American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Foreign Language Programs (AAUSC)

Issues in Language Program Direction
A Series of Annual Volumes

Style for the AAUSC Series
This publication follows the *Chicago Manual of Style* (Reference Style B). See pages 341–347 in this volume for details about preparing articles for submission.

Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study

Claire Kramsch
Editor

Heinle & Heinle Publishers
An International Thomson Publishing Company
Boston, Massachusetts 02116, U.S.A.

Manufactured in the United States of America.

Heinle & Heinle Publishers is an International Thomson Publishing company.

ISBN 0-8384-6029-1

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Redefining the Boundaries of Language Use: The Foreign Language Classroom as a Multilingual Speech Community

Carl Blyth
University of Texas at Austin

> Communities are distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined. Benedict Anderson (1991, p. 6)

Redefining the "boundaries" of foreign language *study* implies a redefinition of the boundaries of language *use*.[1] Sociolinguistics is, of course, the study of how language is used in social contexts—including foreign language classrooms. So what does sociolinguistics have to tell us as we seek to redefine curricular boundaries? What are the social rules that govern the use of languages in our classrooms? What are the attitudes of foreign language teachers toward patterns of language use and language choice inside and outside the classroom? I believe that part of the answer to these compelling questions can be found in the sociolinguistic concept of the *multilingual speech community*. "Imagining" the foreign language classroom as a multilingual speech community reveals the polyvalent nature of our disciplinary boundaries, which intersect with other boundaries—linguistic, geopolitical, and affective. In particular, the metaphor of the multilingual speech community is germane to discussions of curricular reform because it highlights the dissonance between the reality of our postmodern multicultural/multilingual societies and the prevailing monolingual bias of foreign language educators (Cook 1992). I will argue that the monolingual bias of the language teaching profession, a bias inherent in most Western ideology and social practice (Fraga et al. 1994; Romaine 1989), profoundly affects foreign language methodology and curriculum development. In short, I will attempt to show that our debate over language ownership and language usership in the foreign language classroom should be framed in terms of multilingualism.

Sociolinguistics and Foreign Language Pedagogy

Recent models of language pedagogy have been greatly influenced by sociolinguistic concepts, in particular by *communicative competence*, a concept that sociolinguists devised in reaction to Chomskyan linguistic theory. Chomsky (1965) argued that for theoretical linguistics to make progress, it was essential to distinguish *competence*, an idealized speaker's abstract knowledge of the linguistic system, from *performance*, the actual production of language in specific contexts. Performance, Chomsky claimed, was characterized by dysfluencies and grammatical error and as such was an imperfect reflection of a speaker's underlying competence. While sociolinguists were equivocal about the theoretical necessity of the competence/performance distinction, they generally agreed that competence so defined overlooked the significance of sociolinguistic knowledge, namely the knowledge of the appropriateness of an utterance in a given context (Campbell and Wales 1970). Hymes (1972) contended that such grammatical competence was but a single component of a broader base of knowledge, which he named "communicative competence."

While the sociolinguistic concept of communicative competence has gained wide currency among language teachers, the related concept of the *speech community* has garnered little recognition (see Omaggio Hadley 1993 for an overview of research relating communicative competence to foreign language instruction). This is unfortunate because the two concepts are intimately linked in sociolinguistic theory. For example, Saville-Troike (1989) in her introductory text on the ethnography of communication describes communicative competence as the skills and knowledge a speaker possesses, that allow him or her "to communicate appropriately within a particular speech community" (p. 2).

Even though the speech community is a central concept to sociolinguistics, it is difficult to define with much precision. Speech communities, like languages, are hard to pin down; they represent phenomena that are not static and discrete but rather dynamic and gradient. In other words, just as there is no clear demarcation between genetically related languages, the boundary between speech communities is often blurred. And nowhere is the blurring of linguistic boundaries more apparent than in multilingual speech communities, where speakers often mix languages in ways that make it impossible for outsiders to follow even the simplest speech acts. These problems aside, most definitions of speech community equate community membership with language use, including the patterns of verbal interaction and the frequency of interactions (Gumperz 1962). Other definitions emphasize shared attitudes and self-perceptions as indicators of community membership (Dorian 1982). In his study of competence differences between native and near-native speakers of French, Coppieters (1987) concludes that "a speaker of French is someone *who is accepted as such by the community referred to as that of French speakers*, not someone who is endowed with a specific formal underlying linguistic system" (p. 565) (my emphasis).[2] Therefore, ethnographers and sociolinguists are primarily interested in the way "communication within [a speech community] is patterned and organized as systems of communicative events, and the ways in which these interact with all other systems of culture" (Saville-Troike 1989, p. 3).

Foreign language educators and second language acquisition specialists, on the other hand, have generally drawn more heavily from psycholinguistic rather than sociolinguistic paradigms (see Preston 1989 for a discussion concerning the roles of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics in second language acquisition). While both sociolinguists and psycholinguists agree that communicative competence is context-specific, in that communication always occurs in a particular context, their notion of context manifests different emphases. In keeping with their psycholinguistic orientation, second and foreign language teachers typically view students as *individual* speaker/learners rather than as members of a particular social group. For example, in her influential studies concerning the role of communicative competence in foreign language instruction, Savignon (1972, 1983) says comparatively little about the larger social norms governing interaction. Instead, she emphasizes a speaker's ability to negotiate face-to-face communication: "Communicative competence may be defined as the ability to function in a truly communicative setting—that is, in a dynamic exchange in which linguistic competence must adapt itself to the total information input, both linguistic and paralinguistic, of one or more interlocutors" (Savignon 1972, p. 8).

Sociolinguists and anthropological linguists would not disagree with Savignon's definition of communicative competence. Rather, they would be more likely to emphasize what McLaughlin (1985) has called the "surrounding context of events, the goals of the program and of the teacher, or the interrelationship of nonverbal to verbal behavior" (p. 149). McLaughlin advocates the inclusion of more ethnographically oriented studies in second language research which, he argues, would allow for a "more contextual perspective . . . needed to understand the social life of the classroom."[3] Understanding the social life of the classroom is exemplified in the work of Cazden (1988) who examines how cultural factors influence the success or failure of classroom interactional routines:

> All human behavior is culturally based. Ways of talking that seem so natural to one group are experienced as culturally strange to another. Just as all speech has an accent, even though we are not made aware of our own until we travel somewhere where there is a different norm, so patterns of teacher-student interactions in typical classroom lessons are cultural phenomena, not 'natural' in any sense either. (p. 67)

Monolingual Bias and Foreign Language Pedagogy

It would be incorrect to claim, however, that foreign language educators and researchers have paid scant attention to social factors in the classroom. For example, current textbooks on second language acquisition and teaching methodology emphasize the importance of social and affective variables in language learning (Ellis 1985; Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991; Oller 1993; Omaggio Hadley 1993; Shrum and Glisan 1994). Moreover, the metaphor of the classroom as community is not uncommon in the educational literature. Two decades ago, Curran proposed a method of language teaching that he called Community Language Learning (Richards 1986). Yet, while the general idea of community may not be new to foreign language educators, the idea of the classroom as a multilingual speech community most certainly is. Or, even more to the point, the *sui generis* nature of multilingualism, the Pandora's box of linguistics, remains largely unexplored by foreign language educators. This is understandable since foreign language education in the United States (and western Europe) has always been predicated on a rather idealized monolingual native speaker norm. But as Kramsch (forthcoming) points out, even the distinction between native speaker and non-native speaker has become problematic nowadays: "Not only have scholars started questioning the *identity* of the native speaker, but recent years have also seen a slow but sure erosion of his unquestioned *authority.*"

Questioning the identity and authority of the idealized monolingual native speaker is the *modus operandi* of Romaine (1989) who begins her book on bilingualism with this sentence: "It would certainly be odd to

encounter a book with the title *Monolingualism*" (p. 1). If you are a British, American, or Australian English-speaker, you are likely to agree with such a statement. Why go to the trouble of writing a book about the normal state of affairs? Isn't it the unusual or abnormal that requires examination and explanation? Romaine's comment is generally applicable to anyone who has grown up in a society where monolingualism is valued more than multilingualism, although it holds special importance for theoretical linguists.

