Research in the teaching of speaking

Michael McCarthy

University of Nottingham

Anne O'Keeffe

Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick

This chapter reviews research and practice in six main areas relevant to the teaching of speaking: (1) the growing influence of spoken corpora, (2) the debates concerning NS and NNS models for spoken pedagogy, (3) the issue of authenticity in spoken materials, (4) approaches to understanding speaking in the classroom, (5) the selection of texts and aspects of spoken language for the teaching of speaking, and (6) developments in materials and methods for the teaching of speaking. Spoken corpora, whether NS corpora collected in 'old' or 'new' variety locations, or NNS corpora based on learner data or expert/successful user data, have generated vigorous debate as to how spoken language should be modelled for teaching, and their influence is being seen in shifts in methodology towards language-awareness-based approaches as well as new materials based on lexico-grammatical and discoursal corpus evidence. Various approaches to understanding classroom speaking are also reviewed, including discourse analysis, conversation analysis, cognitive approaches, and the Vygotskian perspective.

Applications of insights from these approaches are reviewed, especially how the approaches affect the selection of texts and language features to be taught. Finally, practical discussion on the teaching of specific spoken genres is reviewed and probable future directions are discussed.

The growth of spoken corpora

In the five years since Anne Burns summarised the then current research in the teaching of speaking (Burns, 1998), it is probably fair to say that there has been no paradigm shift in methods and practices, and much of the landscape so accurately described by Burns remains unchanged. However, our knowledge concerning spoken language has indeed changed, mainly through developments in spoken corpus linguistics. Burns' survey devoted sub-headings to the influence of discourse analysis and conversation analysis; it had no section devoted to spoken corpora, nor did Bygate's survey of theoretical perspectives on speaking in the same volume of *ARAL* (Bygate, 1998). It is hard to imagine this present survey article, five years on, without an account of spoken corpora and their growing influence on the pedagogy of speaking. New understandings have prompted new debates about the 'what' and the 'how' of the teaching of speaking, and the debate is seeing its fruits in a number of applications.

In recent years advances have been achieved in spoken corpus size, in the number of languages which now boast spoken corpora, and in applications which have taken corpus linguistics beyond its roots in stylistics and lexicography into the realms of spoken lexico-grammar, discourse- and conversation analysis, and pragmatics.

For English, spoken corpora which have been or are being exploited for the teaching of speaking include the spoken components of the British National Corpus (BNC) (Aston & Burnard, 1998) and of the Bank of English (see Moon, 1997), the British/Irish CANCODE spoken corpus (McCarthy, 1998; Carter, 1998), the Michigan corpus of academic spoken English (MICASE) (Simpson, Lucka & Ovens, 2000) and the Longman Spoken American Corpus (Stern, 1997). The spoken component of the American National Corpus will undoubtedly also contribute to spoken pedagogy research when it is released (scheduled for mid-2003) (Ide & Macleod, 2001; Ide, Reppen & Suderman, 2002).

The expansion of spoken corpora to embrace a wider range of language varieties is also raising new issues for pedagogical modelling. In the case of English, the ICE (International Corpus of English) project makes available spoken data for the Englishes of Hong Kong (Bolton et al., 2003), New Zealand (Holmes, 1996), Singapore (Ooi, 1997), Great Britain (Nelson, Wallis & Aarts, 2002), Ireland (Kallen & Kirk, 2001), Nigeria Banjo (1996), and the Caribbean (Nero, 2000), with others under development. Spoken Irish English is also attested in the Limerick Corpus of Irish English (L-CIE) (Farr, Murphy & O'Keeffe, 2003). Other new English spoken corpus investigations include the work of Cheng and Warren (1999; 2000) for Hong Kong. Corpora are also currently influencing the teaching of spoken French, with similar debates about the modelling of spoken language for pedagogy as those underway with regard to English (Beeching, 1997; Di Vito, 1998; Kinginger, 1999; Lawson, 2001)[1].

Native (NS) and non-native speaker (NNS) models for the teaching of speaking

A number of recent publications debate the issue of NS versus learner and NNS corpora (Flowerdew, 2000; Nero, 2000; Warschauer, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2001; Prodromou, 2003). Prodromou (1997), whose work is based on a mixed NS/NNS spoken English corpus, had already raised issues concerning the undermining effect of spoken corpora for NNS faced with varieties and cultures that they can "never master, never own" (p. 5). Reacting to similar concerns, Seidlhofer proposes a spoken corpus of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) which will help to profile ELF as robust and independent of English as a native language and may establish "something like an index of communicative redundancy" with pedagogical applications (Seidlhofer, 2001, p. 147). The shift away from the NS as the sole model for spoken pedagogy is further underlined by the introduction into the debate of terms aimed at levelling the playing field between NS and NNS as potential models. Building on earlier work by Leung et al. (1997) such terms include "expert users" (McCarthy, 2001, pp. 139-142) and "successful users of English" (SUEs) (Prodromou, 2003), with a focus on the modeling of successful language users (whether NS or NNS) in non-pedagogical contexts. Meanwhile the *The Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage* (LINDSEI) set up in 1995 (see De Cock, 1998, 2000) provides spoken data for the analysis of learner language (see also Granger et al., 2002).

