

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2004

How grammar instruction can benefit students in the second language classroom

Barbara Jean Bivins Peterson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Barbara Jean Bivins, "How grammar instruction can benefit students in the second language classroom" (2004). *Theses Digitization Project*. 2640.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/2640>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

HOW GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION CAN BENEFIT STUDENTS
IN THE SECOND LANGUAGE
CLASSROOM

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
English Composition:
TESL

by
Barbara Jean Bivins Peterson


March 2004

HOW GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION CAN BENEFIT STUDENTS
IN THE SECOND LANGUAGE
CLASSROOM

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino


by
Barbara Jean Bivins Peterson
March 2004

Approved by:




Dr. Ron Chen, Chair, English

2-16-04
Date



Dr. Sunny Hyon



Dr. Wendy Smith

ABSTRACT

In the California school curriculum, some English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms have emphasized a teaching philosophy that provides students with large quantities of unstructured comprehensible English input, reduces form-focused language instruction, and focuses the students' attention on the communicative aspects of a message rather than linguistic forms. In order to emphasize communication, some teachers have downplayed—even eliminated—any form of grammar instruction from the second language classroom. The purpose of this paper is to examine the role that grammar has played in second language teaching methods throughout history and to question whether explicit grammar study has a place in the second language classroom today. By means of a survey, 64 second language learners, most of whom studied their second language in the Mission Training Center of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, express their views about whether or not studying grammar helped them to become fluent in their second language. The results of the survey show that the overwhelming majority—63 out of 64 respondents—view grammar study as an integral part of their second language

acquisition. Therefore, it is suggested that including some type of explicit grammar study in the second language curriculum can aid second language acquisition.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Lane Steinagel, Director of Language Study at the Mission Training Center for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, for allowing me to interview him. I would also like to acknowledge all the returned missionaries who took the time to respond to the survey. Their responses were of incredible value to me in this paper.

I also want to thank Doctor Ron Chen, Doctor Sunny Hyon, and Doctor Wendy Smith for being so helpful and encouraging. They gave me their valuable time and advice, which were most sincerely appreciated. In addition, I would like to acknowledge Soonghee, Miguel, Naoko, Prince, and Elizabeth, who also provided advice and encouragement.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge and thank members of my family who gave help, encouragement, and support and showed amazing patience for a very long time. Thank you to Carole Bivins, Ted Bivins, Ivie Peterson, Todd Peterson, Erik Peterson, Ryan Peterson, Dustin Peterson, Monty Salanoa, Kristin Salanoa, Greg Peterson, Andy Peterson, and most especially to my husband, Nyles Peterson.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND	
Statement of the Problem	1
Demographics	3
Overview of the Study	5
CHAPTER TWO: GRAMMAR IN LANGUAGE TEACHING	
History of Grammar in Language Teaching	8
Second Language Teaching Approaches and Methods	13
Discussion	41
CHAPTER THREE: TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN CALIFORNIA	
Overview	44
The Argument	45
CHAPTER FOUR: SECOND LANGUAGE SURVEY	
Procedure	58
Language Study	59
Responses to Survey	65
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
Analysis of Responses	90
Teaching Grammar	97
Suggestions for Further Study	104

Conclusion	107
APPENDIX A: NUMBER OF ENGLISH LEARNER STUDENTS IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS	109
APPENDIX B: SECOND LANGUAGE SURVEY	112
APPENDIX C: TEXTBOOK FORMAT	114
APPENDIX D: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ONE, TWO, AND THREE	117
APPENDIX E: RESPONSES TO QUESTION FOUR	122
APPENDIX F: RESPONSES TO QUESTION FIVE	130
APPENDIX G: RESPONSES TO QUESTION SIX	138
APPENDIX H: RESPONSES TO QUESTION SEVEN	146
REFERENCES	154

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND

Statement of the Problem

In the California school curricula, some English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms have emphasized a teaching philosophy that provides students with large quantities of unstructured comprehensible English input, reduces form-focused (grammar) language instruction, avoids error correction, and focuses the students' attention on the "gist" of a message rather than on linguistic forms (Krashen, 1983; Scarcella, 1996). In order to emphasize communication, some teachers have downplayed—even eliminated—any form of grammar instruction from the ESL classroom. The theory behind this is that students can have limited linguistic knowledge and still be successful communicators. It may be true that the communicative approach to teaching English has helped ESL students to become communicatively competent in spoken English and, therefore, successful oral communicators; however, many fluent, communicatively competent immigrant students who have grown up in the California school system lack the linguistic competence necessary to take the academic

English classes required at the college level and need to take remedial courses when they enter college (Bender, 2002). Although there may be a number of reasons for this pattern, one of them may be the students' limited command of English grammar (Frodeson, 1991; Larsen-Freeman, 1991; Scarcella, 1996).

One of the goals of teaching English to ESL learners, particularly immigrant students, is that these students become competent enough in English to succeed at the college level if they choose, but the teaching methods of English as a Second Language that have virtually eliminated grammar instruction from the classroom may be inadequate to meet the diverse needs of the ESL population in California. In order to better understand and assess these teaching methods, I am going to explore how the role of grammar instruction has changed over time, particularly during the last two centuries, and then, by means of a second language survey, attempt to discover if grammar instruction has actually lost its useful function in the second language classroom, or if learners believe there is a place for grammar in the twenty-first century. First, however, it will be useful to note just how large the ESL population is in California.

Demographics

According to the California Department of Education (2002a), the state of California is the most populous state in the Union. It has grown quickly and continues to grow. In 1950 there were only 10 million people living in the state. According to the 2000 Census, the population had grown to 34,336, 000, and it is predicted that by 2020 the population will be 45 million (California Department of Education, 2002a). In addition, the census also revealed that no ethnic or racial group forms a majority in California, which represents remarkable diversity in the state. Of the residents of California, 48 percent were white, 31.5 were Hispanic, 12.5 were Asian or Pacific Islander, and 6.7 were of African American descent (California Department of Education, 2002a). According to the 1999-2000 school enrollment (kindergarten through twelfth grade), Hispanic students made up 42.2 percent of the school population, white students 34.8, Asian and Pacific Islanders 8.8, African Americans 8.3, and American Indians 0.9 (California Department of Education, 2002a).

The California Department of Education (2002a) also reports that in the 2000-2001 school year, there were approximately 6,147,375 students enrolled in California's

schools. In the 2001 Language Census of the California Department of Education (2002b), 1.56 million of these students were identified as English learners (previously called Limited-English Proficient, or LEP). The Department of Education (2002b) also notes that 39.6 percent of the students in the state have a native language other than English. Although not all of these students are English learners, according to the Educational Demographics Office of the California Department of Education (2002b), they represent more than 56 languages (see Appendix A for a list of the number of English Learner students in California public schools by language during the 2001-2002 school year).

These statistics are overwhelming, and according to Ignash (2000), California continues to be the first choice of destination for immigrants. Approximately one out of every four students in California schools is an English learner. Over one third of all English learners in the United States of America live in California, and the numbers continue to go up. Because of this, educators in California have a unique challenge as they attempt to help these students become fluent-English-proficient students.

Overview of the Study

Until the past few years, the teaching of grammar in one form or another has seldom been left out of the classroom entirely—only the emphasis on grammar has varied (Kelly, 1969). In order to describe the different emphases more clearly, Rutherford (1988) explains that there are four ways of putting grammar in a syllabus: 1) grammar-based without functional focus; 2) grammar-based with functional focus; 3) function-based with grammatical focus; and 4) function-based with no grammatical focus. During the twentieth century, all four ways have been suggested at one time or another. It was not until Whole Language came to California that teachers were encouraged to take grammar instruction completely out of the classroom (Rigg, 1991). Because Whole Language in the ESL classroom has not worked as well as was hoped, educators are again searching for more effective ways to help students become linguistically as well as communicatively competent in English (Doughty & Williams, 1998a). It is hoped that the results of this paper will help educators decide whether some focus on form is necessary to help learners as they strive to master a second language.

In order to discover the role of grammar instruction throughout history and, more specifically, through the last two hundred years, Chapter Two of this paper will outline several philosophies, approaches, and methods of teaching English as a Second Language that have been implemented, noting how and where grammar instruction is incorporated in each philosophy, approach, or method. Chapter Three follows up with a fuller discussion of the literature concerning approaches to teaching grammar in the ESL classroom, including a discussion about whether or not learning can become acquisition. In Chapter Four, a second language survey is introduced that was given to 64 people, 63 of whom report that they have, or had at one time, acquired communicative competence in a second language (see Appendix B for a sample survey). All but two of the people who answered the survey studied a second language at the Mission Training Center (MTC) in Provo, Utah, which is a language teaching center sponsored by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The purpose of the survey was to discover how the second language learners would respond to questions concerning their study of the grammar of their second language. Chapter Five offers an analysis and discussion of the results of the survey, focusing on how

the study of grammar is perceived by the average language learner at the MTC. The final section of Chapter Five offers suggestions about where grammar might fit in tomorrow's ESL classroom and presents questions for further study.

CHAPTER TWO

GRAMMAR IN LANGUAGE TEACHING

History of Grammar in Language Teaching

The concept of the importance of studying the grammar of a second language goes back over two thousand years, perhaps to the beginning of formal language instruction (Kelly, 1969; Rutherford, 1988). Although the manner of teaching has been disputed, grammar has nearly always been included in the curriculum to one degree or another. Until the thirteenth century, second language study generally consisted of the study of Latin or Greek. Because the language of theology, medicine, and law was Latin, the study of Latin was essential to the educated man. And to study Latin was to study its grammar—orally—until the printing press made it more feasible to study the printed word. Latin was used as a basis to connect all languages because Latin was considered to contain a general grammar in its conjugation of verbs and its declension of nouns and pronouns. According to Kelly (1969), the grammar of Latin was so ingrained in scholars that they believed “the only possible analytical scheme to follow was that which had been developed for Latin” (p. 55). Scholars had the

illusion that all languages shared the same basic grammar. In fact, the idea of comparing all languages to Latin has even lasted into the twentieth century. For example, Neffgen's (1918) Samoan grammar book describes the Samoan language in terms of the conjugations and declensions of Latin grammar!

Although the definition of the term grammar has changed over time, the emphasis on grammar, or language form, was considered a necessary part of language instruction throughout the history of second language learning. In fact, the study of language had a strong relationship with scholarship in general. For example, in Medieval Europe the academic study of grammar was related to philosophy, which itself was a branch of theology (Kelly, 1969). The studies of grammar, logic, and rhetoric were well inherited from classical antiquity and were considered part of the holistic universe of knowledge (Rutherford, 1988). Before the thirteenth century, when Latin and Greek dominated in the second language classroom, grammar was broadly defined as "the science of interpreting poets and historians, and the codifications of the conventions of writing and speech. It is both the origin

and the first step in studying the liberal arts" (Kelly, 1969, p.344).

Coincidentally—or not—when the formal study of living languages commenced in the thirteenth century, the break between linguistic and literary studies occurred. Today, *Webster's American Dictionary* defines grammar in the following way:

- 1) The study of the form of words and of the way they are arranged in phrases and sentences.
- 2) The system of rules for speaking and writing a particular language. (1999, p. 375)

The latter definition suits the purposes of this discussion of the benefits of grammar instruction in second language learning.

Over the centuries, scholars have disagreed about how grammar should be taught. For example, according to Kelly (1969), the method of teaching syntax and flexions has been argued about for hundreds of years, and there have also been disagreements about whether inductive or deductive methods of instruction are the most useful. Certain methods have gained popularity at different times throughout history. For example, St. Augustine used inductive teaching methods in the language classroom,

possibly the first teacher to do so (Kelly, 1969). He developed a practical approach to language teaching and popularized dialogue methods over rule memorization. However, during the Middle Ages, language teaching was usually carried out through the codifications of grammarians (for example, the use of mnemonic devices to decline nouns and conjugate verbs) because, according to Kelly, scholars believed that language competency would result after an "intellectual knowledge of the formal analysis of the target language was obtained" (p. 43). Because of this assumption, "the cardinal preoccupation of teachers was correctness, not fluency of response" (p. 43).

According to Kelly (1969), during the Renaissance, inductive methods became popular once again, and an intuitive command of the target language was required of students, formal knowledge being seen as nothing more than reinforcement in language mastery. Kelly quotes Lubinus and Ramus, scholars of the Renaissance, who believed in the principle that "merely to know the universal rules without knowing particular usage is not real and absolute knowledge" (p. 37).

Interestingly, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the popularity of the deductive methods of the

Middle Ages returned, and in the early part of the twentieth century, the inductive methods of the Renaissance gained popularity once again (Kelly, 1969). The study of grammar was a part of each of these methods, but how grammar was studied alternated between inductive methods and deductive methods, and, with each change, the emphasis on grammar also varied, but some form of grammar was generally included in the instruction.

There are several philosophies, approaches, and methods of teaching English as a second language that gained popularity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Although many of these approaches have been adopted one after the other, they do not always build on previous approaches in order to improve methodology; rather a new approach often serves as a reaction to the weaknesses of a previous approach, moving the method from one extreme to the other. The role of grammar is especially recast in the various approaches. In some approaches, the explicit teaching of grammar predominates—the whole approach is based around it. In other approaches grammar is completely left out, and it is up to the students to induce the grammar of the language for themselves.

The remainder of this chapter discusses several of the philosophies, approaches, and methods of teaching a second language that have been and still are used in America and around the world. The role of grammar in each approach or method is highlighted in order to discover its place in the different approaches and methodologies.

Second Language Teaching Approaches and Methods

The whole concept of teaching languages by comparing the second language to the familiar language—or mother tongue—is the basis of the Grammar Translation Approach (GTA), which was the accepted approach to teaching a second language in the nineteenth century. Introduced in the eighteenth century, it was also called the Classical Method (Kelly, 1969). It was and still is being used for teaching the classical languages of Greek and Latin, and it has also been modified for teaching modern languages (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). GTA was severely criticized in the nineteenth century because, according to Kelly (1969), “most teachers lost sight of the fact that grammar had to be applied” (p. 44). During the second half of the nineteenth century, GTA was mainly involved with the deductive teaching of rules and the drilling of

conjugations (and declensions if the second language was Latin and Greek), and due to the philosophy of the scholar Karl Plotz, "the disciplinary and analytical value of language study was paramount, and the linguistic aims quite secondary" (Kelly, 1969, p. 53).

By the first part of the twentieth century, GTA philosophy had three goals: first, to help students appreciate foreign literature; second, to increase awareness of the grammar of the students' first language (L1); and third, to help students to grow intellectually (Larsen-Freeman, 1991). It was not even expected that the students would ever use the target language for communication purposes. In fact, in the GTA of the twentieth century, the target language is seldom, if ever, used orally.

Richards & Rodgers (2001) explain that the class is actually taught in the L1 of the students, and the primary skills that are taught are reading (translating) and writing. Not much attention is given to speaking and listening, and pronunciation is not considered important. Vocabulary is taught in a decontextualized manner with lists of isolated words given to students to memorize. Much time is spent in the explanation of grammar and how it

provides the rules for putting sentences together. In GTA there is a definite focus on form and inflection of words. Students study grammar deductively—they are given the rules, they memorize them, and then they apply them. Translating texts from the target language to the L1 begins early, and by the second year of study, students are reading some complicated texts. The focus of study is grammatical analysis rather than content. Drills may include translating decontextualized sentences from the target language to the L1 (Larsen-Freeman, 1991).

According to Larsen-Freeman (1991), it is also considered important for students to give the correct answers to questions; therefore, errors are corrected immediately. The teacher makes sure that correct answers are given by the students, and if not, the correct answers are given by the teacher so that the students remain conscious of the grammatical rules of the target language.

In GTA the focus is on form, not on meaning, and students focus on each word rather than on the message itself as they translate. In fact, one criticism of GTA is that it makes no attempt to help students in their efforts to carry on a conversation in the target language (Krashen, 1984). However, it is important to remember that the

goals of the Grammar Translation Approach are to teach students to read literature in the target language and to help students better understand the grammar of their own L1. The other goal of GTA is simply to exercise the students mentally (Celce Murcia, 1979; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Since the goal was not to teach students how to communicate orally in the target language, GTA proved not to be effective in teaching students how to use the target language for communicative purposes. As the study of spoken languages became more and more popular, other methods were introduced to help students communicate more efficiently in the target language.

Natural Method

After the thirteenth century, when the teaching of modern languages became more common, teachers often used inductive methods, probably, according to Kelly (1969), because extensive grammar texts of spoken languages did not exist. Then in the seventeenth century, Lamy, a scholar from that period of history, suggested that languages should be learned in the same way as the mother tongue; thus, the natural method was born (Kelly, 1969). The arrangement of what was to be taught was in terms of the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing

(Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In this method vocabulary came first. Then students were encouraged to attempt to put words together by imitating good models, similar to how children learn to speak their native languages.

