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INTRODUCTION: MAKING A CASE FOR DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION

The concept of heteroglossia is extremely interesting to me. I recently gave a paper in which I discussed Ingeborg Bachmann’s Malina and asserted that the main character had basically two voices: one masculine, one feminine. I found it fascinating after reading the chapter in Fowler [1996] to think about the possibility of not merely two, but perhaps multiple voices. The notion of voice has been a topic of particular importance in feminist criticism, because women have debated how to find a voice in which to write that is not merely a reproduction of the “master discourse”. Yet if we consider voice to be heteroglossic, then it makes little sense to think of a master discourse, which would be, by virtue of definition, singular. (Fran, reaction journal)

Do we really need another term to describe something that already has a name?…the general confusion within the field of linguistics…has arisen due to the fact that the number of linguistic terms has increased in the past few decades to a ridiculous number. (Sam, reaction journal)

The authors of these two lead quotes are both student-teachers of a foreign language (FL), who participated in the same graduate seminar on discourse analysis (DA); yet, as is evident, they have radically different responses to learning about the notion of heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981) in their seminar. The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the influence of exposure to expertise in DA on a particular group of graduate student FL teachers at a public university in the United States. The study focuses on aspects of these teachers’ socio-cultural histories and socio-institutional contexts and the meanings that these have for their responses to exposure to DA.

Definitions of discourse (and DA) range widely from language-focused, structurally-oriented understandings to context-focused, socially-oriented ones. For example, Richards, Platt, and Weber (1985, p. 84) define discourse as “larger units of language such as paragraphs, conversations, and interviews”, while McHoul and Luke (1989, p. 324) propose multiple discourses and see them as “socio-historically specific systems of knowledge and thought.” The stance adopted here is that of educational linguist James
Gee who makes the following distinction between “little d” discourse and “big D” Discourse:

I will reserve the word ‘discourse’ with a little “d,” to mean language-in-use or stretches of language (like conversation or stories). “Big D” Discourses are always language plus “other stuff.” . . . To “pull off” being an “X” doing “Y” (e.g. a Los Angeles Latino street gang member warning another gang member off his territory, or a laboratory physicist convincing colleagues that a particular graph supports her ideas...) it is not enough to get just the words “right,” though that is crucial. It is necessary, as well, to get one’s body, clothes, gestures, actions, interactions, ways with things, symbols, tools, technologies (be they guns or graphs), and values, attitudes, beliefs, and emotions “right,” as well, and all at the “right” places and times (Gee, 1999, pp. 17 and 7).

According to this view of discourse, learning a FL requires more than the mastery of mere grammatical rules; instead it also necessitates an awareness of numerous discourse conventions, i.e. how to ‘pull off being an X doing Y’, and an ability to put these conventions into action in the right places at the right times with the right kinds of people. In the field of German as a Foreign Language, my particular area of expertise, Kotthoff (1989, p. 448) notes that such socio-cultural knowledge is rarely integrated into the classroom (see also Hufeisen, 2002, pp. 20-22). Similarly, Albert (1995) argues that there is an urgent need for the results of discourse analysis to inform German-language teaching, particularly in the area of intercultural communication (see also Byrnes, 2001, p. 518). In fact, German applied linguists have noted often that a lack of awareness of discourse conventions (e.g., culture-specific conversational styles) on the part of FL users have resulted in (a) ‘helpless frustration’ in the course of intercultural communication (Kotthoff, 1989, p. 449); (b) the perception that particular groups of FL speakers are rude or aggressive by nature (House & Kasper, 1981, p. 158); and (c) the assignment of value judgements to speakers of particular groups that result in destructive cultural stereotypes (Byrnes, 1986, p. 191; see also House 1996; 2000; Johnstone, 2002, p. 6). Belz (2003), for example, details the ways in which an under-appreciation of culture-specific conversational discourse conventions led to the complete alienation of one participant in a German-American telecollaborative partnership that was designed to foster inter-cultural understanding.

Instructed FL learners, however, cannot be expected to execute an awareness and/or mastery of FL discourse conventions if they have not been educated to do so and this, in turn, requires an understanding of language-as-discourse in teacher education programs. McCarthy and Carter (1994, p. 201) describe such a realization in the following way: “The moment one starts to think of language as discourse, the entire landscape changes, usually, forever.”

In this chapter, I examine whether or not and in what ways the landscape of FL learning and teaching (FLL&T) changed for a particular group of FL student-teachers when they were exposed to expertise in DA during their professional education as teacher-researchers. The following questions are addressed: (a) how and on what level(s)
do the teachers in this study respond to exposure to expertise in DA with respect to FLL&T?, and (b) what aspects of their socio-cultural histories and their socio-institutional contexts influenced the types of responses that they had?

**AGENCY AND STRUCTURE IN THE INTERPRETATION OF SOCIAL ACTION**

This study draws on social realism (Layder, 1993) in order to provide a detailed and dynamic account of these student-teachers’ responses to DA (see Belz, 2002a; Carter & Sealey, 2000). In general, social realism recognizes the culturally and historically shaped nature of human beings as well as that of the various human activities in which they are situated. Theoretically, the realist position construes the empirical world as highly complex and multifaceted. Within this variegated and layered world, social action is shaped by an intimate interplay of both macro-level phenomena such as context and setting (i.e., structure) and micro-level phenomena such as (linguistic) interaction and psycho-biography (i.e., agency). Furthermore, social action is embedded within history and (inequitable) relations of power and both of these influence the ultimate meanings and shape of human activity in important ways. Methodologically, social realism relies on a theory-generating, multistrategy approach which attempts to make as many “analytic cuts” (Layder, 1993, p. 108) into the research site as possible in order to elucidate the meanings of particular social actions for the people involved. In sum, social realist investigation advocates the examination of the ecology of a particular action in order to elucidate the meaning(s) of that action for the people involved.

**THE STUDY**

*Course description*

In the 1990s I taught a graduate seminar on DA in a “national canonical” (Byrnes, 2002, p. 26) FL department at a university in the United States. The purposes of the seminar were (a) to introduce students of applied linguistics and literature to the field of DA as a research methodology, (b) to enable student-teachers of language to gain a better understanding of the characteristics and ramifications of FL classroom discourse in context, and (c) to enable student-teachers of language to use DA in the teaching and explication of (literary) texts in the FL classroom. Ideally, the achievement of these first three objectives should lead to a fourth, namely, an understanding of the mutually co-constitutive relationship of language and reality. Such an understanding might facilitate a conceptualization of language-as-discourse as opposed to language-as-skills (e.g., McCarthy & Carter, 1994).