Romaine contends that monolingualism is the frame of reference for most theoretical linguists, the most notable exemplar being Chomsky (1965) who defined the "boundaries" of the "scientific" study of language as follows: "Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly" (p. 3). In other words, a perfectly monolingual speaker in a perfectly monolingual speech community, an abstraction if ever there was one. Romaine (1989) points out that linguistic theory does not fall from the sky but originates within a particular cultural context:

> It is . . . no accident that linguistic theory has its origins in the cultural ideology of western Europe and the major Anglophone countries, which attach some special significance to monolingualism and the ethos of 'one state—one language.' At various stages in their history most of these nations have felt that minority groups were threats to the cohesion of the state and have therefore tried to eradicate both the speakers and their language. (p. 6)

Fraga et al. (1994) claim that the one state–one language ethos derives from Western ideology in which the individual is conceived of as a "unified subject . . . an autonomous, coherent, consistent, and definable whole" (p. 8). During the development of the Western nation state, "unified subjects" were cast as "unified citizens" who were seen as sharing a monolithic national identity. In a sense, citizens were embodiments of "*the* national language, *the* national culture, and often *the* national religion" (Fraga et al., p. 8).

French history provides a particularly good example of the one state–one language ethos. When a survey discovered that two-thirds of the French population did not speak French at the time of the revolution, the political left, which had recently come to power formulated a ruthless policy aimed at eliminating all regional languages.[4] The elimination of linguistic diversity in the name of national unity continued during the French empires and monarchies of the nineteenth century and lasted well into the democratic republics of the twentieth century. Even as late as 1972, French President Pompidou openly declared that "'Il n'y a pas de place pour les langues minoritaires dans une France destinée à marquer l'Europe de son sceau.' (There is no room for minority languages in a France destined to make its mark on Europe)" (Ager 1990, p. 30). Such a conscious policy of linguistic hegemony is consonant with France's tradition of political and social centralization, the primary goal being "'to ensure that political boundaries also become affective boundaries'" (p. 30).

Compared to the French, Americans are generally acknowledged as being less concerned with issues of language standardization and correct usage. Nevertheless, the United States has its own history of ambivalence towards multilingualism. Fraga et al. (1994) argue that English monolingualism has always been the ideal accepted by most Americans:

> Bilingualism, except for the brief study of foreign languages in school, is actively discouraged. The story of punishment at school for speaking a language other than English is shared by many generations of Americans of all ethnic backgrounds. The de facto national language here has been and continues to be English, and the exclusive use of this language has been considered fundamental to the nation's social cohesion. Today, the term bilingual is often used in this country as a euphemism to speak about the poor, the uneducated, or the newly arrived. (p. 12)

The most recent manifestation of American ambivalence toward multilingualism is the official English or English only movement, which continues to gain momentum, especially in states with large Spanish-speaking populations, such as Florida, California, and Texas. Leaders of U.S. English and English First, the major political organizations advocating official status for English in the United States, argue that the increase in non-English speaking populations will lead to disunity and eventual social unrest including separatism (Adams and Brinks 1990). Initiatives to pass legislation that would mandate the official status of English and thereby limit the use of other languages in American public discourse have been moderately successful to date.[5] This is not to say that all monolingual Americans view bilingualism or multilingualism with scorn and suspicion. On the contrary, many monolingual Americans see bilingualism in an extremely positive if somewhat idealized light. Skuttnab-Kangas (1981) notes that positive or negative evaluations of a speaker's bilingual ability are essentially evaluations of a person's social class, ethnicity, or educational level:

> If you have learnt French at university, preferably in France and even better at the Sorbonne, then bilingualism is something very positive. But if you have learnt French from your old grandmother in Maine then bilingualism is something rather to be ashamed of. (p. 96)

It is only natural for Americans to evaluate bilingualism either very positively or very negatively given the minority status and socioeconomic stratification of bilingual speakers in the United States. The irony, of course, is that Americans who perceive monolingualism as the natural state of affairs are unaware of the global sociolinguistic facts. It is *multilingualism* that is the norm throughout most of the world, and *monolingualism* that is the exception to the rule.[6] Given that multilingual non-native speakers are the majority, Kramsch (forthcoming) calls on foreign language teachers to "make the multilingual speaker the unmarked form, the infinitive of language use, and the monolingual monocultural speaker a slowly disappearing species or a nationalistic myth." Cook (1992) similarly argues that foreign language teachers and SLA researchers would do well to take multilingual communities as the model for second/foreign language learning: "It would be salutary for SLA research if it started from countries such as Cameroon in which a person may use four or five languages in the course of a day, taken from the 2 official languages, the 4 lingua francas, or the 285 native languages" (p. 579).

Classrooms as Multilingual Speech Communities

If we take the advice of Kramsch and Cook seriously and make Cameroon or some such multilingual country our model, what would happen? What would it mean to "imagine" our classrooms as multilingual communities? What should the role of the L1 and the L2 be in foreign language classrooms? To answer these questions, it is necessary to gain a better understanding of how multilingual speakers use their various languages.

Language Use in Foreign Language and Bilingual Education

One of the primary areas of sociolinguistic inquiry is language choice, the study of why speakers choose one language rather than another in different social contexts (Fasold 1984, p. 180).[7] This sociolinguistic question is easily reworded for foreign language education research: Why do foreign language students/teachers choose one language rather than another in a given learning situation? (Faltis 1990). Or put differently, what are the pedagogical effects of language choice for foreign language study? Such questions are rarely asked by foreign language professionals, presumably because teachers do not perceive the relevance of such questions to their praxis.

Norms of language use differ greatly from one multilingual society to the next. In some communities, speakers permit language mixing, while in other communities, speakers maintain a strict separation of the languages. For example, in so-called diglossic communities, different languages are reserved for specific linguistic functions and specific institutional contexts or domains, e.g., education, business, religion, etc.[8] The functional compartmentalization of languages in a diglossic community resembles many foreign language classrooms in American universities where teachers and students are careful to keep English and the target language separate. Milk (1990) refers to the strict separation of the L1 and the L2 among American second language teachers as "an article of faith" (p. 41). The mixing of languages is impossible in foreign language classrooms where the student's native language is interdicted. Whether the methodology is the direct method, the audiolingual method, or the communicative approach, today's language teacher often views the exclusive use of the target language in the classroom as a *sine qua non* for language learning.

On the other hand, while many teachers feel that the target language should be used exclusively in the classroom domain, they do not always practice what they preach. Zéphir and Chirol (1993) surveyed classroom language use among graduate student teaching assistants in beginning French courses at the University of Missouri and discovered that English and French were reportedly used for different topics in the classroom. English was often selected for explicit grammar explanations while French was chosen for communicative activities. In other words, code choice depended largely on discourse topic or communicative task. Many instructors switched to English when speaking about classroom management issues, e.g., grading procedures, changes to the syllabus, exam schedule. The results of the survey indicate a common contradiction with the foreign language teaching profession: Many teachers continue to speak English with their students while professing a belief in the exclusive classroom use of the target language.

The exclusive use of the target language in foreign language classrooms would seem to make eminent sense, particularly in contexts where students have few if any opportunities to encounter the target language outside of class. It would appear that teachers are simply trying to maximize their students' exposure to the target language, to immerse the students as it were. Yet beginning students are not always convinced that immersion is the best approach. In fact, they frequently report that the exclusive use of the target language raises their "affective filter." Zéphir and Chirol (1993) found in their survey of 300 students enrolled in beginning French that 80 percent preferred classroom instruction in both French and English. Cook (1992) notes that the exclusive use of the target language with beginning foreign language students is reminiscent of a now outdated technique used by teachers of deaf children. In a misguided effort to prevent deaf students from using sign language, teachers required children to sit on their hands thereby forcing them to use spoken language. Cook emphasizes that while teachers may banish the students' native language from the classroom, they can never banish it from their students' minds.

While surveys are interesting in that they uncover teachers' beliefs about their own language choice in the classroom, it is impossible to draw conclusions about *actual* language use based on survey data alone. In order to uncover patterns of natural language use and the possible motivations behind language choice, anthropologists (including ethnographers interested in classroom interaction) generally rely on a different methodology—participant observation. By using such a methodology, anthropologists have been able to document if and when switches from one language to another occur and in what ways the languages may or may not be mixed. In multilingual communities throughout the world, switching between two or more languages in daily discourse is typical (Blom and Gumperz 1972, Gal 1978, 1979, Myers-Scotton 1993a,b). This phenomenon, commonly referred to as code-switching (CS), is defined by Valdés-Fallis (1978) as "the alternating use of two languages on the word, phrase, clause, or sentence level" (p. 1). Most scholars distinguish CS from linguistic interference and integration in that CS maintains the structural integrity of both languages. Valdés-Fallis (1978) gives the following examples from naturally occurring Chicano Spanish/English discourse:

(1) *Well, I keep starting some.* Como por un mes, todos los días escribo y ya dejo. *Last week,* empecé otra vez.

'Well, I keep starting some. For about a month I write every day and then I stop. Last week, I started again.' (p. 1)

In (1), CS occurs between sentences as well as within a sentence (intersentential and intrasentential switching). CS is usually distinguished from the process of borrowing which Valdés-Fallis (1978) illustrates in (2).

