original passage. The grading of the cloze tests was done by the author and a native speaker. The author graded the cloze tests by the exact-word method and the native speaker did by the acceptable-word method. The criteria for an acceptable response were taken from the previous research (Stubbs and Tucker, 1974).

The essay tests were graded independently by three native speakers. The graders used a nine-point Likert-type scale holistically with the consideration of three criteria. The nine-point scale and three criteria taken in grading the essays were from Reid and O'Brien (1981). The nine-point scale, going from 1 (poor) to 9 (excellent), has five main levels: poor, fair, average, good, and excellent. The three criteria are: 1) English structure (the use of grammar and mechanics), 2) content (the quantity and quality of thought and diction), and 3) organization (the process of thought and support).

Prior to the actual evaluation of the essays, a standardization process was made to ensure the overall reliability of the holistic essay evaluation, which was a grader training session. The standardization process consisted of the steps taken in Reid and O'Brien (1981). First, the principles of holistic grading were explained and discussed by the author. Then, the description of the scoring criteria was distributed, read, and discussed. Finally, the graders were each given a group of three writing samples and asked to evaluate the samples in terms of the criteria. When each grader had finished, discussion of the scores followed in an attempt to arrive at a near unanimous rating (within one point). This practice session was repeated three times to refine the perceptions of the graders.

Data analysis

Statistical analysis was performed in three ways. First, descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations, and reliability estimates of the two tests was calculated. For the cloze test, the K-R 20 method was used to determine internal consistency reliability. The interrater reliability for the essays rated by all three graders was calculated following the steps suggested in Perkins (1986). First, the evaluations of all raters were intercorrelated. An average of all three correlation coefficients was derived. To derive the average correlation coefficient, the Fisher Z transformation was used because the correlation coefficient was on a non-linear scale. Then, the average correlation coefficient was adjusted using the Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula to make the final reliability estimate reflect the number of graders.

Second, the transformation of raw scores of the two tests was made for the purpose of easy comparisons; the maximum raw scores for the tests were 30 for the cloze test and 9 for the essay test. Raw cloze scores were recorded and multiplied by 3.3 to obtain percent scores for total cloze performance. Raw essay scores given by the three graders were averaged and then the average scores were multiplied by 11.1 to obtain percent scores for total essay performance. Finally, the Pearson's product-moment correlation was performed to see how the two tests correlated with each other. It indicated the degree of commonality among the tests.

RESULTS

The findings on basic information of the two tests, such as means, standard deviations, and reliability estimates are first presented. Then, the result of the correlational analysis is presented.

Table 1 presents the mean, standard deviation, and K-R 20 reliability estimate of the raw cloze test scores.

Table 1.
Mean, standard deviation, and reliability of the raw cloze scores (n=129)

Scoring Method	Mean	SD	Reliability
Exact-word	10.21	3.88	.73
Acceptable word	13.42	4.75	.78

* The maximum cloze score was 30.

Table 1 shows that the cloze mean score of the present study by the exact-word scoring method was relatively high in comparison with the cloze mean scores obtained in previous research. In Fotos's (1991) study, the mean score of was 12 out of total score of 50. In Brown's (1993) research, the means of fifty cloze tests ranged from 1.02 to 9.92 out of total score of 30, though his "natural" cloze tests were found to be more difficult than typical cloze tests.

The mean score by the acceptable-word scoring method was higher than the mean score by the exact-word scoring method. The difference of the mean scores between the two methods was 3.21. In other words, the mean score by the acceptable-answer scoring method was about 10% higher than the mean score by the exact-answer scoring method.

The cloze test reliability was estimated using the K-R 20 method. The K-R 21 method used in previous research (Fotos, 1991; Hanania and Shikhani, 1986) was criticized for its underestimate or sometimes overestimate of reliability in spite of the advantage of easier calculation (Brown, 1993) and thus avoided in the data analysis of the main cloze test; the assumption of the K-R 21 procedure that all of the items are of equal difficulty is rarely met on real tests. The reliability estimates were fairly high, which means the cloze test is reasonably reliable to produce consistent results.

The correlation coefficient between the exact-word and acceptable-word scoring methods was .94, which was significant ($p < .01$). The coefficient of determination, the value obtained by squaring the correlation coefficient, indicates the percentage of overlapping variance between the two scoring methods. The .88 coefficient of determination indicates the two methods were strongly related to each other.

Table 2 presents the mean, standard deviation, and interrater reliability estimate of the raw essay test scores. Table 2 shows that students' writing proficiency was slightly below the average, which was 5 on the nine-point scale going from 1 (poor) to 9 (excellent). As the small value of standard deviation indicated, most essays (about 60% of the total essays) were in the category of 4 to 6, which were below average, average, and above average. The high .89 interrater reliability estimate of the essay tests calculated using the average of intercorrelation coefficients and the Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula confirmed that holistic evaluations of essay tests are reliable (Flahive and Snow, 1980) as well as valid.

Table 2.
Mean, standard deviation, and reliability of the raw essay scores (n=129)

Mean	SD	Reliability
4.22*	1.23	.89

* The maximum score was 9.

Finally, in Table 3 are listed transformed scores of the two tests from raw to percent correct in order to make easier comparisons among the two tests.

Table 3.
Means and standard deviations of the percent correct scores of the cloze and essay tests (n=129)

Test	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cloze (Exact-word)	33.69	12.81
Cloze (Acceptable word)	44.28	15.68
Essay	46.87	13.62

The maximum score of each test was 100.

The relationships between the essay and cloze scores

Table 5 presents the relationship between the cloze scores and the essay scores, which was expressed by the Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients.

Table 5.
The relationships among the cloze and essay (n=105)

Paairs of Tests	r
Essay and Cloze (Exact-word)	.67
Essay and Cloze (Acceptable word)	.64

Both correlations were siognificant at p<. 01

The correlations indicate a degree of commonality between the tests and confirm their validity as tests of language proficiency. The .67 correlation coefficient between the essay and cloze scores is noticeable in that lower correlation coefficients between essay and cloze scores were found in previous studies: .51 from Hanania and Shikhani's (1986) samples of college applicants and .46 from Fotos's (1991) samples of college freshmen. Besides, considering that the students in this study were restricted samples in terms of their college entrance English test scores, the high correlation coefficient was remarkable; lower correlation coefficients are expected for a truncated sample.

