

CONCLUSIÓN

A raíz de la necesidad del hombre de perpetuar su pensamiento, desarrolló una forma de escritura muy ejemplar como la carolingia, que se distribuyó por toda Europa por sus formas sencillas y su claridad. Estos tipos de escritura han sido influenciados por cada una de las civilizaciones que realizaron intercambio cultural en Europa, hasta llegar a consolidarse como una lengua formal de Europa, aunque seguían utilizándose formas gráficas anteriores como la uncial, capital y semiuncial. El desarrollo de la escritura carolina va íntimamente ligado al desarrollo del poder político de los cristianos en la Península Ibérica, por lo que se convirtió en medio de difusión de la cultura y la lengua española, todavía vacilante. ●

Bibliografía

Paleografía y Diplomática (bajo la dirección de Tomás Marín Martínez, José Manuel Ruiz Asencio), Madrid, UNED, 1987

Arribas Arranz, Filemón: Paleografía documental hispánica, Valladolid, Sever-Cuesta, 1965.

Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Sociocultural Theory, Language Socialization, and Language Identity

Título: Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Sociocultural Theory, Language Socialization, and Language Identity.

Target: Primaria, Secundaria y Bachillerato. **Asignatura/s:** Lengua Extranjera. **Autor/a/es:** Francisco Salgado Robles, Profesor de Inglés y Español como L2, Licenciado en Filología Inglesa.

Recently, rather than the preference for exploring the insights of the acquisition of second languages through isolated approaches, the compatibility of different theoretical models for explaining the processes involved in the development of SLA has been proposed. The current synthesis attempts to delve into three main theoretical frameworks for SLA: Sociocultural Theory, Language Socialization, and Language Identity. This analysis aims to further understand some processes involved in the acquisition of a second language. Therefore, this examination applies and interests to teachers of foreign languages at any level of education.

Influenced by the theoretical perspectives of Vygotsky to second language studies (e.g., humans in control of their mental life), according to Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000), Sociocultural Theory sees language not as the internalisation of a set of linguistic forms, but as an “a struggle of concrete

socially constituted and always situated beings to participate in the symbolically mediated lifeworld of another culture” (155).

Besides, Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) claim that the identity research in SLA tries to make sense of the “experiences of people who have both physically and symbolically crossed the border (...) between one way of being and another and perceive themselves as becoming someone other than who they were before” (174).

On the other hand, the Language Identity model (Norton, 1997) concentrates on the impacts on one’s sense when entering into contact with another language and culture. In Norton’s (1997) words, the term identity is used in order to refer to “how people understand their relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how people understand their possibilities for the future” (410). Norton (1997) further delves into the importance of ‘investment enhancement’ in the target language and questions what the learner’s investment in the target language is. I do agree that the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language becomes important, since this factor could influence the motivation, as well as the personality of the learner. All in all, as Norton (1997) points out, “an investment in the target language is an investment in a learner’s own social identity, which changes across time and space” (411).

That Language Identity is clearly visible in the immigrants’ situation, since immigration may originate the question of linguistic and cultural development, is understandable. However, this idea leads me to consider those cases of language policies, where a language has been imposed to replace or complement another. How would this affect the individual? This case encourages me to think about a current situation in Spain. Historically, after the death of Francisco Franco (1975), the usage of Catalan in Catalonia has increased partly because of new affirmative action and subsidy policies, which has helped so that Catalan can be nowadays in politics, education, and media. However, that Spanish and Catalan coexist is being critically observed in the society. For instance, a public video from YouTube called “Ciudadanos de segunda”², that is, “Citizens of the Second Class” shows this current linguistic confrontation in this region and explains how this has been noticed in the increase number of failure at school recently.

In the case of immigrants the question of language identity can be understood, since they are immersed in a new and different culture. However, how is this identity viewed for a non-immigrant, an individual from the same country, Spain, who moves to Catalonia, for instance, for a better life? In this case, a non-Catalan speaker would be a learner of a second language, regardless of the age and origin, but how would be the ‘investment enhancement’ in this target language? I am convinced that motivation and personality of the learner would be highly influenced by those commentaries of those Catalan speakers, as this video shows, who call them ‘linguistic deviant’, simply because they do not have the command of the target language. That individuals learning another language have to

² See at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VIKXJjZubGU&feature=related>

struggle with changing identities at the individual and social relational levels do I agree. Yet I truly believe that the learners would know which the private language in their “private world” (their family) would be, as Norton (1997) points out in “identity in practice: Mai’s story”, but how would similar attitudes or comments affect their “public world”? Would they continue their struggle to become one of the others? Would this process cease?

Furthermore, in this case, Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) express the process through which immigrants go when they face the target language and culture, what may turn out to be appropriate or reject the linguistic and cultural ‘affordances’ of the new language and culture. If they understand by ‘affordance’ those aspects of the new language and culture potentially capable of transforming one’s sense of self, I wonder how the linguistic and cultural affordances would be for learners of Catalan when meeting people who view them as ‘deficient learners’, learners who are to be in the so-called ‘newcomers classrooms’. Beyond question I believe that this lived histories of learners and the contexts of their interactions may lead them to choose to appropriate or reject the ‘affordances’, referred by Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000), of the new language and culture. To my knowledge, since the situation of the immigrant in Catalonia had not been questioned before, it might explain why there is little research that touches upon this linguistic situation. Given this linguistic and cultural identity is becoming more and more disputable, I believe that it would be an interesting venue to be examined with empirical studies.