(2) Los muchachos están *puchando* la *troca*.

'The boys were pushing the truck.' (Valdés-Fallis 1978, p. 2)

In (2) the verb "push" has been borrowed from the English language and then adapted phonologically and morphologically to conform to the linguistic system of Spanish. Likewise, the word "troca," derived from the English word "truck," has undergone phonological and morphological assimilation. Valdés-Fallis (1978) emphasizes that such borrowings differ from CS "where all items are used exactly as they are found in the original" (p. 2). The distinction between CS and borrowing is problematic, however, since there exist intermediate phenomena that are difficult to categorize as in the following example from Cajun French discourse.

(3) J'ai *draw* mon *security*, pêché des écrevisses . . . et on a *enjoy* ça tu sais.

I withdrew my pension, fished some crawfish . . . and we enjoyed it, y'know.' (Blyth, forthcoming)

The problem that presents itself in (3) is single word switches such as *"enjoy"* which sound like English but lack the correct past tense inflection (e.g., enjoy+ed). Such structures with their anomalous morphology do not follow Valdes-Fallis' CS criterion that all lexical items be used exactly as they appear in the original language (Picone 1994).[9]

In (1), (2), and (3), CS is limited to a single speaker; however, in conversation, CS is quite common *between* speakers. For example, it is typical for parents to address their children in one language and for the children to respond in another language as in (4).

(4)	Adult:	*Cosa vuoi fare Lukas?*
		'What do you want to do, Lukas?'
Francesca		ausgehe
		'go out'
	Luca	in de Wald
		'in the forest'
	Adult	Ja?
		'Yeah?'
	Luca	Ahhh, in der Wald
		'Ohh, in the forest.'
		(Auer 1984, p. 14)

The exchange in (4) is an excerpt from a bilingual conversation between members of an Italian "guest worker" family living in Germany. The mother, a native speaker of Italian, asks her children a question in Italian, but the children who have lived most of their lives in Germany respond in German. Notice that the mother switches to German too ("Ja?").

CS is often the unmarked or normal way to communicate in many multilingual communities (Myers-Scotton 1993b); in other words, it is not remarked upon as long as it occurs in an "appropriate context." Despite its widespread usage, however, CS is almost always stigmatized, even by those multilingual speakers who frequently switch themselves (Fasold 1984; Romaine 1989). This stigma is prevalent in the foreign language teaching profession as well. Even though most foreign language teachers are bilingual, they often subscribe to norms of monolingual discourse, which denigrate the mixing of languages—inside or outside the classrooms. Indeed, the mixing of languages is often assumed to lead inevitably to half-breed codes—"franglais" or "Spanglish."[10]

While the issues of language choice and CS have received relatively little attention in foreign language methodology, they have been centers of controversy in bilingual methodology (Durán 1981; Jacobson and Faltis 1990; Ramirez 1980). Jacobson (1990) claims that for many years bilingual educators supported the common sense view that language switching by teachers would confuse the students and lead to "cross-contamination." Such conventional wisdom, he points out, was felt to be so self-evident that it needed no empirical proof:

> As language separation would lead to the uncontaminated acquisition of either language, the concurrent use of both languages would lead to confusion, mixing and highly accented speech patterns in the target language. Whether this latter argument could actually be upheld, should have been supported by hard data but, unfortunately, no research project in the past has ever explored this issue. (p. 4)

According to Jacobson, there are approximately three basic patterns of language distribution or choice in bilingual education classes: submersion/immersion, separation, and concurrent. In submersion or immersion programs, only the target language is permitted in the classroom. In the other two approaches, both languages are used in instruction but in different ways. In separation approaches, languages are restricted to a specific teacher, a time of day, a place, or a particular content. For example, students may spend the morning speaking English and the afternoons speaking Spanish; or students may only speak English in language arts and Spanish in other content areas, such as mathematics and science. Thus, the separation approach resembles a kind of pedagogical diglossia in which teachers decide the appropriate domains for the different languages.

The concurrent category is reserved for four different approaches, which allow both languages to be used in the classroom. Jacobson refers to these approaches respectively as flipflopping, concurrent translation, preview/review, and new concurrent approach (NCA). Flipflopping is essentially unrestricted CS, which may or may not include intrasentential switches. In (5), an example of flipflopping, CS occurs within the teacher's discourse as well as between speakers.

(5) "Flipflopping"

T: *¿Se recuerdan Uds. de lo que aprendimos about air? ¿Qué es lo que aprendimos* about air and weight?

S1: *Que el aire pesa.*

T: *Muy bien.* And what have we learned about air and space?

S2: *Que el aire ocupa espacio.*

T: *Excelente.*

T: 'Do you remember what we learned about air? What did we learn about air and weight?'

S1: 'That air has weight.'

T: 'Good. And what have we learned about air and space?'

S2: 'That air takes up space.'

T: 'Excellent'

(Jacobson 1990, p. 11)

Concurrent translation requires the teacher to give two versions of every sentence. The students may choose either language to communicate, but the teacher always uses both languages in a highly redundant manner. This approach amounts to saying the same thing twice—once in English and then in Spanish—as exemplified in (6).

(6) "Concurrent translation"

T: We learned yesterday that air has weight. *Ayer dijimos que el aire pesa.* And what have we learned about air and space? *¿Qué aprendimos acerca del aire y el espacio?*

(Jacobson 1990, p. 12)

The preview/review approach refers to the instructional practice of previewing a lesson in the child's vernacular and then switching to the target language for the heart of the lesson. At the end of the lesson, the teacher switches back to the child's dominant language for a review of the main points. And finally, the New Concurrent Approach (NCA), a teaching method pioneered by Jacobson, is a highly structured approach to classroom CS. The basic premise of NCA is that any attempt to exclude a student's L1 from the classroom is likely to result in a highly artificial learning environment. Moreover, such a practice is seen as a waste of a potentially important pedagogical resource—the L1. Jacobson (1983) gives four criteria on which language choice should be based.

1. Both languages are to be used for equal amounts of time;
2. The teaching of content is not to be interrupted;
3. The decision to switch between the two languages is in response to a consciously identified cue;
4. The switch must relate to a specific learning objective. (p. 120)

CS is constrained by two further requirements: 1) all switches are teacher-initiated; and 2) all switches must be intersentential. This last requirement is meant to safeguard against highly stigmatized language mixing of the kind found in Chicano Spanish ("Los muchachos están puchando la troca") and Cajun French ("On a enjoy ça") and thereby insure the structural integrity of the different codes. It should be apparent that NCA is a complicated proposition since it involves learning specific procedures for CS. Foreign language teachers who may be unfamiliar with CS would likely find it difficult indeed to monitor their language alternation in accordance with the sixteen CS cues prescribed by Jacobson (1981). Faltis (1990) groups Jacobson's sixteen CS cues into the four categories of Table 1: classroom strategies, curriculum, language development, and interpersonal relationships.

In essence, the cues serve as a teacher's criteria for deciding the appropriateness and effectiveness of CS during a given lesson. For example, CS may be used to break the fatigue and monotony that students often feel when listening to long stretches of the foreign language (4d, fatigue). The teacher may feel a switch to English is in order because the text is written

Table 1

The New Concurrent Approach Cue System

1. *Classroom strategies*	2. *Curriculum*
a. conceptual reinforcement	a. language appropriateness
b. review	b. topic
c. capturing of attention	c. text
d. praise/reprimand	
3. *Language development*	4. *Interpersonal relationships*
a. variable language dominance	a. intimacy/formality
b. lexical enrichment	b. courtesy
c. translatability	c. free choice
	d. fatigue
	e. self-awareness
	f. rapport

(Faltis 1990, p. 50)

in English (2c, text) or because the topic is closely related to American life/culture and therefore lends itself to discussion in English (2b, topic). Thus, CS is viewed as a valuable technique, that teachers are encouraged to master and use strategically throughout their lessons. Proponents of such an approach emphasize that CS should not be used simply for translation that, they claim, does not encourage students to develop appropriate listening skills in their less dominant language. NCA proponents also emphasize that teacher-initiated CS should always be motivated by a specific objective as exemplified in (7).

(7) "New Concurrent Approach (NCA)"

T: Do you remember what we have been learning about air? Robert, what have we learned about air and weight?

S1: . . . that air has weight.

T: Very good. Isela, what have we learned about air and space?

S2: . . . that air takes up space.

T: Very good.

T: (1b, Review) *¿Se recuerdan del experimento que hicimos el otro día con el vaso y la toallita de papel? Lorenzo, ¿me pueden decir lo que hicimos?*

S3: *Pusimos una toallita encima de un vaso y no se mojó el papel.*

T: *Muy bien, Lorenzo.*

T: (1a, Conceptual Reinforcement) Who can tell me now why the paper didn't get wet?