DISCUSSION

This section discusses the results of the data analyses in light of possible explanations coming from the existing literature.

Descriptive statistics

The cloze mean score of the present study is not in line with the mean scores shown in previous studies (Chavez-Oller et al., 1985; Fotos, 1991). Fotos's (1991) conclusion that "cloze test mean scores are rather low regardless of the institution, the language tested, or the type of students, especially when exact scoring is used" (p. 329) does not fit in the present research. The higher cloze mean score of the present study appears to result from the analysis of readability level of the participants of this study prior to the selection of the possible cloze passages. Unlike the previous research, this study used Dale and Chall's (1948) readability formula to decide the students' reading level correctly. The evaluation of the students' reading ability was found to be the readability formula score of 6.64, indicating the reading level of seventh to eighth graders in the U.S.A. This evaluation on the basis of a scientific calculation led to a more correct selection of cloze passages than that based on testers' subjective judgments or random choices made in the previous studies.

Besides, the revision of the cloze passages made after a pilot study and the final selection of the cloze test made after a pretest seem to contribute to the higher cloze mean score. The importance of careful preparation and selection of cloze tests emphasized in Fotos's (1991) study is again confirmed. This confirmation is in line with a study by Brown (1993) in which the conclusion was drawn that "tester/researcher intervention is necessary for developing sound cloze test" (p. 110). In fact, a tester or a researcher's cloze selection decision on the basis of the most desirable descriptive characteristics such as reliability statistics makes cloze tests reliable and valid tests of overall second or foreign language proficiency. However, since the variation in the effectiveness of cloze tests has been found to be considerable (Brown, 1993), the view of cloze tests as an automatic indicator of second or foreign language proficiency is not advocated in this study.

The .73 (by the exact-word method) and .78 (by the acceptable-word method) reliability estimates of the cloze test in this study are noticeable considering that homogeneous samples in ability levels are often associated with low reliability estimates (Brown, 1993). Despite the restricted range of the cloze scores found in the homogeneous group of the subjects in this study, the fairly high reliability estimates are reported indicating the cloze test is reasonably sound.

The strong relationship between the two scoring methods indicated by the correlation coefficient confirms the findings of the previous research (Oller, 1973; Stubbs and Tucker, 1974) and suggests the easier exact-word scoring method could be appropriate for use by nonnative speaker teachers. Another support for the use of the exact-word scoring method, which has been criticized for discouragingly yielding low scores to the cloze test takers, comes from the about 10% difference of the mean scores between the two scoring methods found in this study. The difference of the mean is quite small in comparison with Brown's (1980) study in which the mean by the acceptable-answer scoring method was 71% higher than the mean by the exact-answer scoring method.

The near-average mean score and the small value of the standard deviation for the essay test seem to show that the subjects in this study are homogeneous with regard to English writing proficiency. It should, however, be noted that just one sample of essay may be insufficient to evaluate the writer's composition ability (Henning, 1987). In fact, after finishing the essay scoring, one of the essay graders mentioned that nearly all essays were similar in terms of the amount of writing and writing style as well as the content of writing. Thus, rather than single compositions often criticized for unreliable representations of writing proficiency, several writing samples whose topics are various are recommended as a more correct measure of writing (Henning, 1987).

The .89 interrater reliability estimate for the essay scores in this study confirms holistic evaluations can be reliable. The subjectivity involved in holistic scoring due to bias, fatigue, and shifting standards from one paper to the next is reduced by several techniques: establishment of criteria to focus graders' attention on significant aspects of the writing, training of graders until they achieve close agreement in the assessment of the same paper, and three independent ratings of each essay.

Validity of the cloze test as a writing measure

The observed high correlation between the essay and cloze tests reflects the concurrent validity of the cloze test as a writing measure. The common integrative nature between the essay and cloze tests is proved. This means both tests require students to draw upon several language skills, which are production of language rather than recognition of correct items. Hanania and Shikhani (1986) and Fotos (1991) viewed the commonality between the two integrative tests is related to the testing of higher-order language abilities.

Limitations

There are some limitations in this study. First, in spite of the efforts put in the design of the cloze test used in this study, the cloze test has not resolved the problems of generalizability and the equivalence of items across different forms. This situation is related to the validity issue. Considering the remark that "... validity is related more to the individual items of the test than to general variables, such as rate of systematic deletion ..." (p. 108, Hanania and Shikhani), the cloze test needs the identification of item characteristics for a more suitable test format.

Second, some study (Stansfield and Hansen, 1983) shows that students' field independence has a consistent relationship with cloze performance. The correlation found between field independence and performance on cloze tests seems to indicate a cognitive style bias operates in cloze solutions. On the other hand, test anxiety was found to affect students' cloze performance (Oh, 1992; Shohamy, 1982). Considering that affective factors have a strong impact on students' performance in testing and learning, the examination of the effect of test anxiety on cloze performance should be needed in research on cloze tests. Thus, certain nonlinguistic characteristics, which have not been considered in this study, are worthy of further investigation and interpretation.

Finally, the evaluation of a student' writing proficiency through an essay sample has been controversial, especially, when holistic scoring is used. Single compositions are said to be unreliable representations of writing proficiency (Arthur, 1979). Thus, to reduce the threats to reliability, the elicitation of multiple writing samples is recommended to control for the fact that writing proficiency may vary with topic (Henning, 1987). With more reliable evaluations of students' writing proficiency, the relationship between cloze and essay scores would be accurately revealed.

Implications

The result of this study has both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically speaking, the results of this study may be an answer to the question of what underlying factors are involved in cloze test performance. The strong relationship between the cloze and essay tests confirms writing proficiency may be an important factor to explain cloze performance. Further investigation of the factors to influence cloze performance, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, may lend insights into how such factors operate in cloze solutions.