We began by reading Schiffrin (1994) who provides a general introduction to various approaches to discourse such as interactional sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication. These approaches are exemplified by detailed linguistic analyses of various data sets including casual conversation and reference desk interviews. Students also were required to video-tape and transcribe a 50-minute language class in order to
identify and elucidate various discourse phenomena (e.g., silence, laughter, backchannel signals, turn-taking mechanisms) described in Hatch (1992). Next, we focused on a discourse-sensitive approach to the examination of literature based, in part, in systemic functional linguistics (Fowler, 1996) and the discourse analytic didacticization of ‘literary’ texts for use in the language classroom. This phase of the course was rich in hands-on, in-class activities in which concepts introduced in Fowler (1996) were applied to particular literary texts. For example, the opening paragraphs of Franz Kafka’s Die Verwandlung were analyzed for point of view; ‘danger of death’ narratives (Fleischman, 1990, pp. 318-326) were analyzed with respect to Labov’s (1972) elements of narrative structure; and Allen Ginsberg’s poem A Supermarket in California was scripted and performed (Cazden, 1992) in order to demonstrate the Bakhtinian (1981) concept of heteroglossia or multi-voicedness.

3.2 Responses to expertise in discourse analysis
I ascertained five levels on which student-teachers might respond to their exposure to expertise in DA with respect to FLL&T. These levels were determined by means of a long-term cyclic process of qualitative data analysis based on my examination of (a) the scholarly literature on DA and on DA in FLL&T, (b) my observations of novice language teachers interacting with knowledge of DA, (c) my own experiences teaching DA to novice teachers, and (d) my professional experiences as the director of a FL program in which DA was a core concept. These levels are examined in the following paragraphs.

3.1.1 Facts and figures
Student-teachers might conceptualize research findings in DA as a set of language facts to be added to the structural FL syllabus. For example, they might add units on backchannel signals to their syllabi alongside units on subordinating conjunctions and the passive voice. This response may originate in exposure to Hatch (1992) where a variety of discourse phenomena are explicated in the form of system and ritual constraints (see, however, McCarthy & Carter, 1994, chapter 5, for a critique of this response).

3.1.2 Techniques
Student-teachers might respond to expertise in DA as a set of research findings from which to extract pedagogical techniques for FLT. For example, Burton (1982, p. 195) draws on an analysis of transitivity patterns in order to ground feminist explications of an excerpt from Sylvia Plath’s short story The Bell Jar in concrete linguistic aspects of discourse rather than in “slippery, competitive sensitivity.” Similarly, Belz (2002b, pp. 228-240) analyzes Werner Lansburgh’s (1977) code-switched novel Dear Doosie with
respect to language functions (Jakobson, 1961) and textual cohesion (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

3.1.3 Professional development tool for teachers
Teachers may use DA to gain a deeper understanding of the nature of classroom discourse (e.g., Cazden, 2001; Johnson, 1995). Such an understanding provides them with a concrete framework in which to reflect on their own situated classroom practices. For example, by becoming aware of the IRE-sequence (Mehan, 1990), hybrid language practices (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López & Tejada, 1999), or the use of contextualization cues (Dorr-Bremme, 1990) and their potential effects on classroom interaction, teachers may be enabled to make informed decisions about the structure of classroom discourse in their own teaching contexts (see also Poole, 2002, p. 78).

3.1.4 (Re)conceptualization of Language
DA may be viewed by teachers as a set of research findings on which to base a reconceptualization of language and FLL&T (e.g., Byrnes, 1998; Kramsch, 1993; McCarthy, 1991; McCarthy & Carter, 1994) where language is not conceived of as a product composed of discrete grammatical units, but rather as a process in which speakers engage and by which they “present[…] a picture of themselves, not just convey[…] information to one another” (McCarthy & Carter, 1994, p. 183; see also Gee, 1999). Thus, exposure of student-teachers to DA can facilitate an alternative (and more accurate) conceptualization of the object of study itself, i.e. language.

3.1.5 Interpretive tool for teacher-researchers
DA might be used as a tool for educators and researchers in FLL&T to better understand teachers’ highly interpretive and locally contingent thought processes in the activity of teaching (see, in particular, case study 2 below). Kinginger (1997), for example, has used the construct of conceptual metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) in order to elucidate the coherence systems by which teachers teach. Furthermore, students of ‘national canonical’ literatures may come to realize that metalinguistic awareness of discourse practices may mediate their efforts not only as teachers of language but also as literary critics (see Byrnes, 2001) by allowing them to ground their analyses of texts in a theoretical understanding of language as social semiotic (Halliday, 1993; Kramsch, 2002).

3.2 Participants
Twelve graduate students from a variety of departments and degree programs took part in this seminar. Although the students came from diverse linguistic, national, educational, and social backgrounds, they fell into three general categories in relation to their educational goals: (a) Ph.D. in linguistics, (b) Ph.D. or M.A. in applied linguistics, and (c) Ph.D. or M.A. in a national literature. Most students were also employed at the
university as a FL or ESL teacher. The present study focuses on two teachers, Fran and Sam (both names are pseudonyms). These students were selected for analysis because their responses are representative of general trends in the data set as a whole.

4. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

In accordance with the social realist framework adopted here, the data are presented in two distinct, but interwoven layers. First, I present information relating to the agency of each student-teacher under study. The primary data for this layer are the semester-long reaction journals that each student maintained as a graded assignment in the seminar. Scholars in diverse fields have argued that aspects of an individual’s agency can be represented in the linguistic features of the texts that they write (Freeman, 1996a; McAdams, 1996; Numrich, 1996; Salaberri & Appel, in press; Wortham, 2001). In this paper, I assume that the language of these student-teachers’ reaction journals is representative of their developing agency as teacher-researchers of a foreign language with respect to their exposure to expertise in DA (Ivanic, 1998; Johnson & Golombek, 2002).