From 'spoken language' to 'speaking': relevant data for input

Bygate (1998) observed that second language speaking (except for pronunciation) had been something of a Cinderella compared with listening, reading and writing, but recent research is redressing that imbalance (see also Bygate, 2001). Current debates

include whether speaking materials do or should truly reflect naturally-occurring spoken language, what teachers' and learners' perceptions are of the importance of using real speech samples (Timmis, 2002; Hughes, 2002, pp. 67-70), and whether learner output reflects authentic spoken patterns. However, there is by no means universal agreement on the relationship between descriptions of spoken language and methods, materials and activities.

Naturally-occurring data has not been the only source for the pedagogic modeling of speech and debate continues as to how elicited speech data compare with naturally-occurring speech, especially data generated by discourse completion tasks (DCTs), which aim to describe what constitutes spoken pragmatic competence based on informants' intuitive reactions to situational prompts. Golato (2003) looks at differences between naturally occurring data analysed using conversation analysis (CA), and DCTs constructed on the basis of naturally occurring conversations. Golato notes that while CA clearly enables the study of language organization in natural settings, CA analyses cannot necessarily be extrapolated to other situations. DCTs, on the other hand, may be construed as a condensation of the informant's prior experience with language. Golato also evaluates other data collection procedures (questionnaires, recall protocols, role play, etc.), and discusses the problems and prospects for generalizing from different kinds of data. Billmyer and Varghese (2000) argue that, in practice, DCTs will continue to be an important resource for spoken pragmatic pedagogy. Their study examines systematic modifications (adding information on social and contextual variables) to DCT situational prompts, and responses from NS and NNS. Modified prompts produced longer, more elaborated responses from both NS and NNS informants. Yuan (2001) further finds that

orally-produced DCTs generate more natural speech features than written DCTs. Such findings suggest that carefully constructed DCTs are not without positive value in speaking pedagogy.

McCarthy (2001, pp. 106-110) and McCarthy and Carter (2001) have continued to argue for a description of spoken grammar and vocabulary which is independent, based on the evidence of spoken corpora, and not presented merely as a list of deviations from written norms, as a means of providing systematic linguistic input for pedagogies of speaking (see also Carter, Hughes & McCarthy, 2000; Hughes, 2002, pp. 61-65). However, not least of the problems of using spoken data in pedagogy is the question of what the basic unit of spoken grammar might consist of. In the absence of well-formed sentences (which are famously rare in causal, NS conversation), clause- and phrase-based units seem to be more appropriate (Foster, Tonkyn & Wigglesworth, 2000; Burns, 2001). On the other hand, corpus analysts and other linguists alike have in recent years stressed the central role of fixed 'chunks' of various kinds in everyday, fluent speech. Wray (2000, 2002), investigating formulaic sequences (which include idioms, collocations and institutionalised sentence frames), stresses that such sequences circumvent the analytical processes associated with the interpretation of open syntactic frames in terms of both reception and production. Attempts to encourage the analysis of formulaic sequences in second language pedagogy are criticised as "pursuing native-like linguistic usage by promoting entirely unnative-like processing behaviour" (Wary, 2000, p. 463). Wray's work attempts to move away from a static, behaviorist account of formulaic sequences, emphasizing their nature as "a dynamic response to the demands of language use", which "will manifest differently as those demands vary from moment to moment and speaker to

speaker" (Wray, 2002, p. 5). Hunston (2002), discussing lexico-grammatical patterns as evidenced in the Bank of English corpus, suggests that sequences such as verb complementation patterns, if learned and stored as holistic units, can contribute greatly to spoken fluency, producing, when chained together in connected, meaningful strings, "pattern flow". Hunston advocates a task-based approach to this aspect of fluency, rejecting presentational approaches as inappropriate to the need to raise awareness of features of speaking as a whole, as opposed to learning individual patterns.

Authenticity and spoken materials

Despite advances in recording technology and available descriptions of naturally occurring conversations, dialogues produced for classroom use are for the most part scripted. While there are often sound pedagogical reasons for using scripted dialogues, their status as a vehicle for enhancing conversation skills has been challenged in recent years (Carter, 1998; Burns, 2001; Burns, Joyce & Gollin, 2001). Burns (2001) notes that scripted dialogues rarely reflect the unpredictability and dynamism of conversation, or the features and structures of natural spoken discourse, and that students who encounter only scripted spoken language have less opportunity to extend their linguistic repertoires in ways that prepare them for unforeseeable interactions outside of the classroom.

Carter (1998) compared real data from the CANCODE spoken corpus with dialogues from textbooks and found that the textbook dialogues lacked core spoken language features such as discourse markers, vague language, ellipsis and hedges (see also Burns, 2001). Burns (2001) and Carter (1997) both refer to the lack of three-part exchanges in question and answer sequences in textbooks. They point out that two-part question-answer sequences which often appear in textbook dialogues are not the norm in

real conversations; replies to questions are usually followed up by some fixed or routinised phrase such as *really, I thought so* (however, see the discussion of exchange structure below).

Modelling speaking in the classroom

Discourse analysis: exchange structure and classroom speaking

Kasper (2001) begins by considering the widely held view that "the IRF routine is an unproductive interactional format for the learning of pragmatics and discourse" (p.518). Exchanges consisting of the familiar classroom pattern of initiation (I), response (R) and follow-up (F), often referred to as IRF exchanges, fail to give opportunities for tackling the complex demands of everyday conversation, especially since teachers usually exercise the follow-up role, while learners often remain in passive, respondent roles. However, Kasper goes on to argue that the negative reputation enjoyed by the IRF exchange may not be the whole story and that what really matters is the kind of interactional status assigned by the teacher to individual learners: where students are seen as primary interactants in speaking activities, teachers offer them more participation rights in the conversation. Kasper refers to evidence which suggests that teachers can help their learners to become actively involved in interaction, even within the typical IRF patterning found in teacher-fronted classroom dialogue.