S4: . . . because the air in the cup didn't let the water into the napkin.

T: (1d, Praise) *Muy bien. Tú sí pusiste atención. El papel no se mojó porque el aire ocupa espacio y no permite que entre el agua.*

T: (2c, Text) Now, I want you to turn to page 18—a one and an eight—Here you will see another experiment.

T: '. . . Do you remember what we have been learning about air? Robert, what have we learned about air and weight?'

S1: '. . . that air has weight.'

T: 'Very good. Isela, what have we learned about air and space?'

S2: '. . . that air takes up space.'

T: 'Very good.'

T: 'Do you remember the experiment we did yesterday with the cup and paper napkin, Lorenzo? Can you tell me what we did?'

S3: 'We put the napkin around the cup and it didn't get wet.'

T: 'Good, Lorenzo.'

T: 'Who can tell me now why the paper didn't get wet?'

S4: '. . . because the air in the cup didn't let the water into the napkin.'

T: 'Very good. You certainly paid attention. The napkin didn't get wet because the air took up space and didn't let the water get through.'

T: 'Now, I want you to turn to page 18—a one and an eight—Here you will see another experiment.'

(Faltis 1990, pp. 50–53)

In (7) the teacher begins the day's lesson in English but switches to Spanish to review the main points of the previous day's lesson. After eliciting the main points, she switches back to English to ask a question that reinforces and refines the basic concepts. When the correct answer is given, the teacher chooses to praise the student in Spanish, presumably to emphasize the praise. And finally, the teacher switches to English when referring to and reading an English text. In this kind of postmortem analysis of classroom behavior the teacher views herself on videotape and specifies her motives for all CS. Faltis (1990) claims that such a method is useful in training teachers to use the sixteen CS cues more successfully. He also notes that such a procedure might prove valuable to researchers who wish to understand the interactive nature of decision making in the classroom.

Foreign language educators who have experimented with the pedagogical potential of CS do not necessarily follow NCA or any specific approach taken from bilingual education. For example, Giauque and Ely (1990) have proposed a procedure for implementing CS at the beginning level of foreign language study that is based on the use of cognates. They argue that CS is a useful procedure that actually increases communication in the foreign language classroom:

> The basic principle of using code-switching in teaching foreign languages is that the teacher speaks the foreign language using many cognate words, and uses code-switching to communicate those words which are not cognates in the target language. As a result, students learn that it is possible to understand a great deal of the target language at a very early stage in their learning experience. From the outset, they are taught, indirectly, to listen for cognate words; the teacher's use of English words when cognates do not exist in the target languge provides additional contextual clues for understanding. We thus have the best of both worlds: students comprehend a large amount, while at the same time, the teacher uses English only quite sparingly. (Giauque and Ely 1990, pp. 174–75)

Giauque and Ely emphasize that CS should be used only in the very beginning of foreign language study when students have virtually no productive capacity in the target language. The procedure encourages students to communicate using any words or expressions they can produce in the target language. Whatever students cannot say or write in the target language, they are free to communicate in English. The result is a hybrid language—French cognates (mostly nouns and verbs) plugged into an English grammar matrix as in (8).

(8) 'Your *explication* is *difficile* to comprendre. *Je* am having *difficulté* with this learning *activité*. The *information* is *insuffisante*.' (Giauque and Ely 1990, p. 178)

Ironically, it is this kind of stigmatized admixture that most foreign language teachers and most bilingual educators take great pains to avoid. In fact, the kind of mixing exemplified in (8) is strictly forbidden in most bilingual approaches to CS. But Giauque and Ely point out that language mixing of this sort is short-lived and is intended to be used exclusively in the first month or so of beginning foreign language classes. They claim that this kind of hybrid language is a stage in students' language development that will quickly give way to stretches of extended discourse produced in the target language: ". . . after a few class periods, the students realize that the teacher is very serious about the use of 'Frenglish.' Soon, definite and indefinite articles begin to appear, not in English, but in French. Pronoun subjects also begin to appear as French words, as do some cognate words, and certain conjugations of the verb 'to be'. . . . From 5% (i.e., one French word for approximately two lines of English text) the amount of French increases to 10%, then 20%, and soon it is 33% to 50%" (p. 179).

To examine reactions to the procedure, Giauque and Ely conducted a pilot study with 30 students enrolled in a beginning French course at the University of Northern Arizona. The students were interviewed at regular intervals throughout the semester. Not surprisingly, most students had no prior knowledge of nor experience with CS and therefore found its initial use in the classroom highly unusual. In fact, most students worried that such a teaching method would lead to "bad habits." However, students who were skeptical at the beginning of the year gradually increased their use of CS in class and soon reported positive feelings about the effectiveness of the technique. Giauque and Ely state that the most important finding of their study was this significant positive change in student attitude toward CS. In terms of further research, the authors suggest that more foreign language professionals should "make an unbiased examination of the usefulness of the CS procedure" in order to uncover the effects of CS on student achievement (p. 183).

L1 in L2 Learning: Scaffolding, Private Speech, and Mental Translation

While the literature on CS in the foreign language classroom may be limited, there is a large and growing body of research that explores the role of the L1 in second language acquisition. For example, the study of so-called cross-linguistic influence has long been central to the fields of second language acquisition, contact linguistics, and historical linguistics. However, these fields have been limited the past to posthoc studies of linguistic development. In other words, in the comparative method of historical linguistics as well as the early methods of applied linguistics, such fields as contrastive analysis and error analysis shared a common reliance on structural, linguistic facts with little reference to social and psychological factors. Recent approaches to transfer in second language acquisition, on the other hand, have made room for nonstructural factors. Odlin (1989) reviews several studies that show that a speaker's metalinguistic awareness and social awareness can affect the transfer of grammatical structures from the L1 to the L2.

In a further attempt to move beyond a purely structural or linguistic approach to second language acquisition, researchers have paid increasing attention to learning as "situated activity" (Lave and Wenger 1991):

> Learning viewed as situated activity has as its central defining characteristic a process that we call legitimate peripheral participation. By this we mean to draw attention to the point that learners inevitably participate in communities of practitioners and that the mastery of knowledge and skill requires newcomers to move toward full participation in the sociocultural practices of a community. (p. 29)

This new perspective seeks an integration of the sociolinguistic and pyscholinguistic paradigms wherein learning is viewed as a "process that takes place in a participation framework, not in an individual mind" (Hanks 1991, p. 15).

Researchers who adopt this perspective shift their focus from the product, the so-called acquired structures, to the process of acquisition. In this vein, Donato (1994) describes a research practice called "microgenetic analysis." He defines microgenesis as "the gradual course of skill acquisition during a training session, experiment, or interaction" (p. 38). In a microgenetic analysis of learner behavior, the researcher pays close attention to all details of an interaction: intonational contours, eye gaze, hesitations, gestures, etc. None of these details can be ignored since they may

potentially give important clues to a learner's consciousness. Thus, phenomena such as CS or, more generally, the use of the L1 in interaction may provide important insights into the development of second language competence. This discursive, sociocultural approach to human cognition is closely associated with the Russian psychologist Vygotsky.

> For Vygotsky (1986), consciousness is *co-knowledge*; the individual dimension of consciousness is derivatory and secondary. To account for this phenomenon requires studies that capture the evolving and dynamic features of interaction that allow individuals to change and be changed by the concrete particulars of their social context (Rommetveit 1985). This perspective differs fundamentally from the current view that maintains that social interactions provide opportunities to supply linguistic input to learners who develop solely on the basis of their internal language processing mechanisms. (Donato 1994, p. 38)

Implicit in such an approach is the rejection of the causal link between input and acquisition. In the strong version of the input hypothesis, comprehensible input brings about language acquisition; in the weaker version, comprehensible input facilitates acquisition. Platt and Brooks (1994) take issue with such an input model of language learning as simplistic and reductionist. They claim that the input hypothesis perpetuates a spurious model of communication based on information processing which is itself founded on the questionable metaphor of language as a container. Such a metaphor equates linguistic messages to packages that contain information. In this conception of communication, the speaker sends a package of information, a message, to the listener who promptly unwraps the package and takes out the information. Platt and Brooks point out that speakers sometimes direct their comments to themselves and not to others (people sometimes send packages to themselves). More important, the container metaphor of language suggests that meaning remains invariant during transmission from speaker to listener. Recent work in discourse analysis characterizes meaning not as the static product of an individual mind but rather the result of a dynamic and collaborative effort. The terms "negotiation of meaning" and "co-construction of meaning" are frequently used to capture this new view of communication within the field of discourse analysis (Schiffrin 1994). Finally, communication as information processing ignores the role speech plays in mediating cognitive functioning as emphasized in Vygotskian approaches to second language acquisition.[11]