Fran’s reaction journal consisted of 11 pages of hand-written text and 26 pages of single-spaced, typed text, whereas Sam’s journal was comprised of 25 pages of hand-written text. The reaction journals were digitized and stored in Ethnograph v5.0 (Seidel, 1998), a software package for qualitative data analysis. This program enables researchers to store, read, code, and variably search large amounts of text in order to discover particular thematic or linguistic patterns, to count the number of tokens of a particular code, or to discover relationships between various codes and various texts or subjects. Researchers create and define their own search codes and tag sections of prose text for a virtually unlimited number of phenomena. In addition, researchers may create face sheets for each subject in which they store biographical information. In this way, data sets may be cross-searched for relationships between established codes and biographical information, e.g. with what frequency did female learners under 25 years of age use the quotative particle ‘like’? In each case, the journal entries were coded for the five levels of response outlined above, the students’ use of particular lexical items and linguistic devices, and re-occurring themes and patterns of language use. Additional data are taken from biographical surveys, my participant observations in the seminar, and email correspondence with the student-teachers.

In the second layer of data, I situate each teacher’s agency in the larger macrosociological aspects of FL teacher education (TE) in the department in question, in FL departments in the U.S. in general, and in the field of FL TE. The primary data sources on this second level of structure include participant observation, policy documents, published research, and demographic statistics.
4.1 Teacher agency

4.1.1 Case study 1: Fran

Psycho-biography
Fran is a native speaker of English and a graduate student of a European literature. At the time of the seminar she had taught a European FL at the introductory level for three semesters. Fran was interested in feminism, fascism, relationships of language and power, issues of identity, and self-reflective writing. In her reaction journal, Fran described herself as a “Lit-Freak” who had never concerned herself with linguistics too much “because all the terminology scared [her] off.” Nevertheless, she decided to participate in the seminar, as she reported on a biographical survey, because she thought it would be helpful for her dissertation “to approach language and writing from not only a literary/philosophical standpoint, but from a linguistic one as well.” Fran’s goals for the course were “to figure out what discourse is” and to be able to incorporate it into her teaching. Her career goal was “to obtain a professorship at a teaching college or a small research university.”

Valuing expertise in discourse analysis
On the whole, Fran seemed to value those aspects of DA that were thematically (or theoretically) related to issues that she had encountered previously in her courses on literary and cultural studies. She confirmed this interpretation of her reception of DA in an email to me: “I think your interpretation of my journal is right on-target.” She was particularly receptive to those discourse-analytic concepts that resonated with issues of identity, hybridity, and plurality. She did not, for example, show any special interest in the linguistic structure of conversational discourse (e.g., turn-taking mechanisms) or the theoretical fine points between various approaches to discourse as outlined by Schiffrin (1994). Her tendency to respond positively to those aspects of the seminar that she perceived to relate to her interests in literature is illustrated well by her reaction to Kramsch (1987). In this piece, the author argues for and exemplifies the discursive construction of foreign reality in American-produced textbooks of German. Fran remarked: “What I thought was interesting about this article – well, two things but first of all, I found the issue of censorship particularly interesting. I immediately thought about the topic of the body, since this is one of my foci in literary texts. In American textbooks, the depiction of the body tends to be…emasculated…When I looked at a German-published textbook of German…it was not surprising at all to see drawings of completely nude men and women with their genitalia labeled [Fran; reaction journal; italics added].” The truncated opening clause of this excerpt, the colloquial particle ‘well’, and the ellipted expression ‘two things’ are characteristic of oral speech (Ong, 1988) and give the impression that Fran wrote her reaction journal in a stream-of-consciousness fashion, i.e. she reported the first thing that came to her mind. With respect to Kramsch (1987), this ‘first thing’ was the thematic connection between an example in the article and one of Fran’s interests in literary studies. The ‘naturalness’ of
Fran’s reaction is underscored by her use of the adverb ‘immediately’ to describe the manner in which the connection was made. It is important to note that Fran did not, at this point, pick up on the way that Kramsch applied the tools of DA in order to provide a critical analysis of a text (the leading activity in Fran’s future profession), but rather that she honed in on themes that were of interest to her, although these were peripheral to the main argument in Kramsch (1987).

If Fran was attracted to those aspects of DA that resonate with her particular interests in literary studies, then she was sometimes critical of those course readings in which the author espoused views that appeared to detract from those ideas that she values. For example, she responded in the following way to Fowler’s (1996, p. 82) explication of textual cohesion: “Fowler’s Enlightenment-informed assertion that ‘We expect the propositions in a cohesive text to be arranged to make a progressive sequence of ideas’ is betrayed by the existence of deconstructionist texts and criticism. Not all texts present progressive sequences; nor should we attempt to interpret texts that do as gaining their cohesion and coherence from this logical sequencing…I found it unfortunate that Fowler did not bring in postmodern theory at this point, especially considering that this edition came out in 1996.”

Levels of response
In general, Fran responded to those aspects of DA that she valued at the level of techniques. To illustrate, Fran commented that she found the in-class scripting (Cazden, 1992) of Allen Ginsberg’s poem A Supermarket in California to be “very helpful for [my] own teaching” because it can be used as a way “to bring students to a level of more critical reflection about the texts they’re reading.” In the same entry, she noted that it would be untenable to integrate such an exercise into her classroom teaching within the confines of the language program in her particular department because “with the readings we have now, it is difficult to find space for creativity in the classroom.” Fran referred to the readings in question as “mostly factual news articles” that “do not seem to lend themselves to this kind of technique.” Nevertheless, Fran remained optimistic about using scripting in her FL classes at a latter date when she remarked that she “look[s] forward to trying this out in class when [she’s] teaching again.”

In his explication of point of view in literary texts, Fowler (1996, p. 177) remarks that the “double voice” of free indirect discourse (FID) allows James Joyce to present and question virtually simultaneously the attitudes of Eveline, a character in his Dubliners stories. According to Fowler (ibid.), Joyce can “place two sets of values in an implicit dialogue with each other” through his judicious use of FID. Fran was so intrigued with this proposition that she wrote in her reaction journal that it will be her “hobby horse for the next couple of months” to find literary texts that incorporate multiple perspectives through the use of FID “so that I can be ready to teach with them when I’m finally back in the classroom next year.” Fran also suggested that E. T. A.
BELZ

Hoffman’s short story *The Sandmann* might be an appropriate choice in a fourth-semester language course for teaching Fowler’s (1996, pp. 178-180) type D point of view. This perspective, in which the use of “estranged, metaphorical language” contributes to portraying literary characters as “grotesque automata”, may have proven to be of special relevance to Fran’s later activities as a literary critic, which include analyses of obscure B-movies such as David Friedman’s (1974) *Ilse, She-Wolf of the SS*.