McCarthy (2002, 2003) argues that responding and follow-up moves play a key role in 'listenership', the manifestation of engagement in the discourse even when one is not in the role of main speaker, a situation NNS often find themselves in. For McCarthy, listenership is not the same as 'listening' in the conventional four-skills paradigm, and is

an important component of the speaking skill. However, Ohta (2001) finds that the overwhelming majority of classroom follow-up moves are spoken by the teacher; learners get few opportunities to use typical listener follow-ups and only experience the teacher's moves as peripheral participants. Ohta argues for peer-to-peer interaction as providing the best opportunities for learners to produce appropriate listener behaviour. Notwithstanding, exposure to the teacher's use of follow-up moves along with explicit guidance on the use of responsive moves can help students gradually move towards more productive use in peer-to-peer speaking activities. S. Walsh (2002) distinguishes different modes of teacher talk and illustrates how these may hinder or optimize learner contributions. More generally, Hall and M. Walsh (2002) give a relevant and wide-ranging survey of current research into teacher-student interaction and language learning.

Conversation analysis and speaking tasks

Advocacy of conversation analysis (CA) as a means of understanding and improving speaking in pedagogical contexts has continued to grow in recent years. Wong (2000) notes that CA illuminates how local choices unfold in interaction and can home in on aspects of talk which are relevant for the participants themselves. Ducharme and Bernard (2001) argue along the same lines in their study of learners of French, using micro-analyses of videotaped interactions and retrospective interviews to gain insights into the perspectives of participants. Mori (2002) uses CA to analyze a speaking activity in a class of NNS learners of Japanese, where students exchanged experiences and opinions with Japanese NS invited to the class. The resulting interaction resembled an interview, with a succession of questions by the students and answers from the NS guests. Interestingly, more natural discussion came about when students made spontaneous

utterances and when they seemed to be attending more to the moment-by-moment unfolding of the talk. Mori ponders how the talk revealed the speakers' orientation towards the institutionalized nature of the task. Overall, the CA argument is that factors of task design and execution can influence the resultant talk in ways that CA can make plain, with clear implications for the improvement of the design and implementation of speaking tasks. However, Rampton *et al.* (2002) warn of the lack of a 'learning' dimension in CA studies of this kind: because CA is a very local kind of analysis, it lends itself less easily to providing evidence of actual development of speaking ability over time.

<u>Cognitive approaches to speaking tasks</u>

Other recent work examines the design and implementation of speaking tasks from the point of view of fluency, complexity and accuracy of production (see Bygate, 2001 for an overview of the evolution of research in this area). Robinson (2001) claims that increasing the cognitive complexity of speaking tasks affects production, with greater lexical variation manifested in more complex versions and greater fluency evidenced in simpler versions of the task. Yuan and Ellis (2003) assert that pre-task planning positively aids learners' spoken production, especially with regard to fluency and complexity, albeit accuracy may not benefit so obviously. Yuan and Ellis also examine on-line planning, where learners are given unlimited time to formulate and monitor their speech while performing, and claim that on-line planning positively influences accuracy and grammatical complexity. Repetition and recycling and their contribution to the increasing integration over time of fluency, complexity and accuracy of oral production is also receiving attention (Bygate, 2001; Lynch and Maclean, 2001). Additionally, the role

of the teacher vis-à-vis the design and execution of tasks and the teacher's role of providing scaffolding (see the section on Vygotsky, below) to help learners develop their oral competence has come under the spotlight (Samuda, 2001).

The Vygotskian perspective on speaking

Since the publication of Lantolf and Appel's (1998) and Lantolf's (2000) influential works on Vygotsky, interest has grown in how such a perspective feeds into speaking pedagogy. Of central importance are the notions of scaffolding and the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Scaffolding is the cognitive support provided by an adult or other guiding person to aid a child or learner, and is realised in dialogue so that the child/learner can come to make sense of difficult tasks. The ZPD is the distance between where the child/learner is developmentally and what s/he can potentially achieve in interaction with adults or more capable peers (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). In the Vygotskian paradigm, instructors (or peers) and their pupils interactively co-construct the arena for development, it is not pre-determined and has no lock-step limits or ceiling. Meaning is created in dialogue (including dialogue with the self, often manifested in 'private speech') during goal-directed activities. Attempts to see how these notions operate in reality in classrooms include Machado (2000), who demonstrates how peer-to-peer scaffolding in the preparatory phases of spoken classroom tasks (mutual help with the interpretation of the tasks and the wording of meanings) is reflected in evidence of internalisation of such help in the performance phases of the same tasks. Machado suggests that peer-to-peer scaffolding may be just as important as expert-novice scaffolding, a theme reiterated by Ko, Schallert and Walters (2003), who examine what marks out higher quality from lower quality negotiation-of-meaning interactions during a

storytelling task (see also Kasper, 2001). As well as through teachers' contributions, improved storytelling was assisted by peer contributions in a negotiation phase between the first and second telling of a story, which, the researchers suggest, shows learners playing a central role in scaffolding (see also Shumin, 2002).

