INTRODUCTION

Knowledge concerning what goes on in the classroom between teacher and students is obviously the core area of information pertaining to formal second language (SL) teaching and learning. Although knowledge of out-of-class aspects of SL teaching such as needs analysis, curriculum design, lesson planning, materials design, and evaluation are necessary for a truly professional operation, at times when these must be dealt with minimally (as when teaching under difficult circumstances), so long as there is a teacher working with a group of students, the essence of classroom SL teaching is present, and SL learning is possible.

In this chapter we identify and discuss some of the more important characteristics and principles of this interaction, most of which derive from a logical analysis of the classroom teaching situation. Our conception of the teacher is someone faced with a great number of decisions to be made at every moment of classroom instruction. In some cases, research findings can guide those decisions. In many others, research can inform professional judgment, but decisions must be based on feel rather than knowledge. However, the decision will be aided by a knowledge of the conceptually determined range of alternatives available.

When a second language is to be taught, a number of major steps must be taken, in terms of which the chapter is organized. First, elements of the language must be brought into the classroom and presented by the teacher to students. Or, if language is not presented, then a skill, a learning strategy, or some aspect of the use of language will be set out for consideration. Second, that which has been presented must in addition be learned, and the teacher has to arrange matters and events to bring this about. The teacher selects learning activities and facilitates their utilization. Third, by the very nature of learning, information must be provided to learners concerning their success—the teacher must provide knowledge of results, i.e., correction, or feedback, to the students. Fourth, all of these processes take place in a social milieu, and because of the way language functions between individuals, the processes cannot be totally separated from the social climate which develops among students and between teacher and students. Finally, although the processes immediately adjacent in time to the lesson (teachers' lesson planning and teachers' evaluation of the students' success, i.e., testing) are dealt with elsewhere in this book, one more process which is very close to the lesson itself will be discussed here. Conscientious SL teachers usually come out of a class asking themselves "how the class went"—which is to say, they engage in a process of self-evaluation. We believe that this is a vital process for professional self-development, and one which needs to be explicitly structured into SL teachers' routines. We include it here as it is an integral part of efficient SL classroom skills.
LANGUAG E PRESENTATION

Meta-planning for Lesson Objectives

Which elements of a lesson are undertaken depends on the objectives a teacher has in mind to be attained by the lesson. (Such objectives need not be the orthodox “behavioral” objectives, it should be noted.) They are then the result of lesson planning, which Purgason’s chapter discusses. However, in general terms, the first element of a lesson is often the first component of the traditional “present-practice-evaluate” sequence which constitutes many teachers’ understanding of basic lesson structure, both within and outside SL teaching.

Though this is not always necessary, particularly if the lesson is intended mainly to practice material already partially learned, let us assume for present purposes that a teacher has selected a particular element of language, or aspect of language learning, to be presented as the first major stage of a class period. There are then two main classes of choices to be made: those concerning the physical characteristics of the presentation, that is, materials, use of audiovisual (AV) equipment, etc., and those concerning the conceptual aspects of the presentation, i.e., deductive or inductive, via rules or analogies, and so on. The former are considered in the following section, the latter in the section after that.

Modalities (Materials, AV)

The increasing quantity and quality of published ESL materials means that teachers are less and less thrown entirely on their own resources, which is undoubtedly a good thing. Without materials, the average teacher is probably even more likely than usual to succumb to the tendency to dominate the classroom by taking up class time. However, there is increasing recognition of SL learning as a process of skill acquisition (O’Malley, Chamot, & Walker, 1987), which implies the importance of practice—that is, output, rather than mere input (cf. Harmer’s 1983 “balanced activities” approach). Teachers thus need to remain aware that they are not in the classroom to fill up the time with the sound of their own voices, but to arrange matters so that their students do the talking (or writing, or listening). Particularly in EFL rather than ESL situations, class time is so valuable that we believe the teacher should get offstage as soon as possible consistent with an adequate presentation of material, and the giving of clear instructions for some practice exercise. (See the section “Class organization.”)

Assuming that the instructor decides that a given teaching objective calls for some support in the way of materials, what then? The major resource is of course the textbook. In addition, other teaching aids fall into two categories (Celce-Murcia, 1979): nontechnical aids, and technical (projected) aids (not counting the students themselves, who can of course play a stimulating role in the presentation stages of the lesson). The former are the chalkboard, realia, flashcards, magazine pictures, charts, and so on. The latter include the overhead projector, audiotape, and videotape. Both types of aids are considered elsewhere in this book (see the chapter by Brinton), so we will not discuss them in detail here, except to point out that although it is obvious that, for example, visual support of a presentation can aid its comprehensibility, by contextualizing the language involved, in most cases the utility of such aids appears rarely to have been thought important enough for SL-related investigation (as opposed to prescription). Whether or not to use them, therefore, is usually a matter for individual judgment, supported by general considerations. Does their use in a given circumstance aid comprehension, for example; does it stimulate more student talk than would have otherwise occurred; above all, does their use constitute an efficient use of class time, particularly taking into account the teacher time required to produce them, or the logistics of setting up and later removing the
equipment? It is also a matter where teachers in general would benefit from some careful teacher investigation and report concerning success and failure in practice.

Perhaps because of the complexity of the question, a similar research vacuum surrounds the question of how actually to use a textbook. For the untrained teacher, a good textbook can stand for a syllabus and training program, while an experienced teacher will not hesitate to use the text as an aid, adopting parts, adapting other elements (cf. Stevick, 1971), and dispensing with it completely under some circumstances. The utility of the average textbook for a typical present-day ESL course is normally unquestioned (but see Allwright, 1981, and O'Neill, 1982, for positions on both sides of this point). The complexity of most textbooks defies specific suggestions, but we would urge teachers to remember that most textbooks are the product of the pressures of the market, as imperfectly interpreted through the interaction of publisher and materials writer. As Ariew (1982) mentions, this is why texts (in a given period of time) are often very much alike; market pressures, however, are not the same as educational pressures. What sells may not be what works; what works may not necessarily have a format which book-publishing companies can utilize or produce. Above all, therefore, a critical stance is called for (see also Richards, 1984).

With regard to the presentation stage, some general points can be made. The main one is that the instructor is, in fact, rather free from constraints despite the various procedures suggested by the teachers' notes typically accompanying the text. Texts designed for beginning and intermediate learners commonly present the material of each unit via a dialog, and the teacher is often instructed to have the students "do" the dialog. This will likely involve having the class as a whole, or in large sections, repeat the dialog in unison, possibly moving on then to partial memorization. Perhaps an equally efficient procedure for some classes would be to have students pair off and read the dialog aloud, while the teacher circulates and checks individual performance. The point is that teachers have full right and responsibility to utilize the material in whatever way seems appropriate. However, we hope they will make use of the findings that SL research suggests can be applied here.

For example, recent work has stressed the role of attention and awareness in SL learning (Schmidt, 1990), and the importance of drawing the learner's attention to certain characteristics of the language which might otherwise be missed (Rutherford, 1987). It follows, therefore, that the teacher should usually present the text or illustrative material with an immediate focus on what the target points are. On the other hand, research over the last decade has made clear that SL learning does not take place in a simple linear fashion, with one linguistic element simply being added to the next. In the syntactic domain, learners proceed at different speeds through fairly regular sequences (Pienemann & Johnston, 1987, inter alia). In particular, it is unlikely that structural target points will be internalized by many in the class after one exposure. Consequently, the presentation phase with regard to a particular aspect of language should almost certainly come up on other occasions, in other lessons. The accurate description of SL learning as the learning of a cognitive skill (O'Malley et al., 1987) implies the appropriateness of an initial presentation, and the inevitability of a first stage of use (the "cognitive stage") which is errorful and difficult for the learner. Movement toward automaticity will require a great deal of active, realistic practice in the use of the target language, which may not be particularly susceptible to general error correction. Again, at the presentation stage, it is relevant to consider what little is known about the learner's development of control over the pragmatic aspects of the SL. This is facilitated by an emphasis on realistic, communicative language use in the classroom from an early stage, and also by developing the metalinguistic language needed to talk about this aspect of language (Henriksen, 1988; Kasper & House, 1981).
As a final comment, though we have used the generally accepted term "textbook" throughout this section, looking to the future, it may be that the textbook as such will become obsolete. As desktop publishing becomes increasingly available, and particularly with increased availability of optical readers (which can input pictorial material directly into word-processed material), it seems likely that in-house materials will become increasingly used. The advantages with regard to personalization and localization of materials are clear; such materials can also be tailored to meet the needs and strengths of the teachers of a given school or program (Dubin & Olshtain, 1986).