Fran often suggested rudimentary lesson plans for the implementation of discourse-based classroom exercises. To illustrate, she was positively impressed by the way in which one of her peers didacticized the Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia by suggesting that students could rewrite the lyrics of famous songs in order to imbue them with the voices of their own socio-cultural contexts. As an example of how this process might work in a German-language classroom, Fran offered the following satirical re-write of the opening lines of the Billy Joel song, *The Piano Man*, in an entry in her reaction journal: “It’s three in the afternoon on a Wednesday, and I’m on my paid three-hour lunch break from the Auslandsamt… I wait for half an hour for the waitress to come, and then someone asks ‘Ist hier frei?’” She further suggested that teachers in her department could incorporate this activity into a particular chapter of the prescribed language textbook. Fran’s enthusiasm for this discourse-inspired classroom activity was conveyed by her placement of three consecutive exclamation points at the end of this suggestion.

At four points in the course of her reaction journal, Fran responds to discourse-level linguistic phenomena with respect to their perceived function as a tool of professional development for FL teachers. To illustrate, Fran considered how her new awareness of bracket signals or “instructions for putting the ongoing talk or text on hold” (Hatch, 1992, p. 26) might translate into a classroom advantage for her students: “Also: bracket signals. This I find extremely useful for the Ig. classroom. How can I as a Ig. teacher be more clear when I’m about to make an aside or tell a joke in [the FL]? How do I help to avoid students getting lost [Fran; reaction journal]?”

On two occasions, Fran appeared to use her new expertise in DA as a developmental tool with regard to her professional activities as a literary critic. Illustrative of this reaction is Fran’s discussion of William Labov’s (1972) well-known article in which he proposes a syntax for narratives of personal experience in American English. In this same contribution, Labov (1972, p. 395) provides a re-evaluation of what he refers to as Black Vernacular English (BVE) by demonstrating that the African-American adolescents in his study had more advanced narrative skills than their white counterparts. In response to reading this piece, Fran wondered whether or not it would be possible to co-opt Labov’s (1972) framework in order to provide a similar re-evaluation of women’s speech: “…in my research on women’s writing, I’ve encountered criticism in the secondary literature that often depicts women’s narratives as crazy, schizophrenic, unstructured, irrational, and/or illogical… My question is then: If we take this way of speaking, for the strategic purposes of research, as typical of women (a sort of “strategic essentialism”), then how can we imbue that sort of speaking with value and/or re-
evaluate that speaking in the way that Labov has re-evaluated Black Vernacular English [Fran; reaction journal]?

4.1.2 Case study 2: Sam

Psycho-biography
Sam is a native speaker of English who was a graduate student in linguistics with a specialization in a European language at the time of his participation in the seminar. He had taught a European foreign language at the introductory and intermediate levels for three semesters and he had taught English grammar and conversation. On his biographical survey, Sam stated that his special academic interest was “researching generative grammar.” In an early journal entry, Sam illuminated his additional interests in structuralism and scientific objectivity in his commentary on Schiffrin’s (1994, pp. 20-23) explanation of functional vs. structural approaches to language: “While I do not wish to say that the one or the other approach is better, I will say that the structuralist approach is the more ‘scientific’ one. The goal of scientific endeavor is to explain the greatest amount of phenomena by means of the fewest number of principles. A scientist wishes to discover those laws he observes and experiment to determine how these laws combine and interact to produce natural phenomena.” Sam did not appear to have any particular interests in DA at the start of the semester when he reported that he “take[s] all courses having to do with linguistics.” He did not relate his participation in the seminar to FLL&T. His career goal, as stated on the questionnaire, was “to become an instructor (Professor) at a higher institution.

Valuing discourse analysis
Sam tended to positively value those aspects of his exposure to expertise in DA that he perceived to be in line with (a) structuralist principles of linguistic inquiry, (b) his commitment to scientific objectivity, and (c) the deductive method of scientific investigation as outlined above. By the same token, Sam appeared to de-value those discourse analytical approaches to language that he considered to be unprincipled or difficult to categorize. His differing evaluation of DA was construed linguistically in the text of his reaction journal by his polemic use of (a) categorical assertions, (b) particular lexical items, and (c) portions of the appraisal system in English (White, 2002). Each of these features is discussed in turn in the following paragraphs.

Simpson (1993, p. 49) explains that the categorical assertion is one of the strongest possible linguistic means of intensifying epistemic modality or a speaker’s commitment to the perceived truth of an utterance. Instead of using hedges such as ‘perhaps’, ‘possibly’, and ‘for the most part’ in his reflections on the new material that he was encountering in the seminar, Sam routinely expressed his reactions to DA in the form of categorical assertions. For example, Sam used a series of categorical assertions to express his reactions to what he calls “the functionalist approach” to FL teaching: “The
idea of trying to teach language from the top down seems quite absurd… I would say that it is not really possible to teach language in this manner because that would disallow the breaking down of language into “chunks”, which is what foreign language teaching is about. This fact is most evident when one considers how tests are created; they are pieced together from various chunks of grammar and vocabulary. I cannot imagine a written test that is not created in this way.” Although Sam does hedge his assertions in the first two sentences of this excerpt with the verb “seems” and the phrase “not really”, his view on the nature of FL teaching is expressed in unqualified fashion. Foreign language teaching is about breaking down language into those clearly delineated chunks that have been ascertained by applying the principles of scientific investigation to an admissible data set. Indeed, Sam’s comments at this juncture in his journal may be metonymic of “the extent to which nearly all institutionalized and proceduralized manifestations of foreign language learning and teaching are intricately enmeshed in and dependent on the validity of formalist approaches” to language (Byrnes, 2002, p. 27). In the next sentence of this excerpt, Sam used the indicative mood in an unmodified declarative sentence in order to state that FL tests consist of a battery of presumably discrete-point questions about vocabulary and grammar. His commitment to the truth of this bald assertion is underscored in the final sentence where he used the emphatic modal verb ‘cannot’ to negate the possibility that alternative forms of language testing could exist.