Predicated on the input hypothesis and an information processing model of communication is the conventional belief of foreign language teachers that the more students are exposed to the target language, the more language they will acquire. This prevalent belief elevates the *quantity* of input above all other possible qualitative factors in second language acquisition. Milk argues (1990) that the question of which language to use in the classroom should not be framed in terms of 'how much' of which language, but rather "in what manner and in what context each language is used, and what kinds of interactions students are involved in when using the language" (p. 38). Researchers who study first and second language discourse have proposed the metaphor of scaffolding to describe the interactions between learners and teachers (or more generally, between nonnative and native speakers). Cazden (1988) provides a helpful illustration of scaffolding from everyday life:

> Imagine a picture of an adult holding the hand of a very young toddler with the caption, "Everyone needs a helping hand." . . . The child does what he or she can and the adult does the rest; the child's practice occurs in the context of the full performance; and the adult's help is gradually withdrawn (from holding two hands to just one, then to offering only a finger, and then withdrawing that a few inches, and so on) as the child's competence grows. (p. 102)

Hatch (1978, 1983) was one of the first researchers to note that L2 learners rely on "experts" to supply them with L2 structures that are missing from their repertoire. In essence, learners build their sentences by adding on to the linguistic scaffolding supplied by the native speakers. The resulting discourse is therefore described as "jointly constructed." The metaphor of scaffolding is a powerful one and has been used to describe learner behavior in various fields other than L1 and L2 acquisition. The term originated in the field of cognitive psychology where it was used to describe the "conditions in which the novice can participate in, and extend, current skills and knowledge to higher levels of competence" (Donato 1994, p. 40). Donato (1994) cites Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) who characterize scaffolding as performing six important functions:

1. recruiting interest in the task,
2. simplifying the task,
3. maintaining pursuit of the goal,
4. marking critical features and discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal solution,

5. controlling frustration during problem solving, and
6. demonstrating an idealized version of the act to be performed. (p. 41)

In recent studies, the concept of scaffolding has been extended to learners who are engaged in group work without the aid of an expert (Donato 1994; Platt and Brooks 1994). Donato (1994) claims that under certain conditions, learners will engage in "dialogically constituted guided support, or collective scaffolding" (p. 53). He gives an example of such collective scaffolding in (9).

(9) Speaker 1 . . . and then I'll say. . . *tu as souvenu notre anniversaire de mariage* . . . or should I say *mon anniversaire?*

Speaker 2 *Tu as . . .*

Speaker 3 *Tu as . . .*

Speaker 1 *Tu as souvenu* . . . you remembered?

Speaker 3 Yea, but isn't that reflexive? *Tu t'as*

Speaker 1 Ah, *tu t'as souvenu.*

Speaker 2 Oh, it's *tu es*

Speaker 1 *Tu es*

Speaker 3 *tu es, tu es, tu . . .*

Speaker 1 *T'es, tu t'es*

Speaker 3 *tu t'es*

Speaker 1 *Tu t'es souvenu.*

(p. 44)

In this interaction between three students in a third-semester French course at an American university, the students collaborate to arrive at the correct French translation of "you remembered" (*Tu t'es souvenu*). Speaker 3 contributes the important information that the verb *souvenir* is reflexive but then selects the wrong auxiliary (**Tu t'as*). Speaker 2 next provides the correct form of the auxiliary (Oh, it's *tu es*). Finally, Speaker 1 synthesizes the two pieces of grammatical information, i.e., reflexive verbs require *être* as auxiliary. According to Donato, this brief interaction is evidence that learners seek out information from other learners for use in the construction of subsequent utterances. He notes that the learners' interaction is characterized by many of the functions typically ascribed to scaffolding in the literature: marking critical features of discrepancies between what has been produced and the perceived ideal solution, and minimizing frustration and risk by relying on the collective resources of the group. Donato emphasizes that scaffolding occurs during nonstructured tasks when the negotiation of form and meaning is required. He provides several examples of scaffolding similar to (9) in which the L1 is used by the learners. It appears then that the L1 constitutes an essential part of collective scaffolding in L2 discourse.

Platt and Brooks (1994) state that the L1 is frequently used when L2 students are faced with a demanding task that requires problem solving. In their analysis of the language produced by university-level third-semester Spanish students engaged in an information gap activity, Platt and Brooks discovered that students frequently talk to themselves in the L1 during a given interaction. In Vygotskian theory, this kind of thinking aloud is called "private speech" and is considered to be "an instrument of thought in the proper sense . . . as it aids the individual in seeking and planning the solution of a problem" (Vygotsky 1986, p. 31). McCafferty (1994) reviews the major findings of studies on private speech in adult L2 learners and concludes that it performs important cognitive, social, and affective functions. Platt and Brooks (1994) give the following example of private speech from their data.

(10) Private Speech

10a J: *¿qué tienes?*
K: *tienen un [vi] um que con con- con- tina contina para un espacio* (whisper to self) how do you say that above

J: 'What do you have?'
K: 'They have [vi] um that "con con- con- tain contains" for a space (whisper to self) how do you say that above'

10b J: *sí*
K: *y segundo [linéa] es a a la tre tres tres um* (to self) how would you say that *en en la tiempo es* (incomprehensible) *es la tres*
J: *tres*
K: (to self) hm it's not making sense

J: 'yes'
K: 'and second [line] is is three um (to self) how would you say that at the time is (incomprehensible) it's three'
J: 'three'
K: (to self) 'hm it's not making sense'

10c K: *yes sí*
J: *¿qué?*
K: *tengo uh uh* (to self) geez how do I say this *cuarto cientos um cuartos uno dos tres cuarto cientos mmm cuatro ciento ciento diez dólares y um quince*
J: *cuatro cien y diez*
K: *cuatro*

K: 'yes yes'
J: 'What?'
K: 'I have uh uh (to self) geez how do I say this four hundred um four one two three four hundreds mmm four hundred hundred ten dollars and um fifteen'
J: 'four hundred and ten'
K: 'four'
(Platt and Brooks 1994, p. 507)

Platt and Brooks claim that K's frequent whispering is not intended for her interlocutor but rather serves to regulate her own cognition. They point out that private speech does not fit into an information-processing model of communication since the message, in this case, is not intended to be "processed" by the interlocutor. Besides private speech, Platt and Brooks also find other uses of the L1 embedded in L2 learner discourse, namely "situation definition" and "metatalk." Learners frequently switch to the L1 when attempting to define for themselves a learning task or situation ("What are we supposed to be doing here?") and when they comment on their own speech production ("Let me think of another way to say this."). Platt and Brooks conclude that teachers should pay closer attention to the ways students use language while performing various so-called communicative activities:

> This is especially crucial with respect to the use of L1, which, as we have seen, is really the only mediational tool fully available to learners, especially at the lower proficiency levels, for solving the kinds of problems we have seen in these various examples of talk.(p. 509)

Researchers in L2 reading have recently been asking similar questions about the role of the native language in text comprehension. Kern (1994) contends that foreign language teachers realize the inevitability of mental translation whenever beginning students read L2 texts. And yet, despite the ubiquity of mental translation, both teachers and students alike view it as an "undesirable crutch". In an attempt to uncover the uses of mental translation in the process of L2 text comprehension, Kern performed a "think-aloud" protocol on fifty-one intermediate-level French students who were asked to verbalize their thoughts while simultaneously reading a French text. He found that beginning L2 readers make strategic use of the L1 whenever cognitive or memory limits are exceeded. He therefore suggests "that translation is not always an undesirable habit to be discouraged at all costs, but rather, an important developmental aspect of L2 comprehension processes" (p. 442).

Monolingual Norms vs. Multilingual Norms

Recognizing the potential benefit of the L1 in foreign language learning, whether it is in class discussions, in communicative activities, or even in reading, will likely remain difficult for teachers wedded to the orthodoxy of foreign language methodology. Even if teachers do recognize the potential cognitive benefits of the L1 as demonstrated in the research literature, they will probably not find such benefits compelling enough to forego long-standing teaching methods founded on the principle of language separation, a principle based on Western ideologies of linguistic and cultural purity. In other words, before they can embrace the seemingly radical metaphor of the classroom as a multicultural/multilingual community, teachers must understand Cazden's important observation that all classroom practice—including foreign language methodology as practiced in American universities—"are cultural phenomena, not 'natural' in any sense . . . " (Cazden 1988, p. 67). Next, they must understand that the metaphor of the classroom as a multilingual community may actually help them present a more realistic picture of the foreign culture.