Rule Presentations

A great deal of research in the 1960s was directed at the question of whether and when to present explicit second language grammar rules to students (Levin, 1972). The upshot of those studies was that explicit grammar instruction was not consistently superior in the long run to other practices. As a result, the various communicatively oriented language teaching methods and prescriptions in recent years have de-emphasized the use of explicit grammar rule presentation, and even a concern for grammatically based materials (see, e.g., Krashen, 1982; Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Richards & Rodgers, 1986). However, recent research on second language acquisition has again raised the question (Harley, 1988; Long, 1988; Rutherford, 1987; Rutherford & Sharwood Smith, 1988), both because sequences of acquisition might be affected by the order of presentation of particular forms (e.g., Tomasello & Herron, 1988; Zobl, 1985) and because students' attention to form may enhance their performance (at least in the short run, e.g., Harley, 1989; Hulstijn & Hulstijn, 1984; Mitchell, Parkinson, & Johnstone, 1981; cf. also the discussion in Chaudron, 1988). Furthermore, rule presentation need not be limited to grammar points. As more and more language curricula include the functional and sociolinguistic or pragmatic aspects of second language use, teachers need to be conversant with the appropriate rules of use and should be prepared to present these to students as they begin to study a given topic.

Effective language teachers should therefore not only be aware of developments in knowledge about acquisition sequences, but they should be able to provide pedagogically comprehensible, accurate descriptions of second language grammar rules and rules of use when appropriate. Some such provision is often made in the text or materials, with graphic displays of paradigms (e.g., the conjugation of "to be," the assignment of relative pronouns depending on case, the sequence of prenominal determiners and adjectives, when to say "Hello," "Hi," and "How's it goin'").

Nevertheless, the teachers' presentation of rules will normally involve reformulations for their students' specific problems and degree of understanding, as Færch (1986) suggests. Teachers should have at the ready descriptions of typical rule applications with illustrations (such as when and how to use "some" versus "any"), and associated practice exercises. After observing several classrooms, Færch (1986) found that a typical sequence in teacher rule-presentation involved, first, a "Problem formulation," next, an "Induction," with the teacher eliciting student opinions, and then the teacher's "Rule-formulation," followed optionally by further "Exemplification" by the teacher or students. Alert teachers will adapt this typical pattern to their circumstances, either shortening the sequence if a rule is judged to be quickly learned, or developing more student-generated ideas and interaction if the students have difficulty with it.

Despite the probable usefulness of rule presentations in many instances, teachers should nonetheless stay closely abreast of current research on second language acquisition, in order to understand which sorts of rules are reasonably learned and controlled, and which are not.
Explanations

As a follow-up to the presentation of rules, teachers need to be prepared at all times during instruction not only to respond to students’ questions, providing explanations of the learning points, but also to react to learners’ problems (see later section, “Correction and Feedback”), clarifying for the learners the possible source of their problems, and “explaining” possible solutions. Obviously, such explanations will not always be phrased in terms of the target grammar, functions, or use, for they may involve study habits, psychological operations with language, or physical behaviors (such as how to place the tongue to pronounce /θ/).

Although explanations are frequent and important, little research has been focused directly on how teachers provide them. Eisenstein (1980) provides a characterization of some of the factors to be considered in giving grammar explanations: whether a grammatical description should be explicit or not; whether a rule is isolated or not; whether the explanation involves a deductive or inductive presentation; who gives the explanation—the teacher, text, or another student; whether the language is abstract or not; and whether the explanation is provided orally or in writing. On the basis of classroom observation and analysis, Chaudron (1982) outlines a variety of features of teachers’ discourse that were used to clarify and explain (sometimes implicitly) teachers’ vocabulary use. The most explicitly explanatory of these included repetition and emphasis in pronunciation, analysis of morphology, provision of antonyms and synonyms, nonverbal demonstrations, verbal examples and collocations, descriptions of characteristics or typical situations for use of a term, translations, paraphrases, and use of definitions.

Following Chaudron’s approach, Yee & Wagner (1984) developed a discourse model of teachers’ vocabulary and grammar explanations. Their model (reproduced in Chaudron, 1988, p. 88) contains several major segments (a framing stage, the explanation itself, and a restatement), with several subcategories as optional features (e.g., with or without mention of the topic item, metastatements, teacher solicits of students, examples), and at each stage, they point out that comprehension checks by the teacher are optional. An example of their model in a brief grammar explanation is the following:

Teacher: Can we say “these” in a tag? Focus + solicit
You can’t use the word “these” in a tag. Explanation + explicit rule
What do we need to use? + solicit

Clearly, teachers should pay attention to the clarity and sufficiency of their explanations, especially to the extent of student comprehension. Just as with general teacher feedback, teachers should never assume that their explanations are understood or “learned.” Students need to be given the opportunity to demonstrate comprehension, and preferably not merely by solicitation of a “yes” or a nod. We will discuss student responsiveness more below, under question types and wait time.

TASKS

Clearly, to aid discussion and communication among teachers (as well as for the sake of comparative research), it is useful to have a set of terms to describe similar teaching procedures. Therefore, in the following sections we will utilize the terms “activity” and “task,” looking in particular at the characteristics of these that are important for successful control over teaching and learning.

Subsections of a Lesson—the Activity

Probably the most commonly used and general term for the units of which a lesson
consists in “activity.” Most teachers, in discussing their lesson plans and behaviors, will use this word, although specific activities often have particular names. Surprisingly, however, through the years there has been remarkably little standardization of either a definition or a delineation of the set of possible language teaching activities. The term rarely if ever appears indexed in the classic language teaching methodology texts and is not an entry in the Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics (Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985), although it is named as an alternative to the entry for “task.” We do not propose here to explore fully the breadth of possibilities, or distinguish definitively among the uses of the terms “activity,” “exercise,” or “task.” In fact, however, much recent analysis of SL classrooms, materials, and syllabi has utilized the last term to discuss those less-controlled activities which produce realistic use of the SL. These have also characterized the communicative approaches whose upsurge marks the current era of SL teaching. In order to discuss both the controlled and freer types of classroom learning procedures we will on this occasion utilize “activity” as a broader term, with “task” applying to a separable element of a lesson, which is primarily geared to practicing language presented earlier (or otherwise learned), usually involving students working with each other, and which has a specific objective (see below).

In much early work on language teaching, the concern was on the nature of skill use, drill types (e.g., Politzer, 1970), and eventually types of communicative interaction (referred to as activities by Paulston & Bruder, 1976). Thus, fairly extensive taxonomies of drill types were detailed, on a continuum from “controlled” to “free” (i.e., with respect to the degree of teacher versus student control), or “mechanical” to “meaningful,” to “communicative.” The frequent dictum is that, for a specific learning point, learners need to develop from more controlled and mechanical to more free and communicative behaviors. Therefore, a classification of activity types along such a continuum sets the options from which the teacher can select a given sequence within a lesson.