My interpretation of Sam’s structurally oriented conceptualization of FL teaching is bolstered by his comment that he “didn’t have much to say” during a classroom discussion on the teaching of culture in the FL classroom. He wrote: “All in all I find the whole discussion about culture…to be quite mundane.” Unlike the teaching of grammatical structure, which, according to Sam, is rooted theoretically in the scholarship of such linguists as Noam Chomsky (see Kramsch, 2000a, p. 313), he did not appear to consider that the teaching of culture could be grounded similarly in a variety of both theoretical and empirical arguments when he remarked that “these matters should be left up to the individual instructor.”

The third sentence of Sam’s statement on the nature of FL teaching (This fact is most evident when one considers how tests are created) illustrates his polemic use of particular lexical items. He consistently designated those discourse analytic theories and constructs that were sympathetic to his own point of view as ‘facts’ (see Halliday, 1994, pp. 264-268). In this particular case, he referred to his own statement that FL teaching is about constituent analysis as a fact. In the quote cited as a lead-in to this chapter, Sam remarks that “the general confusion within the field of linguistics…has arisen due to the fact that the number of linguistic terms has increased in the past few decades to a ridiculous number” (italics added). He categorically asserts that there is ‘general confusion’ in the field of linguistics, then he attributes this confusion to the ‘fact’ that linguists are creating too many terms (see G. Cook, 1994, p. 20, for a similar view). Fran, in contrast to Sam, did not use the word ‘fact’ in the course of her reaction journal.
Just as Sam was inclined to designate those aspects of DA that are theoretically and methodologically compatible with structuralism as ‘facts’, he tended to introduce his opinions about this approach with the word ‘believe’. As might be noted by Fowler (1996, p. 88), this word is a prominent collocate of the terminology of prayer; thus, Sam’s use of it lends his opinions a dogmatic, quasi-religious tone. Such a register ties his interpretations to the divine and amplifies their perceived naturalness. To illustrate, consider Sam’s statement concerning the efficacy of Jakobson’s (1961) notion of foregrounding in the analysis of “poetry and other constructed texts”: “I believe language at all levels, also at the discourse level, can be better analyzed and interpreted and described with the help of such terms as foregrounding.” Sam’s commitment to the ‘truth’ of this utterance is underscored with his use of the lexical absolute ‘all’ in “language at all levels” and his repetitive use of paratactic coordination in the phrase “analyzed and interpreted and described”.

Affect and appreciation, two types of attitudinal appraisal (White, 2002), constitute the final linguistic devices that Sam deployed in a systematic fashion in order to express his differential evaluation of expertise in DA. While evaluation refers to the psychological phenomenon of “how…interlocutors are feeling, the judgments they make, and the value they place on the various phenomena of their experience”, appraisal indicates “the semantic resources [interlocutors use] to negotiate emotions, judgments, and valuations” (Martin, 2000, p. 144). Affect is the semantic resource used to convey emotional responses. Appreciation designates the semantic resource used to express the ‘aesthetic’ quality of natural phenomena and the products of human behavior (such as linguistic theories and descriptive constructs).

On the whole, Sam made slightly more positive appraisals than negative ones, 59 to 48, respectively. Almost without exception, however, he positively appraised those readings and theories that he perceived to resonate with structuralist approaches to the study of language, while he negatively appraised what he referred to as ‘functionalist’ ones. His systematic dichotomization is illustrated particularly well in example (2) below, which occurred immediately after his comment on the “ridiculous” proliferation of terms in current linguistic scholarship.

(2) And only has the number of terms skyrocketed (9) but also the meaning attached to such terms varies from linguist to linguist…From this realization I can extend my criticism (30) of the plethora of confusing (35) and ambiguous (37) terms in linguistics to the field of discourse analysis. It seems to me that of amongst the various fields within linguistics discourse analysis is going to be most susceptible (67) to an overabundance (70) of terminology. Since current trends in discourse analysis seem to emphasize the functionalist perspective there will be no limit to the number of terms that discourse analysts come up with (100). The top down approach takes all variables into account and due to the sheer (114) unlimited (115) quantity of variables, there will be no end (123) to the different approaches and to the different terms within these approaches. This is in opposition to Chomskian syntax (142). Chomsky starts with the smallest units of syntax, he names them and sees how they combine to form greater constituents and
Sam opened this excerpt by using the verb ‘skyrocket’ to describe the perceived increase in linguistic terms. In English, this word is often used to indicate an increase in prices, inflation, or crime and therefore carries with it a negative connotation which, by association, is transferred to the presumed increase in linguistic terms. At word 30, Sam explicitly stated that he is criticizing or evaluating disparagingly what he views to be a “plethora” of linguistic terms. He then negatively appreciated this perceived terminological surplus as “confusing” and “ambiguous” at words 35 and 37. Its negative nature was further amplified at word 67 when Sam used the medical term “susceptible” to construe DA as an endangered victim of the problematic and parasitic plethora. In the next lines, Sam asserted a causal relationship between the threatening “overabundance” (word 70) of linguistic terminology and functional approaches to language, among which he included DA as a whole. At words 98-100, Sam used the verb “come up with” to suggest that the methodology that functionalists employ in order to create new terms is akin to conjuring. Farther down the adverb “sheer”, the adjective “unlimited”, and the idiomatic phrase “there will be no end” heighten the disordered and disorderly quality that Sam ascribed to terminological plurality. With the sharp categorical assertion that ends with word 142, Sam cut the textual string of negative appraisals and introduced what he believed to offer a more ‘scientific’ solution: Chomskyan syntax. Finally, with the use of the phrase “greatest threats” at word 184, Sam called into question the viability of the field of DA as a scholarly discipline based on “the infinite number of variables” that may be subject to analysis.