In the nineteenth century, advocates of the Natural Method denied that any deductive grammatical explanation was necessary in teaching; therefore, learning was inductive in the extreme. Students were saturated with conversation methods in the L2 and were expected to make their own generalizations about rules and customs. By 1860 it was generally accepted that the most natural method of learning a language was through conversation (Kelly, 1969). Translation was rejected altogether because, according to this philosophy, no child learned his L1 by translating into it (Kelly, 1969). Eventually, reading was tacked on to the method in order to help students learn subjunctive constructions as well as the "grace" of the language (Kelly, p. 41).

The early natural methodologists rejected grammar entirely; however, later proponents began to systematize the natural approach by adding some inductive methods of grammar instruction to textbooks (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Thus, the inductive teaching of grammar crept into

the philosophy of the Natural Method, and this change became the seeds for the Direct Approach (Richards & Rodgers 2001).

Direct Approach

The Direct Approach (DA) was introduced in the nineteenth century. Rutherford (1988) explains that DA was a continuation of the NA's reaction to the formal excesses of grammar translation. In 1903 Sweitzer claimed that the Direct Approach was "the only easy and logical way of teaching grammar" (Kelly, 1969, p. 42). The entire goal of DA is to teach students to communicate orally in the target language. The method is somewhat extreme, in that the mother tongue (L1) is never used in the classroom, and, as a general rule of this method, no translation is allowed (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Larsen-Freeman explains that the whole class period is conducted in the target language. Class begins with a dialogue in the target language. The teacher might use pictures or pantomime to explain the dialogue, but even questions about the dialogue are asked and answered in the target language. Grammar is taught inductively, so rule generalization comes about only after experience with the language. For example, verbs are used many times before they are actually conjugated—but they are

eventually conjugated. In this approach, the target language itself is the focus rather than the grammar of the target language. Reading is encouraged, but only for pleasure, not for grammatical analysis.

Critics of the Direct Approach have said that strict adherence to the principle of only using the target language in the classroom can be counterproductive since teachers must go to great lengths, sometimes performing incredible "verbal gymnastics" in order to explain a point that could be explained simply and clearly in a very few words of the native language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p.13). Another criticism of DA is that teachers have to be native speakers, or at least have native-like fluency in the target language in order to use the approach. In addition, the success of the method depends on the skill of the teacher rather than on a textbook, and not all teachers in America are skilled enough to use the approach.

These criticisms were noted early in the twentieth century, and in 1923, the Coleman Report—a study done in America that evaluated the current teaching methods—concluded that conversation skills in a foreign language were irrelevant for the average college student and that reading knowledge of a foreign language would be more

beneficial to the students (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 13). As a result of this study, reading, with an emphasis on vocabulary and grammatical structures, became the goal of most foreign language classes.

Reading Approach

The Reading Approach (RA), a result of the recommendation of the Coleman Report, was developed for the average student who did not travel abroad and did not want to speak the target language but did want to learn another language for reading purposes (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The objective of this approach is to teach students how to read in the target language, as well as to teach students about the history of the country where the target language is spoken.

Only the grammar necessary for reading is taught in this approach. Reading is the most important part of the course, so students are expected to read heavily both inside and outside of class. Vocabulary is expanded as quickly as possible and is considered to be more important than grammatical skills. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), in this approach there is no systematic order for the teaching of vocabulary or grammar; it all depends on the whim of the textbook writer (p. 50). In the early days

of the implementation of the Reading Approach, there was no consensus on what vocabulary, sentence patterns, and grammar were most important for learners at beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels. Of course, this approach was used long before the order of acquisition was even a theory.

Because of its emphasis on reading, RA became unpopular after the advent of linguistically-oriented instruction, such as the Audiolingual Method which became popular during World War II. However, RA is still used occasionally for students who only desire a basic reading knowledge of a second language for literary or academic purposes.

Audiolingual Method

Considered a reaction to the Reading approach, the Audiolingual Method (ALM) has as its goal to use the second language communicatively. Some of its methodology is borrowed from the Direct Approach and some from behaviorism (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Behaviorist psychologists describe all learning, including language acquisition, as a matter of conditioning—as the formation of habits through responses to outside stimuli (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). This

is why mimicry, memorization, and analogy (pattern drills) are basic techniques of ALM.

The linguists whose work encouraged this approach were anthropologists who specialized in oral American Indian languages, and it came at a time when the United States was beginning to emerge from its linguistic isolation and become aware of the necessity of learning other languages (Celce-Murcia, 1979). This happened during World War II when people had to learn to speak other languages quickly and had no need for literature or written language.

Since the behaviorist philosophy professes that learning is merely habit-formation, in the Audiolingual Method, new material is presented in dialogue form, and drills, mimicry, memorization of set phrases, and overlearning (answering automatically without having to think) are emphasized (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). There is little or no grammar instruction. According to the philosophy of ALM, grammar rules should never be taught directly. Grammar should be discovered by the students through inductive analogy rather than deductive explanation (Celce-Murcia, 1979). The basis for this philosophy is the behaviorist idea that people do not need to memorize rules in order to use their native language, so rule

memorization will not help them in second language learning either.

Skills are sequenced in the order of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Although the class is generally conducted in the target language with extensive use of pantomime, pictures and other visual aids, the mother tongue may still be used, making this method less extreme than the Direct Approach (Richards & Rogers, 2001). Vocabulary is not emphasized as much as structure. The idea is that the use of certain structures must become a habit, and vocabulary not used in context can come later. Thus, language manipulation is more important than content. The drills, dialogues, mimicry and memorization help with habit formation, which is what language is, according to the behaviorist philosophy (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Therefore, learning the grammar of the target language inductively is part of the habit formation of the student.

Cognitive Approach

The behaviorist features of habit formation were challenged in the early 1960s by the cognitive psychologists and transformational-generative linguists who claimed that language learning does not come from mimicry because people can create utterances that they have never

heard before (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Although they agreed with the emphasis of ALM, these psychologists and linguists believed that language learners create rules so that they can form original utterances and that learners use their own cognitive devices to discover the rules of the language they are learning. Richards and Rodgers (2001) quote Noam Chomsky, an MIT linguist who rejected ALM with this statement:

Language is not a habit structure. Ordinary linguistic behavior characteristically involves innovation, formation of new sentences and patterns in accordance with rules of great abstractness and intricacy. (p. 65)

Hence, language acquisition began to be seen as rule formation rather than habit formation, and deductive explanations of grammar were preferred in the philosophy that led to the Cognitive Approach to language teaching (Celce-Murcia, 1979). According to Richards and Rogers (2001), no clear-cut methodological guidelines ever came from the Cognitive Approach, but it is still respected as an approach. Richards and Rodgers further state:

The term 'cognitive code' is still sometimes invoked to refer to any conscious attempt to

organize materials around a grammatical syllabus while allowing for meaningful practice and use of language. (p. 66)

DeKeyser (1998) gives credit to the cognitive code for "first instilling declarative knowledge of rules and then practicing (proceduralizing and automatizing) the rules in meaningful and communicative activities" (p. 54). According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), in this approach extensive vocabulary is given; pronunciation is de-emphasized, and group work is encouraged. Comprehension—especially listening comprehension—is emphasized, and written and spoken skills are considered equally important. Repetition is discouraged, and silence is considered useful at times—sometimes necessary. There is abundant contextualization of all teaching points through use of audiovisual aids, stories, etc., and the mother tongue may be used in the classroom. What was considered so innovative and exciting when the approach became popular was that the students were allowed to think in the classroom—they were allowed to use their cognitive abilities and become creatively involved in the lessons (Celce-Murcia, 1979).

A major difference between the Cognitive Approach and the Natural Method is that the Cognitive approach uses knowledge of the L1 to its advantage. While proponents of the Natural Method view the L1 as a hindrance to second language acquisition, in the Cognitive Approach students are allowed to use their L1 to help them grasp the L2. This philosophy differs from the Natural Method philosophy that claims students should learn their L2 naturally, the same way they learned their L1. However, it is thought that using the mother tongue occasionally can speed up acquisition as well as alleviate confusion at critical times (Rutherford, 1988).

In the Cognitive Approach, explicit grammar activities may be taught at the beginning of a class, but the goal is to "develop, test, and refine declarative knowledge," and in order to do this, the student needs time to think and be allowed to practice conscious rule application (DeKeyser, 1998, p. 55). Students are encouraged to practice the conscious rule application in communicative ways rather than through repetitive drills. For example, students may be called upon to explain what they did over the weekend using the simple past tense. In this way, they practice grammar in a communicative format.

Total Physical Response

Total Physical Response (TPR) is a method introduced in the 1960s by James Asher. Conscious grammar instruction is not part of TPR. TPR is actually more of a right-brain tool—or method—than an actual approach. According to Asher (1982), TPR is grounded on the idea that the listening comprehension of a student needs to be firmly established before speaking is required, similar to how children acquire their native languages. He believes that acquisition will happen faster if the students use their kinesthetic-sensory system, that understanding and retention will come quickly through actual movement of their bodies. At least in the beginning stages, TPR uses only the imperative form of the verbs, giving students commands to follow. For example, a very basic technique given by Asher (1979) begins with the teacher giving a command and then performing the action of the command. Then he gives the command, and both he and the students perform the action. Next he gives the command, and only the students perform the action. Eventually, the teacher gives the command to only one student at a time. Finally, the roles of teacher and student are reversed, and students take turns giving the commands to both the teacher and

other students. By the time this exercise is completed, the student should have a firm grasp of certain imperative verb forms.

Asher (2000) does point out that TPR can be overused. He recommends using TPR conservatively and then shifting to another method—preferably the Audiolingual Method—before “adaptation is triggered” (p. 3). Since TPR is for the right brain, teachers must find left-brain approaches for the verbal exercises of speaking, reading, and writing.

In 1990 TPR expanded into Total Physical Response-Storytelling (TPR-S) (Marsh 2001). Similar to basic TPR, TPR-S philosophy is communicative and does not favor a grammar-based approach. Therefore, it does not use vocabulary lists or grammar rules and delays formal grammar study. Ray (2001) explains that grammatical accuracy is taught through mini-situations, not in the traditional way through verb conjugations and grammar rules. TPR-S requires the use of student actors, puppets, pictures, and other aids to act out stories in the target language (Marsh, 2001). The goal is to help the student to think in the target language and use more verb forms than the imperative form of the traditional TPR approach. Proponents believe that receiving consistent, comprehensible exposure to

grammatically correct language helps the student to develop an ear for the target language. A lot of repetition is recommended as reinforcement.

Silent Way

The Silent Way (SW) was devised in the 1970s by Caleb Gattegno. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), the general objective of SW is "to give beginning level students oral and aural facility in basic elements of the target language" (p.83). The concept is that the teacher should be silent as much as possible, allowing the students to produce as much language as they can by means of colored charts and rods. The method's hypothesis is that learning takes place when the learner discovers and creates rather than remembers and repeats, that physical objects facilitate learning, and that students learn more if active problem solving is part of the process.

Grammar rules are learned through inductive processes, and grammar production takes precedence over grammar explanation (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The Silent Way utilizes a structural approach in the organization of the language being taught. The basic unit of teaching is the sentence. The lessons are planned around grammatical items and related vocabulary. Language items are arranged in

order according to grammatical complexity as well as their relationship to previous lessons and how easily they can be presented visually.

Suggestopedia

This method was developed in the 1970s by Georgi Lozanov, a Bulgarian psychiatrist-educator. Music—Baroque largo—and environment—a bright, cheery classroom with reclining chairs arranged in a circle—are central in this method. Teachers are very authoritative and are supposed to constitute a “ritual placebo system” that appeals to most students (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 101). There is no particular theory of language involved in this method, but it has the basic elements of a structured approach. Vocabulary and grammar rules for organizing vocabulary make up the material that is read or recited by a solemn, confident, organized, well-dressed instructor with musical accompaniment in the background. This method was highly controversial when it was first introduced and failed to catch the imagination of educators enough to become an important method (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The impracticality of this method might also have been a factor in its lack of popularity.

The Communicative Approach

The Communicative Approach (CA) in language teaching "starts from a theory of language as communication" (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p.159). Therefore, the primary goal of CA is for students to communicate competently in the target language (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Initially, the role of grammar was de-emphasized in CA because, proponents claimed, the goal was to use the language, not just to know how to use the language. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), the aim was to "focus on communicative proficiency rather on mere mastery of structures" (p. 153). The philosophy behind CA is that language in general is used to "negotiate meaning" in a social context, such as arguing, persuading, or promising (Larsen-Freeman, 1986 p.123). Students are constantly challenged to apply what they have learned in order to communicate successfully. If the listener does not understand what the speaker is saying, the speaker must renegotiate in order to be understood. The major of task of CA is to help students learn to communicate in authentic language in a variety of settings.

The teacher's role in CA is less dominant than in other approaches. The students are given responsibility for their own learning, and they learn to communicate by

communicating—playing games, doing role-plays, and engaging in problem-solving tasks, thereby constantly interacting with one another (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Speaking, listening, reading, and writing are all part of CA, and the purpose of each skill is, of course, to negotiate meaning. Functions of the language are emphasized over forms (grammar), but eventually forms are introduced, beginning with simple forms and moving to the more complex.

The native language is not considered important in CA. The target language is used for instruction as well as for activities. Errors are generally ignored because it is successful communication that is key; linguistic knowledge is not as important as successful communication. Grammar is seen as only a small part of communicative competence and is not stressed. Opponents of this approach like to claim that Tarzan was a victim of the Communicative Approach to learning English, according to Garrett (1986) because of his "me Tarzan, you Jane" talk (p.134).

Recently, some research has been done on focus on form in the Communicative classroom. However, according to Doughty & Varela (1998), "the focus must occur in conjunction with—but must not interrupt—communicative

interaction" (p.114). Accordingly, the focus on form techniques are implicit, as Doughty & Varela point out:

The aim is to add attention to form to a primarily communicative task rather than to depart from an already communicative goal in order to discuss a linguistic feature. (p. 114)

Proponents want to draw learner's attention to formal features but do not want to distract them from their original communicative intent. Although communication still predominates, there is a definite movement among proponents of the Communicative Approach to add some implicit focus-on-form activities to help students gain better linguistic accuracy (Doughty & Williams, 1998).

Whole Language

Developed in the 1980s, Whole Language is more a theory of language learning than an actual approach. It was initially concerned with reading and writing in one's native language at the elementary level and was expanded to middle schools, high schools, and eventually to ESL classrooms. According to Rigg (1991):

The basic assertion is that "language is a whole (hence the name), that any attempt to fragment it into parts—whether these be

grammatical patterns, vocabulary lists, or phonics 'families'—destroys it. If language isn't kept whole, it isn't language anymore."

(p. 522)

According to Richards & Rodgers (2001), activities for learners are similar to the Communicative Approach. There is much freedom in the theory, which uses literature, process writing, cooperative learning, ungraded dialogue journals, writing portfolios, creative writing, and writing conferences to promote whole language learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 111). Rigg (1991) states that writing should be for the students' own purposes and should meet their own standards. Teachers must accept (not just tolerate) non-prestige dialects. Thus, teachers are encouraged to "support their students in finding and using their own voices" (p. 525). Teachers are respected as researchers and are given freedom in the classroom to utilize whatever authentic literature they choose, while the use of pedagogically prepared textbooks is discouraged. Rigg points out that there should be no pressure on the teacher to teach grammar or any type of focus on form, as the students are expected to acquire it from their reading of literature.

Opponents of this theory see it as anti-direct, anti-skills, and anti-materials, while proponents claim that skills development will follow without special attention (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Others view Whole Language as a "rejection of the whole ESL approach in language teaching and one that seeks to apply native-language principles to ESL" and that it "promotes fluency at the expense of accuracy" (p. 113).

Natural Approach

Proponents of the Natural Approach (NA) do not want it to be confused with the Natural Method, which was discussed previously. NA was popularized by Steven Krashen and Tracy Terrell in the 1980s. It is considered a comprehension-based approach because of its emphasis on the silent period. This approach focuses on input rather than grammar practice (Krashen, 1985).

According to NA, communication is the main function of language. Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis, which actually consists of five hypotheses, is the foundation of his theory of second-language acquisition. His first hypothesis is the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis. Krashen claims that there are two independent ways of becoming proficient in a second language. One way is "acquisition,"

a subconscious process similar to the way children naturally acquire their first language (Krashen, 1982, p.10). The student is not aware of the fact that he is acquiring language but is aware of the fact that he is using language for communication, the result being "acquired competence" (p.10). The second way is "learning," a conscious process that helps students to know about a language (p. 10). The study of grammar falls into the learning category. Krashen claims that students can "learn what they have acquired, but they do not acquire what they have learned" (p. 10).

