

A Review of Language Pedagogy and SLA: An ~~internal~~ Internal Perspective

(Rod Ellis & Natsuko Shintani)

Dr .Mohsen Zare

~~Imam Hossein AS)University of Officers and Guards Training- Imam Hussein (AS) University of Officers and Guard Training~~

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Abstract:

When we consider internal perspectives on language teaching, we need a very different set of terms from those used to talk about external perspectives. We will no longer use standard educational terms like “method,” “program,” or “PPP.” Instead, we need to talk about “speech acts”, “turn taking”, “questioning acts”, “negotiation”, “exchange structure”, “topic control”, of “ scaffolding” and “linguistic mediation” (Swain, 2000).). Such terms help us describe how interactive events are constructed as ~~teachers teach~~ teachers teach and how learning opportunities are shaped. They provide the language to talk about teaching as a communicative process in the ~~classroom or~~ classroom or what Douglas Barnes (1976) called the “hidden curriculum.” . However, this is not a language that teachers are usually familiar with. The reality is that ideas about teaching that appear different from the outside can actually turn out to be similar yet very different in terms of classroom procedures. When we use external constructs (such as "task"), we are making assumptions about the type of operations they will generate (e.g., using message-oriented language) but In fact, the actual activity arising from a task may or may not be what was intended. In other words, concepts that provide an external view of teaching may lack value when viewed from an internal perspective. Teaching instructors rarely talk about “teaching as interaction.” However, they identify perspectives on the type of input learners should be exposed to, and they also discuss key aspects of pedagogy related to “interaction” – speaking instruction, learner participation, small group work, and classroom management. There is also an ongoing debate about the role of the L1 in the L2 classroom. One aspect of interaction has received considerable attention. Rod Ellis and Tsuko Shintani consider educational perspectives on these issues in this section and review relevant SLA research.

Key Words: Language Pedagogy, Internal Perspective, Pedagogical Positions

Introduction:

The aim of this work is to explore how what is known about how people learn L2s can inform language pedagogy to maximize its effectiveness. There are two ways to do this. One solution is to familiarize teachers with what researchers have discovered about L2 learning, and then apply those findings to language pedagogy:

SLA research → language pedagogy

There are now a number of extensive surveys of SLA theory and research (e.g. Gass and Selinker, 2002; Ellis, 2008). However, these books treat “SLA” as an academic discipline and it is questionable whether they have a direct relationship to language pedagogy. However, other surveys (e.g. Lightbown and Spada, 2006) are written for teachers and are therefore client-centered. However, even these do not directly answer “the questions that teachers ask themselves” (Pica, 1994). Of course, the starting point for the teacher is not “How do learners learn?” but rather “How should I teach?”

” The second approach therefore consists of starting from general ideas about what makes good language pedagogy, then considering them in light of how learners learn:

Language pedagogy → SLA Research

Study This is the approach they have taken in this book. They examined various pedagogical propositions from popular teacher textbooks and asked to what extent these propositions were consistent with the findings of SLA. They argue that such an approach is more consistent with how teachers and teacher educators view ESL. For example, (Hedge (2000), speaking from the perspective of teacher educators, noted that it would be a mistake “to assume that research in related disciplines produces a unified theory of the use of apply or learn languages that they can apply immediately and in language learning. straight line”.

-Instead, “it is more important to have a base of knowledge against which can evaluate our ideas about teaching and learning, from which they can draw ideas in efforts to solve educational problems” (p.2). This is the perspective that inspired this book. In this concluding chapter, they will explore these

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: English (United States)

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: Times New Roman

two approaches to the use of SLA in language pedagogy in a little more detail. First, they will explore the possibilities of “applying SLA” and second the benefits of “exploring language pedagogy through SLA”.

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Applying SLA:

Formatted: Font: 14 pt, Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: 14 pt

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

SLA researchers have not hesitated to affirm the importance of this subject to language pedagogy. Spolsky (1990), for example, stated: “Traditionally, they have been interested in considering not only the explanatory power of a theory but also its relevance to language pedagogy second” (p. 610). Long (2006), concerned with teachers and teacher educators, saw SLA as an “area with far-reaching social consequences for millions of people around the world” (p. 156).