Levels of response
In short, Sam did not appear to relate his exposure to expertise in DA to FLL&T on any of the five levels outlined above. He did not state that he would add any of the new constructs he encountered to his syllabus, even those that he positively appraised. On the level of agency, this response is somewhat surprising since Sam saw FL teaching as the transmission of discrete grammatical chunks and since he found some discourse-level descriptive constructs encountered in the seminar to be sufficiently concise from a structuralist perspective. He also did not seem ready to try out any of the discourse-inspired teaching techniques that he became acquainted with in his own classroom. In addition, Sam did not appear to use his new knowledge of the structure of classroom discourse as a professional development tool for teaching in order to reflect on his own patterns of interaction in the classroom. Again, some of the descriptive constructs encountered in this segment of the course (e.g., the IRE sequence of turn-taking) would appear to be adequately precise in order to have appealed to his structuralist sensibilities. In an early journal entry, Sam did display the beginnings of a reconceptualization of language in his reaction to a mock classroom debate that was designed to exemplify the system and ritual constraints discussed in Hatch (1992). He wrote: “While observing
how my fellow students presented their arguments, how they interacted, the gestures they made, etc. I thought about how complex the influences on a single person’s communication style can be. I thought about how many signals there are that indicate how a speaker feels about the topic of discussion.” Sam’s consideration of the nuances and complexities of language-in-use in this excerpt stands in contrast to his endorsement of clearly delineated descriptive categories and classificatory systems in other excerpts.

**Summary of Fran and Sam’s responses to DA at the level of agency**

In summarizing this section on teacher agency, it is instructive to compare Fran and Sam’s varying reactions to particular seminar readings and activities. While Fran found the technique of scripting to be very helpful for encouraging students’ critical reflections on (literary) texts in the FL classroom, Sam responded to the object of the application of this technique, namely, abstract poetry, and related that the classroom activity actually increased his “dislike for modern lyrical verse.” Fran appraised the Bakhtinian concept of heteroglossia or multivoicedness (introduced in Fowler, 1996) as “extremely interesting” and used it in her professional activity as a literary critic in order to refine and intensify her interpretation of voice in Ingeborg Bachmann’s Malina. In this way, Fran met the first course objective, as outlined above. In contrast, Sam used heteroglossia as his showcase example of the “ridiculous” proliferation of linguistic terms in current scholarship on language.

Both student-teachers also expressed diametrically opposed views on Fowler’s (1996) explication of textual cohesion. Whereas Fran takes him to task for his “Enlightenment-informed” assertion concerning textual linearity and iconic sequence, Sam found his “discussion of the various facets of cohesion” to be “insightful” and concluded that “knowledge of these concepts can lead to more fruitful text analysis.”

Finally, both Fran and Sam positively appreciated Labov’s (1972) work on narrative syntax. Again, Fran viewed narrative syntax as a means of exposing and perhaps capitalizing on the plurality of student voices in the FL classroom (Belz, 2002c). In addition, she contemplated harnessing this framework in the service of feminist criticism in order to re-semiotize the features of women’s speech. Sam, on the other hand, “got excited” when he “learned about such concrete distinctions used to describe linguistic phenomena” and therefore entered the proposed components of Labov’s model into his personal dictionary of linguistic terms.

**Foreshadowing the importance of structure in teacher cognition**

The case studies of Fran and Sam at the level of agency corroborate the findings of such scholars as Freeman (1996b) and Golombok (1998) who argue cogently that teachers’ previous learning experiences (and not necessarily the knowledge that they are exposed to in the course of their graduate studies) influence what they do in the language classroom. Johnson (1994, p. 767) concludes that “theory can inform classroom practice
only to the extent to which teachers themselves make sense of that theory.” While teacher agency may shed light on Fran and Sam’s differential reactions to particular seminar readings and their divergent portrayals of the ways in which they might incorporate DA into their FL teaching, social realist investigation advocates that their responses to DA might be explicated more fully if one were to simultaneously consider the level of structure. In the cases of Fran and Sam, structure includes the particular institutional setting in which they were embedded as graduate student-teachers of FLs as well as the larger social context of graduate FL study and FL TE in FL departments in the U.S. in general. Sam and Fran (and all student-teachers) have both explicit and implicit “learning experiences” in these configurations as well, which influence the “lived social complexity” (Freeman, 1996b, p. 736; see also Morris, 2001) of FL teaching.

To conclude this section, I offer two excerpts from Fran and Sam’s reaction journals which contain meta-commentary on the disciplinary interests of the other. At the level of situated activity (i.e. maintaining a reaction journal in the DA seminar), these comments mirror the institutional tensions between ‘language’ and ‘literature’ that exist at the structural level in many US FL departments (see Scott & Tucker, 2001). The ‘language’ vs. ‘literature’ dichotomy constitutes a socio-institutional pressure point that will become the focus of the next section:

I’d just like to say for the record that something that really bugs me about linguistics is that some more “traditional” linguists with more “quantitative” methods…are just as subjective (if not MORE so, because they believe their methods are impervious to subjectivity) as the “modern”, more qualitatively-oriented linguists. [Fran; reaction journal]

In our discussion of [Wondratschek’s short story “Mittagspause”] I could not share in on the criticism. I enjoyed the text. I feel it is trying to portray a certain type of person in a certain situation. There is no deeper message but rather just a picture being painted. Since [literature] students believe there is always some sort of deeper message in anything literary,…, they will be looking for something in “Mittagspause” that may not exist. [Sam; reaction journal]

4.2 Structure

4.2.1 Dubious yet institutionalized dichotomies: Language vs. literature in US foreign language departments

The language-literature dichotomy or the idea that language teachers are not competent to teach literature and that literature teachers are above teaching language “has been institutionalized in departments of foreign languages and literatures in North American universities” (Kramsch, 1993, p. 7) and rests, in part, on the prevalent and perhaps more perturbing ‘skills versus content’ dichotomy in foreign language and literature study (see also Byrnes, 2001, p. 514, for the “separation of knowledge and language”). From this perspective, language is seen as a skill that is devoid of any intellectual content and
“becomes intellectually respectable only when learners are able to use it to express and discuss abstract ideas” (ibid., p. 3).

Despite the efforts of Byrnes (1998; 2000) and others to integrate the study, teaching, and scholarly investigation of language and literature on the theoretical, practical, and curricular levels in US FL departments, the institutionalized chasm between these complementary disciplines remains deep in most units. Bernhardt (1997, p. 13) maintains that there are “two distinct curricula in language departments, a language curriculum and a literature curriculum” each with their own objectives, materials and, sometimes, faculty. These two curricula are distinctly out of sync with one another, although the language curriculum generally has been conceived as a feeder program for the literature curriculum. The institutional dichotomization of language and literature has, in some cases, resulted in the departmental ghettoization of language teaching, language teachers, and language TE.