However, Kinginger (2002) warns against the incorporation of Vygotskian notions such as scaffolding and the ZPD into existing practices in oral pedagogy in ways that the notions simply become a justification for current practices (e.g. the input-output hypotheses, all and any types of pair- and group-work tasks, teacher feedback moves, etc.) rather than a genuine re-examination of the role of social interaction in language development. In this respect, Kinginger highlights the work of Merrill Swain and her associates (Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Nassaji & Swain, 2000), who see the ZPD more as an open-ended opportunity for unanticipated development and unpredictability rather than some fixed territory circumscribed by input and output or the closed cycles of teacher-learner exchanges.

Descriptive frameworks and the teaching of speaking

Hughes (2002, p. 38) takes the view that, in general, insights from disciplines such as discourse analysis and CA have been slow to filter through to the teaching of speaking. However, increasingly, applied linguists are addressing the applicability of such insights. Slade (1997) rejects the notion that casual conversation cannot be taught explicitly because it is unstructured. Explicit features that can be taught, she argues, include generic descriptions at the macro-level and moves and speech functions at the micro-level (however, see Lee, 2001 on the as yet inadequate generic modelling of speech; see also Hughes, 2002, p. 36). Shumin (2002) also supports the view that

speaking needs to be taught explicitly, and a number of authors point to the active promotion of language awareness as a way forward (Carter, 1997; Van Lier, 1998; Clennell, 1999; O'Keeffe & Farr, 2003). Hughes (2002, p. 59-61) notes that awareness-raising approaches should not be judged by the amount of speech learners produce but more in terms of depth of understanding of speaking and of why speakers make the choices they do.

Burns (2001) surveys the potential contribution to the pedagogy of speaking of systemic functional linguistics (SFL), exchange structure (IRF) analysis, CA, critical discourse analysis (CDA), and speech act theory and pragmatics. She sees these as relevant "tools" which can "underpin communicative language teaching" (2001, p.125) and which the teacher can draw on depending on student needs and the types of discourse features to be foregrounded.

SFL, according to Burns, can provide a framework for analysing samples of spoken discourse in order to highlight key aspects of a text, for example its genre, as well as the relationship between the Hallidayan notions of *field, tenor* and *mode* and lexico-grammatical choice. Burns sees IRF analysis as a useful complement to SFL as it focuses on the moment-by-moment process of interaction in context. She suggests that it can help students to increase their linguistic repertoire (for example an awareness of follow-up moves) as well as equipping them with skills to renegotiate their positions in encounters outside of the classroom. Within a CA framework, Burns suggests, language tasks can be developed to explore features of conversation such as turn-taking organisation and sequencing (e.g. discussing speaker roles, rights to turns, etc.) and turn types (e.g. observing the nature of preferred and dispreferred responses, and developing strategies

such as repair and reformulation). Burns also sees potential for pedagogical applications from CDA (see Coffin, 2001), which offers opportunities for classroom focus on aspects of power and gate-keeping roles within spoken interactions. Speech act theory and pragmatics, like CA, according to Burns, focus on the micro-structures of conversation and can offer teachers the opportunity to highlight for students the appropriateness of utterances, how speakers negotiate certain situations (e.g. accepting/rejecting invitations) as well as providing a framework for the performance of speech acts, for example through role plays and simulations (see also Burns, Joyce & Gollin, 2001).

Spoken language materials in the classroom

Selecting spoken texts for classroom use

Burns, Gollin and Joyce, (1997) suggest that if learners are involved in spoken text analysis, it should be directly applicable to the speaking task. They suggest as an example that learners could be presented with a partially transcribed text and be given the task of listening to the tape recording so as to fill in features such as backchannel responses in order to raise awareness of such conversational features. They also suggest that learners transcribe small amounts of their own conversation and compare particular features such as length of turn and overlaps, with NS transcripts. For a teacher wishing to use spoken data in the classroom, they suggest the following analytical framework: 1) transcribe the recording, 2) give the background information to the text, 3) analyse the text using an analytical approach (e.g. SFL, IRF, etc.; see the review of Burns, 2001, above), and 4) identify the significant teaching points which arise from the analysis. This approach, as in Burns (2001), argues for teachers to be well versed in methods of analysis

of spoken language and aligns with the general move towards the exploitation of attested spoken data.

<u>Selecting aspects of spoken language to focus on in teaching</u>

Burns, Joyce and Gollin (2001) offer a practical handbook for teaching spoken discourse which provides guidelines for collecting, transcribing and using authentic language, as well as tasks and case studies. Riggenbach (1999) provides numerous template activities to practise macro- (e.g. turn-taking) and micro- (e.g. pronunciation) speaking skills. In what still remains one of the few papers to give practical direction as to syllabus design for teaching conversation, Dörnyei and Thurrell (1994) noted that teachers are often unsure about which topic areas they should focus on in teaching conversation. Based on a synthesis of research from fields such as discourse analysis, CA, and the study of communicative competence, they suggest teaching points under four headings: conversational rules and structure (e.g. openings, topic shifting and closing), conversational strategies (e.g. paraphrase, asking for repetition and clarification), functions and meaning in conversation (e.g. illocutionary functions), and social and cultural contexts (e.g. social norms of appropriateness). Boyer's (2003) textbook integrates traditional speaking domains such as pronunciation, stress patterns, intonation and language functions (e.g. making suggestions), with lexico-grammar in spoken language (e.g. question tags, pronouns) , conversational strategies (changing the topic), discourse-level features (e.g. ellipsis, small talk) and situational contexts (e.g. stages in a medical consultation). Other recent textbooks on teaching conversation include Zelman and Moran (1996), and Measday (1998).