Presenting a realistic picture of any culture is a difficult challenge. Unfortunately, it is further complicated by current textbooks that represent an idealized version of the foreign culture and language. As Heilenman (1993) and Kramsch (1987) both point out, inaccuracies are understandable given that textbooks are the product of many competing forces—the authors, the American educational market, the publishing companies (typically American), etc. In an examination of twelve current college textbooks for first year French, Wieczorek (1994) found that "areas other than France" constituted a mere 5% of a given text's content (p. 495). Ramirez and Hall (1990) found virtually the same situation in a review of five Spanish secondary texts:

> . . . the majority of Spanish-speaking countries are underrepresented in the texbooks examined. In addition, no text contains significant representations of the Spanish-speaking groups living in the United States. . . All but a few of the photographs of all five textbooks examined depict the middle to upper classes, a segment which represents, in reality, a very small percentage of the Spanish-speaking population. (p. 63)

It is obvious that such texts leave students with a distorted reflection of the French-speaking and Spanish-speaking worlds and that such distortion may perpetuate absurd American myths about foreign cultures. One of the most insidious but least recognized myths that such textbooks perpetuate is the myth of cultural and linguistic homogeneity, the myth that foreign language speakers are "unified subjects." While there are encouraging signs of a multicultural trend in textbook publication, most foreign language textbooks depict foreign personages—real or imagined—as bearing a striking resemblance to Chomsky's "ideal speaker-listener"; they inhabit a homogeneous speech-community and they know the language perfectly. In other words, the people populating textbooks are almost always monolingual native speakers—monolingual Parisians, monolingual Berliners, monolingual Madrileños. To most foreign language teachers and students such a practice seems "natural"; Kramsch (forthcoming) claims that foreign language education "has traditionally been *predicated* on the distinction between native speaker and nonnative speaker." Most people generally assume that learning a foreign language is nothing more than learning the rules of the native speaker, "the norm against which the [nonnative] speaker's performance is measured" (p. 2). But if teachers were to imagine their students as *incipient bilinguals* belonging to a multilingual speech community, could they reasonably ask students to adhere to monolingual norms of language use?

Monolingual native speaker norms are inappropriate for foreign language students for a very simple reason: They are impossible, unattainable goals. This is not to deny the possibility of native-like or ultimate attainment by second language learners as reported in the literature (Birdsong 1992). Rather, the point is that monolingual speakers make curious behavioral models for students striving to overcome their own monolingualism. It is obvious to students that they will never be those mythical monolingual Parisians or Berliners or Madrileños. A more suitable norm (although a vastly more complicated one) would be based on bilingual French/English speakers, German/English speakers, and Spanish/English speakers. By making bilingual competence the yardstick against which teachers measure their students' progress, teachers could demonstrate to students that *partial competence* is also of virtue. Teachers (as well as textbook authors and publishers) continue to underestimate the profoundly beneficial impact of hearing the voices of *nonnative speakers of a foreign language*. A Cambodian, a Senegalese, a Tunisian or, for that matter, an American, who speaks French well enough to be interviewed on television by a French journalist sends a more encouraging message to students than do a thousand Parisians whose flawless, monolingual French is simply their birthright. In other words, adopting a different set of language norms can have a felicitous effect on our students' motivation: Bilingual norms encourage students to see their "competence glass" as half-full whereas monolingual norms make them see their glasses as half-empty.[12] Moreover, the inclusion of nonnative speakers is essential in helping students to realize that languages are spoken in a wide array of dialects and proficiencies (Wieczorek 1991, 1994).

Students are not the only ones, however, who gain a new perspective on language learning by embracing multilingual norms. Such norms can be empowering for the nonnative teacher as well. Kramsch entreats language teachers to see nonnative speakers (whether they are students or teachers) not in terms of their shortcomings, but rather in terms of their unique contributions to a multicultural world. Examining the writings of prominent multilingual authors, Kramsch (forthcoming) asserts that being a nonnative speaker is "a prerogative, a right, and even a privilege": "Their story is not one of laborious approximation to someone else's norm, nor does it need to be one of loss of linguistic or cultural identity. More and more they, not monolinguals, are becoming the norm of language use."

Curriculum Development: An Anecdote

The metaphor of the foreign language classroom as a multilingual community takes on special significance as foreign language educators seek to open up the study of languages and cultures to a more diverse group of students. A distinguishing feature of multilingual communities is the existence of ethnic and linguistic diversity. In similar fashion, foreign language classrooms are characterized by tremendous linguistic diversity. The constant challenge facing teachers is to create a sense of belonging, a sense of community, despite very real differences in their students' L2 proficiencies. Creating a sense of community in the classroom is further complicated in language programs that attempt to cross disciplinary boundaries, for example in content-based language programs and in languages-across-the-

curriculum programs (Allen, Anderson, and Narváez 1992).

Intrigued by the parallels between multilingual communities and foreign language classrooms, I attempted to merge the two, to create such a community in a course on the ethnography of Francophone Louisiana at Louisiana State University. The course was the result of a grant from the Louisiana Department of Education for the development of a curriculum focusing on the state's French heritage.[13] The grant monies allowed me to "import the real world" into the classroom by inviting a variety of guest lecturers: Cajun and Creole writers, musicians, cooks, educators, storytellers, etc. As a culminating exercise, students were required to conduct taped interviews of local francophone residents, which they later transcribed.

I had not specified any prerequisite in the course catalogue and, as a consequence, many students chose it as an elective. The students who enrolled in the course represented a staggering diversity of academic backgrounds and linguistic proficiencies. In general, the students fell into three groups: French majors who understood standard French but not the Cajun dialect, nonmajors of Cajun origin whose proficiency in standard French was extremely limited, and three exchange students from France who understood Cajun French but not Cajun English. Reasoning that the linguistic diversity of the classroom was an example of the very phenomenon that the course proposed to examine, I decided to accept all students who had enrolled. I began the course by having the students examine videotapes of conversations between French/English bilinguals so they could see how meaning was negotiated in both languages. During class I made a conscious effort to switch languages myself: I spoke in English whenever taking an anglophone American perspective and in French whenever taking a Cajun perspective. I also switched whenever I thought that some students had not understood. As the weeks passed however, I became much less conscious of my own linguistic behavior.

At first, only the most fluent French speakers dared to open their mouths; and when they did, they invariably spoke in French. A few sessions later, a visibly frustrated nonmajor finally asked permission to speak in English. When I granted her permission, she asked a question that another student answered—in French. And so it went throughout the entire semester, the students switching languages according to their own needs and desires. On a few rare occasions, I drew attention to our codeswitching in order to illustrate a communicative pattern prevalent in the bilingual community. Otherwise, I never commented on the practice of "overt bilingualism," which we had tacitly adopted at the beginning and maintained throughout the semester. On course evaluations, most students commented that the bilingualism was an essential ingredient of the course, especially since it reflected the speech community under study. More important, nonmajors wrote that the occasional use of English had created just enough of a "scaffold" for them to participate successfully in class. In the words of one student, "using English as support allowed nonmajors like me to stay afloat." However, differences in the students' proficiency levels did not magically disappear, rather they were partially neutralized. The nonmajors compensated for their linguistic deficiencies by their intimate background knowledge of the culture. On several occasions, it turned out to be the nonmajors who "explained" the assigned readings to the linguistically more proficient majors on whom many cultural allusions were lost. And surprisingly, both French majors and nonmajors alike agreed that their ability to speak and comprehend spoken French (standard and dialect) had increased as a result of the course.

This anecdote is not offered as a general model for other foreign language teachers to follow. Rather, it is intended as a specific example of how teachers may change their curriculum and practice by changing the "metaphors they teach by." Be that as it may, skeptical teachers may point out, quite rightly, that this course is based on an experience occurring in an area of the country where there are a great many speakers of French, a circumstance that is unusual, if not extraordinary, in the United States. On the other hand, there are many immigrant communities throughout the United States that are readily available to foreign language educators: Hispanic, Portuguese, Haitian, Italian, Pennsylvania German, etc. Foreign language teachers will have to decide for themselves how best to use these largely untapped resources. Many teachers are likely to have misgivings about exposing students to such nonstandard dialects. Frye and Garza (1992) acknowledge that while contact with these immigrant speech communities poses some problems, the rewards greatly outweigh the risks: ". . . opportunities such as these provide a level of authentic contact that can be richly rewarding and ought to be exploited to the maximum, to increase understanding and appreciation of these communities in our midst" (p. 232).

Conclusion

While the metaphor of the multilingual community is useful in helping educators redefine the boundaries of language study, it is not without its

problems. It could be argued that students do not see themselves as belonging to a social group in the same way that members of a speech community do. Their allegiance to their chosen language is frequently superficial; in fact, the choice of a language is often due to the arbitrariness of a student's schedule ("I signed up for German but it conflicts with my chemistry lab so I switched to Spanish."). Teachers may also wonder if it isn't downright ludicrous to refer to beginning language students as bilinguals, even when qualified as "incipient." And finally, foreign language educators could easily take exception to the "deconstruction" of the native speaker category, a category on which rests many long-held assumptions.