Krashen's (1985) second hypothesis is the Natural Order Hypothesis that claims people acquire the rules of language in a predictable order. Krashen himself did not come up with the order, and in fact every language can have its own order of acquisition, but he uses the Natural Order Hypothesis to point out that students do not acquire the rules of a language in the same order in which they are taught them in the classroom.

Krashen's (1985) third proposal, the Monitor Hypothesis, has to do with how acquisition and learning are used to actually speak in a second language. According to Krashen, the ability to speak in a second language depends

on acquired competence, which is subconscious knowledge. Learning is conscious knowledge and serves as an editor or Monitor to make corrections or alter output before the learner speaks. In order to use the Monitor, students must know the rule and must desire to be correct. This is called focusing on form, and while proponents of NA concede that the Monitor helps a student be more grammatically correct, they believe that it takes more time to communicate if the speaker disrupts communication by using the Monitor to produce correct sentences (Krashen, 1985).

The Input Hypothesis is the fourth theory of the five. Krashen (1985) claims that humans acquire language by understanding messages that he calls "comprehensible input" (p. 2). Comprehensible input contains structures that are just one step beyond the student's current level of competence. If his or her current level is "*i*," then the next stage is considered "*i* + 1" (p. 2). Both context and "previously acquired linguistic competence" help students understand at the next level (p. 2). In the classroom the extra linguistic information could be pictures or objects or other visual aids, as well as discussion of familiar topics. Krashen claims that "if input is understood, and there is enough of it, the necessary grammar is

automatically provided" (p. 2). The students acquire what they hear because of their "internal language processor (Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device: LAD)" (p. 3).

Krashen's fifth and final hypothesis, which completes the theory is the Affective Filter Hypothesis (p. 3). He claims that although comprehensible input is necessary for acquisition, there is more to it than that—the student must also be willing to accept the input. The affective filter is like a mental block that prevents the student from making use of the comprehensible input. If students are unmotivated or lack confidence, their affective filter goes up. When students are so involved in the message that they forget they are second language students, their filters are at their lowest—and that is good.

Krashen (1985) briefly summarizes his Input Hypothesis in two sentences:

Comprehensible input is the essential ingredient for second-language acquisition. All other factors thought to encourage or cause second-language acquisition work only when they contribute to comprehensible input and/or a low affective filter. (p. 4)

Krashen (1985) describes the learning activities of NA by explaining that at first, students remain silent, and during this "silent period," they are "simply building up competence by listening, via comprehensible input" (p. 9). They listen and comprehend what the teacher is saying or pointing at and eventually begin to respond to commands by giving one-word answers to yes or no questions. From there they progress to "either/or" questions and "wh" questions (p. 9). NA often borrows techniques from other methods or approaches and adapts them to meet the needs of the Natural Approach. For example, NA uses TPR techniques, Direct Method activities such as gestures and context, and group work activities from the Communicative Approach, all of which favor an inductive approach to the teaching of grammar. Extensive outside reading is also recommended in Krashen's Natural Approach. Krashen (1985) claims that reading in the target language will help the learner in all aspects of acquisition, including grammar. Finally, teachers are the primary source of input and have the responsibility to keep the flow of comprehensible input going. The teacher must create a friendly atmosphere in order to lower the affective filter.

The Natural Approach does not suggest eliminating a focus on form entirely. Krashen (1982) believes that students should use the monitor when they have time, such as in writing or preparing a speech. In fact, he states:

When given time, and when focused on form, some people can use conscious grammar to great advantage. In the case of the second language performer who has acquired nearly all of the grammar of the second language, but who still has some gaps, the use of the conscious grammar can fill in many of the non-acquired items.

(p. 90)

What Krashen (1982) is opposed to is the constant teacher correction of oral unmonitored performance in the early stages of second language acquisition, especially on late-acquired items. The reason for this, Krashen claims, is that conscious knowledge of a grammatical item has no relationship to a student's ability to use it in unmonitored speech. Krashen uses himself as an example of this conscious knowledge. When writing in French, Krashen confesses that he appreciates the opportunity to focus on form (p. 91).

Discussion

After studying several approaches and methods in second language instruction, one might feel that researchers are divided into several camps--some favoring a deductive focus on form, others preferring inductive means to teach communicative skills, and still others favoring no focus on forms in any way. Often the proponents of a certain philosophy are firmly convinced that their approach is the only one that truly benefits students. However, according to Celce-Murcia (1999), "Using language grammatically and being able to communicate are not the same, but they are both important goals" (p. 2). So, perhaps each approach has its own advantages in certain aspects of second language learning. If the goal is communicative competence, then a communicative approach might be the most appropriate. If the goal is linguistic competence, then perhaps a deductive approach with a focus on form might be the most useful to the student. However, some students desire to be both communicatively and linguistically competent. A truly comprehensive approach would have to meet both objectives--the challenge for the instructor would be deciding when to use certain approaches or methods to best meet the learning needs of the student.

In addition to meeting the learning goals of the students, educators must be aware of individual differences among the students. Perhaps one approach might be more effective for one student, and a different approach might be more effective for another. The theory of Multiple Intelligences encourages teachers to use a variety of methods in the classroom in order to help each individual student to learn and comprehend in his/her own learning style. Richards and Rodgers (2001) encourage teachers to use the eight "intelligences"—linguistic, logical, spatial, musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic—of students to enhance learning (p. 116). Just as there are many different approaches to second language acquisition, there are incredible variations in the needs and abilities of the students of a second language.

In addition, it might be possible that one approach might be ideal for teaching a certain language form while a different approach might be suitable for another skill in second language acquisition. For example, TPR might be an effective method for teaching the command form of a verb, but it would not be very effective when students are learning idioms. In any case, eliminating grammar

instruction entirely might cause some students to acquire their second language more slowly than if some focus on form were presented to them in the second language classroom.

The next chapter will begin with a discussion of potential problems resulting from the downplaying of grammar in some second language teaching approaches in California. I will then present different researchers' perspectives on the value of focusing on form in the ESL classroom. Some researchers challenge Krashen's Input Hypothesis and claim that students in California who are receiving extensive comprehensible input are not gaining linguistic competence in English. Other researchers challenge his theory that learning does not become acquisition and put forth their own theories. The role of practice in second language acquisition will be discussed, and the chapter will conclude with a discussion about why linguistic competence, which generally comes through some form of grammatical instruction, is as important as communicative competence.

CHAPTER THREE
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND
LANGUAGE IN CALIFORNIA

Overview

Since California now has the largest number of English learners of any state in the United States (Rosenthal, 2000), educators in this state have an obligation to search for the best approaches and methods available in order to help these students become fluent English speakers. During the twentieth century, ESL teachers have alternated between favoring philosophies that focus primarily on communicative approaches centered on language use and those that focus on the forms of language (grammar). The question of how students actually learn a second language is what causes the disagreement. Do they learn it by communicating, or do they learn it by studying the vocabulary and structure of the target language? If a student desires not only to be able to communicate successfully but also desires academic success in both spoken and written English, what is the best approach for teaching him or her?

This chapter discusses California's experience with communicative approaches to language learning and the

subsequent addition into the ESL curriculum of the Whole Language philosophy, which promotes the idea that language be taught as a whole, thus discouraging, if not eliminating, any focus on form in the ESL classroom. This chapter also discusses why Whole Language has failed in California among the ESL population as well as why unstructured, comprehensible input alone is not adequate to meet the needs of ESL students. Views on learning versus acquisition follow, and grammar consciousness-raising is suggested as one means of increasing the rate of acquisition of a second language. Included in the suggestions for grammar consciousness-raising will be an explanation of how pidginized systems of communication might develop when a focus on form is left out of the teaching syllabus. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the recent focus-on-form movement in the communicative classroom.

The Argument

In the 1980s the California Department of Education began to favor the Communicative Approach to teaching English as a second language (Scarcella, 1996). It is interesting to note that the basic philosophy of the

problems with sentence structure, verb tense, modals, causative structures, conditionals, passive constructions, and relative clauses, all of which are necessary parts of academic English. Krashen (1998) backhandedly agrees with Scarcella when he admits that Whole Language is not working in California. He states, "Whole Language hasn't failed California, but California has failed Whole Language" because of the state's "print-poor environment" (p. 10). He believes that because of the poor quality of its libraries (California ranks last in the country) and the fact that so many of its children do not have books in their homes, California has not had success with Whole Language due to a lack of reading material (p.11). Krashen points out that California ranks ninth in the country in the number of children ages five to 17 living in poverty and close to the bottom of the list in the percentage of homes with more than 25 books in the home (p.11). This condition may be because of the huge influx of immigrants who have moved to California in the last several years. Whether or not the situation is caused by the large influx of immigrants, the Whole Language philosophy is not the only problem in California ESL classrooms.

Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis also has had a strong foothold in California and has been widely applied in classrooms throughout the state. Scarcella (1996) notes that the textbooks approved by the Department of Education recommend using the Input Hypothesis. Teachers have learned in the college classroom that if they provide their students with meaning-oriented, natural, unstructured comprehensible English input, then their students' English skills will improve (Scarcella, 1996). Swain (1985) argues against this hypothesis, claiming that productive output in addition to comprehensible input is critical for adequate second language development. She claims that even after years of exposure to comprehensible input, the language ability of immersion students still lags behind native speaking peers. Sobin (1994), who feels that students must study grammar in order to have academic English at their disposal, points out that even English students who are using their mother tongue do not receive enough comprehensible input to be able to write in academic English. Sobin also claims that most basic writing students in college with high school diplomas, who have watched American television for twenty years or so, who have had extensive exposure to academic English from school

courses and books, from television and radio, from newspapers and magazines, have not often acquired productive command of the unique features of academic English which set it apart from other varieties of English. He further states, "Such a massive exposure simply does not result in a uniform acquisition of prestige English. Even the most motivated basic writing students sometimes encounter considerable difficulty with the features of prestige English" (p. 55). And he is writing about native speakers!

If native speakers have difficulties mastering academic English, then it is entirely understandable that immigrant students might also struggle with it. In fact, Scarcella (1996) has found that those who speak English as a second language do have problems because unstructured input does not necessarily expose the students to academic English. Scarcella claims that "structured or unstructured, comprehensible input alone does not ensure L2 acquisition" (p. 136). Although comprehensible input helps acquisition, it does not necessarily guarantee it. She reports that many former ESL high school students who attend UCI acquired nonstandard varieties of English interlanguage in high school from their nonnative English-

speaking friends, and this generally happened in school settings. "Interlanguage," according to Gass and Selinker (2001), is "the language produced by a nonnative speaker of a language" (p. 455). These students spoke English interlanguage when they had peer-directed learning activities in their classrooms; they used it to communicate with their friends during the lunch hour; and they also used it and listened to it in classes where teachers had little control over the students. Even though textbooks exposed them to Standard English, group collaborative activities exposed them to more English interlanguage as they interacted with their nonnative English-speaking classmates in communication-based classrooms. As they were in close contact with non-standard forms of English, they tended to acquire the forms that they heard the most often. Since this is a common phenomenon in California ESL classes, Krashen's Input Hypothesis may not be effective in California ESL classrooms at this time. Scarcella also reports that "there is considerable evidence that form-focused language instruction significantly improves the UCI ESL students' ability to use grammatically correct sentences in their writing" (p. 140). The ESL students study verb tenses, passive structures, relative clauses,

and modal auxiliaries prior to enrolling in Freshman English courses. And, according to Scarcella, "Studies have shown that students are highly capable of learning grammatical structures through instruction" (p. 140).

In addition to the Input Hypothesis, Krashen (1982) claims that learning does not become acquisition. If this is true, then studying and learning grammar structures might be unnecessary in the ESL classroom. However, not every second language researcher agrees with this hypothesis. Research shows that students can accelerate the natural learning of grammar through instruction (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Mohammed (1996) states:

Drawing learners' attention to linguistic patterns and providing them with the underlying rules and principles is believed to be a short cut to the learning, production and comprehension of the forms and structures which the learners have not heard or seen before. (p. 1)

Smith (1988) goes a step further when he contradicts Krashen' (1985) hypothesis about learning not becoming acquisition. Smith describes the process through which learning can become acquisition:

It is surely reasonable to suppose that a certain number of structures planned and performed slowly and consciously can eventually develop into automatized behavior. (p.57)

More specifically, he states:

One first begins slowly, haltingly, sometimes with a great deal of conscious awareness and then in the course of time, we are able to automatize the whole process and execute the relevant programs and routines swiftly and without reflection. (p.56)

Similarly, Rutherford and Smith (1988) question the assumption that formal grammar instruction has a minimal or even non-existent role in language pedagogy, especially if linguistic competence is considered a part of communicative competence. They find it disturbing that many teachers—especially teachers in California—have been encouraged to discard textbooks that draw attention to grammatical forms of the target language because of their “nonnaturalistic” character (p. 107). They firmly believe that some form of grammar consciousness-raising can increase the rate of acquisition. To clarify this concept, Sharwood Smith has developed his own Pedagogical Grammar Hypothesis (PGH):

Instruction strategies which draw the attention of the learner to specifically structural regularities of the language, as distinct from the message content, will under certain conditions significantly increase the rate of acquisition over and above the rate expected from learners acquiring the language under natural circumstances where attention to form may be minimal and sporadic. (p.109)

Drawing the attention of the learners to specific forms is hypothesized to speed up acquisition. However, there may even be more advantages to some kind of focus on form in the ESL classroom. It is possible that attention to form may help prevent pidginization of a second language.

Bley-Vroman (1988), who seems to favor Smith's hypothesis, states that some form of grammar instruction can prevent learners from developing the pidginized systems, or fossilized interlanguage, that work at best only for basic communication. Similarly, Celce-Murcia (1988) suggests that "a communicative approach can lead to the development of a broken, ungrammatical, pidginized form of the language" (p.2). Higgs and Clifford (1982; as quoted in Celce-Murcia, 1988) state that these grammar

weaknesses "are not missing grammatical patterns," but rather "fossilized incorrect patterns," and that the data suggest that these students have arrived at this level "through street learning or through 'communication first' programs" (p. 3). The danger in communication-only programs is that students may fossilize linguistically when they feel they are communicating successfully and, as a result, stop progressing in their second language.

Selinker's (1972) discussion on interlanguage supports this suggestion; he points out that once students know enough of the target language in order to communicate, they often stop learning, and once they have fossilized, it is very difficult to "un-acquire" incorrect acquired grammatical functions (p. 217). Although the Grammar Translation Approach was abandoned years ago as an effective way to teach language, Garrett (1986) warns:

The baby of grammatical competence is being thrown out with the bathwater of the grammar-translation method, with the result that students who have been allowed or encouraged not to worry about grammar may develop a kind of irremediably inaccurate fluency. (p. 133)

Celce-Murcia (1988) promotes accuracy first programs—not the old Grammar Translation Approach, but programs that have some type of focus on form in them—because they typically show the opposite prognosis, although it may take a little longer to become both linguistically and communicatively competent than to become communicatively competent only.

Recently, many Communicative Approach advocates have concluded that some type of focus on form might be necessary in the ESL classroom. Doughty & Williams write, "The noninterventionist position is inefficient at best," and "Always leaving L2 learners to their own devices results in [a] sort of incomplete language learning" (p.260). Long & Robinson (1998), communicative approach advocates state:

Studies show that although learning much of an L2 through experiencing its use is possible, it is inefficient. There are rate advantages for learners who receive formal instruction of various kinds. (p. 21)

Although these researchers and educators have found that some type of focus on form might be necessary in the ESL classroom, they are very careful about what they advocate,

as some teachers completely reject any focus on form in the communicative classroom while others use this concession as "justification for a return to explicit, discrete-point grammar instruction" (Doughty & Williams, 1998, p. 2).

It is interesting that second language researchers not only disagree about where to place grammar in the second language teaching syllabus, they even disagree about whether or not to place grammar in the syllabus at all. Knowing that researchers disagree, it would be interesting to ask students their views about studying grammar when learning a second language. Since most adults fail at second language learning, it might not be useful to ask for the views of those who never felt fluent in their L2. It is important to examine the perspectives of second language learners who feel they are both linguistically and communicatively competent in their L2.

Chapter Four will report the perspectives on grammar of 64 second language learners, 63 of whom feel, or felt at one time, completely fluent in their second language. The one respondent who didn't feel fluent was still working toward fluency. I will discuss the responses to questions about the respondents' experiences studying the grammar of their L2 and whether or not they viewed the explicit study

of grammar as useful to them as they successfully acquired their second language.