Unfortunately, very little classroom research has involved a consistent system of description upon which to base comparisons of the communicative degree of activities (though see the teacher attitude/opinion surveys of Swaffar, Arens, & Morgan, 1982, and Nunan, 1988a). For example, Fröhlich, Spada, and Allen (1985) do not specify the set of activities they used to segment their classroom analyses. Mitchell et al. (1981) also only analyze a small set of “language” activities as segments of lessons (e.g., “translation,” “real FL,” “transposition,” “imitation”), which they propose interact with class groupings, topics, skills areas, and modes of teacher involvement. Nunan (1988) cites a 1985 study by K. Eltis and B. Low which polled 445 teachers on the perceived usefulness of teaching activities, and the following ranking was found (from high to low usefulness):

students working in pairs/small groups
role-play
language games
reading topical articles
students making oral presentations
cloze exercises
using video materials
students repeating teacher cue (drill)
exercise in free writing
setting and correcting homework
listening and note taking
repeating and learning dialogs
students reading aloud in class
exercises in conference writing
(adapted from Nunan, 1988, p. 89)

In recent classroom observation work by Chaudron and Valcárcel (1988), a tentative list of activity types has been developed. We display this list grouped according to three degrees of teacher versus student control over the performance of the activity, although, like other practitioners, we recognize that factors such as the topic and the teacher’s goals can influence the degree of control. Teachers should be familiar with each of these types,
and pay attention to the various discussions in the literature of their benefits and disadvantages.

Controlled—Teacher Has Basic Control Over Processes

Warm-up: mimes, dance, song, jokes, play. This activity has the purpose of getting the students stimulated, relaxed, motivated, attentive, or otherwise engaged and ready for the classroom lesson, not necessarily related to the target language.

Setting: Focusing in on lesson topic. Either verbal or nonverbal evocation of the context that is relevant to the lesson point; by way of questioning or miming or picture presentation, possibly tape recording of situations and people, teacher directs attention to the upcoming topic.

Organizational: managerial structuring of lesson or class activities. Includes reprimanding of students and other disciplinary action, organization of class furniture and seating, etc., general procedures for class interaction and performance, structure and purpose of lesson, etc.

Content explanation: explanation of lesson content and grammar or other rules and points. Phonology, grammar, lexis, sociolinguistics, or whatever is being "taught."

Role play demonstration: use of selected students or teacher to illustrate the procedures(s) to be applied in the lesson segment to follow. Includes brief illustration of language or other content to be incorporated.

Dialogue/Narrative presentation: reading or listening passage presented for passive reception. No implication of student production or other identification of specific target forms or functions (students may be asked to "understand").

Dialoge/Narrative recitation: reciting a previously known or prepared text, either in unison or individually.

Reading aloud: reading directly from a given text.

Checking: teacher either circulating or guiding the correction of students' work, providing feedback as an activity rather than within another activity.

Question-answer, display: activity involving prompting of student responses by means of display questions (i.e., teacher or questioner already knows the response or has a very limited set of expectations for the appropriate response). Distinguished from referential questions by means of the likelihood of the questioner's knowing the response, and the speaker's being aware of that fact.

Drill: typical language activity involving fixed patterns of teacher and student responding and prompting, usually with repetition, substitution, and other mechanical alterations. Typically with little meaning attached.

Translation: student or teacher provision of L1 or L2 translations of given text.

Dictation: student writing down orally presented text.

Copying: student writing down text presented visually.

Identification: student picking out and producing/labeling or otherwise identifying a specific target form, function, definition, or other lesson-related item.

Recognition: student identifying forms, etc., as in Identification, but without producing language as response (i.e., checking off items, drawing symbols, rearranging pictures).

Review: teacher-led review of previous week/month/ or other period as a formal summary and type of test of student recall and performance.

Testing: formal testing procedures to evaluate student progress.
Meaningful drill: drill activity involving responses with meaningful choices, as in reference to different information. Distinguished from Information Exchange by the regulated sequence and general form of responses.

Semicontrolled

Brainstorming: a special form of preparation for the lesson, like Setting, which involves free, undirected contributions by the students and teacher on a given topic, to generate multiple associations without linking them; no explicit analysis or interpretation by the teacher.

Story-telling (especially when student-generated): not necessarily lesson-based, lengthy presentation of story or event by teacher or student (may overlap with Warm-up or Narrative recitation). May be used to maintain attention, motivation, or as lengthy practice.

Question-answer, referential: activity involving prompting of responses by means of referential questions (i.e., the questioner does not know beforehand the response information). Distinguished from Question-answer, Display.

Cued narrative/Dialog: student production of narrative or dialog following cues from miming, cue cards, pictures, or other stimuli related to narrative/dialog (e.g., metalanguage requesting functional acts).

Information transfer: application from one mode (e.g., visual) to another (e.g., writing), which involves some transformation of the information (e.g., student fills out diagram while listening to description). Distinguished from Identification in that the student is expected to transform and reinterpret the language or information.

Information exchange: task involving two-way communication as in information gap exercises, when one or both parties (or a larger group) must share information to achieve some goal. Distinguished from Question-answer, Referential in that sharing of information is critical for the resolution of task.

Wrap-up: brief teacher or student produced summary of point and/or items that have been practiced or learned.

Narration/exposition: presentation of a story or explanation derived from prior stimuli. Distinguished from Cued Narrative because of lack of immediate stimulus.

Preparation: student study, silent reading, pair planning and rehearsing, preparing for later activity. Usually a student-directed or -oriented project.

Free

Role-play: relatively free acting out of specified roles and functions. Distinguished from Cued Dialogues by the fact that cueing is provided only minimally at the beginning, and not during the activity.

Games: various kinds of language game activity, if not like other previously defined activities (e.g., board and dice games making words).

Report: report of student-prepared exposition on books, experiences, project work, without immediate stimulus, and elaborated on according to student interests. Akin to Composition in writing mode.

Problem solving: activity involving specified problem and limitations of means to resolve it; requires cooperative action on part of participants in small or large group.

Drama: planned dramatic rendition of play, skit, story, etc.

Simulation: activity involving complex interaction between groups and indi-
individuals based on simulation of real-life actions and experiences.

**Discussion:** debate or other form of grouped discussion of specified topic, with or without specified sides/positions prearranged.

**Composition:** as in Report (verbal), written development of ideas, story, or other exposition.

**A propos:** conversation or other socially oriented interaction/speech by teacher, students, or even visitors, on general real-life topics. Typically authentic and genuine.

### Task Types and Parameters

In the list above, the headings "Free" and "Semicontrolled" cover a number of activities which have been discussed elsewhere as "tasks." Since more information has been collected on them than on other classroom activities, they are considered separately in this section.