Teaching distinct genres of spoken interaction

<u>Small talk</u>

Shumin (2002) stresses the need for learners to be able to engage in small talk in the target language (i.e. inconsequential talk about the weather, traffic, and so on). Such interactional talk functions to create a sense of social communion. Shumin therefore suggests that from the outset adult learners should develop skill in short, interactional exchanges in which they are required to make only one or two utterances at a time (e.g. *I hate rush-hour traffic – me too*).

Cunningham Florez (1999) suggests that speaking lessons can follow a classic pattern of preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and extension, and gives the example of teaching small talk. In the preparation phase, learners are shown visuals of people in informal settings and brainstorm on what they might be saying. The presentation phase then has video clips of people doing small talk, during which students focus on the topics of talk and the language involved. The practice phase maintains the dual focus on topics and language with simple dialogues generated by the learners based on the material of the earlier stages. In the evaluation phase, learners compare their dialogues with a teacher-prepared dialogue, and discuss similarities and differences. Finally, the extension phase sends the learners out into the community (where this is feasible) to observe small talk in real settings and then report back to their class. A combination of traditional pedagogic structuring and the learner-as-researcher is at the center of this kind of activity, especially in relation to a conversational genre difficult to recreate naturally in an institutional setting.

Discussions

Green *et al.* (2002) note that discussion skills are much neglected in the EFL/ESL classroom, and are critical of overly structured discussion activities. However, Shumin (2002) notes that the totally unstructured alternative of simply assigning a topic to students for discussion is not enough to ensure that speaking skills will be developed. In this respect, Green *et al.* (2002) suggest a three-stage format for the implementation of successful classroom discussions which are not overly controlled: 1) pre-discussion (discussion groups are formed, with four per group as the optimum, possible topics are chosen; responsibility for researching the topic are divided within the groups), 2) discussion (the groups discuss the topic while partner groups observe and monitor), and 3) post-discussion (peer-feedback from the observer-evaluators, plus teacher feedback, and finally groups decide on ways to extend the topic or choose a new topic). Lam and Wong (2000) identify key strategies which students need in order to play an effective part in discussion: seeking clarification, clarifying oneself, and checking that other people have understood one's message. While Lam and Wong's study underscores the value of strategy training, they raise two issues: 1) the necessity to support strategy training with linguistic scaffolding, and (2) the importance of peer help and co-operation in facilitating strategy use. A number of recent classroom resource books on discussions are now widely available, for example, Wallwork (1997a, 1997b), Barnard, (1997), Kehe (1998), and Folse and Ivone (2002a, 2002b).

Narratives

Slade (1997), in her research into workplace talk, found that social conversation were dominated by narrative genres, but notes that such genres are rarely represented in

language teaching materials. She identifies four types of stories common in casual talk (narratives, anecdotes, exempla and recounts), and argues strongly that the generic structure of narratives can be taught explicitly and that those aspects of story-telling that are culturally specific can be discussed (for further description of everyday storytelling see Norrick, 2000). Jones (2002) proposes a strategy for teaching the narrative pattern of 'the reminiscence story'. Based on Deacon (2000), Jones looks at the technique of the 'split story', which involves telling students a story, but stopping at a crucial point and inviting students to provide their own imaginative ending (see also Jones, 2001). According to Wajnryb (2003), stories are a familiar and reassuring way of acquiring language and therefore can be easily applied to the language classroom. Wajnryb's (2003) textbook aims to promote the exploration of story-telling as discourse in the language classroom and provides examples of meaningful activities which can be used in a range of teaching situations (see also Paran and Watts, 2003 for a collection of stories and related classroom activities).

Future directions

Hughes (2002) repeatedly stresses the need for proper social and cultural contextualisation of speaking activities, and there certainly seems to be a growing awareness that speaking activities, however cleverly designed, should not take place in a void, separated from the social and cultural life of the learner, and undoubtedly this will be an important direction for future research in the teaching of speaking. Alongside this, new definitions of 'literacy' are emerging which are no longer singularly focused on writing, but see literacy as encompassing an awareness of the nature of written and

spoken texts and the development of literacy as intimately bound up with communicative activity in the classroom (Kern, 2000).

Technology and the blurring of the traditional speech-writing division as new modes of communication emerge are also at the center of discussions of how to enhance speaking pedagogy. Payne and Whitney (2002), for example, already claim that synchronous computer-mediated communication (CMC) can indirectly improve L2 speaking proficiency by fostering the same cognitive mechanisms which underlie spontaneous conversational speech. Their study shows that an experimental group for whom two of four contact hours per week took place in an internet chatroom environment performed better in speaking than a control group. One important implication of the use of technological support, Payne and Whitney claim, is that learning environments can, by design, reduce the cognitive burden and thereby have a facilitating effect for oral production. Simpson (2002), also investigating synchronous CMC, suggests that the communication, although written is "conversation-like" and that CMC generates communicative strategies that are medium-appropriate, borrowing from conversation, but taking on a special identity of their own. Although in its early days, such research points to fresh possibilities for enhancing the teaching of speaking.

When the time comes for the next *ARAL* review of teaching speaking, we can expect further progress in the application of spoken corpus research. Published classroom materials are likely to increasingly reflect the growing body of research into spoken discourse, and useful insights may be available as to the global use of spoken English with implications for teaching it in an international context.