Practically speaking, the confirmation of the cloze procedure as a valid language proficiency test suggests the use of the procedure beyond a testing format. It can be used as an effective teaching device. Hinofotis (1987) suggests some variations in the cloze format suited for classroom use such as use of the cloze format in an exercise in listening comprehension. Such a modified use of the cloze procedure is found in other research (Buck, 1988) and indicates individual teachers can vary the cloze format to suit their instructional needs in the classroom.

Conclusion

This study aims to determine whether cloze tests can measure Korean students' English writing proficiency. Result supports the view that cloze tests can be used as an integrative measure of writing proficiency. However, for the effective and accurate use of cloze tests, careful preparation of cloze tests should be done. In addition, nonlinguistic factors such as cognitive and affective style bias should be considered in the interpretation of cloze test scores.

REFERENCES

Arthur, B. (1979). Short-term Changes in EFL Composition Skills. *On TESOL '79*. Eds. Yorio, C. A., K. Perkins and J. Schachter. Washington, D. C.: TESOL.

Bachman, L. F. (1985). Performance on Cloze Tests with Fixed-ratio and Rational Deletions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 535-56.

Brown, J. D. (1980). Relative Merits of Four Methods for Scoring Cloze Tests. *The Modern Language Journal*, 64, 311-17.

-------- (1983). A Closer Look at Cloze: Validity and Reliability. *Issues in Language Testing Research*. Ed. Oller, J. W., Jr. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

-------- (1993). What Are the Characteristics of Natural Cloze Tests? *Language Testing*, 10, 93-115.

Buck, G. (1988). Testing Listening Comprehension in Japanese University Entrance Examinations. *Japan Association of Language Teachers Journal*, 10, 15-42.

Chaavez-Oller, M. A., T. Chihara, K. A. Weaver, and J. W. Oller., Jr. (1985). When Are Cloze Items Sensitive to Constraints across Sentences? *Language Learning*, 35, 181-203.

Dale, E. and J. S. Chall (1948). Formula for Predicting Readability. *Educational Research Bulletin*, 27, 11-20, 37-54.

Flahive, D. E. and B. G. Snow (1980). Measures of Syntactic Complexity in Evaluating ESL Compositions. *Research in Language Testing*. Eds. Oller, J. W. Jr. and K. Perkins. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Fotos, S. S. (1991). Cloze Test as an Integrative Measure of EFL Proficiency--A Substitute for Essays on College Entrance Examinations. *Language Learning*, 41, 313-36.

Hanania, E. and M. Shikhani (1986). Interrelationships among Three Tests of Language Proficiency--Standardized ESL, Cloze, and Writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 97-109.

Henning, G. H. (1987). *A Guide to Language Testing: Development, Evaluation, Research.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hinofotis, F. B. (1987). Cloze Testing: An Overview. *Methodology in TESOL: A Book of Reading.* Eds. Long, M. H. and J. C. Richards. New York: Newbury House.

Oh, J. (1992). The Effects of L2 Reading Assessment Methods on Anxiety Level. *TESOL Quarterly,* 26, 172-76.

Oller, J. W., Jr. (1973). Cloze Tests of Second Language Proficiency and What They Measure. *Language Learning,* 23, 105-18.

Perkins, K. (1986). A Proposed Research Program for ESL Composition Evaluation. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English.*

Reid, J. M. and M. O'Brien (1981). The Application of Holistic Grading in an ESL Writing Program. *Paper Presented at the Annual Convention of TESOL.*

Shohamy, E. (1982). Affective Considerations in Language Testing. *Modern Language Journal,* 66, 13-17.

-------- (1983). Interrater and Intrarater Reliability of the Oral Interview and Concurrent Validity with Cloze Procedure in Hebrew. *Issues in Language Testing Research.* Ed. Oller, J. W., Jr. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Stansfield, C. and J. Hansen (1983). Field Dependence-Independence as an Variable in Second Language Cloze Test Performance. *TESOL Quarterly,* 17, 29-38.

Stubbs, J. and G. Tucker (1974). The Cloze Test as a Measure of English Proficiency. *Modern Language Journal,* 58, 239-41.

APPENDIX A

Cloze test

As the head chef of a 120-seat formal Northern Italian restaurant, I have cooked many beautiful and delicious meals. The most important critics, our customers, have for four years in a row named us their favorite restaurant in this city. All of the hard work has paid off.

This career of mine was not (1)__________ with any foresight at all. Rather, (2)__________ kind of snuck up on me (3)__________ blossomed unexpectedly.

The beginnings of my (4)__________ were quite typical: I was out (5)__________ college, broke, and in debt. When (6)__________ set out to look for a (7)__________, my criteria were simply to find (8)__________ that I enjoyed, and to use (9)__________ natural ability. I decided to try (10)__________.

At first, I wondered whether I (11)_________ made a wise choice. My first (12)_________ position exposed me to all of (13)_________ evils of the restaurant business. There (14)_________ the owners who cared only about (15)_________ bottom line, and the managers who (16)_________ nothing about food and who cared (17)_________ less.

I wanted a job where (18)_________ *cooking* was taking place. I looked (19)_________ a place where quality products would (20)_________ handled professionally, and where I would (21)_________ able to contribute what I had (22)_________ offer.

So, eight years ago, I (23)_________ an apprentice here at Giovanni's. Working (24)_________ this kitchen proved to be a (25)_________ "education" for me. I gradually became (26)_________ of how temperature, cooking times, and (27)_________ affected the look, texture, and flavor (28)_________ the food I was preparing.

On (29)_________ down side, the hours were murder. (30)_________ kitchen was as hot as a furnace. I worked under a disagreeable chef.

This man eventually left, and that was the turning point for me. Although I had very little experience, almost no trained help, and a hot summer ahead, I took over as the new chef.

Answers for cloze test

1) planned 2) it 3) and 4) career 5) of 6) I 7) job 8) something 9) my 10) cooking 11) had 12) cooking 13) the 14) were 15) the 16) knew 17) even 18) real 19) for 20) be 21) be 22) to 23) became 24) in 25) good 26) aware 27) ingredients 28) of 29) the 30) The

APPENDIX B

Directions for Taking Cloze Tests

At the bottom of this page is a sample of a new kind of test. The test is made by copying a few paragraphs from a book. Every seventh word was left out of the paragraphs, and thirty blank spaces were put where the words were taken out.