CHAPTER FOUR
SECOND LANGUAGE SURVEY

Procedure

In order to discover what second language learners think about the grammar they study as they acquire their L2, an open-ended survey was given to 64 second language learners (see Appendix B for a sample of the survey). Sixty-three of these learners are labeled successful because they claim that they can, or could at one time, converse freely with a native speaker of the L2 they studied. Nearly all of the men and women involved in this study took intensive classes in their L2 at the Mission Training Center (MTC) of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, located in Provo, Utah, in order to serve as missionaries for their church. Although the majority of the respondents of this survey acquired Spanish as their second language, others studied Korean, Portuguese, Japanese, Marshallese, Tagalog, Kosraen, French, Norwegian, Dutch, German, Italian, Czech, and Mandarin Chinese. After spending two months in the MTC, the learners went to a specific area or country where the L2 was spoken by native speakers and completed their

language acquisition through personal study and immersion in the L2. All of the respondents to the survey now live in the United States, having served their "missions" for two years. Many have recently returned from their missions, while a few returned twenty years ago or more. Many respondents live in California, but others live in Arizona, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, Texas, Maryland, Nebraska, and Kentucky. Their occupations vary. Some respondents are students, while others are involved in occupations such as law, construction, military service, education, law enforcement, and business. Many occupations and home states are unknown because they were not asked for in the survey.

Language Study

Language study in the MTC is quite intensive. According to Lane Steinagel (personal communication, March 24, 2003), the Director of Language Study, the MTC does not follow a certain approach to language learning. Students are in class for nine hours a day. They are required to take two three-hour language classes per day. Classes are small, and the teachers are usually young men and women who

have previously gone through the MTC themselves, having recently returned from their own missions.

From the beginning, students study grammar and memorize lessons they will teach in the field. Most are challenged immediately to speak only in the target language. Students who are studying some of the more difficult languages, such as Chinese and Korean, are not required to speak immediately but are allowed a silent period to become adjusted to the new sounds of the target language. Those studying Spanish, Portuguese, Japanese, Russian, and French use computers to enhance their studies.

The emphasis is on listening (to the teacher, to the computer, and to other students), speaking the target language (both in class and outside of class with other students—during mealtimes, recreation activities, and even free time), and reading, both silently and aloud (content-based scripture study and lesson memorization). There is not a big emphasis on writing in the MTC, but those using computers are required to type in responses when using the computer for study.

A variety of methods are used to help students acquire their target languages. The teachers speak in both English and the target language as they teach the students. The

students have textbooks, but they are not given written homework from the texts. Even so, they study from them both inside and outside of the classroom. They do not write in the workbooks very often because answers are generally given orally in class. Students memorize entire lessons, called "Discussions," that they will be giving in the field, and in addition they study vocabulary and verb conjugations until they are also committed to memory.

The introduction to a Portuguese textbook used in the MTC gives an overview of the lessons (see Appendix C). The manual states:

Upon analyzing all spoken languages on a general level, one finds that they can be broken down into five parts: 1) pronunciation, 2) grammar, 3) vocabulary, 4) fluency, and 5) comprehension. (*Portuguese for Missionaries*, 1984, p. 7)

The first lesson teaches the students how to give greetings in their L2. They practice the phrases orally and are also given a list of vocabulary words to practice pronouncing correctly. The translations of the words and phrases are also given. Students speak the phrases orally as a group. Then they begin to memorize them. Students know the

meanings of each phrase they memorize. Students practice asking simple questions (for example, "Where are you from?") with each other in the very first lesson. The second lesson focuses more specifically on pronunciation and adds more vocabulary for students to both pronounce correctly and memorize. The third lesson uses TPR to teach the command form of verbs, and thus begins the teaching of grammar. In the fourth lesson the students learn cognates and compare English to their target language. Students continue to study grammar and are encouraged to use their L2 in all their communication. From this point, lessons are both grammar-based and communication-based. For example, Lesson Five in *Portuguese for Missionaries* lists as performance objectives that by the end of the lesson, students should be able to:

1. Explain the definitions of the following items in your own words: stem, tense, conjugation, number, person, (first, second, third).
2. When given a conjugated verb, recognize its infinitive, stem, tense, person, and number.

(p. 34)

In the lesson, students are taught each item listed in the objectives, including present, preterit, and future

tenses of verbs and are subsequently tested on them in a "Performance Activities" section (p.41). One way they are tested is for all students to close their books while the teacher divides the class into two teams. The teacher writes a verb form in the center of the blackboard. A member of each team will go to the board and write the person, number and tense of the verb form. The first one to correctly identify the person, number and tense of the verb receives one point for his team. The team with the most points at the end of the game wins.

By the end of the second week, the performance objective is that by the end of the lesson, the student should be able to do the following in Portuguese:

1. Carry on a conversation about your living quarters.
2. Talk about things you do in your room in the morning. (p. 76)

During the lesson, students are given a dialogue with translation below it. They practice the dialogue and work on pronunciation. They are then given a vocabulary list. The teacher models the words and the students repeat them until they have mastered pronunciation and can translate the word. The words have to do with items they might find

in their living quarters and are generally nouns and verbs. After they have completed these lists of words, they are given colors to memorize, and they practice number and gender as they connect colors to the nouns they have previously memorized. For example, "casa branca" means "white house"; the gender is feminine and the number is singular (p.77). Using the nouns, verbs, and adjectives they have acquired to this point, they practice communicating with each other as if they are in their apartments in the morning. In a "Performance Activity" toward the end of the class period, the teacher will divide the class into three groups (p. 80). He will assign each group to write and act out a scene in their room in the morning. Then the students will give the teacher a "guided tour" of their living quarters, explaining what they do in the various places (p.80).

After two months of intense study, the missionaries leave the MTC and go to the area of their L2, where they are put into companionships. One of the companions has been in the field for a longer period of time and is called the "senior" companion. Often, but not always, the senior companion is a native speaker of the L2, which can be very helpful to the "junior" companion.

Companions are required to spend some time every day on language study, either independently or as companions. They have freedom to choose what they will focus on during their study time. Part of the survey asks them what they concentrated on during this time in order to discover if they ever chose to study grammar on their own.

Responses to Survey

Questions One, Two, and Three

In order to examine how the missionaries viewed grammar study in the MTC and how the missionaries studied the language in their free time in the field, I designed a survey that focuses on their views of grammar study both in the MTC as well as in the field (see Appendix D for responses). The first question asks the L1 of the respondent and the second asks the L2 he or she studied. The third question asks how fluent the respondent is in the L2:

- A. I can converse freely with a native speaker of my L2.
- B. I can carry on a conversation if the native speaker speaks slowly enough.

C. I can understand the L2, but I am uncomfortable speaking.

D. I can read a little of the L2, but that is all.

Of the respondents, 56 (88%) said that they could converse freely with a native speaker of their L2 (response A). Five respondents said that they could carry on a conversation if the native speaker spoke slowly enough (response B). However, these respondents wrote that they have been home for several years and feel they have lost their fluency. Three respondents said that they can understand the L2 but are uncomfortable speaking (response C). One of the two returned from his mission 30 years ago and another returned 22 years ago, and they both feel they have lost fluency over the years. The third had only recently left the MTC and had not spent much time in the area of his L2. However, his answers are valuable because, at the time he took the survey, he was still studying to gain fluency in the field. All of the respondents but the one new to the field considered themselves quite fluent in their L2 at one time. Even the responses of those who felt they had lost fluency over the years are important in this study, so they will all be included.

Question Four

The fourth question asks about studying the grammar of the target language: "Do you think that studying the grammar of the L2 in the MTC helped you learn the language? (Grammar: rules of the language—i.e., verb conjugation and tenses, subject-verb agreement, syntax [word order], etc.) Can you explain?" Altogether there were 64 respondents to the survey (see Appendix E for responses); 59 (92%) of them stated that studying the grammar of the L2 helped them. Of the five respondents that felt the grammar study in the MTC did not help, one German learner said, "No, but it was a good review." This response suggests that he had studied German previously and already had a strong foundation in the grammar. A French learner gave a similar response: "I had already been studying French for nine years before the MTC." Two other respondents, one who studied Kosraen and another who studied Marshallese, did not study their L2s in the MTC—there was no program for those languages then—but had to learn them in the field, so they had no experience studying any language in the MTC. The final negative response was from a Spanish learner who said, "No, the MTC did not help because of the school-like setting" and felt that "doing things on paper and reading in a book

is not as effective as speaking with others." These responses actually only show one respondent who viewed grammar study itself as not helpful. The other four negative responses were either because they already had a strong foundation in L2 grammar, or they had no opportunity to study grammar in the MTC.

The remaining 59 respondents gave their own responses as to why they appreciated studying the grammar of their L2 in the MTC. Many gave explanations that were similar to each other: some respondents called the grammar, a "good base to work from," a "background," a "skeleton," a "foundation," a "framework," a "structure to learn from," and that grammar was "integral" to learning the language and helped "put things in order." A responder who learned French wrote, "Memorizing vocabulary words won't do any good unless you know how to put them together." A respondent who studied Norwegian clarified this:

I personally concentrated a great deal of time on verb conjugation and sentence structure. I found that from the outset, several missionaries would devote their efforts to simply expanding their L2 vocabulary.

Consequently, while they did learn a great deal of words, they merely spoke "English" and interjected the new vocabulary words rather than learning to speak the L2 with proper sentence structure and tone inflection.

Another respondent, who studied Mandarin Chinese, appreciated studying syntax:

Chinese syntax is completely different than English. There is a specific pattern that has to be learned. Learning the grammar helped to organize and clarify the language.

A Portuguese learner also appreciated studying syntax:

On first appearance, Portuguese syntax can seem loose, but once you learn it, you find the rules are pretty rigid, and if you think it's loose and say what you want, you sound silly.

Another respondent who learned Portuguese wrote:

By learning the grammar, I was able to learn on my own while in the country. The grammar allowed me to learn vocabulary and properly use new words in speech and writing."

A respondent who studied Japanese responded similarly:

"It provides a framework to fit the words in and allows new

vocabulary to be used properly and accurately." Another Portuguese learner said, "It gave me the tools I needed to adapt to using unfamiliar words and communicating in new and different situations." A Spanish learner appreciated "being able to say exactly what I meant, so there was a big difference for me between 'he came here' and 'he used to come here.'"

Another major reason given for appreciating the grammar instruction, especially in conjunction with communicative practice, was because it seemed to speed up acquisition of the L2. A respondent who studied Spanish stated:

Because of the way that the course is laid out in the MTC, with emphasis on grammar and then, especially, applying those grammar lessons in a speaking based environment, the language came much faster than it does in school.

Another Spanish learner said, "When I understood the grammar, the rest came a lot quicker because I didn't have to worry about how everything was structured." Yet another Spanish learner commented:

The best way to learn the language in my opinion was to be exposed to the rules of the

language while simultaneously engaging in conversation in the new language. This allowed me to hear phrases and sentences and to be able to determine why a verb was conjugated a certain way or why the words were in a particular order. Within a few months I began noticing grammatical errors of native speakers . . .

Not only was speed of acquisition mentioned in survey responses, but also ease of learning. A Spanish learner claimed that "once grammar was learned it was much easier." An Italian learner said:

I wasn't able to speak very much when I left [the MTC], but I remembered the grammar lessons quite well, which made learning the language much quicker and simpler.

A Spanish learner who has not used the L2 very often in the last several years made an interesting comment: "Now that I use my L1 most of the time, I rely heavily on grammar knowledge when I use my L2. [Studying grammar] gave me a better understanding of the language."

Question Five

The fifth question had to do with what the respondents studied in the area of their L2: "After you left your

intensive study and went to the area of your L2, did you ever study or practice the language on your own or with a companion? If so, what did you study? (Vocabulary, grammar, idioms, pronunciation, etc.)" Several respondents (see Appendix F for responses) suggested that possibly the best learning tool they had was immersion in the L2. They practiced the language daily with native speakers because the whole purpose for their being there was to communicate with the people. Even so, they generally listed several items that they focused on during personal study time.

The missionaries were required to devote a minimum of a half hour each day to personal language study. Five respondents said that they did not study at all. The remaining 59 (92%) of them studied either individually or with a companion during personal study time. Often, according to the survey, they had a native speaker as a companion, which was a great help for pronunciation and vocabulary. However, having a native speaker as a companion did not always help when it was time to study grammar. A Portuguese learner found:

I could ask vocab questions of Brazilian companions, but technical grammar questions I'd talk to knowledgeable Americans who'd learned

them. Brazilians didn't know the rules—they'd just internalized them.

The respondents generally listed more than one area of study that they focused on in their personal study time. Of the 64 respondents, 39 (61%) said that they specifically studied vocabulary even after they entered the area where the L2 was spoken, and they did it in several ways. Some, of course, said they learned vocabulary words just by conversing with the natives. As a learner of Norwegian said, "Vocabulary essentially took care of itself as speaking freely would identify new vocabulary words to search for." A young man who went to Japan carried a Japanese/English dictionary around with him wherever he went—and used it. A Spanish learner carried a pocket notebook during the day and wrote down words and phrases that were new to him in order to study them later. Others studied vocabulary during personal study time each day, adding five to ten new words to their vocabulary per day. A Spanish learner said, "Every day I wrote down new words and tried to use them."

The second most frequently mentioned item was grammar. A total of 36 (56%) respondents said that they studied grammar specifically during their personal study time,

especially the first year. A speaker of Norwegian said, "One hour every day for about a year I studied grammar." Some of the respondents said that they took charts with them and studied conjugations during the day with their companions. One respondent said he "kept a book for new words and conjugations, etc." A Spanish learner who went to Chile said:

I mainly studied conjugation and tenses because that was the most difficult for me. My companions were great at correcting me and helping me speak correctly.

She was not the only one who appreciated correction. A Portuguese learner felt that he learned a lot by "asking questions or their (his native Portuguese speaking companions) correcting my language." A few missionaries gained quite a sophisticated understanding of the grammatical functions of the language and said that they began noticing grammatical errors of native speakers.

Two respondents had unique experiences in that the languages they studied, Marshallese and Kosraen, were not offered at the MTC, so they were required to learn their L2s in the field. It is interesting to note what they studied on their own. The learner of Marshallese wrote,

"Mostly vocabulary and grammar. Idioms and pronunciation I learned by talking with the natives." The Kosraen learner also said that he studied vocabulary and grammar during his personal study time.

The next most frequently mentioned item was pronunciation. Of the respondents, 21 (33%) specifically reported studying pronunciation. Some studied it during the study hour, and others practiced while talking with the natives. One respondent read out loud during study time to practice pronunciation. Another said, "I read out loud with my companion and he would help me pronounce and understand what I was saying."

Other specific areas of study mentioned by the respondents were conversation (27%), reading (25%)—some stating that they read aloud, others stating they just read a lot), idioms (20%), and translation (2%). A few respondents (11%) reported that they studied "everything" and didn't explain specifically what that meant.

Some respondents changed the focus of their study as they progressed in their fluency. The Czech learner explained, "I studied the language every day. Initially, I focused on grammar and vocabulary. By the time I left I was more focused on dialect, accent and idioms." A Spanish

learner said, "One hour every day for about a year I studied grammar. Then the last year I concentrated more on idioms and pronunciation while still learning new words."

Although it was mentioned specifically only 16 times in the survey, practice was implied on virtually every survey. A Spanish learner explained how he and his companion practiced:

We studied every day. For the first part of the time I was at my L2 [country], I studied intensely while in the streets, with my companion, mulled over grammar and vocabulary in my head, etc. I was involved in learning the language in every spare minute I had. We would do things like memorizing vocabulary, memorizing grammar skills (conjugation of verbs, etc.), and analyzing signs, posters, our missionary discussions, the music we heard, etc., for such things as well. We would also do 'practice conversations' in which we would practice those things we had learned. Also, talking to people on a regular basis in the L2 was probably the most helpful practice we could get.

Another Spanish learner said the same thing in a simpler way: "Vocabulary, idioms, and pronunciation—the best way to become fluent was by use—practice." This was echoed by still another Spanish learner who said, "I practiced all the time when I got to the field. Having a native speaking companion helped the most." A respondent who went to Japan echoed that statement: "Most of my improvement came through daily use and practice, especially with native speakers."

Question Six

The sixth question focused on the grammar that respondents had acquired while studying their L2s compared to the grammar they already acquired in their L1s. The question was: "Which do you understand better—the grammar of your L1 or your L2?" Of the 64 respondents (see Appendix G for responses), 26 (41%) felt that they had a better grasp of English grammar, seven (11%) said that they had an equal grasp of the grammar of both languages, and 30 (47%) claimed that they understood the grammar of their L2 better than the grammar of their L1. One respondent said that he did not have a grasp of the grammar of either language.

One of the main reasons that respondents felt that their L1 grammar was better than their L2 grammar was because they were more comfortable speaking English. As a Spanish learner said, "I understand my L1 naturally because I've spoken it for 21 years and my L2 for two years." A Portuguese learner felt his L1 was stronger, and simply said, "Just because it comes more naturally." A respondent who learned Marshallese made a similar comment: "I have grown up using [English] and studying it. Marshallese was just two years." A learner of Portuguese said, "I still feel more comfortable with my L1 grammar. However, I had a good understanding of the L2 grammar as well." A Spanish learner said, "For me I understand the English language better. I think because it is my first language." Others gave similar responses. A speaker of Dutch explained his reason: "I spoke English for 19 years before I learned my L2, so I understand English grammar a little better than Dutch grammar." One Portuguese learner who felt stronger in his L1 actually majored in Portuguese in college after he came back to The United States.