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

However, there is no consensus among SLA researchers on how SLA should inform language pedagogy, reflecting Bardovi-Harlig's (1995) observation that “the relationship between crime and language”. Second language acquisition is a complex relationship that is not clearly accepted by applied linguists. .” (p. 151). For some, SLA provides “concrete evidence” that should be used to advise teachers on which techniques and processes are most effective (Long, 1990). However, in general, SLA researchers are wary of prescribing or restricting teaching methods, preferring to suggest that SLA results can only provide “tentative specifications ” (Stenhouse, 1975) about how to teach and it is up to the teacher to decide whether they should act appropriately in their classroom (Ellis, 1997).

One way researchers seek to provide the results of their research to educators is to add a “Implications” section to the end of the research report. However, this is not agreed upon by all researchers, as an interesting discussion in TESOL Quarterly 41(4) shows. Han (2007) criticizes the tendency for research articles to “appear to link research with practice” (p. 31), but Chapelle (2007) responds by asserting that “if the author cannot state any implications for teaching and learning, TESOL Quarterly is not the appropriate journal” (p. 405) and goes on to point out that the author is best placed to make a first attempt at the implications pedagogy and therefore should DO. Chapelle is right. There is a clear danger in trying to apply the results of a single study; it does not follow that the implications drawn from a

single study are relevant to all teachers in all educational contexts. It is also questionable whether teachers (or many teachers) read the research, so that the “implications” drawn have no bearing on language pedagogy. It is worth noting that the teaching guides they have reviewed in this book rarely cite ALS research and only occasionally show familiarity with it. An approach that is perhaps more likely to gain traction in educational circles is to base advice on theories that have been supported by research.

Krashen (1983) argued in favor of this approach, pointing out that he initially made the mistake of trying to apply research results to pedagogy before realizing that an acquisition theory could clarify “education”. The problem, however, is that there are many theories to choose from, and to date there has been no consensus within the SLA as to which theory offers the strongest explanation of ‘The Acquisition’.

Krashen thought about his own theory, the control model (later renamed the input hypothesis). This has had a significant impact on language pedagogy, but it has been the subject of much criticism from other SLA researchers and clearly lacks adequate explanatory power in some respects. No other theory can replace it as a teaching guide. We are now in a situation where there are many SLA theories, all of which have some merit, but which in some ways also offer fundamentally different versions of L2 acquisition. For example, in this study they found that cognitive and sociocultural interactionist theories offer contrasting accounts of the role of interaction in L2 learning. Thus, although it may be useful to explore the applications of specific theories to language pedagogy, it remains doubtful whether a grounded theory approach holds much promise. Are not. This requires many instructional guide authors to navigate the various applications of all the different theories.

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

However, there is another way. Lightbown (1985b, 2000) attempted to summarize SLA research in a set of generalizations that “are consistent with the research conducted to date and can serve as a” source of information that can help teachers set appropriate expectations for yourself and your students. ” (2000: 431). Lightbown is careful to apply these generalizations to language pedagogy. She criticized researchers like Krashen and Truscott, who were less cautious, because she believed their recommendations did not align with her understanding of the research. She argues that while SLA research is useful in helping to challenge teachers’ intuitions about how to teach, it is important to guard against endorsing teaching behaviors that are “inconsistent with understanding their knowledge of their role as teachers” (p. 453). She commented: “when researchers make strong claims contrary to the views that teachers have developed through their experiences with learners and when those claims are made on the basis of Research conducted in contexts that do not reflect reality as teachers know it risks alienating teachers and causing them to view researchers as oddballs in the ivory tower. For this reason, she views SLA research as a body of knowledge that can help shape teacher “expectations” rather than as a source of specific recommendations. She calls on researchers to “engage in dialogue with teachers” by listening to them. tell and inform them about SLA .