It might be thought that the construction of a list of possible task types from which a teacher could select was one of the most fundamental jobs for writers on SL pedagogy, one long since completed. Surprisingly, though, SL methodologists have only recently started dealing with general principles of communicative materials design (e.g., Nunan, 1989; Wright, 1987: with a precursor in Breen, Candlin, & Waters, 1979). So there exist in the literature various descriptors, and various definitions of task, some quite promising, but without much in the way of evidence of their utility. To begin with, there is no one agreed-upon description, though there is substantial overlap in the definitions which are in use. We list them so that a general impression can be gained, as it is not our intent to legislate a single form here.

one of a set of sequenceable, differentiable and problem-solving activities which involve learners in some self-reliant selection among a range of variably available cognitive and communicative strategies applied to existing or acquired knowledge in the exploration and attainment of a variety of pre-specified or emergent goals via a range of procedures, desirably independently with other learners in some social milieu.—Candlin (1984)

a piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward . . . by "task" is meant the hundred and one things people do in everyday life, at work, at play, and in between.—Long (1985, p. 89)

a task is . . . any structural language learning endeavor which has a particular objective, appropriate content, a specified working procedure, and a range of outcomes for those who undertake the task . . . [it refers] to a range of workplans which have the overall purpose of facilitating language learning—from the simple and brief exercise type to more complex and lengthy activities such as group problem-solving simulations and decision-making.—Breen (1987a, p. 23)

One of a set of differentiated, sequenceable goal-directed activities drawing on a range of cognitive and communicative procedures relatable to the acquisition of pre-genre and genre skills appropriate to a foreswn or emerging sociohistorical situation.—Swales (1990b)

the smallest unit of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language. Minimally, tasks will contain some form of data or input (this might be verbal, e.g., a dialogue or reading passage, or non-verbal, e.g., a picture sequence). The task will also have (implicitly or explicitly) a goal and roles for teachers and learners.—Nunan (1989, p. 5)

A wide variety of text types are in use as the stimulus material for tasks. Nunan (1989) refers to the following forms:

- speech
- dialogs
- monologs
- interviews
- conversations
- aural descriptions and narratives
- descriptions of processes
- media extracts
- public announcements
- games and puzzles
- picture strips
- photo essays
- writing
- public notices and signs
- diary extracts
- postcards
- poems, songs, and rhymes
- newspaper headlines
- short stories
- instructions and directions
- telephone directories
- junk mail
- textbook/journal extracts
- invitations

Our purpose in citing this taxonomy here is simply to alert teachers to the fact that almost anything can be used as the basis of a task. In many SL teaching situations, use of a
wide variety of texts (written and spoken) is justified, since part of developing learners’ skill is ensuring that they become familiar with as wide a range of text types as possible.

Some of the terms given in the lists above also have been used occasionally as task descriptors, but they are too superficial for this purpose. More useful are statements concerning the possible, desirable, or minimal units of a task. Nunan (1988a) would identify them as goals, data, activities, and roles; Candlin (1987) refers to input, roles, settings (classroom or out-of-class), actions (procedures and subtasks), monitoring (degree of supervision), outcomes, and feedback (evaluation). Outside the SL field, the classroom-research based work of Doyle (1979, 1980, 1983) has been quite influential, and antedates most SL-related statements on task components. His position on the parameters or components of a task has been summarized as follows:

a task is comprised of several elements. One element is content, the subject matter to be taught. . . A second element of a task is materials, the things that [can be] observe[d] and manipulate[d]. A third element of the task is activity . . . the things that the teacher and student will be doing during the lesson. . . . A fourth element is goals, the teacher’s general aim for the task. . . . A fifth element is the student, especially his [sic] abilities, needs, and interests. The last element is the social context of instruction. (our emphasis; Shavelson & Stern, 1981, p. 478)

Doyle’s position seems relatively well founded, but it is definitely oriented to the non-SL classroom; more recent SL-oriented positions are primarily based on perceived ease of use and conceptual analysis. Future investigation must further substantiate their adequacy. We hope that these statements provide a general idea of the concept being considered here. However, we recognize that their utility is restricted by the very limited amount of research on which they are based at present. Because of the long-term nature of SL learning, on the one hand, and the short-term nature of many observations of SL learning in the classroom, it is at present difficult to demonstrate that a given task or classroom arrangement is better than another. Nevertheless, we can direct attention to some aspects of, for example, the discourse generated by a particular arrangement, and argue that in the light of what we know about SL learning, or about learning in general, such an arrangement is (or is not) desirable.

Relevant Characteristics

Several of the characteristics to be discussed focus on the provision of comprehensible input, as indicated by markers of interactional modification. It has been argued that language which is comprehensible to the SL learner (and at an appropriate level) will be of high utility for learning purposes, and that indicators of such discourse are those deviations from normal talk which are used to clarify misunderstandings or problems in communication (see Long, 1980). The role of practice in SL development has also been emphasized, and Swain (1985) has referred to this as the output hypothesis. This would suggest that task characteristics which require learners to produce more complex constructions than they would otherwise use should be valuable (see Crookes & Schmidt, 1990; Duff, 1986). If teachers are aware of these factors, they can make more informed decisions about what material to select or to develop themselves (for more detailed discussion see Chaudron, 1988; Crookes, 1986).

The task characteristic on which most work has been done to date has been termed information structure (an aspect of “information transfer” activities—see list above under “Subsections of a lesson”). Information gap tasks may be designed so that each participant holds different information which must be shared verbally in order for the task to be successfully completed. Such a “two-way task” can be compared to one in which verbal information transfer is also necessary for task completion, but where the information is allocated solely to one participant, who is required to convey it to the other. Long (1980) showed that two-way tasks produce more interactional modification (repetitions, expan-
sions, confirmation checks) than do one-way tasks, for native speaker-nonnative speaker (NS-NNS) dyads. Studies by Doughty and Pica (1986, Pica & Doughty, 1985) give further support for the differences discovered between one-way versus two-way tasks with respect to talk between nonnative speakers.

A second characteristic of tasks, which is in a sense complementary to the one-/two-way distinction, is shared assumptions. Some studies suggest that the extensive shared background information available in some two-way tasks may work against calling forth more negotiation of meaning. It may be (as Gass & Varonis, 1985, argue) that if both participants in an information-gap task have a very clear idea of the structure of one another's information, there will be less likelihood of partial or complete meaning breakdowns. Similarly (as Gaies, 1982, suggests), if both participants are well acquainted with each other, they will be able to manage communication difficulties without the need for extensive negotiation that is probably useful for language acquisition. This may also apply to the availability of visual support for a task. In an investigation of the degree to which three different tasks produced changes in learners' interlanguages, Crookes and Rulon (1988) found that of two problem-solving tasks, the one which was less productive of immediately observable IL development was that in which the task provided visual support to both members of the dyad. Even though the pictures used were not identical, they were versions of the same picture, differing only in certain limited features. This effect of shared assumptions is further supported by non-SL work: in research on young children's production of oral narrative (in their first language, English) on different tasks, investigators found that "in summary . . . telling an original story elicited a greater quantity of language and somewhat more mature language structures than the other tasks, although each task yielded slightly different structures" (Nurss & Hough, 1985, p. 283).

A third feature which has been posited as likely to be relevant is recycling. If the discourse generated by a task requires the same linguistic material to be used repeatedly, such a conversation would be potentially more useful to the NNS than one in which many items occurred once only. However, the sole attempt to investigate this so far (Crookes & Rulon, 1985) used "discourse topic" as an indicator of recycling, but found that different topics may contain the same linguistic items, possibly because this unit of analysis was too large. The question would still seem worthy of further investigation, nevertheless.

A fourth possible factor is convergence, which derives from the work of Duff (1986). Many communicative tasks available on the ESL materials market require participants to "reach a mutually acceptable solution" (Duff, 1986, p. 150), often in solving some values clarification problem (for an early example, see Cole, 1970). Also quite common now are materials which require students to take a stand on one or another side of an issue, and argue their positions (e.g., Alexander, Kingsbury & Chapman, 1978). The former type may be termed a "convergent task type," the latter a "divergent task type" (Duff, 1986, p. 150). Duff found that the discourse which these two types of task produce have different characteristics. Specifically, her results show that convergent tasks lead to frequent exchange of turns and more communication units, whereas divergent tasks lead to longer turns of greater syntactic complexity. If convergent tasks may produce more questions and shorter turns, it might be assumed that more comprehensible input is available in the discourse which accompanies their performance. Alternatively, if emphasis is being placed on output and the role of practice, divergent tasks may be more highly valued, although "the extended discourse (long turns) in [divergent tasks] reduces opportunities for negotiation of input . . . coupled with the greater syntactic complexity of [discussion], this reduces . . . the amount of comprehensible input available" (Duff, 1986, p. 170).