A few respondents said that they had forgotten the grammar of their L2 over time. A respondent who went to Mexico said, "It has been over 30 years since I served in

Mexico, and I haven't used the language much since that time. I have forgotten most of what I learned there."

Another Spanish speaker answered similarly: "I haven't spoken L2 in 22 years—enough said."

Another reason respondents said they understood English grammar better was because they took more classes in English grammar than they did in their L2. A respondent who studied Mandarin Chinese said, "I understand the grammar of English better because I teach fourth grade and teach the rules of grammar." A Spanish learner felt stronger in his L1 because he "took lots of English classes." Another elementary school teacher who went to Guatemala felt her English grammar was stronger than her Spanish grammar. She wrote, "[My] L1 [is stronger] because I have studied it for a lot longer than L2. However, I do understand Spanish grammar fairly well."

Several respondents felt that studying their L2 reinforced their understanding of their L1. A Spanish learner said, "I understand the grammar of my L1 better; however, learning Spanish helped me to better understand the grammar of my L1 because of their similarities." Another respondent who felt stronger in his L1 said, "The grammar of L2 helped me learn the grammar of L1 better than

I had in school growing up." A Portuguese learner stated, "I understand English grammar better, but all the grammar terminology I know beyond simple verb, noun, etc., I learned studying other languages."

Eight respondents said that they understood the grammar of both languages equally well, but sometimes their reasons were quite different. A German learner wrote, "No difference," because he was very confident in both languages. A Spanish learner felt his skill in both languages was the same for a different reason. He said:

Neither-grammar is a very difficult part of the English language for me to understand, and I understood Spanish grammar better when I was studying it. Right now I would say they were equal.

A Spanish learner who went to Guatemala felt his understanding of the grammar of both languages was "probably about the same." However, he also said, "Learning Spanish actually helped me with English." This thought was echoed by another Spanish learner who went to Honduras:

I think I understand both L1 and L2 equally or at least at relatively the same level.

Understanding the mechanics and rules of L2 helped reinforce what I understood and learned about L1."

And a French learner said:

I majored in English and I also studied French, so I had training in both grammars. I did notice, though, that my study of French augmented my understanding of English and vice versa.

A Spanish learner who felt his understanding of the grammar of both languages was the same recognized a difference in how he learned the grammar of each language. He wrote, "I understand both well—English is intuitive rather than rules memorized. I still remember the rules for Spanish (most of them)."

Of the 30 respondents who felt they had a stronger grasp of the grammar of the L2, several claimed that they never really learned the grammar of their L1. Some responses were: "I never felt I really had a great grasp of L1's grammar." "I can't remember what I learned about English grammar." "I never paid much attention to the English lessons." "I never learned English grammar." "I never understood grammatical rules in English." "I still

don't know the English grammar." "I have not had an English grammar class in a long time so I forgot many rules." Why they were able to grasp the grammar of the L2 when they weren't familiar with the grammar of their L1 might be explained by the following responses. A French learner wrote:

I've never really studied English grammar before. I did though have to study French grammar so I wouldn't make mistakes in a language I was not familiar with.

A Spanish learner explained his reasons in a similar way:

I would say that being extremely comfortable with knowing my L1 instilled also a 'comfort zone.' . . . I didn't need to learn the mechanics, the whys and wherefores, of a language that I have spoken fluently for most of my life! But, when I needed to learn an L2 to speak it fluently with people that have had it as their L1 for all their lives, then it was necessary to learn the grammar of that language. So I did, and now I know it better than my own!

Interestingly, several respondents felt that the grammar of their L2 was easier than English grammar. A

young man who went to the Philippines explained it this way: "After learning the grammar of Tagalog, it seemed easier than English. If I had to explain the two, I could explain Tagalog better." A Spanish learner said, "Because I had to work so hard at L2 to learn it, the rules now are easier to understand and explain." Another respondent said about Spanish, "I've been studying it the past two years and it's got a simpler grammar base." One Spanish learner appreciated studying the grammar and felt that "when studying Spanish there was a lot of grammar given. It made the learning easier." Another said, "I understand L2 better because I studied my L2 grammar more intensely. I also think that it is a lot simpler than English."

A few respondents used the grammar of their L2 to better understand the grammar of their L1 and still felt that they were stronger in their L2. A Spanish learner explained:

I understand Spanish grammar much better; however, I did become an English major in college and my knowledge of Spanish grammar was very helpful while I was a student. I still feel most comfortable with teaching and explaining Spanish grammar.

Another Spanish learner gave a different explanation:

[L2 grammar] makes sense to me, and I find myself taking rules for L2 and applying them to L1. I never understood grammatical rules in English. They are much more clear and applicable in Spanish.

A Czech learner felt he understood the grammar of his L2 better, and explained it this way:

Though complex, Czech grammar is very consistent and regular. Once you learn it, it's hard to go wrong. Learning Czech grammar actually helped me better understand English grammar.

Question Seven

The last question had to do with writing in the L2: "Are you comfortable writing in your L2? Why or why not?" Of the 64 respondents to the survey (see Appendix H for responses), 11 (17%) felt uncomfortable writing in their L2. A Korean learner explained that most of his studying was verbal—he did very little writing—so he could only write basic conversation. A Japanese learner pointed out that even after taking several college courses when he got home from Japan, he felt he was "never able to read and

write at more than an elementary level." A student of Mandarin Chinese did not spend any of her time in Taiwan learning written Chinese, and even after taking a course at Universtiy of California at Riverside is uncomfortable writing. A learner of Kosraen felt he was losing his writing ability after two years away from the island. Three Spanish learners said they were losing their ability in their L2 because of lack of practice. A Spanish learner who has been back for several years, wrote, "I used to be [comfortable writing]. It's been 28 years. . . ." Two other Spanish learners blamed their loss of writing ability on the years that have passed since they used their L2 (30 years for one, and 22 years for the other), and another Spanish learner said, "I am not comfortable writing—just because I don't remember all the rules for accent marks. I don't have a problem with syntax, grammar, or spelling."

The remaining 53 (83%) respondents, however, felt comfortable writing in their L2. The most unique response came from a learner of Marshallese:

Aet, I lukken menana in jeje ilo Kajin
Majol. Kinke ej juan men me iar Komenone han
katak ippa make. (Yes, I am very comfortable

writing in Marshallese because it's one thing which I did to study by myself.)

He did not study Marshallese in the MTC because it was not offered; he had to learn it in the field. Similarly, a Spanish learner responded, "Si, como no? (Yes, why not?)"

A German learner, a Tagalog learner, two Portuguese learners, and several Spanish learners felt comfortable writing in the L2 because the L2 was phonetic and easy to write in, unlike English. Several others were encouraged by their native-speaking companions. They still write often to friends in their L2, so they feel comfortable, due to practice. "I write to people I met on my mission all the time," said a Spanish learner, and an Italian learner wrote, "I've been fortunate enough to maintain e-mail contact with one of my Italian mission companions." A Czech learner said, "It takes a little more time than I would like, but I'm otherwise fine with it and correspond fairly regularly with a friend in Prague." And a Portuguese learner feels confident in his writing. He stated, "It helps being married to a Brazilian!"

Some respondents felt comfortable writing in their L2s, specifically because of studying the grammar of the language. A respondent who studied Norwegian wrote:

Writing I found was an important aspect of learning to speak correctly as it causes one to be forced to learn proper sentence structure. Reading is more or less an exercise in vocabulary and speaking conversationally often allows one to dismiss their errors and move along because it is often sufficient to simply "get the point across." Writing properly in the L2 requires more dedication to actually learning the language. This in turn makes reading the L2 easier, and speaking more effective.

A Dutch learner explained why studying grammar helped him with his writing:

Not only were we taught to speak the Dutch language, but we were also taught to write and read Dutch. Because we studied the grammar rules so much, the writing aspect of the language sort of came naturally. We concentrated so much on speaking properly that all we had to do was write the way we spoke.

Others appreciated the grammar background because, as a Spanish learner said:

I actually feel very comfortable writing in the language because I have time to think through the conjugations and I feel fairly confident that I'm writing things correctly. Speech can be more difficult when you are out of practice because to be an effective speaker you need to have things roll off your tongue naturally without having to do "real-time" translation in your mind.

Another Spanish learner said the same thing a little more concisely: "I can stop to think and perfect it." And another responded, "There is no pressure when writing to keep the flow of a conversation going."

The respondents to this survey are a unique group of men and women who, in general, were highly motivated to learn a second language. The fact that some of them have only recently returned from the area of their L2 and others returned many years ago adds another dimension to the survey. Answers varied, but considering the differences in when they learned their L2s and the fact that that there are 14 languages involved in the survey, it is notable that their answers are quite similar.

The next chapter will analyze the responses to the survey and discuss how learners of a second language actually feel about studying the grammar of that language. A discussion on grammar instruction in the second language classroom will follow. And, finally, some suggestions for further study will be given.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Responses

As already noted in a previous chapter, the respondents to the second language survey were randomly selected. The only requirement to answer the survey was that the respondent was serving or had served a two-year mission in an area where he or she was required to learn a second language. None of the respondents was selected because of a particular learning style or strategy he or she employed in order to learn a second language. Their educational backgrounds and occupations varied. There were 14 different languages involved in this study; twelve of the languages were studied in the MTC, while two of the languages had to be learned in the field because there were not enough missionaries learning it to establish a class in the MTC. One of the respondents was new to the field, having only recently left the MTC, so he was still in the process of gaining fluency in the field. Several respondents have been away from the area of their L2s for a long time, the longest time being more than 30 years. L2

use after their missions varied among the respondents, also, and this had an effect on their answers.

Considering all of the variation among the respondents, it is interesting to note that out of all 64 men and women who took the survey, only one second language learner claimed that studying grammar was not helpful. It is also noteworthy that after leaving the MTC, 37 (58%) of the respondents included grammar study in their own personal study time each day, which suggests that they did not study grammar for grammar's sake, but rather studied grammar in order to speak the language better.

Even so, none of the respondents said that grammar was the only thing they studied. Possibly the greatest weakness of the Grammar-Translation Approach is its absolute focus on grammar to the exclusion of speaking and creating original phrases and sentences in the L2. It would be very difficult to become fluent in an L2 by studying grammar only. However, this study shows that some type of focus on form, at least according to these respondents, still has an important place in second language acquisition.

Grammar is explicitly taught in the MTC. At the same time, students are given long lists of vocabulary and they

practice pronunciation from the first day. Except for the more difficult languages, such as Chinese, Japanese, and Korean, students are encouraged to use the language immediately for communicative purposes. The MTC seems to have elements of several teaching approaches in its program.

In the MTC students have very little choice about what to study. However, in the field, they have freedom to study what they feel will help them the most to acquire the language. In the field, as their vocabulary grew—whether by personal study or conversation—many of the respondents expressed appreciation for the grammatical knowledge they received in the MTC because it helped them understand how to use their new vocabulary. Krashen (1982) writes about the "Eureka" experience, where students who have already acquired a particular form—for example, the present progressive tense and its three meanings—learn in a formal classroom explanation that present progressive form is three ways ambiguous, and they are able to confirm (Eureka!) that their acquisition is correct (p. 88). Respondents to the survey write of Eureka experiences the other way around. They studied the grammatical forms first and then recognized them (Eureka!) in conversation later.

The respondents who had these Eureka experiences felt that grammar study helped to speed up their acquisition. Those that said learning grammar made acquisition easier may also have been able to make connections as they used their grammatical knowledge in real conversation. Of the respondents, 25 (39%) specifically expressed the necessity of grammar instruction as a "base," a "foundation," a skeleton," that helped to "organize and clarify" the language. Having a grammar base may often provide Eureka experiences for a second language learner.

Additionally, what several respondents appreciated about the grammar they studied was that they were able to create their own original syntactically correct sentences by incorporating their new vocabulary into the framework of the grammar they had already acquired. They also felt that with the grammar background they could add vocabulary properly in the syntax of the L2, and they could do it on their own.

Similarly, many respondents claimed that studying grammar helped to speed up their acquisition and made studying the L2 easier. Respondents stated that since they already understood the structure of the language, they could acquire the language itself more quickly because they

did not have to worry about structure. These comments support Rutherford and Smith (1988), as well as Larsen-Freeman (1997), both quoted in Chapter Three, who suggest some sort of grammar consciousness-raising in order to speed up acquisition.

It was quite interesting to find that the majority of respondents studied grammar on their own even after they left the MTC. Although vocabulary was reported to be studied the most, grammar was listed as the second most studied item. In personal study, some respondents studied books from the MTC and books they acquired in the area of their L2, sometimes alone and sometimes with a companion. Some took charts with them during the day to check over and review as they conversed with the native speakers. Others went over conjugations in their heads or with companions during the day whenever they could. And many used correction by native speaker companions as a tool for learning grammar. Nevertheless, it is likely that there is variation in the success of the accuracy of these second language learners. This variation will be discussed in the section of this chapter, which offers suggestions for further study.

Some of the most interesting responses of those who studied grammar in the field came from respondents who studied Kosraen and Marshallese. These two missionaries could have tried to learn their L2s by total immersion only since they did not have the rigorous classroom study to continue in the field. Even so, they studied grammar and vocabulary during personal study time on their respective islands and reported that studying in these areas helped their acquisition.

Many of the respondents reported that practice helped them a great deal. They listed several ways that they practiced their new languages. They practiced through conversation with their companions and with native speakers. They practiced by improving their pronunciation as they learned new vocabulary. They practiced by reading, both silently and aloud. They practiced by going through conjugations in their heads while traveling. They practiced by memorizing the Discussions that they taught investigators. One missionary practiced by translating literature from English into German for friends in the field. Others practiced by translating aloud for people when English-speakers were in the area and needed translators. Their success makes it seem quite possible

that the natural result of constant practice could be acquisition.

It was interesting to find that more respondents (47%) understood the grammar of their L2 better than the grammar of their L1 than understood the grammar of their L1 better than their L2 (41%). The survey suggests that students are able to learn the grammar of an L2 even if they do not have a strong grammar base in their L1. It also shows that L2 grammar can be forgotten over time if it is not used. Several respondents reported that learning the L2 grammar helped them to better understand the grammar of their L1, which is interesting. The answers also show that grammar is learnable—only one respondent of the 64 said that he did not understand the grammar of his L1 or his L2. Everyone else either understood what he or she had learned, or at least had understood it at one time, depending on how many years it had been since his or her mission.

An overwhelming majority of respondents (53) felt comfortable writing in their L2. Most gave credit to the grammar base for their ability. Those who had been away from their L2 for several years said that they relied heavily on the grammar they had learned to help them write. Many said that they lost their vocabulary skills first, but

that with a dictionary they could remedy that part of writing. Most respondents claimed to remember the grammar they studied. The survey shows that they first learned the grammar, practiced it until they acquired it, and then as the years went by, lost acquisition and are back to using the grammar they learned. Most respondents who have been home for several years said that it takes a little longer than it used to, but they can still do it. The respondents who used writing in the field remembered it better than those who did not. The learners of Chinese, Korean, and Japanese did not focus much on writing in the field, and none of them feel confident writing now. Others who did not write often in the field do not feel comfortable writing now. Those who are still using their L2s seem to feel the most comfortable writing in them. This shows that practice helps in writing as well as in speaking. Because of the limitations of this study, it is impossible to know if those who are comfortable writing can write accurately. That concept will be discussed in the questions for further study.

Teaching Grammar

This study did not attempt to discover the best approach to teaching grammar. It merely tried to answer

the question of whether or not learners of a second language appreciate the study of grammar, and if they believe it helps them in second language acquisition. Because nearly every respondent found value in studying grammar, the results of this survey suggest that it might be beneficial for an ESL teacher to put the study of grammar somewhere in the teaching syllabus.

According to Larsen-Freeman (1997), many teachers feel that they do not know enough grammar to teach it. This might be part of the reason so many teachers dropped grammar study from their curriculum when Whole Language (Rigg, 1991) and Krashen (1982) gave them permission by saying that studying grammar does not help the second language student. It is unfair to the students to have a teacher who cannot answer their questions concerning grammar, whether it is in their curriculum or not. Perhaps teachers who do not feel confident putting any focus on form could study grammar themselves until they do feel confident.

Some teachers dread teaching grammar because they believe that the study of grammar is boring. If teachers feel that the only way to study grammar is through tedious, rote methods of the Grammar Translation Approach, then they

are sadly lacking in imagination (Fotos, 1994). Grammar study can be made both interesting and meaningful by a creative teacher. Larson-Freeman (1997) gives an example of practicing past-tense yes/no questions in English. The teacher may ask her students to close their eyes while she changes five things about herself. She may take off a shoe, her watch, her ring, and add glasses and a sweater. Then students are asked to pose questions to figure out what changes she has made. Students may ask, "Did you take off your watch?" or "Did you put on your glasses?" This can be made into a fun yet valuable grammar lesson, as students are required to think and not just provide mechanical responses. Finding ways to teach grammar creatively requires imagination, but teaching grammar does not have to be—and should not be—boring.