By way of extension, the applied linguist, (either correctly or incorrectly) conceptualized primarily as the individual who investigates the academically “less sophisticated” field of language teaching (Kramsch, 1993, p. 7), has been marginalized as well in the intellectual work of many US FL departments (Byrnes, 1998). For example, Bernhardt (1997, p. 4) asserts that language teachers “accept low status, higher course loads, lower salaries and often part-time employment” despite the fact that their courses typically generate 90% of a department’s enrollment and, therefore, financial support (see also Kramsch, 1995, p. 6; 2000a, p. 320; Rivers, 1993, p. 4).

Similar characterizations of language learning and teaching abound in the field of ESL where (intensive) English language programs are viewed routinely as a “cash cow” (Eskey, 1997, p. 25; see also Kaplan, 1997, p. 6), capable only of generating revenue for the departmental literature program (Bernhardt, 1997, p. 4). In step with the pervasive misconception that “anyone who can speak a language can teach it” (Eskey, 1997, p. 23), Kaplan (1997, p. 15) notes that language teachers typically are regarded as “second class citizens” in the hierarchy of academic faculty. Kramsch (1993, p. 7) argues that the language-literature dichotomy is not based in intellectual content, but rather that it “serves to maintain a certain academic, political, and economic power structure, where language teachers and literature scholars are careful not to tread on each other’s territories.”

The language-literature dichotomy was firmly in place in Fran and Sam’s academic unit. In this section, I restrict my comments on this split to the ways in which it was reflected in the structures of the departmental curriculum (see Patrikis, 1995) as well as in the disciplinary interests of the faculty members. The DA seminar under study was one of the first seminars in applied linguistics to be offered in Fran and Sam’s home department. Soon faculty discussions arose surrounding a proposal for a departmental M.A. in ‘Second Language Acquisition’ or SLA (see Kramsch, 2000, pp. 311-313, for mis/uses of the term ‘SLA’ in FL departments). It was reasoned that this new M.A.
would parallel the existing M.A. in literature. The intended bifurcation of the M.A. degree into ‘literature’ and ‘language’ tracks is an example par excellence of the institutionalized split between language and literature in the setting under investigation. If these two disciplines were understood to be inextricably inter-related and mutually co-constitutive (Byrnes, 2001; Kramsch, 2002), then the proposal might be for a single M.A. in which this relationship were reflected at the levels of both theory and praxis. This bifurcation of the departmental curriculum may represent the reluctant acceptance of applied linguistics as a ‘necessary evil’ in the established intellectual practices of the ‘national canonical’ foreign language department in question, but in no way does it reflect the legitimacy of language and FL teaching, the inextricable relationship of language and culture, and their centrality to the study of literature and, thus, to the intellectual work of FL departments (Byrnes, 1998; 2001; Kramsch, 1995, 2002; Patrikis, 1995; Seeba, 1989). According to Byrnes (2001, p. 514), “a separatist construal of knowledge and language”, embedded in the curricular structures and practices of Fran and Sam’s department, “supports the very dichotomy between teaching and scholarship and between teachers and scholars that has for so long sustained the status quo in FL departments, despite growing awareness of its serious flaws.”

4.2.2 Foreign language teacher education

If language study (and its scholarly investigation) are conceptualized as the poor cousins of literary studies instead of as integral parts of them (as a discourse-based approach would ensure [see Kramsch, 2000a, p. 320]), then it follows that a proportional amount of (scholarly) attention will be paid to FL TE. In a recent review of the literature on second language TE, Vélez-Rendón (2002, p. 457) confirms this speculation when she writes that “very little attention has been paid to how second language teachers learn to teach, how they develop teaching skills, [and] how they link theory to practice…” The marginalized status of language TE in US FL departments may be reflected best in quantitative assessments of the published knowledge base in this field. Bernhardt and Hammadou (1987) found only 78 articles on FL TE in their review of the literature from 1977 to 1987 and only 8% of these were research-based (see also Freeman & Johnson, 1998, p. 398; Schulz, 2000, pp. 516-517, for similar reviews). The paucity of published research on FL TE may be related to the fact that only 14% of Language Program Directors (LPDs), i.e. those individuals entrusted with the education of graduate student-teachers, has received a Ph.D. in a field related to FLL&T (Teschner, 1987, p. 29). Although the demand for faculty members with expertise in a sub-discipline of applied linguistics has increased in recent years, Kramsch (2000, p. 311) notes that there remains “a certain confusion about what an SLA specialist actually is….”

In current educational scholarship teaching is recognized as a highly interpretive, socially negotiated, eminently situated, and continuously restructured process in which the beliefs, values, and prior experiences of teachers play a definitive role (Freeman & Richards, 1996; Johnson & Golombok, 2002; Salomon & Perkins, 1998). Despite this
complex characterization, Freeman and Johnson (1998) suspect that many language teacher education programs continue to operate under the assumption that they must provide teachers with a codified body of knowledge about language, language learning, and language teaching [and that this] knowledge base...often remains compartmentalized in separate course offerings, continues to be transmitted through passive instructional strategies, and remains generally disconnected from the authentic activity of teaching in actual schools and classrooms (Freeman & Johnson, 1998, p. 402).

In Fran and Sam’s home unit, even the transmission of a codified body of language-specific knowledge was not guaranteed, since it was routine practice to send graduate student-teachers to another language department for their methods course. As a result, student-teachers in Fran and Sam’s unit did not have the opportunity to deal adequately with language-specific examples, texts, issues, and concerns in the course that constituted the curricular vehicle of their preparation as language teachers. Such an arrangement sends the implicit message to graduate student-teachers that FL TE (and, by extension, FL teaching) is not sufficiently important to be located department-internal and that it is thus peripheral to the intellectual work of the department.