Generalization :

1. Adults and adolescents can acquire a second language
2. Learners produce a systematic language of contact that is often characterized by systematic errors just as children learning the same language with first language, as well as other languages seem to rely on the perception of the native language learner
3. There are predictable sequences in L2 acquisition such that some structure must be achieved certain before integrating other structures
4. Practice does not make perfect.
5. Knowing a language rule does not mean that one will be able to use it in communicative interaction.
6. Correcting explicit errors alone is often ineffective in changing linguistic behavior.
7. For most adult learners, acquisition stops before the learner reaches native language proficiency
8. It is impossible to achieve native (or near-native) proficiency in a second language in a day
9. The task for the learner is enormous because the language is extremely complex.
10. The learner's ability to understand language in a meaningful context exceeds the learner's ability to understand language out of context and produce language of comparable complexity and accuracy.

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Justify Low, Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Commentary :

1. While it is clear that incidental learning can occur in a classroom setting, it is also clear that “guided teaching” benefits learning.
2. Exposure to formal education does not prevent the emergence of systematic patterns of multilingualism.
3. However, these patterns are not the same as those observed in L1 acquisition, as the learner's L2 influences them in subtle ways.
4. Progress in learning the number 12 cannot be assessed solely based on whether the learner can use the number 12 purposefully or not, progress is also evident through sequential movement develop.
5. Rote-based practice is not effective, but it can help absorb formulaic parts that the learner can then decompose to acquire the language.
6. Although there are limits to what explicit teaching can achieve, there is growing evidence that explicit teaching of grammatical rules is beneficial and, in some cases, can necessary to overcome the

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Justify Low, Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

influence of the learner's L1.

7. Error correction does not result in the immediate elimination of errors, but it can be effective if it is sustained, focused on functions that the learner is capable of learning, and occurs in response to the learner's communicative efforts.

8. Although there is a "critical period" for language acquisition, this does not mean "the younger the better".

9. Furthermore, the "critical period" is of little importance in the context of foreign languages.

10. To be successful, learners, no matter what age they begin learning, need deep and intensive exposure to the L2.

Due to the complexity of a language, it is difficult for learners to master the morphological or sociolinguistic and pragmatic features of a language if they are completely dependent on the classroom. Reception exceeds production, and acquisition can be promoted by manipulating input to encourage attention to grammatical forms.

Mastering an L2 for use in everyday social interactions does not mean anything. Master how to use it in complex academic contexts. However, there is another way to apply ESL more directly to language pedagogy, and that is to engage teachers in ESL research. Vasquez and Harvey (2010) provide a good example of how this can be achieved. They asked a group of master's and doctoral students in an SLA course to replicate Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study of corrective feedback.

To help these novice researchers, they divided the research process into several steps.

First, they asked them to videotape their own lessons, then prepare transcripts of the lessons, and then, after extensive discussion of Lyster and Ranta's taxonomies, they coded the data. They were also given the opportunity to share their results before writing their research report.

Vasquez and Harvey were interested in the impact of their study on teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. They reported that teachers were surprised to find a widespread change in their own teaching practices and that they had become more aware of the importance of learner ownership. Interestingly,

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Justify Low

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

they were more likely to recognize the cognitive rather than the affective aspects of corrective feedback as a result of their study—a change that they also suggest may be warranted based on our own review of popular pedagogical views about corrective feedback. Replicating SLA studies in this way seems like a great way to encourage teachers to examine their own teaching intuitions. However, this is time consuming and probably not something most teachers are willing or able to do.

Exploring language pedagogy through SLA :

The alternative to applying SLA to language pedagogy is to take pedagogical questions as a starting point and then examine them in the light of SLA outcomes. This is the approach they have taken in this book. Our starting point was to identify a range of educational topics. This is not easy because today's language pedagogy is a rich and complex body of “practical teaching thinking” (Levine and Phipps, 2011), informed not only by learning experiences practical practice and teaching but also through theories about language, its usage and uses. It is about thinking about how language as a system and the four language skills can be taught. In its critical form, language pedagogy also addresses how teachers can help learners confront inequality and oppression (Crookes, 2010).

Clearly there is a need to select the educational questions we are about to consider. They have chosen to define “language pedagogy” quite narrowly based on how it approaches language as a system – that is, teaching aimed at developing the linguistic knowledge that learners need ~~to communicate in their L2~~ ^{L2} ~~& # 41;~~. Therefore, They did not take into account the four language skills as well as social issues. Nor have they addressed in depth the difficult question of whether the focus of the educational program should be on the norms of the target language or on the functional lingua franca applied in communication between non-native speakers. indigenous people (Seidlhofer, 2011).