Your job will be to guess what word was left out of each space and to write that word in that space. It will help you in taking the test if you remember these things:

1. Write only one word in each blank.
2. Try to fill every blank. Don't be afraid to guess.
3. You may skip hard blanks and come back to them when you have finished.

4. Wrong spelling will not count against you if we can tell what word you meant.
5. All blanks can be answered with ordinary words.

Sample Test

Below is a sample of the test to help you to be familiar to the main test. Fill each blank with the word you think was taken out. You may check your paper when you finish it by looking at the answers which are written at the bottom of the page.

What is a friend? More than (1)_______ father, more than a brother: A (2)_______ companion. With him, you can conquer (3)_______ impossible.

1) a 2) traveling 3) the

APPENDIX C

Instruction

This is a test of your ability to write an essay in English. When I give you the test paper, you will have twenty five minutes to write an about one page essay. The topic you are write about is stated on the test. You may take a few minutes, if you want, at the beginning of the test, to make notes or an outline for your essay on the back of the paper you receive. If you do not have enough space on the front of the page, you may continue on the back.

Criteria of evaluation

Your essay will be evaluated as to your ability to communicate effectively in writing. We will look at three qualities in particular: English structure, content, and organization.

Research Review

Trends of Language Learning Strategy Research

MI-AE LEE

Almost all language learners initiate some action to overcome their problems in language learning and seek the best and quickest way in which they can improve their foreign language skills. These techniques, steps, actions, or behaviors taken by language learners to enhance acquisition are called language learning strategies (Oxford and Cohen, 1992; MacIntyre, 1994; Chamot and Kupper, 1989). During the last two decades or so, research on language learning strategies (LLS) has boomed, and succeeded in opening the eyes of researchers to the possibilities of the learner exerting control over the learning process. Nevertheless, the literature may cause confusion because theoretical assumptions and claims often vary from researcher to researcher. The author, therefore, feels a strong need to summarize the trends of LLS studies for better understanding of the literature.

The present paper attempts to chronologically examine previous studies on LLS and then group the individual studies into the following sets:

1. 1970s	Good language learner studies
2. 1980s	Cognitive psychology-based research
3. 1990s	Vygotskian approach
	A. Style-strategy linkage
	B. Sociocultural theory-based research.

Interestingly enough, a common psychological basis can be found underlying studies within each set. This tendency shows that language learning strategy research basically conforms to a psychological approach to understanding human learning.

The first set, carried out mainly in the 1970s, includes such researchers as Wong-Fillmore (1979), Rubin (1975), Stern (1975), and Naiman et al. (1975), who focused on characteristics and strategies of the good language learner. Furthermore, such researchers suggested that language teachers teach poor language learners the strategies used by good students. The second school of language strategy experts, those of the 1980s, enriched the previous research results. They are represented by O'Malley et al. (1985a; 1985b; 1990; etc.). They sought an overall accounting of cognitive language learning.

The 1990s have witnessed a divergence between two slightly different research groups. Both groups reflect Vygotskian theory of educational psychology in that they emphasize influences of culture and social interactions on human learning. However, these groups still find differences in their research methodology and claims. Therefore, the present paper prefers to consider those groups as two different strands of research in 1990s. The former school of style-strategy linkage has been led by Oxford and her colleagues (1989; 1992; 1993; 1995; etc.), while the school based on sociocultural theory includes Lantolf and Appel (1994), Wertsch and Tulviste (1992), and Donato and McCormick (1994). The paper will briefly review those four sets.

1. 1970s -- Good language learner studies

Researchers in the 1970s attempted to define the strategies that successful language learners employ, and then they tried to draw a profile of good language learner behaviors. Reflecting the shift from behaviorism to cognitivism in psychology, researchers paid attention to learners and tried to see what learners do to assist in their own learning.

A. Wong-Fillmore's study (1979)

After her study with Spanish speaking children, Wong-Fillmore discounted aptitude as a basis for learning variation that until then had been widely regarded as one of the crucial individual difference factors in language learning. Instead, she emphasized the cognitive and social strategies (shown by Table 1 below) employed by the children that helped in their language learning (Wong-Fillmore, 1979; Skehan, 1989). Agreeing with Grice's cooperative principle in conversation, which is that the speakers assume that the listeners can understand them so that communication between them is possible (Grice, 1975), Wong-Fillmore further proposed that some social strategies play a more important role in language acquisition than do cognitive strategies. Wong-Fillmore stated:

> The crucial factor was this: Because the friends believed that the learners could understand them, and that communication between them was possible, they included them in activities and conversations, and this allowed the learners to assume roles in social situations and activities that made sense to them, and gave them an opportunity to observe and acquire the kind of language children use in these activities, despite their initial inability to speak or understand the language.
> (Wong-Fillmore, 1979: 209-10)

Wong-Fillmore also implied that children who focus on details are apt to have difficulty in assembling these details in a larger system.

One may argue from this study that the result would reflect very much the quality of the subjects and their language learning context, which means that children are likely to be more interested in establishing social relationships than in learning a language.

Table 1. Classifications of Language Learning Strategies by Researchers in the 1970s

Author	Primary strategy secondary strategies	Representative classification
Rubin (1981)	Direct strategies	Clarification/verification Monitoring Memorization Guessing/inductive inferencing Deductive reasoning Practice
	Indirect strategies	Creates opportunities for practice Production tricks
Naiman et al.	Active task approach	Responds positively to learning opportunity or (1978) seeks and exploits learning environments Adds related language learning activities to regular classroom program Practices Analyzes individual problems
	Realization of language as a system	Makes L1/L2 comparisons Analyzes target language to make inferences Makes use of fact that language is a system a means of communication and interaction Emphasizes fluency over accuracy Seeks communicative situations with L2 speakers Management of affective demands Finds sociocultural meanings Copes with affective demands in learning
	Monitoring L2 performance	Constantly revises L2 system by testing inferences and asking L2 native speakers for feedback

Wong-Fillmore	Cognitive strategies	Assumes relevance of what is being said (1979) Gets some expressions Looks for recurring parts in formulae Makes the most of what he/she has acquired Works on the big things first
	Social strategies	Joins a group Gives the impression he/she can speak the language Counts on his/her friends

Source: O'Malley and Chamot (1990: 4-5) and Skehan (1989: 81) revised

B. Rubin (1975), Stern (1975), and Naiman et al.'s (1975) profiles of good language learners.

Based on observations and interviews, Stern and Rubin separately presented influential lists of characteristics of successful language learners (Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975). Influenced by Stern's idea about the characteristics of good language learners, Naiman, Frohlich, and Todesco also interviewed a sample of effective and less effective language learners in order to explore such traits. The present paper will show the profile by Stern and the one by Naiman, Frohlich, and Todesco, as examples.