The factors covered in this section consti-
FACILITATION

As we mentioned earlier, and as is taken for granted in most current SL pedagogical prescriptions, a major role of the instructor is to arrange matters so the material presented gets used and thereby learned. This is, of course, far more critical in the learning of a cognitive skill, where practice assumes major dimensions, than in the learning of most school subjects, where declarative knowledge (Anderson, 1982; O'Malley et al., 1987) is being presented, and where clear presentation may be sufficient in itself to ensure learning (cf. West, 1960). We need, therefore, to give some consideration to such matters as the overall organization of the classroom, the nature and dynamics of teacher-student and student-student interaction, and the interface between these matters and the selection of classroom learning tasks.

Class Organization

The way in which a classroom is organized can have a significant influence on language learning processes. The key participants for describing classroom organization are the following: the teacher, the teacher aide or trainee, the individual student and groupings of students, the class as a whole, the language presentational materials used (e.g., textbook, AV media), and any visitors or outsiders. Combinations of these result in particular structures in class organization (sometimes referred to as “participant organization,” cf. van Lier, 1988).

The dominant view of second language classroom processes today favors a great amount of student-centered learning instead of the traditional teacher-dominated classroom (Nunan, 1988a). The teacher-dominated classroom (“teacher-fronted”) is characterized by the teacher's speaking most of the time, leading activities, and constantly passing judgment on student performance, whereas in a highly student-centered classroom, students will be observed working individually or in pairs and small groups, each on distinct tasks and projects. The most extreme sort of student-centered learning (known as “autonomous learning”—Henner-Stanchina, 1976), of course, is conducted entirely separately from the classroom environment, as individual learning projects are carried out in the target language community, and intermittent, perhaps infrequent, contacts are made with the teacher on an as-needed basis.

Learner-centered instruction has the benefits of greater individualization of learning objectives, increased student opportunities to perform (whether receptively or productively) with the target language, increased personal sense of relevance and achievement, and, in fact, a relieving of the teacher's constant supervision of all students. Furthermore, students often will pay more attention and learn better from one another, since their performances and processes of negotiation of meaning are more closely adapted to one another's level of ability. Teachers should thus be prepared to develop fewer teacher-dominated activities and tasks, while remaining conscious of their students' need for guidance in setting objectives, for appropriate models of and feedback about the target language, and for constructive and supportive evaluation of their progress.

In general, the most appropriate and effective classroom organization is therefore pair and group work. Contrary to a popular negative view of the outcomes of learner-dominated activities, classroom-centered research has demonstrated that at the same time that students have many more opportunities to employ the target language, they manage...
to perform equally successfully in terms of grammatical accuracy as when the teacher is leading discussion (Pica & Doughty 1985; cf. discussion in Chaudron, 1988, pp. 150–152). We will therefore focus briefly on the management of group work in second language classes.

**Group Work**

Pica and Doughty (e.g., 1985) looked at *interactional modification* in teacher-fronted versus student-only group decision-making discussions, comparing complete classes plus a teacher with small groups minus a teacher. On the one-way task used in this study, they did not find differences, but when they used a two-way task they found more interactional modifications did occur in the group situation. As mentioned above, this does not directly consider learning, but rather a factor which should facilitate it (i.e., negotiation of meaning via changes in the structure of discourse).

One of the earliest studies to provide evidence in favor of SL group work was that of Long, Adams, McLean, and Castaños (1976), who found NNS participants in a dyadic discussion task utilizing a wider range of language than NNSs in a larger, teacher-fronted group engaged in discussing the same question. This referred to what kinds of remarks students made, whether or not they initiated changes of topic, and in general whether or not they used a wide range of language functions. It was also suggested that a large group situation might cause students’ utterances to be briefer and less complex, as opposed to the more relaxed atmosphere provided by the small group.

These findings are probably consistent with the practical experience of many teachers, who may well have found that students, particularly those from Asian cultures, are reluctant to speak in front of the whole class, but are much more forthcoming in smaller groups. Obviously, this has implications for the utility of the group setting, from both a “pedagogical” and a “psycholinguistic” point of view (Long & Porter, 1985). Concerning the former, it is a better use of class time. For the latter, since output is probably very important for SL learning, situations which permit or encourage only one- or two-word responses are less desirable than those which allow more complex speech, or more risk taking in terms of the use of unfamiliar, as yet unautomatized language.

Assuming the general utility of group work, there are other, lower-level questions to consider. An elementary matter is group size, and at least one study exists to support the elementary observation that participants in larger groups speak less (Liski & Puntanen, 1983). More details on which teachers may base decisions about this factor come from a study (Antony, 1986) of the discourse of NNS groups of two to five in size performing “task-based consensus activities.”

Group size does not seem greatly to affect the number of wpm (words per minute) of the group as a whole, so smaller groups likely generate more wpm per student. Larger groups, however, seem to introduce new ideas more quickly and have more simultaneous starts and more brief overlaps. So while smaller groups may provide more practice in speaking, larger groups may well provide more valuable input (Antony, 1986, p. 5).

While SL teaching in the last decade has emphasized group work, a related development in mainstream education has focused on “cooperative learning,” which adds consideration of reward structures and sometimes team competition to the characteristics of SL group work. Its applicability to the SL classroom has just begun to be investigated. For example, Bejarano (1987) conducted a large-scale longitudinal study of cooperative learning organization in EFL classes in Israel, and reported superior results for the experimental groups. Although the findings in this study are not as clear-cut as claimed (cf. Chaudron, Crookes, & Long, 1988; Zhang, 1988), students in the cooperative learning groups maintained equivalent performance to those in regular EFL classrooms, despite starting at a lower level of ability.
There is a large number of possible arrangements for cooperative learning tasks in language classrooms, and second language teachers need to be familiar with the basic principles of this type of organization. Three essential elements are identified by Bossert (1988): (1) Students are told to work together, (2) reward contingencies are arranged to encourage this, (3) tasks are constructed which can only be completed if learners work together. Obviously, point 1 is simple to carry out. Point 2 requires a little more planning. It is possible to allocate rewards to groups as wholes. Some forms of cooperative learning allow groups to compete against other groups, in which case rewards may be allocated in inverse proportion to those of other (successful) groups. The third point is probably the one to which most attention has been given in SL work, since task interdependence is a major feature of information-gap tasks and related activities. In these cases, students know only one piece of the solution to a puzzle or information required to solve a problem, and must communicate it to others in their group. More typical of mainstream cooperative learning and less common in current SL materials is the possibility that task interdependence can be fostered by assigning special functions to group members—for example, chairperson, checker, gofer. (See Johnson, Johnson, Holubec, & Roy, 1984; cf. Jacobs, 1988, for discussion of SL applications of this approach.)

In addition to group size and the shared cooperative goals of group work, it should be recognized that group work results in greater diversity of performance from one group to another. This fact suggests that just as individuals contribute to a group, the different groups in a classroom can be linked through different tasks and roles, and shared responsibilities, to generate whole-class tasks and objectives. Although competitive models can be employed in this way (as in one of Bejarano’s treatment groups), this view points rather toward whole-class cooperative learning projects.

Aspects of the Teacher-Fronted Class

Although we emphasize the relative productivity of the small group over the teacher-fronted class, teachers sometimes need to operate in a "lock-step" mode. There are a few general characteristics of teacher—student interaction which can fairly easily be manipulated under those conditions, to the advantage of SL learning. One is question type, and another is wait time.

Question Types

A number of studies (Brock, 1986; Dinsmore, 1985; Early, 1985; Long & Sato, 1983; Long et al., 1984; Nunan, 1986; Pica & Long, 1986) have shown that ESL teachers’ classroom questioning patterns are typically different from those used by native speakers conversing casually with adult nonnative speakers. SL teachers ask more display questions (those to which the questioner already knows the answer) than do ordinary NSs talking to NNSs. The latter usually use referential questions (those to which the questioner does not already know the answer). This may be because teachers have a tendency to act as if the SL was information which they must transmit to the students, thus leading them to test whether it has been understood by using display questions.