Some researchers (AtKisson, 1991; Griggs & Dunn, 1996; Richards and Rodgers, 2001; Taylor, 1990) have said that learning style may affect how a student acquires grammar. This is a good case for saying that even grammar should be taught in a variety of ways that will help students, regardless of learning style, be able to grasp the concepts. Some students respond better to an inductive approach, while others understand deductive approaches

better. Some respond to music, while others respond to art. Some students enjoy group work; others prefer working on their own. By using a variety of teaching strategies, teachers not only can reach individual students by using a method that will appeal to them, but they can also help students learn to respond positively to styles they do not prefer. Celce-Murcia (1988) claims that learning preferences among students change anyway.

Mohammed (1996) gives an example of a method of teaching grammar that he found successful. He advocates terminology-free grammatical explanations. In his study, he found them to be more effective in his classroom than explanations presented with formal pedagogical terms. According to Mohammad, grammar can be made less formal by avoiding or minimizing grammarians' jargon and complicated analysis. For example, a learner may be able to use the relative clauses correctly without being able to verbalize the underlying rules. Mohammed believes that a teacher may not need more than five basic terms—noun, verb, pronoun, subject and object—in order to teach grammatical principles.

In addition to grammatical consciousness-raising, developing accuracy in English requires a great amount of

time and practice, even for skilled learners. Smith (1988) promotes practice above all:

Whatever the view of the underlying processes in second language learning, it is quite clear and uncontroversial to say that most spontaneous performance is attained by dint of practice. (p. 56)

Smith hints that consciousness-raising of grammatical features may help the process when he states, "Explicit knowledge may aid acquisition via practice" (p. 56). In describing the fundamental character of foreign language learning, Bley-Vroman (1988) emphasizes that grammar study must be accompanied by practice in the L2. These researchers do not say that learners must be able to articulate the rules; what is important is that they have access to the relevant information in explicit knowledge, and with practice they can automatize them. If they can transfer the explicit information through practice, then learning can lead to acquisition if indeed it does not become acquisition.

Perhaps some adult learners can acquire second language grammar on their own. However, most second language learners can only achieve partial proficiency

without some form of instruction. Larsen-Freeman's research (1997) has brought her to the conclusion that form-focused instruction will improve learners' accuracy more than a program with no focus on form. What Smith (1988) calls "pedagogical description" are aids in learning, not what the second language student learns (p. 210). Some researchers say that to study form, or grammar is to study about the language and not to study the language itself. But, according to Smith, the true goal of pedagogical grammar is "to facilitate the acquisition of target language grammatical competence" (p. 210). The goal is to use grammar correctly, not merely to know how to explain it—grammar study is a means to an end, not the end itself.

The goal of this paper is not to promote a certain method for teaching grammar. It is rather to suggest that grammar be included in the second language teaching syllabus. Prabhu (1990) claims that there is not yet a best method of teaching—rather that "when we encounter an instance of really bad teaching, it is most often not a case of the teacher following a method with which we disagree, but rather of the teacher merely going through the motions of teaching, with no sense of involvement" (p.

172). Although there does have to be a certain degree of routine in teaching, "overroutinization" results in mechanical teaching, where both students and teachers are bored (p. 173). When teachers enjoy the students and have a good rapport with them, learning becomes productive and real. Teaching grammar to students, regardless of learning style, does not have to be boring. Appealing to different learning styles can add excitement and variety to the classroom experience.

Of all the approaches and methods for teaching grammar, which one is the best? This paper does not recommend a certain method for teaching grammar except to recommend that grammar be a part of a well-rounded program for second language learning. Of course, there is emphasis on the word "part." To teach grammar only will not help a student become communicatively competent in a second language. To teach communicative skills only will not help a student to acquire the accurate linguistic skills necessary to become successful in the academic classroom. What the respondents to the survey did to become fluent in their L2 was to practice vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and idioms. They read both silently and aloud, silently to grasp the nuances of the language, and

aloud to improve their pronunciation. They memorized, they translated, and they listened to music in their L2. They listened to native speakers and appreciated being corrected by them; it was part of their learning process. And every day, once they entered the area of their L2s, they conversed with native speakers—perhaps the best practice of all, when combined with the other learning strategies. A combination of these strategies seems to help a motivated student become fluent in a second language.

Suggestions for Further Study

A few of the answers in the survey suggest that some respondents had a better grasp of the L2 than others. For example, one German learner was translating literature for people while a Spanish learner claimed he never had an occasion to write at all. So, even though nearly all of them shared a similar MTC experience, experience in the field varied from missionary to missionary. It is quite possible and probable that interest in perfecting the language varied from missionary to missionary also.

One thing this study shows is that most of the second language learners who participated in the survey appreciated the grammar they studied in their L2. What it

does not show is the actual level of their grammatical competence in their L2. It would be interesting to check the grammatical competence of those who felt grammar was important enough to study during personal study time in the field with those who didn't study grammar at all after they left the MTC. Of course, a few of the second language learners had a background in the grammar of their L2 before they even went to the MTC and may not have needed to study grammar in the field. Therefore, in order to be more accurate, perhaps a study of grammatical competence could involve only those whose grammar experiences were limited to the MTC and the field.

This study included missionaries who have been home a short time as well as returned missionaries who have been home for many years. A similar study could be done to analyze retention rate of the L2. Some missionaries come home and continue to find ways to use their L2, but others are not always able to find people to communicate with in their newly acquired language (for example, Kosraen) and begin to lose their fluency.

In this survey, several said that they lose vocabulary first, but that they have been able to retain much of their grammatical competence. Because of this, with a dictionary

at their side, they can still write in their L2 with fairly good accuracy. It would be interesting to find out if linguistic competence in writing stays longer than oral linguistic competence. In general, the respondents think it does.

And, finally, a fascinating study would be one that tests the grammatical competence of students who view themselves as fluent in two languages. It might be that certain people reach a comfort level in their L1 and fossilize linguistically before they have gained complete grammatical competence. If so, when they study a second language, do they study the grammar until their grammatical competence in their second language is stronger than their competence in their native tongue? Or do they find a certain communication level that they feel comfortable with, and once again, fossilize linguistically before their grammatical competence is complete? This study interests me because of comments made by missionaries who note the lack of linguistic accuracy among native speakers in the area of their L2. Some returned missionaries who have come home to California are amazed at the lack of linguistic accuracy among Spanish speakers in California. Not every American speaks academic English, and it is very likely

that not all native speakers of other languages speak their native tongues with linguistic accuracy.

Conclusion

This group of second language learners is interesting to study because in less than two years each missionary actually attained fluency in a second language. It is a given that some attained greater fluency than others, but even so, everyone could communicate freely with a native speaker before he or she left the area where the L2 was spoken, and nearly all of them felt confident writing in the L2.

Immigrants to California are in a somewhat similar situation, but in general they have more than two years to become competent in their second language. They study English each day at school and can be immersed in English if they choose to be around native speakers. Their progress is slowed down if they only choose to communicate with others whose language proficiency is similar to theirs, and it is a disadvantage for them if only their native tongue is spoken in the home. The findings of this paper suggest that perhaps students may also have slower

progress linguistically if they are not introduced to the grammar of English.

In general, the respondents to the survey were highly motivated when they studied their second languages. They had a strong purpose for learning a second language and studied hard. Immigrant students in California who are strongly motivated to learn academic English can do so if they are given the opportunity. Highly motivated students are capable if teachers are willing to put forth the effort it takes to provide more than communicative competence in the classroom. Teachers will have to go beyond appreciating the students' writing in their own voice, to helping them write in academic English. Immigrant students who hope to succeed at the college level must have instruction that will give them linguistic competence that can complement their communicative competence and help them to meet the requirements for writing academic English at the college level.

APPENDIX A
NUMBER OF ENGLISH LEARNER
STUDENTS IN CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Number of English Learner Students in
California Public Schools

Source: Language Census (form R30-LC)
Educational Demographics Unit
California Department of Education
[http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/reports/
statewide/leplcst2.htm](http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/reports/statewide/leplcst2.htm)

Number of English-Learner Students in California Public
Schools, by Language, 2001 through 2002:

<u>Language</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
Albanian*	89	101
Arabic	7,529	7,834
Armenian	11,753	12,218
Assyrian	1,191	1,153
Burmese	499	535
Cantonese	30,852	31,866
Cebuano/Visayan	612	620
Chaldean	189	224
Chamorro/Guamanian	104	87
Chaozhou/Chaochow	950	932
Croatian	350	308
Dutch	478	481
Farsi/Persian	12,186	12,077
French	1,915	1,964
German	1,987	2,024
Greek	713	704
Gujarati	2,782	2,852
Hebrew	2,158	2,134
Hindi	5,341	5,347
Hmong	6,746	7,003
Hungarian	479	439
Ilocano	2,174	2,068
Indonesian	1,235	1,338
Italian	926	863
Japanese	5,640	5,791
Khmer/Cambodian	12,187	10,172
Khmu	168	193
Korean	27,145	27,806
Kurdish	75	83
Lahu	54	36

Lao	4,528	4,386
Mandarin/Putonghua	26,710	28,523
Marshallese	49	47
Mien	1,607	1,667
Mixteco	15	13
Native American	N/A	N/A
Pashto	526	505
Pilipino/Tagalog	37,609	36,403
Polish	971	995
Portuguese	3,339	3,374
Punjabi	6,265	6,464
Rumanian	1,664	1,617
Russian	7,676	8,526
Samoan	1,499	1,412
Serbian	N/A	N/A
Serbo-Croatian	367	372
Spanish	549,017	578,347
Taiwanese	926	979
Thai	2,223	2,186
Tigrinya*	364	303
Toishanese	78	79
Tongan	1,052	1,257
Turkish	339	327
Ukrainian	719	888
Urdu	3,095	3,206
Vietnamese	35,956	36,769
<i>Other languages of China</i>	N/A	N/A
<i>Other Philippine languages</i>	N/A	N/A
<i>Other non-English languages</i>	19,286	20,096
State totals	844,387	878,139

* New language beginning in 1999.

APPENDIX B
SECOND LANGUAGE SURVEY

Second Language Survey

1. What is your native tongue (L1)?
2. What is your second language (L2)?
3. How fluent are you in your L2?
 - A. I can converse freely with a native speaker of my L2.
 - B. I can carry on a conversation if the native speaker speaks slowly enough.
 - C. I can understand the L2, but I'm uncomfortable speaking.
 - D. I can read a little of the L2, but that is all.
4. Do you think that studying the grammar of the L2 in the MTC helped you learn the language? (Grammar: rules of the language—i.e., verb conjugation and tenses, subject-verb agreement, syntax [word order], etc.) Can you explain?
5. After you left your intensive study and went to the area of your L2, did you ever study or practice the language on your own or with a companion? If so, what did you study? (Vocabulary, grammar, idioms, pronunciation, etc.)
6. Which do you understand better—the grammar of your L1 or your L2? Can you explain?
7. Are you comfortable writing in your L2? Why or why not?

APPENDIX C
TEXTBOOK FORMAT

Textbook Format

Portuguese for Missionaries. (1984). Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. p. iii.

This book employs four lesson types: Overview, SYL (Speak Your Language), Grammar and Review. Each has its own characteristics.

Overview: Unit One in the text contains an overview of the five areas of language: vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension. The overview unit brings missionaries to mastery on general concepts of the language and language learning. It emphasizes things they already know about language and helps them relate these things to their new language.

Speak Your Language: The SYL lessons emphasize topics. They give the missionaries the skills they will need to participate in the Speak Your Language Program. The SYL lessons are sequenced according to the missionaries' schedule and language needs. The first half of the book will emphasize survival language and basic social dialogues. The second half of the book will emphasize language needed as a missionary.

Grammar: Grammar lessons are arranged in sequence from simple to complex. They help the missionary draw on his adult understanding of his own language either to compare or contrast with the characteristics of the new language. Missionaries are taught how to manipulate structures and rules to expand language ability.

Review: The review Module comes at the end of each unit, a unit containing a mixture of SYL and Grammar lessons adding up to five. The Review Module emphasizes the five areas of language as dealt with in the unit. Vocabulary items and grammar structures are reviewed. The fine points of pronunciation are brought to a higher degree of mastery. Activities which lead to fluency are introduced. Listening comprehension is tested.

APPENDIX D
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ONE,
TWO, AND THREE

Responses to Questions One, Two, and Three

Question 1: What is your native tongue (L1)?

Question 2: What is your second language (L2)?

Question 3: How fluent are you in your L2?

A. I can converse freely with native speaker of my L2.

B. I can carry on a conversation if the native speaker speaks slowly enough.

C. I can understand the L2, but I'm uncomfortable speaking.

D. I can read a little of the L2, but that is all.

- | | | | |
|-----|----------|--------------|---|
| 1. | English. | Korean. | A |
| 2. | English. | Spanish. | A |
| 3. | English. | Marshallese. | A |
| 4. | English. | Spanish. | A |
| 5. | English. | Japanese. | B |
| 6. | English. | Spanish. | C (It has been over 30 years since I served.) |
| 7. | English. | Portuguese. | A |
| 8. | English. | Spanish. | A |
| 9. | English. | Spanish. | A |
| 10. | English. | Spanish. | A/B |
| 11. | English. | German. | A |

12.	English.	Kosraen.	B	(Away from the language for 2 years)
13.	English.	Tagalog	B	(Away from the language for 6 years)
14.	English.	Spanish.	B	(Away from language 25 years)
15.	English.	French.	A	
16.	English.	Spanish.	A	
17.	English.	Dutch.	A	
18.	English.	Spanish.	A	
19.	English.	Spanish.	A	
20.	English.	Spanish.	A	
21.	English.	Portuguese.	A	
22.	English.	Mandarin.	A	after mission. B now-17 years later.
23.	English.	Spanish.	A	
24.	English.	Norwegian.	A	
25.	English.	Portuguese	A	
26.	English.	Spanish.	B+	(Away from language 28 years)
27.	English.	Spanish.	A	
28.	English.	Spanish.	A	
29.	English.	Spanish.	A	
30.	English.	Spanish.	C	(New to mission field-fresh out of MTC)

- | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------------|---|--|
| 31. | English. | Spanish. | A | I used to be. I'm very rusty, but it comes back quickly. |
| 32. | English. | Portuguese. | A | 25 years ago when I returned. B now. |
| 33. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 34. | English. | Spanish. | C | I haven't spoken L2 in 22 years—enough said. |
| 35. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 36. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 37. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 38. | English. | Italian. | A | |
| 39. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 40. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 41. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 42. | English. | German. | A | |
| 43. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 44. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 45. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 46. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 47. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 48. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 49. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 50. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 51. | English. | Spanish. | A | |

- | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------------|---|---|
| 52. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 53. | English. | Italian. | A | |
| 54. | English. | Spanish. | A | Although lately I have experienced a pronounced loss of vocabulary. |
| 55. | English. | Spanish. | A | |
| 56. | English. | German. | A | |
| 57. | English. | French. | A | |
| 58. | English. | Portuguese | A | then. C/D now, 30 years later. |
| 59. | English. | Spanish. | A | then. C now, 9 years later. |
| 60. | English. | Italian. | A | |
| 61. | English. | Spanish. | A | On a scale of one to ten—a nine. |
| 62. | English. | Spanish. | A | then. Now, 20 years later, B/C |
| 63. | English. | Portuguese. | A | |
| 64. | English. | Czech. | A | ten years ago. |

APPENDIX E
RESPONSES TO QUESTION FOUR

Responses to Question Four

Question: Do you think that studying the grammar of the L2 in the MTC helped you learn the language? (Grammar: rules of the language—i.e., verb conjugation and tenses, subject-verb agreement, syntax [word order], etc.) Can you explain?

1. Yes
2. No, the MTC did not help because of the school like setting. Doing things on paper and reading in book is not as effective as speaking with others.
3. We didn't learn it in the MTC. Was learned in the mission field [Marshallese].
4. Yes, I was able to learn the skeleton of the language, and as I learned more vocabulary I knew how to use it correctly.
5. Yes, definitely—it provides a framework to fit the words in, and allows new vocabulary to be used properly and accurately.
6. Yes. It was called the LTM at the time. It provided the grammatical foundation and some of the basic survival words to get me started. It would have been much harder without the training.
7. Yes. By learning the grammar, I was able to learn on my own while in the country. The grammar allowed me to learn vocabulary and properly use new words in speech and writing.
8. Yes, it built a foundation on which to build my language usage.
9. Yes, tenses and conjugations helped while studying in the MTC.
10. It was integral to learning the language.
11. Yes—verb conjugation is critical in German. It also helped me with my L1 grammar.