Stern's Profile

Stern (1975: 311-316) compared and contrasted his profile of good language learners with that of Rubin. He suggested ten strategies that differentiate the good learner from the poor one. These strategies include the following:

a. A personal learning style or positive learning strategies. Good learners will match their own styles or strategies with their own learning.
b. An active approach to the learning task. Compared to poor learners, good learners are active, and they do not depend heavily on the teacher.
c. A tolerant and outgoing approach to the target language and empathy with its speakers. This feature is consistent with Rubin's observation that "the good language learner is not inhibited".

d. Technical know-how about how to tackle a language. Good learners have available linguistic knowledge to cope with the complexities that may impede poor learners. This feature echoes Rubin's good learner who is "prepared to attend to form" (1975: 47).
e. Strategies of experimentation and planning with the object of developing the new language into an ordered system, and revising this system progressively. Good learners are purposeful and systematic in developing the second language.
f. Constantly searching for meaning. Good learners understand the cultural significance of language use, and make efforts to get not only surface meaning but also the underlying sociocultural connotations as well.
g. Willingness to practice. Good learners know practice makes perfect and search for opportunities to practice the language.
h. Willingness to use the language in real communication. Good learners seek every opportunity available to use the language, since they realize that formal practice does not transfer to functional use.
i. Self-monitoring and critical sensitivity to language use. Good learners are sensitive and self-critical in language use.
j. Developing the second language more and more as a separate reference system and learning to think in it. Good learners strive to attain an intuitive command of the language.

<u>Profile by Naiman, Frohlich, and Todesco</u>

Naiman, Frohlich, and Todesco (1975), through interviews in a study designed to more accurately discover behaviors of successful language learner, provided a list of six characteristics related to good language learner. The list includes the following:

a. Finding a set of individual learning preferences and selecting language situations that allow for those preferences to be used.
b. Actively engaging in language learning processes through language activities, discovering and dealing with individual learning problems, and searching for opportunities to use the language.
c. Enhancing an awareness about the language both as a rule system of grammar and as a means of communication.
d. Constantly extending and revising one's understanding of the target language system as new information is internalized.
e. Learning to think in the language, and developing the second language into a reference system separate from that in the native language.
f. Addressing the affective demands imposed on language learning.

Research efforts concentrating on the good language learner had managed to identify strategies used by students. Rubin (1981) proposed related lists of learning strategies, including deduction, inferencing, practicing, and so forth (Refer to Table 1). She introduced the distinction between direct and indirect strategies, with the direct strategies being immediately involved in learning (e.g., inferencing) and the indirect strategies contributing indirectly to language learning (e.g., creating opportunity for practice).

With Rubin's classification scheme that subsumes learning strategies under two primary groupings and a number of subgroups, 1970s' LLS research generated an alternative classification scheme such as Naiman et al.'s (1978). This system contains five broad categories of learning strategies and a number of secondary subsets, as illustrated in Table 1.

2. 1980s --- Cognitive psychology-based research

The major research in the 1980s was that conducted by O'Malley and his colleagues in the United States. The researchers found a research program on the cognitive information processing view of human learning. The research was based mainly on Anderson's production systems (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990). This paper briefly summarizes the Anderson framework and then shows the relationship between cognitive theory and strategies.

A. Summary of Anderson's cognitive theory

Anderson portrayed the human information processor in terms of three types of information storage: one short-term memory and two interrelated long-term memories, namely a declarative memory and a production memory. The basic framework is summed up by Figure 1.

Anderson also posited that there are two kinds of knowledge: declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge. Declarative knowledge consists of all the facts the learner has learned and all the experiences the learner has had. In short, declarative knowledge involves what the learner knows. In contrast, procedural knowledge involves the learner's knowing how to do something. For instance, our abilities to understand language or apply rules to the solution of a problem would be examples of procedural knowledge.

Figure 1

A general framework for the ACT (Adaptive Control of Thought) system, identifying the major structural components and their interlinking processes

APPLICATION

DECLARATIVE MEMORY

PRODUCTION MEMORY

STORAGE

MATCH

RETRIEVAL

EXECUTION

WORKING MEMORY

ENCODING

PERFORMANCES

OUTSIDE WORLD

Source: J. R. Anderson (1983: 19)

In this context, all knowledge is initially declarative. When information that has been stored in the declarative memory is proceduralized into a behavior by means of interpretive strategies, notably general problem solving and analogy, the information is transferred to the production memory. This process involves a creation of productions, which are IF (condition) . . . THEN (action) statements. Anderson (1983: 5-6) claimed that

> . . . underlying human cognition is a set of condition-action pairs called productions. The condition specifies some data patterns, and if elements matching these patterns are in working memory, then the production can apply. The action specifies what to do in that state. The basic action is to add new data elements to working memory.

As successful proceduralized productions are repeated, they will eventually become fully autonomous. Anderson, therefore, argued that there exist three stages of skill acquisition. The earliest stage of learning is a cognitive stage, in which only declarative knowledge can be accessed in performance. At the second stage, the so-called associative stage, learning progresses and productions are formed through processes of composition and proceduralization. The autonomous stage is the last at which time the information is stored in more economical productions that enable the learner to access more rapidly the productions through matching.