ANNOTATED REFERENCES

Burns, A. (2001). Analysing spoken discourse: implications for TESOL. In A. Burns &
C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analysing English in a global context: a reader* (pp. 123-
148). London: Routledge.

A wide-ranging survey of the potential contribution to language teaching of a
number of approaches to the analysis of discourse, including systemic
functional linguistics, exchange structure analysis, conversation analysis,
critical discourse analysis, and speech act theory and pragmatics. The essence
of each approach is summarised and from each Burns extrapolates relevant
analytical tools which can be applied to conversational data for the purposes
of language teaching.

Burns, A., Joyce, H., & Gollin, S. (2001). '*I see what you mean', using spoken discourse
in the classroom*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching
and Research.

This is designed as a teachers' handbook for introducing naturally-occurring
discourse into the classroom. It provides background information on socially-
based theoretical approaches to the analysis of discourse and a workable
framework for syllabus design and classroom implementation. It also gives
practical guidance about transcribing spoken language, as well as principles
for assessment.

Bygate, M. (2001). Speaking. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.) *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 14-20). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bygate's chapter provides an historical perspective for the teaching of oral language (or lack thereof) over the years across different approaches and methodologies. It also surveys the characteristics of speech and stresses how it is distinct from writing both as a process and a product. Contrasting perspectives and research on speaking tasks in language learning are cogently summarised and the need for more longitudinal classroom-based research in this area is highlighted.

Hughes, R. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Speaking*. London: Pearson Education.

Hughes' book gives a great deal of historical and contextual background for the research and teaching of speaking and is a good source of information on current paradigms and issues. In dealing with the question of teaching materials, Hughes discusses the issues surrounding the role of 'real' speech in the classroom. The book also includes suggestions for action research for both classroom practitioners and students, and is a useful source of information on available resources for researching and teaching speaking, both in print and new media (CD-ROM and the Internet).

OTHER REFERENCES

Aston, G., & Burnard, L. (1998). *The BNC handbook: exploring the British National Corpus with SARA*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Banjo, A. (1996). The Sociolinguistics of English in Nigeria and the ICE project. In S. Greenbaum (Ed.), *Comparing English Word-Wide: The International Corpus of English* (pp. 239-248). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barnard, R. (1997). Good news, bad news: new stories for listening and discussion: student book. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beeching, K. (1997). French for specific purposes: the case for spoken corpora. *Applied Linguistics 18*, 374-394.

Billmyer, K., & Varghese, M. (2000). Investigating instrument-based pragmatic variability: effects of enhancing discourse completion tests. *Applied Linguistics 21*, 517-552.

Bolton, K., Gisborne, N., Hung, J., & Nelson, G. (2003). *The International Corpus of English project in Hong Kong*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Boyer, S. (2003). *Understanding spoken English. A focus on everyday language in context*. Glenbrook, NSW: Boyer Educational Resources.

Burns, A. (1998). Teaching speaking. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18*, 102-123.

Burns, A., Gollin, S., & Joyce, H. (1997). Authentic spoken texts in the language classroom. *Prospect, 12*, 72-86.

Bygate, M. (1998). Theoretical perspectives on speaking. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18*, 20-42.

Carter, R. (1997). Speaking Englishes, speaking cultures, using CANCODE. *Prospect 12*, 4-11.

Carter, R. (1998). Orders of reality: CANCODE, communication and culture. *ELT Journal, 52*, 43-56.

Carter, R., Hughes, R., & McCarthy, M. J. (2000). *Exploring Grammar in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (1999). Facilitating a description of intercultural conversations: the Hong Kong Corpus of conversational English. *ICAME Journal, 23*, 5-20.

Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2000). The Hong Kong Corpus of Spoken English: language learning through language description. In L. Burnard & T. McEnery, *Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective* (pp. 133-144). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Clennell, C. (1999). Promoting pragmatic awareness and spoken discourse skills within EAP classes. *ELT Journal, 53*, 83-91.

Coffin, C. (2001). Theoretical approaches to written language – a TESOL perspective. In A. Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analysing English in a global context: a reader* (pp. 93-122). London: Routledge.

Cunningham Florez. M. (1999). Improving adult English language learners' speaking skills. *ERIC Digest*, *June 1999*. ED425304. National Center for ESL Literacy Education. Available on the world-wide-web at http://www.cal.org/ncle/digests/Speak.htm. Accessed September 2003.

Deacon, B. (2000). Sp-Stories-lit. *The Language Teacher, 24*, 32-33.

De Cock, S. (1998). A recurrent word combination approach to the study of formulae in the speech of native and non-native speakers of English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 3,* 59-80.

De Cock, S. (2000). Repetitive phrasal chunkiness and advanced EFL speech and writing. In C. Mair & M. Hundt (Eds.) *Corpus linguistics and linguistic theory. Papers from the twentieth international conference on English language research on computerized corpora (ICAME 20), Freiburg im Breisgau 1999* (pp.51-68). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Di Vito, N. (1998). *Patterns across spoken and written French. Empirical research on the interaction among forms, functions and genres*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1994). Teaching conversational skills intensively: course content and rationale. *ELT Journal, 48*, 40-49.

Ducharme, D. & Bernard, R. (2001). Communication breakdowns: an exploration of contextualization in native and non-native speakers of French. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 825-847.

Farr, F., Murphy, B., & O'Keeffe, A. (in press). The Limerick Corpus of Irish English: design, description and application. *Teanga, 21*.

Flowerdew, J. (2000). Globalization discourse: a view from the East. *Discourse and Society, 13*, 209-225.