There are reasons to be concerned over this pattern. First of all, there is general acceptance of the idea that the model of the target language provided by the teacher in the classroom should not deviate greatly from that likely to be encountered in real life. Second, if teacher—student interaction is predominantly by way of display questions, relatively little real communication is going on. As Long and Crookes (1987, p. 181) observe, "display questions by definition preclude students attempting to communicate new, unknown information. They tend to set the focus of the entire exchanges they initiate on accuracy rather than meaning. The teacher (and usually the student) already knows what..."
the other is saying or trying to say, so there is no meaning left to negotiate."

Without negotiation of meaning it is questionable whether students addressed by a teacher are actually receiving useful input, in terms of its being appropriate to their current level of comprehension and/or language development. Furthermore, less complex language is likely to be produced by learners who know that the teacher is only asking the question to check their knowledge, rather than really wanting a proper and complete answer to a real question.

A further distinction is relevant, between closed referential questions (questions to which the speaker does not know the answer, but to which there is either only one or a very limited set of possible answers) and open referential questions (questions to which the speaker does not know the answer, and to which a large [infinite] variety of answers are possible). Long et al. (1984) found that open referential questions produced more complex student responses than did closed referential questions (with complexity measured by number of words per student turn).

**Wait-Time**

Wait-time refers to the pause which follows a teacher question either to an individual student or to the whole class, which lasts until either a student answers or the teacher adds a comment or poses another question. It can also apply to the period between one student's answer to a question and the response of the teacher or another student. Wait-time has been the subject of a substantial number of investigations over the last 20 years, mostly outside the SL field. These have found that wait-times can be altered by teachers, but tend to be short, around one second (e.g., Rowe, 1969; for review see Tobin, 1987). Also, when wait-time is increased to three to five seconds, there is improvement in learning, and in the quality of classroom discourse. The principal SL study of wait-time (Long et al., 1984), found that increased wait-time after teacher questions resulted in longer SL student utterances. It did not result in more utterances per student turn, however, which may have been due to the low level of the students on whom the study was conducted, or possibly an interaction between cognitive level of questions and wait-time. When asking "harder" questions, teachers tended to wait longer anyway, but the difficulty of such questions was not always compensated for by proportionately longer wait-time. We advance the matter of wait-time here as an example of a classroom procedure which is very easy to manipulate, and one which warrants further classroom investigation. Teachers might want to try the effects of simply waiting longer as they interact with their SL students, knowing that their findings, if communicated, could aid their colleagues and further substantiate (or perhaps disprove) the potential of increased wait-time in SL teaching.

**CORRECTION AND FEEDBACK**

In earlier sections on rule presentations and explanation, we noted that a focus on formal aspects of the SL had again become a concern of methodologists and practitioners. Error correction and feedback have typically been considered to be part of such a focus. However, as Chaudron notes in his review of feedback in language teaching (1988; see also Chaudron, 1986, for a review of feedback on writing):

In any communicative exchange, speakers derive from their listeners information on the reception and comprehension of their message. . . . From the language teacher's point of view, the provision of feedback . . . is a major means by which to inform learners of the accuracy of both their formal target language production and their other classroom behavior and knowledge. From the learners' point of view, the use of feedback in repairing their utterances, and involvement in repairing their interlocutors' utterances, may constitute the most potent source of improvement in both target language development and other subject matter knowledge. (pp. 132–133)

Thus, there is no reason to associate feedback and correction solely with a formal fo-
cus. Nevertheless, approaches to language teaching will vary in the degree to which the teacher is considered to be the source of "correcting" behavior. A traditional notion is that the teacher or materials provide a correction of every (important) learner error, while a more current view would emphasize the importance of learners obtaining feedback (and possible correction) only when the meanings they attempt to convey are not understood, and even then, the feedback should be a natural outcome of the communicative interaction (often between learners). Even in the most learner-centered instruction, learners need feedback in order to differentiate between acceptable and unacceptable target language use.

Communicative language teaching materials must provide opportunities for learners to recognize the communicative effectiveness of their target language productions (in the form of feedback and repairing of misunderstood speech), for example, when correct description of pictures in a two-way information gap task is the only source of success on the task. Regrettably, research on the effects of teacher feedback on development of accuracy in learner-centered tasks has not been conducted (but see Crookes & Rulon, 1985, for feedback in NS-NNS dyadic tasks).

The provision of feedback, or even "corrections," does not mean that the information provided must be stated in formalized grammatical or other descriptive terms. The teacher has many options available (Allwright, 1975; Chaudron, 1977; Long, 1977), from simply indicating lack of comprehension, or otherwise signaling the fact of an error, and getting the learner to self-correct (see discussion of learner-oriented correction in Chaudron, 1988; Long & Porter, 1985), to the most elaborate grammatical explanation and drill of correct forms.

Teachers will most frequently make the mistake of thinking that by providing a correct "model," by repeating student statements with some slight change in the grammatical form, learners will perceive the correction and incorporate it into their developing grammar. Such feedback is likely to be perceived by the learner not as a formal change, but rather as a confirmation, rephrasing, or clarification of the functional meaning. As a hypothetical example:

**Student:** I can no go back home today early.
**Teacher:** You can't go home early today?
**Student:** No.

If there is in fact reason to provide formal feedback in such a case, it helps to focus on the specific correction by emphasizing and isolating the modeled forms (Chaudron, 1977); "I can't go home," or "early today." On the other hand, this practice may still be less effective than one of getting learners to self-correct (see Herron & Tomasello, 1988), or having other learners assist in corrections. Peer correction has the potential advantage of being set at the right level of development in the learner's interlanguage grammar. If there are further grounds for ensuring that a correction be understood, teachers should make an effort to verify comprehension and ability to produce an appropriate form (preferably supplied by the learner or peers), by means of a follow-up elicitation. Caution must be maintained, however, in not resorting to extensive drills in such cases.

Moreover, a recent study of learners of French as a SL suggests that provision of correct forms may be more effective if learners are induced to produce an incorrect form before having it "corrected." Tomasello and Herron (1988) induced certain errors by presenting exceptions to rules and either indicating or not indicating that they were exceptions. Those students who were corrected after producing overgeneralized forms of the exceptions were superior on tests of the forms than students who were simply shown the exceptions in contrast to the rules.

An important limitation on the effectiveness of feedback and correction, especially with respect to grammatical development, is the natural order of development of a given structure or function. Ultimately, teachers must remain current with findings of research in second language acquisition, in order to be...
knowledgeable about fixed sequences of acquisition, for it is unlikely that any sort of error correction or feedback can radically influence these.

CLASSROOM CLIMATE

As teachers we cannot ignore the fact that classroom SL learning has a social dimension. It might be assumed that all practitioners are aware of this, and also that all SL teachers will strive to arrange for a relaxed, supportive environment in order to promote learning. However, it is desirable to ask what evidence we have to support this position, or if it is only an assumption (cf. Brumfit, 1981; Moskowitz, 1978). It certainly has not always been assumed to be an accurate statement, as a glance at the prescriptions for SL classrooms of 20 years ago will quickly show. In addition, the position that such an environment favors learning is not accepted across all cultures (particularly non-Western educational systems). Culturally determined student expectations, the individual teacher’s personality, and the interaction between these two impose limitations on the social climate of the classroom. Nevertheless, teachers have some flexibility as to what choices they make.