12. I didn't learn it [Kosraen] in the MTC
13. Yes. By learning the sentence structure before the language, I was able to focus on Tagalog when we started learning it.
14. Yes. [It] gave me a background by in country really helped.
15. Yes. I think that understanding those things are key when learning a language. Memorizing vocabulary words won't do any good unless you know how to put them together.
16. Yes. Studying the grammar of L2 helped because it gave me a good foundation of how the language works.
17. My study of Dutch in the MTC gave me a foundation to build upon for the remainder of the two years.
18. Yes—put things in order.
19. Yes. It helped to form and ingrain everything in my mind so that I would be able to begin putting it into practice as I speak.
20. Yes. It helped out a ton because I was able to sight the difference between verbs and such.
21. Yes. For one, when you're trying to conjugate a verb—that is, trying to remember the conjugations—it takes you a step beyond trying to merely remember vocabulary, so the vocabulary is easier. Also, on first appearance, Portuguese syntax an seem looser, but once you learn it, you find the rules are pretty rigid, and if you think it's loose and sy what you want, you sound silly.
22. Yes. Chinese syntax is completely different than English. There is a specific pattern that has to be learned. Learning the grammar helped to organize and clarify the language.

23. My time in the MTC served to teach me the basic grammar concepts, and basic words. The MTC really helped my understanding of the language. I gained an ear for it in about 7 weeks.
24. Yes. Although it was not expressly dealt with us that way at the MTC, I personally concentrated a great deal of time on verb conjugation and sentence structure. I found that from the outset, several missionaries would devote their efforts to simply expanding their L2 vocabulary. Consequently, while they did learn a great deal of words, they merely spoke "English" and interjected the new vocabulary words rather than learning to speak the L2 with proper sentence structure and tone inflection.
25. Yes. It gave me a good base to work from.
26. Yes. However, I could not speak or understand for several (4+) months after arriving in Guatemala. Then the rules became helpful.
27. Yes. Now that I use L1 most of the time--I rely heavily on the grammar knowledge when I use L2--gave me a better understanding of language.
28. Yes. In the MTC we only learn the basic grammar rules of the language but you really pick up the conversation part in the field, talking day to day with the native people.
29. Yes, conjugation very helpful.
30. Absolutely. As you are in the MTC, you start understanding the grammar which forms a strong foundation for your second language.
31. Studying the grammar was the only way I could make any sense of it. I really struggled with the language at first. I never did pay much attention to the grammar rules of English while it was taught to me in school, but in learning Spanish, I would say it was critical.
32. Yes. I think it gave me the basic rules of conjugation that applied as my vocabulary expanded.

33. Yes—it was critical. Understanding the underlying grammar and rules of verb conjugation were absolutely essential. Not having a grasp of the rules of the language would have made it extremely difficult to make sense of why people would say things in a particular way, and would have made me look even more foolish than I actually did while trying to learn to communicate.
34. Yes. Spanish has very few exceptions, once grammar was learned, it was much easier.
35. Yes. The grammar they taught contained all the rules needed to truly become fluent in the language.
36. Yes. It helped because I had taken no Spanish before entering the MTC. I was able to learn the language rules and pronouns and all of the other grammar rules.
37. Yes. It enabled me to understand better—why something was said the way it was said.
38. Yes. I wasn't able to speak very much when I left, but I remembered the grammar lessons quite well, which made learning the language much quicker and simpler.
39. Yes. I actually learned the language more grammatically correct than many native speakers by studying the grammar. I found this similar to someone from another country learning English—being able to speak more grammatically correct than most from the US. I had previously studied Spanish in school, but flew past that by the first week or so in the MTC.
40. It reinforced what I had learned in school and gave me tons of practice with someone who could correct mistakes.
41. Yes.
42. No, but it was a good review.

43. Yes. Spanish requires a knowledge of grammar to speak correctly. The MTC study was very helpful. The immersion process for learning made it faster.
44. Yes. I do believe it was a good part of learning the language and while being in the field was a major part of learning the language I still needed to study the info you specified above and it was a lot easier in the MTC. French was learned in Peace Corp and they do immerse you in the country and language day one, but the grammar was not taught as it was in the MTC. MTC system was way better.
45. Yes. When I understood the grammar the rest came a lot quicker because I didn't have to worry about how everything was structured.
46. Oh, yes! Because of the way the "course" is laid out in the MTC, with emphasis on grammar and the, especially, applying those grammar lessons in a speaking based environment, the language came much faster than it does in school. (And since this may be a secular study, I will leave out the importance of the presence of the Spirit in learning it.) The grammar (and I keep spelling grammar with an "e" . . .hehe) is really what needs to be learned in order to gain a firm grasp of the mechanics of a language . . .in other words, you can go out and learn the language by practice as much as you want, but until you learn and apply the basics of the grammar of the language, your skill will remain at a very basic level.
47. Yes. In many areas I learned more than my native language.
48. Yes. Without the MTC I wouldn't know the grammar as well.
49. Yes. I had forgotten most of what I had studied in high school so the language lessons taught in the MTC were important and very helpful.
50. Yes, it helped me a lot. It gave a basic knowledge to start with.

51. I think that the study of grammar at the MTC stuck with me and helped me get a better grasp on the language. As I heard and practiced the language, the grammar made more sense to me. It was very nice to have that base of grammar to help me start off even though it did give me a headache.
52. Absolutely, it was a good base, but I wish I had more grammar lessons while in Brasil.
53. Yes, it helped. I had formal language training (Latin) in high school, so the process was familiar to me.
54. Yes, studying the grammar was very helpful. Unfortunately, the MTC teachers are all non-professionals, so their command of grammar was not at the level of a professional English teacher. In other words, the MTC teachers sometimes (especially the men) did not have the skills to teach proper grammar.
55. Yes. It's quite a biteful at first, but as you learn, or understand more Spanish, you recall the instructions from the MTC.
56. Yes, it helped, although I had extensive German education before the MTC. (Six years in Utah public schools and one semester in Germany at a gymnasium and a full year at the U of U.)
57. Not especially because I had already been studying French for nine years before the MTC. I left the MTC for France four weeks before the rest of my district because I was bored.
58. Yes, because it gave me the tools I needed to adapt to using unfamiliar words and communicating in new and different situations.
59. Yes, very much. It gave me the structure, the framework that I needed to have it all make sense. I could add vocabulary later.
60. Yes, it helped a lot. I had already studied several languages by my mission time, and the combination of

language study and language practice at the MTC was helpful. I also taught at the MTC for a year, too, so I may be biased.

61. I still remember things I learned in the MTC.
62. Yes. My mom was an English teacher, so I was very familiar with the rules of grammar. It helped me a lot to know how things were different, so that I wasn't translating directly from English. Also I liked being able to say exactly what I meant so there was a big difference for me between "he came here" and "he used to come here."
63. Very much so . . . a lot of words actually were similar to English words—just needed to change the suffix (example, communication—comunicacao).
64. It was helpful, but only marginally so. When I was learning Czech in the MTC there were not yet any RMs (Returned Missionaries) from my mission, so we were taught by a convert from Czechoslovakia who did not speak much English, a nonmember from Czechoslovakia who did not teach much gospel, and a barber at the MTC who had learned the language 30 years earlier in the army and had retained a little of it all those years later.

APPENDIX F
RESPONSES TO QUESTION FIVE

Responses to Question Five

Question: After you left your intensive study and went to the area of your L2, did you ever study or practice the language on your own or with a companion? If so, what did you study? (Vocabulary, grammar, idioms, pronunciation, etc.)

1. Yes. We studied primarily vocabulary, idioms, pronunciation, and also conversation.
2. When I was in the field w/ my comp. We never practiced specifics, just conversated back and forth.
3. Yes. Mostly vocabulary and grammar. Idiom sand pronunciations I learned by talking with the natives.
4. I did study for the first few months but as I got more comfortable with the language I studied less. I studied mostly vocabulary and verb conjugation.
5. Yes, I studied some, but most of my improvement came through daily use and practice, especially with native speakers. I did carry a Japanese/English dictionary constantly so I could work on vocabulary.
6. Mostly on my own. I kept a book for new words and conjugations, etc.
7. I read scriptures and other materials. I practiced grammar by asking questions and practiced pronunciation. I studied by myself the materials supplied at the MTC.
8. Very limited study, mostly vocabulary.
9. Yes, book I had purchased at the MTC. Picture books of items really helped. We only mainly learned vocab. That pertained to church words, but on the mission I learned other words through the natives and books.
10. No.
11. Yes—grammar and vocabulary.

12. Yes—vocabulary and grammar.
13. Vocabulary and grammar of course, but just like English, I had to learn their own way of speaking the language.
14. Yes. Vocabulary
15. Yes, we had personal language study for a half hour every day. I would study a grammar book for French College students.
16. Yes. I had two companions for a period of six months who were native speakers and spoke no English. This helped me learn the language; I had to speak Spanish all the time. "Sink or swim."
17. Yes. At least 3 times a week my companion and I studied the grammar, vocabulary and sentence structure of the Dutch language.
18. Yes—try to do all every day.
19. Yes—we studied each day for 30 minutes. Each study session we would divide into practices of the grammar, vocab, pronunciation and so forth.
20. Yes. Read the Book of Mormon out loud.
21. Yes. We tried to study the harder pronouns and the harder pronoun syntaxes. I would ask vocab questions of Brazilian companions, but technical grammar questions I'd take to knowledgeable Americans who'd learned it. Brazilians didn't know the rules—they just internalized them.
22. I had daily language practice on my own. In the field I concentrated mostly on vocabulary and pronunciation.
23. All day every day I wrote down new words and tried to use them. One hour every day for about a year I studied grammar. Then the last year I concentrated more on idioms and pronunciation while still learning new words.

24. Yes. More on my own than express companionship study. Pronunciation and grammar were primarily my focus, and vocabulary essentially took care of itself as speaking freely would identify new vocabulary words to search for.
25. Not much—but speaking it every day, and reading and praying helped and was active practice.
26. Yes. All of the above but not a lot.
27. Yes. Vocabulary, idioms and pronunciation—the best way to become fluent was by use—practice.
28. Yes, I studied the language on my own every day and then with my companion. I mainly studied the conjugation and tenses because that was the most difficult one for my. My companions were great at correcting me and helping me speak it correctly.
29. Yes. Everything.
30. (New to field) I study all of these things on my own and with the help of my companion. A companion that already knows the language is a valuable tool.
31. When I arrived in Ecuador, I still could not understand anyone, let alone speak to them. Then way I learned to speak was practicing the discussions, studying vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and idioms. It took me at least 6 months before I felt comfortable speaking without someone to help if needed. By the time I had been there a year, I couldn't be fooled or confused and understood everything that was said to me.
32. My companions were all native Portuguese speakers so the practice was informal. More asking questions or their correcting my language.
33. Yes. 30 minutes minimum/day focusing on vocabulary and verb conjugation, both on my own and with my companion. I did this for the first year of my mission. The first 6 months were for my own learning,

and the second six months I did it to help my new companions.

34. I studied the discussions. I did read in Spanish—which is a form aof study, but nothing formal.
35. Yes, we studied vocabulary, grammar rules, and even some of the local dialects spoken (i.e., Valenciano and Catalan).
36. I would study about one hour per day. I read out loud with my companion and he would help me pronounce and understand what I was saying. I also studied vocabulary, trying to learn 5-10 words a day.
37. Rarely.
38. Yes. I made vocabulary lists, studied grammar in the gook given us at the MTC, and practiced pronunciation when memorizing discussions and scriptures.
39. Yes, I studied vocabulary mainly, with conjugation of verbs as a focus. Grammar came later, after a few months.
40. No. I just spoke the language, but I did have several native companions wo would correct my grammar when needed.
41. Vocabulary, grammar, idioms, pronunciation—every morning.
42. Yes, rarely with American companions, but more with natives. I read scriptures, religious and secular books, translated excerpts into L2 for Germans. I never studied grammar, more pronunciation, vocabulary, and idioms.
43. I studied and practiced daily. I brought my grammar books with me to the mission field. I also carried around a pocket notebook to write down words and phrases during the day.

44. Not often. Midway through I had to practice more (suggested by mission president). Grammar, verb tense.
45. Just about everything.
46. Yep. We studied every day. For the first part of the time I was at my L2, I studied intensely while in the streets, with my companion, mull over grammar and vocabulary in my head, etc. I was involved in learning the language in every spare minute I had. We would do things like memorizing vocabulary, memorizing grammar skills (conjugation of verbs, etc), and analyzing signs, posters, our missionary discussions, the music we heard, etc., for such things as well. We would also do "practice conversations" in which we would practice those things we had learned. Also, talking to people on a regular basis in the L2 was probably the most helpful practice we could get.
47. Yes--vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation.
48. Yes--vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation.
49. Anything grammar related such as vocabulary, conjugation, and formal vs. informal styles of L2 was learned through conversation with my companion. Also, I used my dictionary a lot to look up words that I didn't understand and to find synonyms to word that I already knew. Very rarely did I use the instructional materials that I used while in the MTC.
50. Yes, I studied a little of everything.
51. I practiced all the time when I got to the field. Having a native speaking companion helped the most. I would read in Spanish out loud and have him correct me. I would learn new words and write them down. I did grammar practices and tried to improve during the two years.
52. No.
53. Not really.

54. Yes. I studied vocabulary, local idioms, and (of course) grammar. Mostly, I tried to attune my ear to the local accent and speech rhythms.
55. Yes, all of the above. Also with natives. They of course would correct you.
56. Yes, we were required to study the language 30 minutes per day. We had required grammar textbooks provided by the mission.
57. Yes. Every day during companionship study we played word games to help us learn new vocabulary. We also set goals to speak as much French and as little English as possible, even when we weren't in public.
58. Nothing formal, but I tried to read as much as I could in my L2--the standard works, whatever church books were available in the L2 (I specifically remember reading *The Great Apostasy* and *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*) as well as newspapers, magazines, even comic books (missionary reading rules were a lot less strict in those days). I had not been a fan of comic books since I was about 10 years old, but I found that the pictures, combined with the elementary level of the language and vocabulary made them a useful tool in language study.
59. Yes. Vocabulary.
60. I studied quite a bit. I read miscellaneous things in Italian (church tracts, books left around the apartment, etc.) as well as studying from an intermediate-level grammar I found.
61. If you can call listening to him speak the language and me passing off memorized discussions in Spanish study.
62. My first two companions were native speakers, so I had little choice but to speak the language. My first companion was especially helpful with correcting my Spanish.

63. Yes—Everything!!! Vocabulary—I learned new words all the time and then how to pronounce them correctly (very important!!!).
64. I studied the language very day. Initially I focused on grammar and vocabulary. By the time I left I was more focused on dialect, accent and idioms.

APPENDIX G
RESPONSES TO QUESTION SIX

Responses to Question Six

Question: Which do you understand better—the grammar of your L1 or your L2? Can you explain?

1. L1. I probably studied L2 grammar more than L1 grammar, but I still understand L1 grammar better.
2. I understand my L1 naturally because I've spoken it for 21 years and my L2 for 2+ years.
3. L1 because I have grown up using it and studying it. Marshallese was just 2 years.
4. I understand the grammar of my L1 better; however learning Spanish helped me to better understand the grammar of my L1 because of their similarities.
5. L1 (English)—even though I learned to use my L2 effectively, it was still never as good as my native language.
6. L1. It has been over 30 years since I served in Mexico and I haven't used the language much since that time. I have forgotten most of what I learned there.
7. L2. I learned the language and vocabulary based upon the grammar rather than learning the vocabulary first and then trying to apply the grammar.
8. L1. I am still learning and practicing L2 and increasing vocabulary.
9. Second language. I can't remember what I learned about English grammar Spanish grammar is slowly leaving me also.
10. L2, no questions asked. I never felt I really had a great grasp of L1's grammar.
11. L1
12. L2

13. After learning the grammar of Tagalog, it seems to be easier than English. If I had to explain the two, I could explain Tagalog better.
14. Both difficult, English not a strong point for me.
15. My L2. I've never really studied English grammar before. I did, though, have to study French grammar, so I wouldn't make mistakes in a language I was not familiar with.
16. L1—because I have studied it for a lot longer than L2. However, I do understand Spanish grammar fairly well. Spanish grammar (the rules) is a lot more consistent than English.
17. L1. I spoke English for 19 years before I learned my L2 so I understand English grammar a little better than Dutch grammar.
18. L1—took lots of English classes
19. L2. Spanish. Because I had to work so hard at L2 to learn it, the rules now are easier to understand and explain.
20. L2. I've been studying it the past 2 years and it's got a simpler grammar base.
21. I understand English grammar better, but all the grammar terminology I know beyond simple verb, noun, etc., I learned studying other languages. However, the rules for Portuguese were so complicated I don't know how long it would take to understand them all. So the short answer is, I feel I know more of what there is to be known of English Grammar than Portuguese.
22. I understand the grammar of English (L1) better because I teach 4th grade and teach the rules of grammar.
23. L2. I never learned English grammar. However I did have Spanish grammar hammered into me.
24. L1, although I believe that the principles are generally interchangeable. I.e., if I were asked to

diagram an L1 and L2 sentence, I believe the results would be rather similar; however, my understanding for L2 grammar principles is probably better characterized as average, such that I would have a better grasp of complex grammar concepts in L1.