Folse, K.S., & Ivone, J. A. (2002a). First discussion starters: speaking fluency for beginning and low-intermediate ESL/EFL students. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Folse, K. S., & Ivone, J. A. (2002b). *More discussion starters activities for building speaking fluency*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring spoken language: a unit for all reasons. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 354-375.

Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: a comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics, 24,* 90-121.

Granger, S., Hung, J., & Petch-Tyson, S. (Eds). (2002). Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Green, C. F, Christopher E. R., & Lam J. (2002). Developing discussion skills in the ESL classroom. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practices* (pp. 225-233). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 22*, 186-203.

Holmes, J. (1996). The New Zealand spoken component of ICE: Some methodological challenges. In S. Greenbaum (Ed.), *Comparing English World-Wide: The International Corpus of English* (pp. 163-178). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunston, S. (2002). Pattern grammar, language teaching and linguistic variation. In R. Reppen, S. Fitzmaurice, & D. Biber (Eds.), *Using corpora to explore linguistic variation* (pp. 167-183). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ide, N., & Macleod, C. (2001). The American National Corpus: A Standardized Resource of American English. *Proceedings of corpus linguistics 2001,* Lancaster UK: University of Lancaster. Available on the world-wide web at: http://americannationalcorpus.org/pubs.html. Consulted September 2003.

Ide, N., Reppen, R., & Suderman, K. (2002). The American National Corpus: more than the web can provide . In *Proceedings of the Third Language Resources and Evaluation Conference* (LREC) (pp. 839-44). Las Palmas, Canary Islands, Spain. Available on the world-wide web at: http://americannationalcorpus.org/pubs.html. Consulted September 2003.

Jones, R. E. (2001). A consciousness-raising approach to the teaching of conversational story telling skills. *ELT Journal, 55*, 155-163.

Jones, R. E. (2002). We used to do this and we'd also do that: a discourse pattern for teaching the reminiscence story. *The Language Teacher 26* (2). Available on the world-wide web at http://langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/02/feb/jones.html. Accessed September 2003.

Kallen, J. L., & Kirk, J. M. (2001). Convergence and divergence in the verb phrase in Irish standard English: a corpus-based approach. In: J. M. Kirk & D. P. Ó Baoill (Eds.), *Language links: the languages of Scotland and Ireland* (pp. 59-79). Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona.

Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics, 22*, 502-530.

Kehe, D. (1998). *Discussion strategies.* Brattleboro, Vermont: Pro Lingua Assoc.

Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kinginger, C. (1999). Videoconferencing as Access to Spoken French. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 55*, 468-489.

Kinginger, C. (2002). Defining the zone of proximal development in US foreign language education. *Applied Linguistics, 23*, 240-261.

Ko, J, Schallert D. L., & Walters, K. (2003). Rethinking scaffolding: examining negotiation of meaning in an ESL storytelling task. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*, 303-324.

Lam, W., & Wong, J. (2000). The effects of strategy training on developing discussion skills in an ESL classroom. *ELT Journal, 54*, 245-255

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds). (1998). *Vygotskyan approaches to second language research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Lawson, A. (2001). Rethinking French grammar for pedagogy: the contribution of spoken corpora. In R. C. Simpson & J. M. Swales (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics in North America. selections from the 1999 symposium* (pp. 179-194). Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Lee, D. (2001). Genres, registers, text types, domains, and styles: clarifying the concepts and navigating a path through the BNC jungle. *Language Learning & Technology*, *5, 37-72.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 543-558.

Lynch, T., & Maclean, J. (2001). 'A case of exercising': Effects of immediate task repetition on learners' performance. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing* (pp. 141-162). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Machado, A. (2000). A Vygotskian approach to evaluation in foreign language learning contexts. *ELT Journal, 54*, 335-345.

McCarthy, M. J. (1998). *Spoken language and applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M. J. (2001). *Issues in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M. J. (2002). Good listenership made plain: British and American non-minimal response tokens in everyday conversation. In R. Reppen, S. Fitzmaurice & D. Biber (Eds.), *Using Corpora to Explore Linguistic Variation* (pp. 49-71). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

McCarthy, M. J. (2003). Talking back: 'small' interactional response tokens in everyday conversation. *Research on Language in Social Interaction*, *36*, 33-63.

McCarthy, M. J., & Carter, R. A. (2001). Ten criteria for a spoken grammar. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 51-75). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Measday, E. (1998). *Speak out!: authentic communication activities for the intermediate and advanced ESL student.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Moon, R. (1997). Vocabulary connections: multi-word items in English. In N. Schmitt & M. J. McCarthy (Eds.), *Second Language Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy* (pp. 40-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-Interaction: an analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics 23*, 323-347.

Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 279-310.

Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness, 9,* 34-51.

Nelson, G., Wallis, S., & Aarts, B. (2002). *Exploring natural language: working with the British component of the International Corpus of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nero, S. J. (2000). The changing faces of English: a Caribbean perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 34,* 483-510.

Norrick, N. R. (2000). *Conversational narrative: storytelling in everyday talk*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

O'Keeffe, A. & Farr, F. (2003). 'Using Language Corpora in Language Teacher Education: pedagogic, linguistic and cultural insights', *TESOL Quarterly, 37*, 389-418.

Ooi, V. (1997). Analysing the Singapore ICE corpus for lexicographic evidence. In M. Ljung (Ed.), *Corpus-based studies in English* (pp. 245-260). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Paran, A., & Watts, E. (Eds.) (2003). *Storytelling in ELT*. Whitstable: IATEFL.