4.3 The Influence of Structure on Fran and Sam’s Responses to DA in FLL&T.

Fran indicated that she wanted to include discourse analytic pedagogical applications of literary texts in her classroom, but suggested that it was difficult within the language program in which she was teaching. She explained that weekly meetings within the departmental teaching practicum left no time for the discussion of text-specific pedagogical interventions, since they consisted primarily of administrative concerns. The notes to the instructor in the teachers’ edition of the commercial textbook used in the department’s basic language program served as the primary source of suggestions for ‘what to do in class’ (personal communication to the author). As a systematic approach to language TE, this practice is dubious, since several scholars have argued that the profit-driven interests of commercial presses often result in (a) an obfuscated or streamlined portrayal of the foreign reality that the textbook is designed to convey (Kramsch, 1987; 1988), and (b) the simplification or even misrepresentation of the interrelationship between research findings in SLA and applied linguistics and classroom teaching practices (see Belz & Kinginger, 2003, for the presentation of the socio-pragmatic complexity of address forms in a number of introductory German-language textbooks). While Fran’s previously developed professional interests in identity, plurality, and hybridity may have primed her to adopt those aspects of DA that resonated with these constructs into her repertoire of analytic tools for literary analysis, she did appear to develop an understanding of the ways in which FL teaching also was bound together with these concerns. Her apparent willingness to incorporate many of these theories and techniques into her own FL teaching may belie a growing understanding of the intellectual validity of FL teaching and its crucial role in the intellectual work of FL
departments. It may be the case that the limited possibilities for the integration of literary texts and theory-based pedagogical applications of those texts into Fran’s language class in this particular setting exerted influence on her decision to leave the department in the following fall semester.

Prior to his participation in the DA seminar, Sam had taken numerous courses in the university’s linguistics program, in which Chomskyan approaches to linguistic inquiry were well-represented. As a result, Sam had experienced his primary socialization as a linguist in a scholarly discourse community where language was thought to be largely autonomous of socio-cultural factors. At the time of the DA seminar under study, there was no alternative scholarly community at Sam’s institution in which he might encounter a competing discourse with respect to the epistemology of language. If Sam were to adopt alternative perspectives on the nature of language and FL teaching, he may run the risk of not being recognized as a member of the scholarly discourse community into which he initially had been socialized (Gee, 1999, p. 20). For example, if he were to pursue his line of thought concerning the nuances and complexities of language-in-use (i.e., performance) that he began in an early entry in his reaction journal, then he might have to consider that FL teaching is not necessarily about breaking language down into smaller and smaller chunks and transmitting these chunks to students. He may have to reconsider his views on ‘functionalist’ approaches to FL teaching and he may no longer be able to uphold the opinion that discussions of the teaching of culture are “quite mundane.”

Such reconceptualizations of language and FL teaching may not only set Sam apart from the community of linguists at his institution, they may also complicate his livelihood as a student-teacher in his home unit. The disproportionate number of faculty lines devoted to literature study, the displacement of the methods course into other language departments, and the proclivity of the departmental teaching practicum toward administrative concerns may indicate to Sam that FL teaching is nothing to worry about; he can sit back and enjoy the theoretically-grounded, discourse-based suggestions for FL teaching that he was experiencing in the DA seminar because, in the grander political scheme of his home unit, he can afford to discount their implementation into his own language classroom. In short, all the structural signals at Sam’s institution appear to indicate that language and FL teaching are not validated components of the intellectual work of his degree-granting unit.

5. CONCLUSION

The social realist model suggests that psycho-biography, situated activity, setting, and context as well as history and power all influence the meanings that complex social actions have for the people involved. Based on an examination of course reaction journals for two graduate student-teachers of German, I have demonstrated how aspects of their psycho-biographies (i.e., their fundamental belief systems and their disciplinary interests) influenced the ways in which they perceived expertise in DA to be of relevance.
to their professional activities as graduate-student teachers.

Fran, a student of literature with interests in feminism and post-modern criticism, appeared interested in adopting those discourse-inspired teaching activities that resonated with her notions about the nature of reality and the goals of language and literature study. Sam, a structural linguist, found it difficult to positively value more functionally oriented approaches to linguistic inquiry.

Aspects of the institutional setting and socio-professional context in which these two teachers were embedded also may have contributed to the ways in which they chose to interface with expertise in DA. The minimal and theoretically impoverished attention to TE in their particular FL department as well as institutionalized attitudes concerning the disciplinary boundaries of the language and literature curricula may have sent the implicit message that while it was acceptable to take a seminar on DA, it was quite another thing to re-conceptualize one’s notion of language, language learning, language teaching, and, ultimately, the nature of the intellectual work of a FL department.

Thus, the education of FL teachers as ‘discourse analysts’, i.e. those with an awareness of the importance of both “little d” and “big D” discourse, appears to be rooted in the macro-level structure of the institution and the societal context in which the institution is embedded as much as it is located in the personal agency of any particular student-teacher. In effect, the education of FL teachers as discourse analysts “takes a department”, as Byrnes (2001) proposes. It requires an institutionalized conceptualization of the intellectual work of FL departments to not only include language and FL learning and teaching as curricular satellites of literary and cultural studies, but to place them at their center ideologically, structurally, and in praxis. This is because language and culture are inextricably bound, as Gee’s (1999) definition of discourse illustrates. Indeed, grammar (in a broad sense) is “a theory of human experience” (Halliday, 1990, cited in Kramsch, 1993, p. 8) and must therefore form the core of any intellectual enterprise that seeks to interpret people by means of the linguistically mediated cultural products (i.e. literary texts) that they produce.

In the case of Fran and Sam, however, it appears that the development of FL teachers is framed and determined within a socio-professional context that appears to devalue them. Perhaps the influence of this fundamental disconnect between language and literature is reflected in the following comment by a student of literature and teacher of language in the seminar under study: “I don’t know, it seems like an awful lot to learn; wouldn’t it just be easier to follow the book?”

NOTES

1 Earlier versions of this chapter were presented at the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) in Dallas, Texas, in November, 1999 and at the Modern Language Association (MLA) in Chicago, Illinois, in December, 1999. I would like to express my thanks and gratitude to Karen E. Johnson for her help in the conceptualization of the ACTFL version and for her professional and personal support in general.

2 Although I have focused on the foreign language environment in this chapter, many of the arguments could
apply equally well to the second language environment.

3 In the past, I have been the director of a FL language program at a public institution in the United States. At the institution where I taught the DA seminar under investigation (a different university), I did not have any contractual responsibilities for the language program nor was I responsible for the methods course.

4 My field notes as a participant observer during classroom discussions indicate that there was no clear consensus concerning the quality of Schiffrin’s (1994) writing.

5 See Long (1990) for a similar argument with respect to theoretical plurality in the field of applied linguistics.
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