25. L1—I still feel more comfortable with my L1 grammar. I focused mostly on pronunciation and effective communication rather than rules of grammar. However, I had a good understanding of the L2 grammar as well.
26. Probably about the same. Learning Spanish actually helped me with English.
27. L2—when studying Spanish there was a lot of grammar given. It made the learning easier.
28. For me I understand the English language better. I think because it is my first language. But because I understand English I was able to pick up on the Spanish and the Samoan.
29. The grammar of my L2 because there aren't as many exceptions to rules.
30. L2 because with English I talk but with Spanish I know why I'm saying it.
31. I probably understand the grammar of Spanish better. I never paid much attention to the English lessons. I just speak as I learned from my parents. I'm a terrible speller in English.
32. In some ways I think I understand the L2 a little better. The Latin based language rules seem a little more consistent.
33. I understand Spanish grammar much better; however, I did become an English major in college and my knowledge of Spanish grammar was very helpful while I was a student. I still feel most comfortable with teaching and explaining Spanish grammar.

34. I haven't spoken L2 in 22 years—enough said. However, I never understood L2 grammar as well as L1 even when I was speaking mostly L2.
35. L2. It makes sense to me and I find myself taking rules from L2 and applying to L1. I never understood grammatical rules in English. They are much more clear and applicable in Spanish.
36. I understand L2 better because I studied my L2 grammar more intensively. I also think that it is a lot simpler than English.
37. Neither—grammar is a very difficult part of the English language for me to understand, and I understood Spanish grammar better when I was studying it. Right now I would say they were equal.
38. I would say that I understood my L2 grammar better than the L1 by the time I was about a year in Italy. I am now using that knowledge to better my understanding of English grammar.
39. The grammar of L2 helped me learn the grammar of L1 better than I had in school growing up. I would say now I understand the grammar of L1 better as it has been a long time since I studied and used the grammar of L2 frequently.
40. Both about the same. It has been quite a few years since I have had formal instruction in grammar for either language.
41. L1—native language.
42. No difference.
43. I understand both well. English is intuitive rather than rules memorized. I still remember the rules for Spanish (most of them).
44. I don't really feel I have a perfect grasp of either, but I would say I feel I remember a bit more from L2 (Spanish that is . . .). When I write it I find myself checking my grammar and all.

45. L2. Because I grew up speaking English and so never really learned the grammar until later. Plus there are a lot less rules in Spanish and at times I have a tough time explaining to Spanish people why things are the way they are in English.
46. I would say that I know the grammar of my L2 better than the grammar of my L1. The reason being that I didn't apply myself in school! HA! Ok, just kidding . . . that has a little to do with it, but not a whole lot. I would say that being extremely comfortable with knowing my L1 instilled also a "comfort zone." Ummm . . . in other words, I didn't need to learn the mechanics, the whys and wherefores, of a language that I have spoken fluently for most of my life! But, when I needed to learn an L2 to speak it fluently with people that have had it as their L1 for all their life, then it was necessary to learn the grammar of that language. So I did, and now I know it better than my own! (Though I am trying to improve on that!)
47. Same in actual book learning.
48. Second language. I still don't know the English Grammar.
49. Neither. I have never understood grammar. Just kidding. Honestly I think I understand both L1 and L2 equally or at least at relatively the same level. Understanding the mechanics and rules of L2 helped reinforce what I understood and learned about L1.
50. I understand better the L2 grammar. I have not had an English grammar class in a long time so I forgot many rules.
51. I would say that the grammar from my L2 is better ingrained in my own mind than my English. I learned English grammar in school and I can speak it fairly well, but I just [don't] have a lot of motivation to learn all the rules of English.
52. I understand L1 the best because I've had the most study and practice learning it.

53. I understand my native language grammar better, mostly because it doesn't have things like "remote past" or variations on formal address.
54. L1, because I had studied it a lot before my mission. However, learning a second language did improve my English grammar.
55. Probably more so the L1, only because I've had more years and education with such. However, I'm always trying to improve the L2.
56. Probably L2, because I have engaged in a much more formal study of the grammar than I have of L1. Having all those irregular verbs drilled into me made my German conjugation skills surpass my English conjugation skills.
57. I'd say I understand them about equally. I majored in English and I also studied French, so I had training in both grammars. I did notice, though, that my study of French augmented my understanding of English and vice versa.
58. At the time of peak fluency, probably L2, mainly because I paid attention in class in the LTM (the precursor to the MTC) better than I did in high school. Now I probably understand English grammar better, just because I haven't used much Portuguese for such a long time.
59. Then: not sure, probably I knew Spanish grammar better. Now: probably English.
60. I'd say they're roughly comparable, since I kind of study grammar professionally, but probably my L1 is best.
61. It's sad, but I believe I understand the grammar of Spanish better than English. . . I think it was the way it was taught.
62. English. Again, Mom was an English teacher.
63. L1—just because it comes more naturally.

64. I understand the grammar of L2 better. Though complex, Czech grammar is very consistent and regular. Once you learn it, it's hard to go wrong. Learning Czech grammar actually helped me better understand English grammar.

APPENDIX H
RESPONSES TO QUESTION SEVEN

Responses to Question Seven

Question: Are you comfortable writing in your L2? Why or why not?

1. Not really. Most of my language study was verbal. Very little writing. I can write basic conversation, but my speaking skills are ahead of patience for writing.
2. Yes, it's been a while but I am sure I could write a letter still.
3. Aet, I lukken menana in jeje ilo Kajin Majol. Kinke ej juan men me iarKommoni han Katak ippa muke. (Yes, I am very comfortable writing n Marchaltese because it's one thing which I did to study by myself.)
4. Yes, the writing in my L2 is somewhat easy because everything is spelled as it sounds.
5. No---I've been told that the Japanese language is possibly the most difficult written language in the world. I learned rudimentary skills, and even took several college courses when I got home, but even at my best, I was probably never able to read and write at more than an elementary level. (I'm not even that good anymore—I haven't practiced much for years.)
6. Not anymore. See 6 above. (It has been over 30 years since I served in Mexico . . .)
7. Yes. I feel comfortable because I read a lot and wrote all my weekly reports to the mission president in Portuguese.
8. Reasonably. I use it often enough, but I still could improve grammar usage.
9. Yes, but I perceive in a few years no.
10. Yes. It was easy to pick up as I learned the language.
11. Yes—German words are spelled like they sound.

12. I am not anymore. I have been away from it for two years and am beginning to forget it.
13. Not extremely, but I can. With Tagalog, it is spelled like it sounds. That makes it easier.
14. No, never needed to.
15. Sure, I wrote notes sometimes for my language study. Also because grammar was so key to learning the language, I would often picture the words in my head before speaking. However, I do not feel I learned French by studying grammar only. I also learned French by listening and study and fervent prayer. I know that the Lord greatly magnified my ability.
16. Yes. After I came home from Guatemala, I continued studying Spanish at the university level. Because I did a lot of reading in Spanish, and then received formal instruction in writing, I am able to write in Spanish fairly well.
17. Yes. Not only were we taught to speak the Dutch language, but we were also taught to write and read Dutch. Because we studied the grammar rules so much, the writing aspect of the language sort of came naturally. We concentrated so much on speaking properly that all we had to do was write the way we spoke.
18. Pretty comfortable—can pretty much say what I want to say.
19. I'm comfortable writing it. For several months for part of my practice and I would translate different things from English to Spanish and write it all down.
20. Yes. I can talk freely with anyone.
21. Yes. Portuguese is very phonetic, so I can spell confidently the things I would say out loud, even if I haven't seen it written.

22. No. I am learning characters slowly. However, as a missionary we did not spend any time learning written Chinese.
23. Yes! I learned the language out of a book and it has always been a visual language for me. I spell the words out in my head when I say them.
24. Yes. I am not exactly sure how to explain why I am comfortable writing in my L2 other than I feel no less comfortable than writing in my L1. Writing I found was an important aspect of learning to speak correctly as it causes one to be forced to learn proper sentence structure. Reading is more or less an exercise in vocabulary and speaking conversationally often allows one to dismiss their errors and move along because it is often sufficient to simply "get the point across." Writing properly in the L2 requires more dedication to actually learning the language. This in turn makes reading the L2 easier, and speaking more effective.
25. Yes, knowing spelling also helped with my pronunciation.
26. Not really. I never practiced it.
27. No-practice.
28. I write better in Spanish than I do in Samoan. I guess it is because I've had more practice with it. I am not required to write in Samoan because there is no need for it. When I was in Chile, Santiago, I had to write notes to all of my investigators and that gave me practice with writing in Spanish.
29. Yes, because I have studied a lot.
30. Yes, because nobody is listening and I can take my time. Writing your L2 is also another valuable tool.
31. I used to be. It's been 28 years since I spoke Spanish on a regular basis. Spelling was so much easier in Spanish as it has so few exceptions. It is usually spelled exactly like it sounds, unlike English.

32. Yes 25 years ago, No now. I felt I had a pretty good grasp on vocabulary and grammar and was always comfortable writing in L1.
33. Yes. However I don't get much practice anymore. I actually feel very comfortable writing in the language because I have time to think through the conjugations and I feel fairly confident that I'm writing things correctly. Speech can be more difficult when you are out of practice because to be an effective speaker you need to have things roll off your tongue naturally without having to do "real-time" translation in your mind.
34. No, I just don't remember it now, but when I was fluent (22 years ago) I wasn't comfortable primarily because of the spelling and the sentence construction.
35. Yes. Because in L2 you write the same way you speak. I had native companions who encouraged me to write.
36. Yes. For the most part. It is easy to write because if you can pronounce the word, you can spell it. English is harder because letters sound a different way. Spanish is the same in all words.
37. Yes—it is very similar to talking in the language and the spelling is really easy.
38. Yes. It is written just as it is spoken, so it isn't very difficult at all.
39. Yes. It is like riding a bike. I learned early on that writing in the L2 was easier for me than speaking. I do have a hard time with non-religious reading of L2, i.e., literature.
40. Yes. There is no pressure when writing to keep the flow of a conversation going.
41. Yes.

42. It depends on the subject matter. Personal letters, emails, no problem. Stylistic writing and business or political writing I feel less comfortable.
43. I am not comfortable writing--just because I don't remember all the rules for accent marks. I don't have a problem with syntax, grammar or spelling.
44. Well I try. I use a bit of help from reference guides and well my memory oof it and my ability to speak it, and if I am lucky I ask those native to L2 to review it before I use it. I have the opportunity to use it in my work.
45. Yes. It is phonetic.
46. Yes, I am. I do it on a regular basis . . . mainly to stay in touch with some of those people I've left in my "L2 area." Though I realize that I make mistakes . . . I've become comfortable writing in my L2 through many months of making such mistakes and learning from them, and learning that I don't have to do it perfectly to do it at all. That's basically it.
47. Yes. It gives me more time to think things through.
48. Yes. Spanish is phonetic--it is written exactly as it sounds (well, almost).
49. Yes I am comfortable writing in L2. I have forgotten some words but I keep my dictionary/thesaurus handy.
50. Yes I am. I write to people I met on my mission all the time.
51. I feel comfortable writing in Spanish, I email a lot of people in Peru still and I feel fine. Also continual reading in Spanish has helped me maintain grammar skills. As for English, I'm slowly getting those writing skills back. When I first went back to school my papers looked like a five year-old had done them.
52. Yes, I majored in Portuguese in college and expanded on the solid base I'd learned in the MTC.

53. Yes, I am comfortable writing in Italian. I've been fortunate enough to maintain email contact with one of my Italian mission companions.
54. Yes. Spelling in Spanish is much more phonetic and therefore easier for me to spell. (I have been home for 20 years now.)
55. Yes, it's probably easier because I can stop to think, and perfect it better.
56. Yes, but I don't know how much of that is attributable to my mission. I completed a German degree upon returning from my mission which required some writing-intensive coursework, and I continue to keep up on the language through e-mail contact with German members as well as through reading German newspapers and magazines on-line.
57. Not as comfortable as I used to be. The longer I'm home the harder it is to remember how things are spelled!
58. At peak fluency yes, now no, just because I haven't done it for so long.
59. Then: yes. Now: with a Spanish/English dictionary I would be.
60. As comfortable as I am speaking it, yes.
61. Si, como no?
62. Not really. I wrote very little Spanish because most of the people we taught had very little, if any, schooling, and so was not able to read. Also, there wasn't much call for us to write in Spanish, as most clerking was done by members.
63. Yes—I speak the language very day still. (It helps being married to a Brazilian.)

64. For the most part, yes. It takes a little more time than I would like, but I'm otherwise fine with it and correspond fairly regularly with a friend in Prague.

REFERENCES

- AtKisson, A. (1996). Difference is not deficiency an interview with James Vasquez. *In Context*. 27, 1-6. Retrieved March 6, 2003, from <http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC27/Vasquez.htm>.
- Bender, M. (2002, September 30). County failing exit exams. *San Bernardino County Sun*, p. B1.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1988). The fundamental character of foreign language learning. In W. Rutherford and M. Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language learning* (pp. 19-30). New York: Newbury House.
- California Department of Education. (2002a). *Education in California Looking Through the Prism*. Retrieved March 6, 2003, from <http://www.cde.cagov/iasa/California.html>.
- California Department of Education. (2002b). Number of English-Learner Students in California Public Schools, by Language, 2001 through 2002. *Language Census (form R30-LC) Educational Demographics Unit*. Retrieved March 6, 2003, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/reportsstatewide/leplcst2.htm>.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1999). *The grammar book*. USA: Heinle & Heinle.

DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.42-63). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. & E. Varela. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in second language acquisition* (pp.114-138). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. & J. Williams (Eds.). (1998a). *Focus on form in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. & J. Williams. (1998b). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in second language acquisition* (pp. 197-261). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 8, 323-347.

- Frodesen, J. (1991). Grammar in writing. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 264-276). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Garrett, N. (1986). The problem with grammar: what kind can the language learner use? *Modern Language Journal*, 70(2) 133-148.
- Ignash, J. (2000). Linguistic diversity, immigration, and today's undergraduates: demographics. In J. Rosenthal (Ed.). *Undergraduate second language education* (pp. 3-21). Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kelly, L. (1969). *25 centuries of language teaching*. USA: Newbury House.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: issues & implications*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S. (1998). Has whole language failed? *ESL Magazine*. 1(6) 8.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). Consensus and divergence on the content, role, and process of teaching grammar. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1991* (pp.260-272). Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997 March). Grammar and its teaching: challenging the myths. *ERIC Digest on Languages and Linguistics*, 1-5. Retrieved March 4, 2003, from <http://www.cal.org/erical/digest/larsen01.html>.
- Mohammed, A. (1996). The role of grammar in language learning. *IRAL*, 34, 283-291.
- Neffgen, H. (1978). *Grammar and vocabulary of the Samoan language* (A. Stock, Trans.). New York: AMS Press. (Original work published 1918).
- Portuguese for Missionaries*, (1984). Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
- Rigg, P. (1991). Whole language in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 5(3), 521-547.
- Rodgers, T. (2001, September). Language Teaching Methodology. *ERIC Digest*, 1-5. Retrieved March 4, 2003, from <http://www.cal.org/ericcl1/digest/rodgers.html>.
- Rutherford, W. (1988). Functions of grammar in a language teaching syllabus. In W. Rutherford and M. Smith (Eds.). *Grammar and second language learning* (pp. 231-249). New York: Newbury House.
- Rutherford, W. (1988). Grammatical consciousness raising in brief historical perspective. In W. Rutherford and M.

- Smith (Eds). *Grammar and second language learning* (pp.15-18). New York: Newbury House.
- Rutherford, W. & Smith, M. (1988). Consciousness raising and universal grammar. In W. Rutherford and M. Smith (Eds.). *Grammar and second language learning* (pp. 107-116). New York: Newbury House.
- Scarcella, R. (1996). Education in California and second language research instructing ESL students in the 1990s. *CATESOL Journal*, 129-152.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-231.
- Smith, M. (1988). Consciousness raising and the second language learner. In W. Rutherford & M. Smith (Eds.). *Grammar and second language learning* (pp. 51-60). New York: Newbury House.
- Sobin, N. (1994). Why we should reconsider teaching grammar; a response to the romantic position. *Language Quarterly*, 32(1-2), 51-74.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.). *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-256). Rowley, Mass: Newberry House.