Payne, J. S. & Whitney, P. J. (2002). Developing L2 oral proficiency through synchronous CMC: Output, working memory, and interlanguage development. *CALICO Journal, 20,* 7-32.

Prodromou, L. (1997). Global English and its struggle against the octopus. *IATEFL Newsletter, 135*, 12-14.

Prodromou, L. (2003). In search of the successful user of English. *Modern English Teacher,12*, 5-14.

Rampton, B., Roberts, C., Leung, C., & Harris, R. (2002). Methodology in the analysis of classroom discourse. *Applied Linguistics, 23*, 373-392.

Riggenbach, H. (1999). *Discourse analysis in the language classroom, vol. 1: The spoken language.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics, 22*, 27-57.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a Lingua Franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*, 133-158.

Samuda, V. (2001). Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: The role of the teacher. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing* (pp. 119-140). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to consider: developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities. In J. C. Richards and W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching – an anthology of current practices* (pp. 201-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, J. (2002). Discourse and synchronous computer-mediated communication: Uniting speaking and writing? In K. Spelman Miller & P. Thompson (Eds.), *Unity and Diversity in Language Use* (pp. 57-71). London: Continuum, in Association with BAAL.

Simpson, R. C., Lucka, B., & Ovens, J. (2000). Methodological challenges of planning a spoken corpus with pedagogical outcomes. In L. Burnard & T. McEnery (Eds.), *Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective*: *papers from the third*

international conference on teaching and language corpora (TALC) (pp. 43-49).

Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Slade, D. (1997). Stories and gossip in English: the macro-structure of casual talk.

Prospect, 12, 72-86.

Stern, K. (1997). The Longman Spoken American Corpus: Providing an in-depth analysis

of everyday English. *Longman Language Review 3*, 14-17.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through col-

laborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language*

Acquisition (pp. 97-114). New York: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task based second language learning: The uses of the

first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4*, 253-276.

Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and International English: a classroom view.

ELT Journal, 56, 240-249.

Van Lier, L. (1998). The relationship between consciousness, interaction and language

learning. *Language Awareness, 7*, 128-145.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wajnryb, R. (2003). *Stories: narrative activities for the language classroom*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Wallwork, A. (1997a). *Discussions A-Z*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallwork, A. (1997b). *Discussions A-Z advanced teacher's book: a resource book of*

speaking activities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, *6*, 3-23.

Warschauer, M. (2000). The changing global economy and the future of English teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 511-535.

Warschauer, M. & Whittaker, P. F. (2001). The Internet for English language teaching: Guidelines for teachers. J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practices* (pp. 368-373). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 244-267.

Wray, A. (2000). Formulaic sequences in second language teaching: principle and practice. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 463-489.

Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yuan, Y. (2001). An enquiry into empirical pragmatics data-gathering methods: written DCTs, oral DCTs, field notes, and natural conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 271-292.

Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. (2003). The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 monologic oral production. *Applied Linguistics, 24*, 1-27.

Zelman, N. E. & Moran, P. R. (1996). *Conversation Inspirations.* 2nd. ed. Brattleboro, Vermont: Pro Lingua.

Author biographical sketches

Michael McCarthy is Emeritus Professor of Applied Linguistics, University of Nottingham, UK, Adjunct Professor of Applied Linguistics, Pennsylvania State University, USA, and Adjunct Professor of Applied Linguistics, University of Limerick, Ireland. He is author of *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers* (Cambridge University Press, 1991) *Language as Discourse* (Longman, 1994, with Ronald Carter), *Exploring Spoken English* (Cambridge University Press, 1997, with Ronald Carter), *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy* (co-edited with Norbert Schmitt, Cambridge University Press, 1997), *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), *Exploring Grammar in Context* (with Ron Carter and Rebecca Hughes, Cambridge University Press, 2000) and *Issues in Applied Linguistics* (Cambridge University Press, 2001). He is author of more than 50 academic papers. From 1994 to 1998 he was co-editor of *Applied Linguistics* (Oxford University Press). He is co-director (with Ronald Carter) of the 5-million word CANCODE corpus project.

Anne O'Keeffe is Lecturer in Applied Linguistics at Mary Immaculate College (MIC), University of Limerick, Ireland. She is founder and coordinator of the Inter-Varietal Applied Corpus Studies (IVACS) research centre at MIC. Her research interests centre on spoken corpora, their description and pedagogical applications, and their application in the study of language in the media. She has also been involved in the building of the Limerick Corpus of Irish English (L-CIE) with her colleagues at the University of Limerick. She has recently published a number of papers in edited volumes on corpus

linguistics and (with Fiona Farr) in *TESOL Quarterly*. She has also co-guest edited a

forthcoming special issue of *Teanga* (the Irish Yearbook of Applied Linguistics) on

'Corpora, Varieties and the Language Classroom'.

Contact information: anne.okeeffe@mic.ul.ie

(Anne O'Keeffe gives permission for this email address to be made public in ARAL 24)

---

[1] English dominates the present discussion, though it is apparent that similar problems exist in the establishment of pedagogical models for speaking of multi-national languages such as French and Spanish. North American universities often insist on the spoken model of metropolitan France rather than that of nearby French Canada, and publishers routinely sanction language teaching materials for use in Latin America in terms of their faithfulness to European (Castillian) Spanish norms.