In recent years there have been two streams of discussion in this area directly connected to SL learning. One is that broadly associated with the label “humanistic approaches.” In this area are the so-called innovative methods such as Counseling-Learning and Suggestopedia. The training needed to utilize these techniques according to the full prescriptions of their founders is more extensive than most SL teachers have time for, and the evidence for their success has not been forthcoming (cf. Wagner & Tilney, 1983). The second strand here is the less doctrinaire position associated in particular with Schumann (1978) and Krashen (e.g., 1982). Krashen in particular has posited an “affective filter,” which must be lowered if successful unconscious SL development is to take place. However, these positions have suffered from a general lack of direct support (McLaughlin, 1987a; Schumann, 1986).

Meanwhile, for the last 20 years or more, mainstream educational researchers have been investigating the topic of classroom climate, or classroom environment, in non-SL classes (Fraser, 1986). Their results have not been particularly clear-cut, either. Observational measures of positive affect correlate poorly with achievement, which may have to do with the fact that praise, a major component of such measures, is distributed inconsistently across high- and low-achieving pupils. Teachers thus may need to reconsider the tendency to use “Good!” far too often, and inconsistently, even though they may accept the need for a positive classroom climate in general (cf. Soar & Soar, 1975). More usefully (and as might be expected), negative affect correlates significantly, and negatively, with achievement. More well-defined results come from student self-report measures of learning environment (e.g., the Learning Environment Inventory [LEI], Walberg, 1968). Since these investigations are concerned with students’ perception of classes, a distinction has been made between the previous aspect of this topic, “classroom climate,” and that implied here, “classroom psychological environment.” The latter is keyed to such concepts as students’ familiarity with each other, enjoyment of classwork, physical environment, influence on class activities, familiarity with course goals, organization of the course material, and its speed of coverage. The validity of the LEI is indicated by research which finds it to be a better predictor of in-class achievement than IQ measures, and there is also evidence for the measure’s cross-linguistic and cross-cultural validity (Anderson & Walberg, 1974).

How then does one achieve a positive learning environment? The moves one should make seem straightforward, but in the press of so many other considerations (the section of the textbook to be covered, tests to be administered, activities to do) they can sometimes be lost sight of. We can remind teachers of a number of fairly obvious points, some of
which derive from research using the LEI—others from recent developments in the study of motivation.\(^7\)

It would appear desirable, then, to arrange matters so that the class is cohesive, with students as far as possible knowing each other, and being assured that the teacher knows them. As has often been suggested in SL pedagogy (e.g., Bailey & Celce-Murcia, 1979), there is value in ice-breaking activities at the beginning of a class—short questionnaires which must be filled in about a fellow student, or simple games which require each person to enquire about others' names and backgrounds are fine for this. The teacher must also make an effort to know names and backgrounds (seating plans and the same short questionnaires will be useful here). Interpersonal skills will be needed to ensure that there is an absence of friction, that students mix with each other, and that there are neither cliques nor perceived teacher “favorites.” Related factors which may also be important are how enthusiastic the teacher appears, and whether s/he appears happy, and uses humor in the classroom (Moskowitz & Hayman, 1974).

The importance of a good physical environment shows up in mainstream educational research (Walberg, 1985) and in comments on SL classrooms (Bailey & Celce-Murcia, 1979). It has often been observed that the SL instructor typically has limited control over the teaching environment, but we would urge teachers first to push their degree of control in this area to the maximum, particularly concerning seating arrangements, and second to monitor and be sensitive to changing aspects of the classroom environment (noise, temperature, light). Obviously, the bright, clean classroom with relevant pictures on the walls, and movable, comfortable chairs with some support for writing on, is the ideal to be striven for.

Then there are aspects of the way the course is conducted which contribute to a favorable classroom environment. Course goals should be known by the participants. Even if it is only an ordinary conversation class, they should be made explicit and referred to. (This will also aid teacher planning and evaluation.) Whatever rules may be necessary for the class to run smoothly should be spelled out and adhered to—prompt attendance, no smoking, and so on. As is obvious (but not always easy to achieve), the material should be appropriate to the level of the students, well organized, and coverable at a comfortable speed.

Finally, let us consider some motivational factors (see also Keller, 1983). An important area here is interest. Taking the content of the class as a given, the instructor can work on keeping up interest by personalizing instruction—making connections between the material and individual students, or to him- or herself. It is also important to use a wide range of activities, so that classes vary in format.

According to motivation theories, we all have personal needs for achievement, affiliation, and power. In a classroom context that means we like to succeed, we like to make connections with others, and we like to have control over our own learning situation. Consequently, the instructor should ensure that learning activities are pitched at an appropriate level. Success will engender confidence and higher expectations of future success (sometimes called expectancy). This should lead to a greater degree of effort in future work. Then, the instructor should choose activities and tasks which facilitate the establishing of relationships between students. In addition, s/he should allow a measure of choice, or control, over what is done in the classroom by the students.

Satisfaction can be worked toward particularly by attending to the motivating qualities of the activities selected and the rewards given in the class. As far as possible, it is desirable to choose learning activities which have “task-endogeneous rewards”—that is, they are fun to do in and of themselves. If external rewards are to be given with these activities, they should be unexpected, non-contingent on performance. Students will also be more satisfied if they are given feed-
back when they can use it, which may be not only after a response, but just before the next opportunity to practice.

TEACHER SELF-EVALUATION

It is natural for conscientious teachers to ask themselves whether a lesson (or a course) was successful. Consciously or unconsciously, they probably do so during any given element of teaching. However, one is more likely to be reflective at the end of a day, or a lesson, than during it, simply because of one's cognitive limitations—it is very hard to make a balanced judgment while in the midst of teaching, because there are too many factors to attend to simultaneously. On the other hand, once the class is over, it is also difficult to make an unbiased assessment, since the data needed to do so are absent—there is only the memory of a very complex situation, which fades quickly. Yet how can teachers plan for future classes, or find aspects of their teaching skills to improve, if they do not assess themselves? Formative self-evaluation is needed as the basis for change and development, rather than summative evaluation from outside, which is often done on the basis of a single lesson. We need to find a way for teachers to reflect on their teaching, and then go about improving it (cf. Cruickshank, 1987).

For present purposes, we suggest a model for this process based on Fleming, Fleming, Oksman, & Roach (1984), who have formalized the fairly commonsense procedures that need to be undertaken under four headings: (1) focusing, (2) monitoring, (3) appraising, and (4) reacting. In the first stage, the individual using this model has to decide what the main areas of job functioning are to be, and how they are to be examined. This might mean referring to a position description, or to any previous external supervisor's evaluation of performance. Other organizational information, such as guidelines for practice or regular procedures to be followed, might be relevant. This process can obviously cover all aspects of a teacher's performance, both in class and out of class, but we will concentrate on in-class activity. In doing this first step, the teacher will decide what data to collect and how to collect it. For self-evaluation of regular teaching, audiotape is the easiest data-collection procedure. It is a straightforward matter to bring a small tape recorder to class, place it on a table, and set it going. Quite soon, students and teacher will ignore it. More adventurous teachers may wish to explore the use of videotape, where in fact again both students and teachers will rapidly ignore the equipment. This source of data could be combined with observation by fellow teachers, and even, in some situations, written comments from students.

The second stage in most cases would be to review the tapes outside of class, and possibly to transcribe some of them, or some portions of them. Then, third, they need to be subjected to analysis, or appraisal. The teacher may decide to use one of the widely available classroom observation schemes which cover all aspects of class interaction, or simply focus on a particular element, such as use of praise (see Chaudron, 1988; Long, 1983b). If the latter, the item or behavior focused on should presumably follow from those aspects of the individual's performance identified in the first "focusing" stage of the process.