A response to these reasonable counter-arguments comes from Cazden (1988) who advises teachers to understand the limits and assumptions of any metaphor used to describe classroom practice. Cazden points out that metaphors, by nature, serve to highlight similarities but may completely disregard or ignore important differences. For this reason, she cautions educators that they must not forget the particularities of the classroom when invoking metaphors. Thus, the metaphor of community as it applies to the classroom refers to "a community of people who are changing, and whose change the environment should be specifically designed to support" (p. 198). Furthermore, the classroom-as-a-multilingual-community metaphor must be taken in the spirit in which it is used here—as a heuristic, a tool to help educators explore the conventional wisdom that holds curricular boundaries in their places. Cognitive scientists have recently argued that metaphor is not simply a figurative device restricted to literary discourse but rather an essential building block of human cognition (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Thus, the metaphors foreign language educators use tell much about how they conceive of their profession and their classroom practice.

As for the problem of seeing students as bilinguals rather than as "aspiring monolinguals," to use Kramsch's aptly caustic phrase, I think it is time that foreign language educators reevaluate the received categories *native speaker* and *nonnative speaker* . The linguistic establishment has concluded that there is no simple method by which to prove that two speakers have the same grammatical competence. Neither has the sociolinguistic establishment a simple metric for determining native speakership (Davies 1991). It seems that we have no choice but to accept our most basic concepts as fuzzy, their boundaries as blurred. This is a most difficult choice since it is human inclination to prefer categories with discrete boundaries (Lakoff 1987). One may ask what the point of a boundary is if not to demonstrate unequivocally what things are in and what things are out. The metaphor of the multilingual speech community emphasizes the reality of being both in and out at the same time. It also indicates the suspicion and even derision directed at speakers who straddle the linguistic and cultural line.

Bialystok and Hakuta (1994) state that "the exciting challenge for teachers and learners of a second language, from a cultural perspective, is to construct a context for creative and meaningful discourse by taking full advantage of the rich personal, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds of all the participants" (p. 203). It is unfortunate that current curricular and methodological "boundaries" of foreign language education prohibit teachers from taking full advantage of this richness. At present, the foreign language teaching profession is caught between a monolingual ideology and a multilingual reality. Students are likely to find foreign language courses increasingly irrelevant and anachronistic unless teachers can find ways to address the growing cultural and linguistic diversity inside and outside their classrooms. It is time to "reimagine" our classroom communities. It is time to see students as they are—as multilingual nonnative speakers—and to encourage in them the unique linguistic adaptability that is the hallmark of multilingualism.

Notes

1. This article is a longer version of a paper by a similar title presented at the ACTFL/AAUSC meeting in Atlanta, November 1994. My thanks to Claire Kramsch and two anonymous readers for their helpful suggestions. Thanks also to Keith Walters for bringing to my attention Benedict Anderson's important insight that communities are essentially products of the human imagination. Any remaining problems are mine.
2. Attempts to determine who belongs to a speech community based on self-perceptions or the perceptions of others run into difficulties too. For example, in francophone Louisiana as in many bilingual communities speakers move back and forth between Cajun French, Louisiana Creole, and American English according to communicative need. Under such fluid conditions, self- and other-perceptions of membership are often in conflict. For example, it is not unusual for speakers to identify themselves as Creole speakers when in fact their first language variety is more appropriately classified as French (according to

linguistic criteria). The converse has been reported too—informants who say they are French speakers when in fact their language variety is actually closer to Creole (Tentchoff 1975; Valdman, forthcoming).
3. McLaughlin (1985) and Cazden (1988) include several classic ethnographic studies of classroom interaction. Johnson (1992) discusses the usefulness of ethnographic methods in her survey of approaches to second language research.
4. The survey conducted by Abbé Grégoire reported that in 1789 only three million of the twenty-six million French population fully understood French (Ager 1990, p. 16)
5. English only advocates have claimed that the English language is in need of protection from immigrants who refuse to learn English unlike previous generations of immigrants who assimilated quickly to English monolingual norms. The claim is leveled primarily at Spanish-speaking populations who insist on special language services like bilingual education and bilingual ballots. Such claims, however, are at odds with the facts uncovered in the Latino National Political Survey. The survey, undertaken in 1990 and released in 1992, was conducted under the auspices of the Ford, Rockefeller, Spencer, and Tinker Foundations. According to the survey, Spanish-speaking Americans overwhelmingly feel that it is important to learn English. In fact, the survey shows that the majority of the Latino population already considers itself to be English-speaking. As Fraga et al. (1994, p. 13) point out, monolingual Americans simply do not understand how Latinos claim to support the learning of English, while simultaneously supporting the use of two languages in education and the expenditure of tax dollars to provide public services in Spanish. To bilingual Latinos, however, there is no contradiction. Latino parents simply wish for their children to belong to both cultures and to speak both languages, in other words, to inhabit the same bilingual world as they.
6. Fraga et al. (1994) describe the world-wide multilingual situation in these terms: "In the approximately 160 nation states in the world today, 5,000–8,000 ethnic groups and more than 4,000 distinct languages exist. Obviously, few nations indeed are either monolingual or mono-ethnic. Each has groups living within its borders who do not speak the societal language, who may speak it with limitations, or who interact in other languages in addition to or instead of the national language" (p. 11).

7. The notion of choice is not limited to the category "language." Speakers may also choose between dialects or even registers of a single dialect. Indeed, speaker choice is at the heart of all questions surrounding linguistic variation.
8. The term diglossia comes from the French word *diglossie* as used by the French linguist Marçais. The seminal article on diglossia is Ferguson (1959). Fishman (1967) later expanded and modified Ferguson's original ideas. Ferguson, for his part, continues to refine the concept of diglossia (Ferguson 1990). It is important to note that diglossia does not imply bilingualism per se. For example, in Haiti, a diglossic society, only a small percentage of the population is proficient in both Haitian Creole and French. The large majority of Haitians who are monolingual Creole speakers find themselves excluded from activities that require French.
9. At present, it is unclear if borrowing and CS are distinguishable based on phonological and morphosyntactic criteria (see Myers-Scotton 1993a for an in-depth treatment of the grammatical aspects of code-switching). Picone (1994) argues for an intermediate category in which grammatical structures may share properties of borrowing and code-switching. He gives many examples of such code-intermediate phenomena from Louisiana French: Il a *retire* ('He retired'); J'ai *drive* en ville ('I drove to town'); J'ai *ride* sur le bike ('I rode on the bike') (p. 323).
10. Given this widespread negative attitude toward language mixing, it is surprising to find intrasentential code-switching in a recent first-year French textbook entitled *«J'veux bien!»*. Examples of such code-switching in the text are restricted to two cartoon characters, Gaston and Gigi, who introduce themselves to the reader as guides who address the student directly through the text: "We'll be offering you models and explanations that we hope will answer many of the questions you may have about French" (Bragger and Rice 1994, p. 2). The code-switching is always set off by quotation marks and clearly recognizable as belonging to an informal oral register:

> **Bien entendu** *(Of course)*, all French houses are not the same. **Chez moi, par exemple**, we have **une terrasse** behind the house and **une cave à vin** *(wine cellar)* in the basement. **Chez Gigi**, there are **des balcons** off the second story windows, her parents have **un bureau** *(a study)*, and there's also une **chambre d'ami**, where I've stayed lots of times. (Bragger and Rice 1994, p. 95)

11. For an overview of Vygotskian sociocultural theory as it applies to second language acquisition, see Frawley and Lantolf 1985; Lantolf and Appel 1994.
12. My point in invoking the container metaphor of the half-empty/half-full glass is simply to show how different norms lead to different language learner attitudes. I am aware that much has been written about the inappropriateness of the container metaphor as applied to bilingual competence (cf. Romaine 1989).
13. The proposal was entitled "Teaching Language and Culture Through Local Resources: A Curriculum on French Louisiana" and was funded through a grant from the Quality Education Fund of the Louisiana State Department of Education (1991–1992).

Works Cited

Adams, Karen, and Daniel Brink, eds. 1990. *Perspectives on Official English: The Campaign for English as the Official Language of the USA.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ager, Dennis. 1990. *Sociolinguistics and Contemporary French.* Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

Allen, Wendy, Keith Anderson, and León Narváez. 1992. Foreign Languages Across the Curriculum: The Applied Foreign Language Component. *Foreign Language Annals* 25: 11–19.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* Revised Edition. London and New York: Verso Publishers.