Adapting this theoretical notion to their strategy research, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) provided a description and classification of strategies. For them, language is a complex cognitive skill that can be described within the context of cognitive theory, and language learning strategies are "special ways of processing information that enhance comprehension, learning, or retention of the information" (1990: 1). O'Malley and Chamot, therefore, characterized strategies within the production system with an IF condition and a THEN action constituent, as illustrated below:

> IF the goal is to comprehend an oral or written text, and I am unable to identify a word's meaning,
> THEN I will try to infer the meaning from context.
> IF the goal is to comprehend a concept in a written text, and I know the concept is not at the beginning,
> THEN I will scan through the text to locate the concept.
> (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990: 52)

They argued that through these proceduralizations, learners can strengthen their L2.

B. Study by O'Malley et al.

O'Malley and his colleagues (1985a) conducted interviews with, and observations of, high-school ESL (English as a Second Language) students in typical language learning classrooms. The interviewers asked for strategy reports of the various activities, and the collected strategy data produced a well-known language learning strategy classification systems (Refer to Table 2). The system classified strategies into three broad categories, which are metacognitive, cognitive, and social mediating strategies.

It is striking that many of the strategies by 1970s' researchers, such as Naiman et al. and Wong-Fillmore, are excluded here. It is also noticeable that the work of O'Malley and his colleagues, which was based on cognitive theory, considerably enlarged the role of the learner as a self-reflective being with insight into his or her learning processes. As they put it,

> This line of research suggests that transfer of strategy training to new tasks can be maximized by pairing cognitive strategies with appropriate metacognitive strategies. Students without metacognitive approaches are essentially learners without direction or opportunity to review their progress, accomplishments, and future directions.
> (O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzares, Russo, and Kupper, 1985b: 560-561)

This study (1985a) also found that both beginning and intermediate students used an extensive variety of learning strategies, and interestingly intermediate level students tended to use metacognitive strategies more often than beginners. Additionally, this study revealed that ESL teachers were generally unaware of students' strategies and rarely introduced strategies while teaching.

C. Chamot and Kupper's study

Another notable study based on cognitive theory was a three-year project by Chamot and Kupper (1989). In this study, involving group interviews and thinking-aloud protocols, Chamot and Kupper found that successful language learners use language learning strategies more effectively than do less successful language learners. According to the study, effective students were purposeful, monitored their performance globally, and used background knowledge successfully. Chamot and Kupper believed that although students of all ability levels use learning strategies, many language learners are low achievers simply because they rely on infrequent or inappropriate use of a narrow, limited repertoire of strategies, such as rote memorization, translation, repetition, and deduction.

Table 2
Learning Strategy Definitions (O'Malley et al., 1985b: 582-584)

Learning Strategy	Description
METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES	
Advance Organizers	Making a general but comprehensive preview of the organizing concept or principle in an anticipated learning activity
Directed Attention	Deciding in advance to attend in general to a earning task and to ignore irrelevant distracters
Selective Attention	Deciding in advance to attend to specific aspects of language input or situational details that will cue the retention of language input
Self-Management	Understanding the conditions that help one learn and arranging for the presence of those conditions
Functional Planning	Planning for and rehearsing linguistic components necessary to carry out an upcoming language task
Self-Monitoring	Correcting one's speech for accuracy in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, or for

	appropriateness related to the setting or to the people who are present
Delayed Production	Consciously deciding to postpone speaking in order to learn initially through listening comprehension
Self-Evaluation	Checking the outcomes of one's own language learning against an internal measure of completeness and accuracy

COGNITIVE STRATEGIES

Repetition	Initiating a language model, including overt practice and silent rehearsal
Resourcing	Using target language reference materials
Translation	Using the first language as a base for understanding and/or producing the second language
Grouping	Reordering or reclassifying, and perhaps labeling, the material to be learned, based on common attributes
Note Taking	Writing down the main idea, important points, outline, or summary of information presented orally or in writing

COGNITIVE STRATEGIES

Deduction	Consciously applying rules to produce or understand the second language
Recombination	Constructing a meaningful sentence or larger language sequence by combining known elements in a new way
Imagery	Relating new information to visual concepts in memory via familiar, easily retrievable visualizations phrases, or locations
Auditory Representation	Retention of the second or a similar sound for a word, phrase, or longer language sequence
Keyword	Remembering a new word in the second language by (1) identifying a familiar word in the first language that sounds like or otherwise resembles the new word and (2) generating easily recalled images of some relationship between the new word and the familiar word

Contextualization	Placing a word or phrase in a meaningful language sequence
Elaboration	Relating new information to other concepts in memory
Transfer	Using previously acquired linguistic and/or conceptual knowledge to facilitate a new language learning task
Inferencing	Using available information to guess meanings of new items, predict outcomes, or fill in missing information

SOCIOAFFECTIVE STRATEGIES

Cooperation	Working with one or more peers to obtain feedback, pool information, or model a language activity
Question for Clarification	Asking a teacher or other native speaker for repetition, paraphrasing, explanation, and/or examples

3. 1990s --- Vygotskian approach to second language learning strategy research

Recently, there has been a growing interest in the approach to cognition developed principally by Lev S. Vygotsky, which offers a fundamentally different view from information processing theory and has found application in the study of SLA (Second Language Acquisition) as well. LLS research in 1990s also reveals the impact from Vygotskian theory, and therefore, it is necessary to review Vygotsky's basic ideas, so as to understand the direction of the study of LLS in the current literature.

A. The Vygotskian perspective

In order to trace the behavioral change of human development, Vygotsky was interested in how children overcome the difficulties that they confront. Thus Vygotsky observed the phenomenon of a little child invoking private speech while trying to solve a problem. From such observations and using the theoretical framework of dialectical and historical materialism, Vygotsky explained transformation of elementary psychological processes into higher ones.