One possible system to start from in analyzing performance could be the self-evaluation checklist of Bailey and Celce-Murcia (1979), with the teacher extending it to fit his/her personal teaching concerns. However, we recommend that before completing any such checklist, the teacher should first list the main objectives of a given lesson, in at least three categories: target language learning objectives (e.g., plurals of nouns, acts of apologizing), learning skills objectives (e.g., asking peers or teacher for clarification, studying rules), and personal or social attitudes objectives (e.g., appreciating others' point of view, understanding the cultural connotations of target language use). We also note that while the checklist items concern-
ing variety are important, other aspects of a lesson should be considered, such as clarity of teacher presentation, and appropriate sequencing of lesson activities and tasks.

Finally, if the self-evaluation process is to have an effect, the teacher must consciously decide how to react to the information—whether change is needed, and how it can be achieved. Fleming et al. (1984) point out that this phase is one where it may be beneficial to consult colleagues, because options for effecting change may not always be obvious. The practitioner may also need to consider whether a change is feasible or essential, and to evaluate its likely effect on other aspects of the class or the teacher's procedures. Finally, if substantial change is desired, it may be useful to draw up a checklist for professional development in this area, which might set as goals the development of materials, seeking regular observation and coaching from a trusted colleague, or a determination to alter one's allocation of time outside the class to allow for a search for professional resources relevant to an identified teaching problem.

The primary reason for taking the sort of steps suggested above is to actually improve one's own practice. However, an additional incentive might come from the fact that a documented plan for self-evaluation is likely to contribute positively to any outside supervisors' evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS

In discussing the topic of principles of SL classroom teaching, we find vast areas of ignorance where there should be knowledge. On the one hand, teachers should know what relatively firm information does exist, and where there is room for investigation. This should obviously aid their difficult decision making. Moreover, as the SL profession develops, more teachers are qualified to conduct their own research, or to collaborate with researchers on investigations, as is increasingly done elsewhere in education (Billups & Rauth, 1987; Klinghammer, 1987; Mohr & MacLean, 1987; Neubert & Binko, 1987). We are also seeing increased recognition of the importance of action research (Argyris, Putnam, & Smith, 1985), which starts with the teachers' own problems and concerns.

On the other hand, teaching will always be a series of judgment calls—the real-time cognitive complexity of the task means it will never be just a science, and will ever remain something of an art (cf. Clark & Lampert, 1986; Leinhardt & Greeno, 1986). It has been the purpose of this chapter to help the judgment calls to be educated, informed ones, through the teacher's combined use of knowledge and educated professional reflection.

NOTES

1. We are grateful to the following people for their assistance in the preparation of this chapter. Beverly Edge, Rosario Albuquerque, Juana Marin, Marisol Valcărcel and her team in Murcia, Mercedes Verdu, and Julio Roca. Portions of this chapter were also made possible through grants and support of the Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii, the Research Corporation of the University of Hawaii, and the Comité Conjunto Hispano-Norteamericano para la Cooperación Cultural y Educativa, Madrid. We also acknowledge the valuable basis provided by the article on this topic in the previous edition (Bailey & Celce-Murcia, 1979), from which we have noticeably drawn several of our ideas.

2. Our discussion is traditional to the extent that we will not deal with approaches to SL teaching which involve going outside the classroom (e.g., Ashworth, 1985; Fried-Booth, 1982, 1986).

3. What “size” the elements are is not at issue here. That is to say, we are not concerned with whether the units presented are structural, functional, or the language of a given pedagogical task, in an unanalyzed whole.

4. It should be remembered that some less traditional approaches do not require a text per se (e.g., the Silent Way, Counseling-Learning).

5. We might say re-recognition, as the idea is not a new one—see e.g., West (1960).

6. We should point out that we are deliberately avoiding the word “method” here—we do not accept its general validity as a term of art or analysis (cf. Richards, 1984).
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7. It may be said that these are also supported by common sense; but as this is an elusive concept which continues to change from one generation to another, we feel it is desirable to be able to support its prescriptions with evidence where possible.

**DISCUSSION QUESTIONS**

1. Why should the ESL teacher be concerned about keeping up with the results of classroom research and second language acquisition?

2. Do you agree that teachers should make their lesson objectives clear to their students? Can you think of situations in which this would be inappropriate? Why?

3. How much do you think presentation, explanation, and discussion of rules for language use have a place in the SL classroom? What underlying view of language and language learning supports your view?

4. Discuss the ways in which one might investigate what is the most effective way of giving feedback (or correction). What data would you collect, and how would you identify successful correction?

5. Discuss ways in which a teacher with a multicultural group of students can best maintain a positive classroom climate, promoting student interest and motivation.

**SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES**

1. With several other teachers draw up a list of teaching behaviors or techniques that you think are important in your own teaching situation. Then observe each other, using a checklist of these behaviors as a guide. On the basis of your colleagues' observations, which of these do you think you need to improve or alter? Draw up a plan for how you would achieve this change in your teaching.

2. Prepare and compare a minilesson—as a group, select a specific point of language form or function, rule of conversation, or other social use of English. Individually develop a sequence of activities that you might use to present, develop, and evaluate this point, and then compare your suggestions. Develop a jointly agreed-upon way of teaching this point and practice it with one another. A useful alternative way of practicing this would be for each one to teach the point in a language unknown to the others in the group. Discuss your feelings on once again being a second language learner.

3. Select a unit from a currently available ESL textbook. Identify ways in which it is not appropriate to your current teaching situation (e.g., wrong level, inappropriate cultural content or interest level for your students, orientation toward small/large groups). What sort of changes do you think would improve the unit?

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING**


Provides thorough coverage of what is known about all types of cooperative learning in regular classroom situations.

**Chaudron, C. (1988)**

Second Language Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

At present the most comprehensive survey of the state of knowledge of SL classroom research. It should be read in small bites.

**Cruickshank, D. R. (1987)**

Reflective Teaching. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

A very accessible book, which intends to aid teachers to become more knowledgeable about their own practice, and encourages them to become lifelong students of teaching and learning.

**Harmer, J. (1983)**

*The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.

One of the best of the practical guides to SL teaching (apart from the present volume) on the market. It has a British perspective, knowledge of which can broaden the SL teacher's horizons.


Presents a simple and straightforward model
which enables teachers to add an investigatory technique to their classroom teaching. This enables them to make use of research findings, test them, and add new information to existing knowledge so as to aid other teachers.

This down-to-earth article is one of the few recent comprehensive considerations of just why we bother with materials.

English for Specific Purposes (ESP)
Its History and Contributions
Ann M. Johns

ESP: WHAT IS IT?

English for Specific Purposes (ESP), by far the largest contributor to the international movement dealing with languages for specific purposes, comprises a diverse group of teachers and curriculum designers dedicated to the proposition that all language teaching must be designed for the specific learning and language use purposes of identified groups of students. The movement’s practitioners can most commonly be found among those teaching adults, who have more easily identifiable needs than do children, and among those teaching abroad, where contact with first language speakers is often not readily available. Therefore, for teachers in English-speaking countries who plan to work overseas, a knowledge of ESP and its rationale is essential. However, ESP is also important in North America; for there, it is closely allied to content-based instruction for primary and secondary immigrant students, and to survival and vocational programs for adults who are not native speakers of English.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Almost 30 years ago, ESL/EFL practitioners in many parts of the world began to convene in order to discuss the development of systematic analyses of student needs, particularly as they related to the features of the English that students must employ in the “real world.” The practitioners asked, “What will our students be doing with English when they finish our classes?” (e.g., reading technical manuals, listening to academic lectures, selling products). “What are the characteristics of the language they need in order to succeed?” and “What are the best methods available for answering these questions?” Since that time, ESP advocates have continued to insist that curricula should be based upon the most systematic, accurate, and empirical measures of student needs and of the language required by the tasks they must perform outside of the classroom.

In the first phase of its history (the 1960s and the early 1970s), ESP researchers and teachers concentrated on the sentence-level