They justify our choice in two ways.

First, traditional language pedagogy, as evidenced by the popular educational materials they examined (e.g., Conclusions teacher guides like those by Harmer, Hedge, Nunan, and Scrivener), focuses primarily on language as a system and has not yet introduced critical perspectives or English as the common language on the plane. Second, SLA is primarily concerned with how learners acquire language knowledge at levels 1,2 and so it makes sense to choose teaching questions that can be easily tested through SLA. They acknowledge the limitations of our choices but also assert that the questions they have selected can be considered relevant to teacher educators and teachers in a variety of educational contexts. The problems they identify are all “interface problems” (i.e. problems of central importance in language pedagogy, but also problems that the SLA speaks to explicitly). They have divided these questions into those related to “external” and “internal” perspectives on language teaching. The first is made clear in the description of what and how to teach. This is the “technical knowledge” of teaching and appears most clearly in teacher's manuals. The latter perspective views

Formatted: Font: 14 pt, Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: 14 pt

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Justify Low

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

teaching as an interactive event, classroom discourse creating the context in which learning takes place. As they have seen, this topic receives less attention in teacher guides, which is perhaps understandable, since providing guidance on how Teaching works as a process rather than a clear set of techniques and procedures would be much more difficult.

However, it could be argued that it is the 'insider perspective' that SLA is best equipped to address, and the relative absence of this perspective in teacher guidance is a sign that SLA has not had an impact on mainstream conceptions of language pedagogy.

To identify issues of concern to teachers, they conducted an examination of educational materials. Because the literature is so voluminous, they focus on some popular teacher guides, first identifying general themes related to language teaching as a system. These topics provide the content of the various chapters in this book. They then consider the guidebook authors' perspectives on each topic, noting both the similarities and differences between them. In general, the similarities far outweigh the differences. As Hedge (2000) notes in the introduction to his teacher guide, it is possible to "recognize some persistent concerns in teachers' professional practice" despite the "heterogeneity "large range of activities" that characterize language teaching in the classroom (p. 1).

She then lists these concerns, starting with the central question of this book: "What are the goals of language teaching and what kinds of activities are needed to achieve them?" » The guides take a variety of approaches to each educational topic. In some cases, they simply describe different approaches, techniques, and procedures and avoid making specific recommendations.

However, in other cases, they are more direct in regulating and prohibiting educational activities. In other cases (e.g. Ur, 1996), they invite teachers to explore their own thinking about particular aspects of teaching (e.g. how to give written corrective feedback) before offering their own opinions.

In a sense, these guides are practical handbooks designed to provide teachers with a

comprehensive view of teaching practice. The authors often draw explicitly on their own teaching experiences as teachers and are therefore well placed to offer practical advice.

In addition, to varying degrees, the authors demonstrate knowledge of educational theory and sometimes SLA research findings. This is reflected in the broader purpose of the guides.

They seek to identify basic principles that can help teachers develop teaching theories and provide teachers with a variety of options to choose from based on the needs of their own teaching contexts. These guides provide excellent overviews of current thinking on language pedagogy and are an important source of knowledge for teachers. Our goal in writing this book is not to criticize but to test how well they reflect what we know about how learners learn. They will now turn to some of the main conclusions of this review. There are no guidelines promoting a particular method for language teaching and therefore they adopt a post-method approach (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). However, these guides often refer to different methods and in one example (Klapper, 2006) it is explicitly advocated to help teachers become familiar with the theoretical premises and procedures of different methods.

Some of the earliest research on SLA aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of popular methods at the time. One way to make teachers aware of the limitations of teaching based on a particular method is to examine why comparative studies of methods have failed to demonstrate that the method is superior than the other method.

They also argue that it is still possible to compare “local” (rather than “global”) methods, because it is still necessary to determine whether claims are made on behalf of a method (or approach) is proven experimentally or not.