Vygotsky believed that culturally provided sign systems such as speech or language function as the "mediating link" between the individual and the world, and the mediating link ultimately becomes the bridge between early and later forms of individual development (Vygotsky, 1978). Therefore, the term "speech" reflects an important fact that Vygotsky viewed individual mental functioning as deriving essentially from the internalization of social processes. Such a belief, accordingly, led Vygotsky to assert that the child's psychological development appears first between the child and other persons and then within the child (Vygotsky, 1986; Wertsch and Tulviste, 1992). The following sample dialogues demonstrate well what Vygotsky means:

<u>Stage one</u>: Interacting with adults or better speakers

Brenda:	hiding
Adult:	Hiding? What's hiding?
Brenda:	balloon
Takahiro:	This broken
Adult:	Broken.
Takahiro:	broken This /∂z/ broken. broken
Adult:	Upside down.
Takahiro:	upside down this broken upside down broken.

Source: Peck (1978: 385)

<u>Stage Two</u>: Interacting with self

A four-and-a-half-year-old girl was asked to get candy from a cupboard with a stool and a stick as tools.

Girl:	(Stands on a stool, quietly looking, feeling along a shelf with stick.) On the stool. (Glances at experimenter. Puts tick in other hand.) Is that really the candy? (Hesitates.) No, that doesn't get it. I could use the stick. (Takes stick, knocks at the candy.) It will move now. (Knocks candy.) It moved, I couldn't get it with the stool, but the stick worked.

Source: Vygotsky (1978: 25)

<u>Stage Three</u>: Internalization, automatization

Noriko: (without help from others or self-talk) Mi-Ae, can I borrow your cassette tapes, *Whaddaya say*, tonight?

Given the scheme of human development, Vygotsky proposed the notion of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). In his words, this zone constitutes

> . . . the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem-solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.
> (Vygotsky, 1978: 86)

The actual developmental level characterizes the learner's ability to carry out tasks without help, while the potential developmental level characterizes the learner's ability to perform with the help of an adult or expert. For Vygotsky, effective learning or teaching tasks takes place only in the ZPD. By the notion of ZPD, Vygotsky again emphasized that higher cognitive processes emerge as a result of interactions between people. In sum, according to the Vygotskian perspective, not only does the learner actively construct knowledge, but the individual's acquisition suggests socially mediated activity.

A number of researchers have attempted to apply the Vygotskian view of human learning to LLS studies. Oxford and colleagues have explored mainly the relation between learning styles and strategies, the so-called style-strategy linkage. On the other hand, another group of scholars, including Lantolf and Appel (1994) and Donato and McCormick (1994), have made sociocultural claims in the area.

B. Style-strategy linkage

In 1990s, one of the most productive researchers on the LLS issue has been Oxford. Oxford and her colleagues, in a number of empirical studies (Ehrman and Oxford, 1989, 1990; Oxford and Nyikos, 1989; etc.), have found a statistical link between students' L2 learning strategies and learning styles. Briefly put, learning styles are the general approaches to learning or problem-solving, while learning strategies are "the specific behaviors or actions -- often conscious -- used by the students to improve or enhance their learning process" (Oxford et al., 1992: 440).

According to numerous studies about language learning styles and strategies (Ehrman and Oxford, 1990; Hansen and Stansfield, 1981; Jamieson, 1992; Oxford et al., 1992; Oxford, 1993; Oxford and Ehrman, 1993), individual learners seem to have a composite of the following style-dimensions that are regarded as the most significant for language learning: global and analytic; field-dependent and field-independent; visual, auditory, and hands-on, etc. For instance, a well-known study by Ehrman and Oxford (1990) found regularities in the preferred learning strategies associated with each of eight psychological type preferences by the language learners: The eight psychological types are formed by combinations of dimensions, one each from the pairs of sensing/intuition, thinking/feeling, introversion/extroversion, and judging/perceiving.

A key assumption here is that learning styles and learning strategies have a strong cultural component. Accordingly, Oxford et al. (1993) attempted to show cross-cultural style conflicts in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms, and meanwhile Reid (1987) concluded that ESL students from different language backgrounds differ from one another in their learning style preferences. Therefore, learning styles, a significant determiner of L2 strategy choice, seem to be very much influenced by the individual's sociocultural background. Applying Vygotsky's work to SLA, Scarcella and Oxford (1992) implied that language learners can and must extend themselves beyond their "stylistic comfort zone" and use new behaviors with the teacher's assistance (p. 63).

Oxford's notable contribution to LLS research is that she proposed a new strategy classification system after reviewing the characteristics of language learning strategies. As shown below (Refer to Figure 2), Oxford divided learning strategies into six branches: 1) memory, 2) cognitive, 3) compensation, 4) metacognitive, 5) affective, and 6) social strategies.

Donato and McCormick (1994), however, strongly argued that the Vygotskian method differs from the current research on LLS which relies heavily on "making lists" of particular aspects of an individual's strategy use. According to Donato and McCormick, this cultural-historical approach "goes beyond static taxonomies" (1994: 454). Nevertheless, Adair-Hauck and Donato (1994) regarded Oxford as one of the Vygotskian second language specialists, because she has invoked the theories of Vygotsky, especially, in terms of the concept of ZPD and the emphasis on social context supports in language learning.

One who observes a gradual shift in mood from Oxford's earlier studies through current ones may see Oxford's theories as a transition between the 1980s' cognitive approach to LLS and the 1990s' Vygotskian perspective.

Figure 2

Diagram of the strategy System Showing Two Classes, Six Groups, and 19 Sets

DIRECT STRATEGIES	INDIRECT STRATEGIES
1. Memory and strategies	I. Metacognitive strategies
A. Creating mental linkages	A. Centering your learning
B. Applying images and sounds	B. Arranging and planning your learning
C. Reviewing well	
D. Employing action	C. Evaluating your learning

II. Cognitive strategies	II. Affective strategies
A. Practicing	A. Lowering your anxiety
B. Receiving and sending messages	B. Encouraging yourself
C. Analyzing and reasoning	C. Taking your emotional temperature
D. Creating structure for input and output	
III. Compensation strategies	III. Social strategies
A. Guessing intelligently	A. Asking questions
B. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing	B. Cooperating with others
	C. Empathizing with others

(Oxford, 1990: 17)

C. Sociocultural theory of LLS research

Sociocultural theorists define language learning strategies as instrumental actions to fulfill specific goals for learning (Donato and McCormick, 1994; Lantolf, 1994). In light of this theory, language learning strategies come from the primary social practice of the classroom. For instance, if the language class is too much focused on examinations or grading rather than on functional language practice, as is often the case in EFL, the use of strategies to develop communicative competence will be rare. Therefore, an LLS is "a by-product of the mediational processes" in a foreign language task (Lantolf, 1994: 419). In other words, to those theorists, social interaction and cultural institutions such as schools, classrooms, literature, etc. play important roles in an individual's cognitive development.