On the other hand, it is in the 1970s that important studies of caretaker-child interaction are developed, many of which use the label of “Language Socialization”. Of particular interest in our reflection is the seminal work by Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) which accounts for Language Socialization. They view language as a medium or tool in the socialization process in particular speech communities. In other words, for them, language acquisition through socialization means learning the norms and rules of language use in a given community of practice and viewed as an interactional display (covert or overt) to a novice (child) of expected ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. Since language socialization is the process in which children are socialized “through the use of language (...) and to use language” (184) within a community, all aspects of language use in local contexts are promising candidates for exploration.

Following this line of reasoning, the study of language socialization can be considered compatible with other linguistic fields concerned with the development of language. Indeed, Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) distinguish “language socialization” from “language acquisition”. While the former aims at understanding linguistic competence at different points in a speaker’s development, the latter is concerned with how people become competent members of social groups, as well as how the role of language is played in this process. Here “language socialization” and “language acquisition” integrate “language identity” as well, since language socialization must take on the norms of a certain group so that an insider identity can be attained.

To me, examining these fields together (i.e., that language identity and language socialization for SLA are intertwined) becomes highly interesting and can be more fruitful especially in naturalistic settings, such as the immersion in the native speech community by studying abroad, rather than in a regular academic classroom setting at home in the United States, for instance.

Likewise, as Kasper and Rose (2002) claim, another aspect of inclination of language socialization for SLA that merits attention is the distinction that Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) establish between “language socialization” and “developmental pragmatics”. While the former takes a broader, more holistic, culturally contextualized view, the latter, on the contrary, takes a narrower focus on children’s acquisition of linguistic action and interaction in social contexts either in naturalistic settings (e.g., children’s home or kindergarten) or in the laboratory.

Although I believe in both approaches, I feel reluctance to trust the gains of developmental pragmatics in the classroom, since potential factors, such as the instructor profile is to be borne in mind. In other words, how could developmental pragmatics be examined in those learners whose teacher has never had the opportunity to experience the community of the target language? We know that this issue is present in FL classrooms. Wouldn’t it be a good contribution to study the gains of students with NS and NNS teachers? Needless to say, in attending different talks in Europe which touched upon these empirical studies (i.e., pragmatics in language teaching), I was advised by some former professors to design and conduct a similar pilot study in the US context. However, once I presented this proposal to different professors in this country, I feel that they declined my suggestion. That is why I wonder how productive studies of this nature could elucidate the field of developmental pragmatics in FL classrooms. If Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) claim that the basic premise of Language Socialization is that “cultural knowledge and linguistics are constructed through each other”, how could this phenomenon be accounted for in the classroom setting with teachers with a different background of cultural and linguistic knowledge? To me, this is moderately unbalanced, as well as studies showing such gains would be further advantageous in naturalistic settings.

However, as proposed in the beginning, there are empirical studies which combine these theoretical frameworks (i.e., Sociocultural Theory, Language Socialization, and Language Identity) for explaining the processes involved in the development of SLA. A challenging example is the study of Joan Kelly Hall, ““Practicing Speaking” in Spanish: Lessons from a High School Foreign Language Classroom” (2004), which investigates “the processes and outcomes of Spanish language learning as they are constructed in the communicative practices of a first year high school Spanish-as-a-foreign language classroom” (68). That is, Hall harmonizes the compatibility of these three theoretical models for SLA: Sociocultural Theory, Language Identity, and Language Socialization. First, as far as the Sociocultural Theory is concerned, it is found in the impact of the classroom interactions on the performance of participants in the foreign language classroom; on the other hand, from Language Identity it is also viewed the language acquisition in a foreign language classroom; and thirdly, Language Socialization is achieved by the dynamics set into play, which achieves a considerable role in shaping the learner’s understanding of and ability to communicate in the target language. ●

Bibliografía

- Boxer, D. and A. D. Cohen (eds.) (2004). *Studying Speaking to Inform Second Language Learning*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Hall, J. K. (2004). “Practicing speaking” in Spanish: Lessons from a high school foreign language classroom. In Boxer, D. & Cohen, A. (Eds). *Studying speaking to inform second language learning*. (pp. 68-87). Clevedon:

Multilingual Matters

Kasper, G. and K. Rose (2002). Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. Blackwell.

Pavlenko, A. and Lantolf, J. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J. Lantolf (ed.) Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning (pp. 155-177). New York: Oxford University Press.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. TESOL Quarterly 31(3), 409-429.

Schieffelin, B. and Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. Annual Review of Anthropology 15, 163-191.

Como conseguir los mejores resultados

Título: Como conseguir los mejores resultados. **Target:** Primaria. **Asignatura/s:** ninguna asignatura en concreto. **Autor/a/es:** Judith Domínguez Martín, Maestra Educación primaria, Diplomada en Magisterio Especialidad Educación Infantil y Audición y Lenguaje.

Cuando nos incorporamos por primera vez a un centro educativo no conocemos a nuestros alumnos/as y eso es una tarea difícil para los maestros/as, podemos encontrar mucha diversidad en el aula y diferentes ritmos de aprendizaje, lo que supondría tener que adaptar el ritmo a cada alumno/a.

Por eso debemos buscar las mejores estrategias para “ganarnos” a los alumnos/as y con ello conseguir los fines que nosotros como docentes nos proponemos en un principio y los que los discentes deben alcanzar en cuanto al aprendizaje y adquisición de conocimientos, sin olvidar las normas de comportamiento.

Las normas de comportamiento se trabajan desde que los alumnos son escolarizados en infantil, y se deben respetar para el buen funcionamiento de las clases. En las primeras reuniones de tutoría con los padres se deben establecer unas normas básicas a cumplir, y debe haber una coordinación entre los docentes y las familias.

Las normas básicas son: prestar atención en clase, depositar la basura en la papelera, no hablar con los compañeros, respetar a los profesores y a los iguales, levantar la mano para hablar, salir en fila y en orden, cuidar el