It would be unfair to characterize mainstream accounts of language pedagogy as treating language entirely as an 'object' with the emphasis on a list of discrete items to be taught. Clearly, there is awareness that language is also a 'tool for communicating. But, by and large, the emphasis in the teacher guides is on language-as-an-object and on intentional learning. This is understandable as it provides the easiest way of specifying the aims of teaching, which Hedge rightly saw as the main concern of teachers. But it ignores the importance of incidental learning in a classroom. Language is hugely complex and as SLA researchers have noted there are limits to what can be learned intentionally. Learners cannot be taught all the collocations a word can enter into nor can they be taught everything there is to know about the grammar of a language. While it is undoubtedly useful to divide language up into a series of bits and pieces which can be systematically taught, it is crucial that teachers recognize the limitations of such an approach. Consideration also needs to be given to how incidental learning can be fostered in the classroom.

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Justify Low

Educational materials address this problem primarily by encouraging widespread reading . This is considered to not only help develop reading skills but also provide learners with exposure to vocabulary and grammar that they can learn incidentally. However, the educational literature also makes recommendations that are inconsistent with what we know about incidental learning. there is a strong commitment to the importance of authentic records, but this does not take into account how input to collection works. Incidental acquisition is only possible if learners can understand the information they are exposed to, and an emphasis on authentic materials is unlikely to achieve this, especially in the early stages of learning practice. It is not an authentic contribution that learners need, but one that they can authenticate. Authentic contribution may have a place in language pedagogy for more advanced learners, but from an SLA perspective it has been overemphasized. The importance of teacher discourse as a source of incidental learning is also overlooked. The rather simplistic statements sometimes made in guidelines about limiting teachers' instructional time to maximize opportunities for learners to talk in class need to be reassessed. The teaching method most clearly oriented towards incidental learning is task-based teaching, in which language is seen as a tool for creating meaning and thus creating opportunities for learners to acquire new languages and develop mastery. However, in general the educational guidelines they consult pay little attention to this. "Tasks", as they appear in the guide, are often considered tools that provide free PPP production opportunities.

There are issues that still need to be resolved for task-based teaching to become an effective teaching method, including how to grade and arrange tasks in the task-based curriculum, but the method Traditional criminals certainly cannot continue to ignore your academic potential for a long time. It is worth noting that task-based teaching has attracted criticism from advocates of traditional pedagogy (e.g. Swan, 2005) on the grounds that it is based on "theory" and is not tested investigated by experiment. However, such criticism ignores much of the research on SLA that has shown that task-based instruction is effective and, in fact, more effective for some learners than traditional instruction. system (see, for example, Shintani and Ellis, 2010). However, our view is that this debate is fruitless. SLA research has shown that traditional teaching (i.e. explicit teaching) is also effective, especially with older students. What is needed is a balanced approach to teaching that treats language as an "object" and a "tool" and thus addresses both intentional and incidental learning.

Teaching is best seen not as a set of techniques and procedures but as 'interaction'. Techniques and procedures are of value only if they give rise to the kinds of interactions in which and through which learning can take place. In general, teaching-as-interaction receives little attention in the guides, reflecting the emphasis placed on the 'external' as opposed to 'internal' aspects of teaching. Where 'interaction' is considered, it is discussed in terms of giving opportunities for student talk viewed primarily in terms of quantity rather than quality.

SLA theories - whether cognitive-interactionist or sociocultural - point to the need for the importance of the quality of learner talk rather than quantity. Learners need to be 'stretched' by being pushed to experiment with and extend their output. SLA research suggests ways in which this can be achieved. It also points to the need to reconsider the contribution that initiate-respond-follow-up (IRF) exchanges can make to learning. A

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Conclusion number of the guides point out the dangers of this type of classroom discourse but none suggest how it might be adapted to foster learning. From an SLA perspective, perhaps, the central question that teachers need to consider is "How can teaching ensure that the interactions that occur in a classroom create the conditions for successful learning? This requires a fuller answer than we could find in the guides.