Auer, J. C. P. 1984. *Bilingual Conversation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bialystok, Ellen, and Kenji Hakuta. 1994. *In Other Words: The Science and Psychology of Second Language Acquisition.* New York: Basic Books.

Birdsong, David. 1992. Ultimate Attainment in Second Language Acquisition. *Language* 68: 706–755.

Blom, Jan Peter, and John Gumperz. 1972. Social Meaning in Linguistic Structure: Code-Switching in Norway. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, edited by J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, 407–34. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Blyth, Carl. Forthcoming. The Sociolinguistic Situation of Cajun French: The Effects of Language Shift and Language Loss. In *French and Creole in Louisiana*, edited by A. Valdman. New York: Plenum Press.

Bragger, Jeannette, and Donald Rice. 1994. *«J'veux bien!» Manuel de classe.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Campbell, R., and R. Wales. 1970. The Study of Language Acquisition. *New Horizons in Linguistics*, edited by J. Lyons. Harmondsworth (UK): Penguin Books.

Cazden, Courtney. 1988. *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cook, Vivian. 1992. Evidence for Multicompetence. *Language Learning* 42: 576–91.

Coppieters, René. 1987. Competence Differences Between Native and Near-Native Speakers. *Language* 63: 544–73.

Davies, Alan. 1991. *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

109

Donato, Richard. 1994. Collective Scaffolding in Second Language Learning. In *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research*, edited by J. Lantolf and G. Appel, 33–56. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Dorian, Nancy. 1982. Defining the Speech Community to Include Its Working Margins. *Sociolinguistic Patterns in Speech Communities*, edited by Suzanne Romaine, 25–33. London: Edward Arnold.

Durán, Richard P. 1981. *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Ellis, Rod. 1985. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faltis, Christian. 1990. New Directions in Bilingual Research Design: The Study of Interactive Decision Making. In *Language Distribution Issues in Bilingual Schooling*, edited by R. Jacobson and C. Faltis, 45–57. Clevedon (UK): Multilingual Matters.

Fasold, Ralph. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. London: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Ferguson, Charles. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325–40.

———. 1990. Diglossia Revisited. *Studies in Diglossia. Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10: 214–34.

Fishman, Joshua. 1967. Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 32: 29–52.

Fraga, Luis, Herman Gallegos, Gerald P. López, Mary Louise Pratt, Renato Rosaldo, José Saldívar, Ramón Saldívar, and Guadalupe Valdés. 1994. Still Looking For America: Beyond The Latino National Political Survey. A report prepared by the Public Outreach Project, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

Frawley, William, and James Lantolf. 1985. Second Language Discourse: A Vygotskyan Perspective. *Applied Linguistics* 6: 143–59.

Frye, Robert, and Thomas Garza. 1992. Authentic Contact With Native Speech and Culture at Home and Abroad. In *Teaching Languages in College: Curriculum and Content*, edited by Wilga Rivers, 225–44. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Gal, Susan. 1978. Peasant Men Can't Get Wives: Language Change and Sex Roles in a Bilingual Community. *Language in Society* 7: 1–16.

———. 1979. *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria.* New York: Academic Press.

Giauque, G., and C. Ely. 1990. Code-switching in Beginning Foreign Language Teaching. In *Language Distribution Issues in Bilingual Schooling*, edited by R. Jacobson and C. Faltis, 174–184. Clevedon (UK): Multilingual Matters.

Gumperz, John. 1962. Types of Linguistic Communities. *Anthropological Linguistics* 4: 28–40.

Hanks, William F. 1991. Foreword. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, by J. Lave and E. Wenger, 13–24. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

Hatch, Evelyn. 1978. Discourse Analysis and Second Language Acquisition. *Second Language Acquisition*, edited by E. Hatch, 401–35. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

———. 1983. *Psycholinguistics : A Second Language Perspective.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Heilenman, L. Kathy. 1993. Of Cultures and Compromises: Publishers, Textbooks, and the Academy. *Publishing Research Quarterly* 9: 55–67.

Hymes, Dell. 1972. On Communicative Competence. In *Sociolinguistics*, edited by J. B. Pride and J. Holmes. Harmondsworth (UK): Penguin Books.

Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1981. The Implementation of a Bilingual Instructional Model: The New Concurrent Approach. In *Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research, vol. 3: Bilingual Education Technology*, edited by R. Padilla, 14–29. Ypsilanti, MI: Eastern Michigan University,

———. 1983. Can Two Languages Be Developed Concurrently? Recent Developments in Bilingual Methodology. In *Dimension: Language '82*, edited by H. Altman and M. McClure, 110–31. Louisville: University of Louisville.

———. 1990. Allocating Two Languages as a Key Feature of a Bilingual. In *Language Distribution Issues in Bilingual Schooling*, edited by R. Jacobson and C. Faltis, 3–17. Clevedon (UK): Multilingual Matters.

Jacobson, Rodolfo, and Christian Faltis, eds. 1990. *Language Distribution Issues in Bilingual Schooling*. Clevedon (UK): Multilingual Matters.

Johnson, Donna M. 1992. *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*. New York: Longman.

Kern, Richard G. 1994. The Role of Mental Translation in Second Language Reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16: 441–61.

Kramsch, Claire. 1987. Foreign Language Textbooks' Construction of Foreign Reality. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 44: 95–119.

———. Forthcoming. The Privilege of the Intercultural Speaker. In *Foreign Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective*, edited by M. Byram and M. Fleming. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

———, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lantolf, James P., and Gabriela Appel. 1994. *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane, and Michael H. Long. 1991. *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. New York: Longman.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

McCafferty, Steven G. 1994. Adult Second Language Learners' Use of Private Speech: A Review of Studies. *Modern Language Journal* 78: 421–36.

McLaughlin, Barry. 1985. *Second Language Acquisition in Childhood: Volume 2. School-Age Children*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Milk, Robert D. 1990. Integrating Language and Content: Implications for Language Distribution in Bilingual Classrooms. In *Language Distribution Issues in Bilingual Schooling*, edited by R. Jacobson and C. Faltis. 32–44. Clevedon (UK): Multilingual Matters.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993a. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1993b. *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Odlin, Terence. 1989. *Language Transfer: Cross-linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

Oller, John W. 1993. *Methods That Work. Ideas For Literacy and Language Teachers*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Omaggio Hadley, Alice. 1993. *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Picone, Michael D. 1994. Code-intermediate Phenomena in Louisiana French. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 30: 320–34.

Platt, Elizabeth, and Frank B. Brooks. 1994. The 'Acquisition-Rich Environment' Revisited. *Modern Language Journal* 78: 497–511.

Preston, Dennis. 1989. *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Ramirez, Arnulfo. 1980. Language in Bilingual Classrooms. *NABE Journal* 4: 61–79.

Ramirez, Arnulfo, and Joan Kelly Hall. 1990. Language and Culture in Secondary Level Spanish Textbooks. *The Modern Language Journal* 74: 48–65.

Richards, James. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1989. *Bilingualism.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd.

Rommetveit, R. 1985. Language Acquisition as Increasing Linguistic Structuring of Experience and Symbolic Behavior Control. In *Culture, Communication, and Cognition*, edited by J. V. Wertsch, 183–204. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press

Savignon, Sandra. 1972. *Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching.* Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.

———. 1983. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Practice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Welsey Publishing Company.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. 1989. *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse.* London: Basil Blackwell, Ltd.

Shrum Judith L., and Eileen W. Glisan. 1994. *Teacher's Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Skuttnab-Kangas, T. 1981. *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities.* Clevedon (UK): Multilingual Matters.

Tentchoff, D. 1975. Cajun French and French Creole: Their Speakers and Questions of Identity. In *The Culture of Acadiana: Traditions and Change in South Louisiana*, edited by S. Del Sesto and J. Gibson, 87–109. Lafayette: University of Southwestern Louisiana.

Valdés-Fallis, Guadalupe. 1978. *Code Switching and the Classroom Teacher.* Center for Applied Linguistics. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics.

Valdman, Albert. Forthcoming. Le français en Louisiane. In *Le français dans l'espace francophone*, edited by A. Valdman.

Vygotsky, Lev S. 1986. *Thought and Language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wieczorek, Joseph A. 1991. Spanish Dialects and the Foreign Language Textbook: A Sound Perspective. *Hispania* 74: 175–81.

———. 1994. The Concept of 'French' in Foreign Language Texts. *Foreign Language Annals* 27: 487–97.

Wood, D., J. S. Bruner, and G. Ross. 1976. The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 17: 89–100.

Zéphir, Flore, and Marie-Magdelaine Chirol. 1993. Attitudes of Teaching Assistants and Students Toward the Exclusive Use of the Target Language in Beginning French Classes. In *The Dynamics of Language Program Direction.* AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction, edited by David P. Benseler, 241–63. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.