The researchers also suggested that activity theory is germane to the study of LLS. According to this claim, because activity theory defines activity as containing contextual, intentional, and circumstantial dimensions, activity theory enables the literature to adequately analyze LLS, that is, why the learner is using a particular strategy, how the learner performs the task, and how the situation shapes such strategic actions (Lantolf and Appel, 1994: 21).

Unlike Oxford and her colleagues, sociocultural theorists believe that LLS cannot be directly taught, nor are they a function of cognitive style or individual's personality (Donato and McCormick, 1994; Lantolf, 1994: 419). Donato and McCormick (1994) examined portfolios that required students to supply concrete, self-selected evidence of their growing language abilities. The portfolios thus differed from previous methodologies, such as diaries or journals. The researchers confirmed that strategies developed and changed over time, depending on the classroom culture. In this light, sociocultural theorists tend to pay acute attention to processes and changes, not to products, as Schinke-Llano (1993) has pointed out.

In fact, the perspective of sociocultural theory in LLS study seems to be in its infancy. As a result, there is a need for further research to examine its claims.

Intending to be dedicated to a general understanding of LLS research, the present paper provided a brief summary of the trends of LLS research from the 1970s to the mid-1990s in terms of their theoretical backgrounds. The author would like to hear further discussions on a more explanatory framework for LLS research.

REFERENCES

Adair-Hauck, B., and Donato, R. (1994). Foreign language explanations within the zone of proximal development. *The Canadian Modern Language Review 50*, 532-557.

Anderson, J. R. (1983). *The Architecture of Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chamot, A. U., and Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in Foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals 22*, 13-24.

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

Ehrman, M., and Oxford, R. L. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal 73*, 1-13.

Ehrman, M., and Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal 74*, 311-327.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. L. Margin (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Vol. 3* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Hansen, J., and Stansfield, C. (1981). The relationship of field dependent-independent cognitive styles to foreign language achievement. *Language Learning 31*, 349-367.

Jamieson, J. (1992). The cognitive styles of reflection/impulsivity and field independence/dependence and ESL success. *Modern Language Journal 76*, 491-501.

Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. *Modern Language Journal 78*, 418-420.

Lantolf, J. P., and Appel, G. (1994). Theoretical framework: An introduction to Vygotskian approaches to second language research. In J. P. Lantolf and G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research* (pp. 1-32). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
MacIntyre, P. (1994). Toward a social psychological model of strategy use. *Foreign Language Annals 27*, 185-195.
Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., and Todesco, A. (1975). The good second language learner. *TESL Talk 6*, 58-76.
Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H., and Todesco, A. (1978). The good language learner. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
O'Malley, J. M., and Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., and Russo, R. P. (1985a). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning 35*, 21-46.
O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., and Kupper, L. (1985b). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly 19*, 557-584.
Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Oxford, R. L. (1993). Research on second language learning strategies. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 13*, 175-187.
Oxford, R. L., and Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System 23*, 1-23.
Oxford, R. L., and Cohen, A. (1992). Language learning strategies: Crucial issues of concept and classification. *Applied Language Learning 3*, 1-35.
Oxford, R. L., and Ehrman, M. (1993). Second language research on individual differences. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 13*, 188-205.
Oxford, R. L., Hollaway, M. E., and Horton-Murillo, D. (1992). Language learning styles: Research and practical considerations for teaching in the multicultural tertiary ESL/EFL classroom. *System 20*, 439-456.
Oxford, R. L., and Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal 73*, 291-300
Oxford, R. L., Park-Oh, Y., Ito, S., and Sumrall, M. (1993). Learning a language by satellite television: What influences student achievement? *System 21*, 31-48.
Peck, S. (1978). Child-child discourse in second language acquisition. In E. M. Hatch (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition* (p. 385). MA: Newbury House.

Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly 21*, 87-111.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly 9*, 41-51.

Scarcella, R., and Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in The Communicative Classroom.* Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Schinke-Llano, L. (1993). On the value of a Vygotskian framework for SLA theory and research. *Language Learning 43*, 121-129.

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning* (pp. 73-99). New York: Edward Arnol.

Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review 31*, 304-318.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Wertsch, J., and Tulviste, P. (1992). L. S. Vygotsky and contemporary developmental psychology. *Developmental Psychology 28*, 548-557.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1979). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In C. Fillmore, D. Kempler, and W. Wang (Eds.), *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior* (pp. 203-228). New York: Academic Press.

Editorial Policy

TPFLE is devoted to the promotion of pedagogical and theoretical issues relating to Foreign/Second Language Education, the Teaching of English as a Foreign/Second Language, and Applied Linguistics related to language learning and teaching. Manuscripts submitted for publication undergo blind evaluation by two referees selected from the members of the editorial advisory board. The editor has the right to make editorial changes in any manuscript accepted for publication.

Submission Information

To be considered for publication, manuscripts should be typewritten according to APA style and format (see *TESOL Quarterly*), and no more than 30 double-spaced pages in length (including references and appendices). Leave one and one half-inch top and left margins, and one-inch margins elsewhere. Include abstract of not more than 200 words under the title of the manuscript, and a separate page containing the title of the manuscript, the author's name, address, and phone number. The author's name should not appear anywhere in the text. Refer to your previous publications in the third person. Submit three copies of the manuscript to:

The editors of TPFLE
Sánchez Building 528
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712

The author(s) will be required to submit the manuscript on a Macintosh floppy disk (three and half-inch size, 12 point, Palatino) if the manuscript is accepted for publication.

Subscription Information

TPFLE is published annually in the Spring. The annual membership to TPFLE is $5.00, inclusive of postage, and the individual copy of this journal is available at $5.00. Make your checks payable to "The University of Texas at Austin."

FL025032 - FL025

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").