There were two topics that received careful attention in the guides - the role of the L1 and corrective feedback. The common view in language pedagogy is that teachers should strive for maximal use of the target language and also encourage students to avoid use of the L1. However, they saw that in fact teachers often do resort to the L1 and that SLA research on language transfer points to the positive way in which the L1 can contribute to L2 learning, as well as the possibilities of negative transfer. There needs to be a much more discriminating account of how the L1 can be used by both teachers and students to manage instructional activities and to facilitate interlanguage development. Translation, for example, can function as an effective pedagogic tool for both teachers and learners and can assist learning.

All the guides recommend that teachers correct both speaking (but not proficient writing) and writing errors. Error correction is seen as necessary - because students expect it - and helpful for learning. However, on two key points, the views expressed in the guidelines and ALS research findings differ. First, the guidelines emphasize the importance of the emotional aspects of corrective feedback, highlighting the potential dangers of eliciting negative emotional responses from learners. They found that the teachers in Vasquez and Harvey's (2010) study all started from the same perspective. In contrast, SLA focuses on the cognitive side, exploring the impact of different forms of correction on

Formatted: Justify Low

learning.

Second, the guidelines simply list different remedial strategies that teachers can use without considering their role in learning. SLA distinguishes strategies according to clearly defined general categories (i.e. providing encouraging inputs or outcomes and implicit or explicit). There is now a large body of research that has examined the impact of strategies of these types on the learning of new and partially acquired language features. The results of this research, summarized in Chapter 10 in this book, are now sufficiently robust to provide more detailed and nuanced information about remedial feedback than is currently available in teaching guidelines. The final topic they will cover is “individual differences in learners”. This is another topic of “interface”: it has received attention from educational circles and SLA. However, in some ways this is the most difficult topic to tackle for both teachers and researchers. First, there is a lot of variation among learners .

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

However, from an educational perspective, it is impossible to design instructional materials that take into account all the different factors. It is for this reason that they have chosen to focus on two factors that research has shown to play a key role in language competence and motivation and argue that considering how teaching can take them into account is reasonable. They found that although motivation was mentioned in the guidelines, language ability was overlooked. Instructors pay more attention to learning strategies and the role of strategy training. However, they think this is a much less promising approach than what some proponents have claimed, although they find it useful to encourage students to verbalize the use of specific strategies as they carry out an educational task. Very helpful. Individual differences between learners are clearly important, but how to take them into account in effective teaching remains a challenge. With the exception of Dörnyei's (2001) work on "motivational strategies", which deserves full consideration, they have sought to understand whether research on individual difference factors in SLA can yield any effective contribution to the educational literature. Clearly, further research is needed to explore the connection between language pedagogy and SLA on this topic.

Formatted: Font: 14 pt, Font color: Text 1, Complex Script Font: 14 pt

Conclusion:

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Justify Low

In the introduction to the first part, they emphasized the difference between “practical discourse” and “theoretical discourse” and they also noted the problems that arise when explaining the previous part in terms of after. As Brumfit (1983) noted, “learning to perform competently is never the same as learning to explain the performance process” (p. 61). Practical discourse relies heavily on “practical knowledge”; Theoretical discourse refers to “technical knowledge”. The question is how the latter can

inform the former. There is no easy answer to this question (Ellis, 2010b), but one way to bridge the gap between the two discourses is to design a theoretical discourse that is accessible to teachers. This is what educational materials, especially teacher manuals, seek to achieve by trying to explain the “doing process” in a way that teachers can understand and relate to. On the other hand, the theoretical discourse on SLA is generally not intended to be accessible to teachers. She was motivated by the interests of researchers and cultivated a style that would be rewarded through publications in scholarly but often obscure journals. Busy teachers may skip studying SLA. There are two ways to solve this problem. The first is to prepare a simple report on SLA research for teachers. As they have noted, a number of books have attempted this. The other way is more indirect. This is an attempt to influence the theoretical discourse of language pedagogy itself. This involves examining the interface between two manifestations of “technical discourse,” namely SLA and that of language pedagogy. This is what they have tried to do in this book. Teachers read teaching guides because they are the clearest source of information about how to teach, if SLA is to have an impact on actual teaching discourse.

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

References:

EXPLORING LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY THROUGH SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION RESEARCH. Rod Ellis and Natsuko Shintani. London, UK: Routledge, 2014. Pp. xi + 388.

