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READING STRATEGY REPERTOIRES IN EAP CONTEXTS: STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN ACADEMIC READING STRATEGY USE
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ABSTRACT
Potential mismatches between learners’ and teachers’ perception of appropriate reading strategies in academic reading contexts are of singular importance. This study reports a number of these mismatches in the context of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) at the college level. The reading strategy section of Reading and Writing Strategies Questionnaire (Baker & Boonkit, 2004) was submitted to 12 male sophomore EAP undergraduate students of psychology at the University of Tehran, and their responses were analyzed for their exploitation of reading strategies. Students were asked to check how often they would use reading strategies from 1 “Never” or “Almost never” to 5 “Always” or “Almost always” (Likert-scale inventory). Then, the same questionnaire was given to three faculty members of the psychology department who taught EAP courses to psychology students. The results showed that the students did not use strategies as intended, indicating a mismatch between what was reported to be useful to students by their teachers and their uptake of those strategies. Finally, a set of mismatches between the teachers’ recommended and practiced reading strategy repertoires and those of students were identified.
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INTRODUCTION
Defining language learning strategies (LLS) and learner strategies is well indicative of their significance and features. The dictionary meaning of the word strategy carries notions of “planning, directing, and managing things well for a certain purpose” (Hornby, 1990, p. 1270). Research on language learning strategies in second language (L2) learning started in the mid 1970s (Anderson, 2005). Oxford (1990) expands the definition of language learning strategies by stating that “learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations” (p. 8). Thus, strategies are said to refer to specific actions or techniques and not characteristics that describe a general approach to learning (Wenden, 1987). According to the widely used technical definition from cognitive psychology, strategies are “operations employed by the learner to aid the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information” (Oxford, 1990, p. 8; Wenden, 1987, p. 7).

A common assumption in strategy use is that effective strategy use helps students self-direct and control their own learning processes inside and outside the classroom. Self-direction is significant for the learners’ language development as it reduces their reliance on teacher, and enables them to take responsibility for their own learning and develop more confidence, involvement, proficiency (Oxford, 1990), empowerment (Grenfell & Harris, 1999), and autonomy (Benson & Voller, 1997; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989). To promote opportunities for self-access language learning, researchers (Gardner & Miller, 1999) suggest that teachers raise students’ awareness of language learning
strategies that could be employed in handling specific language tasks by discussing with them how to approach these tasks and by playing strategy search games urging students to think of possible uses of strategies in a particular context (Oxford, 1990). Therefore, a number of researchers argue that raising students’ consciousness or awareness of the possible uses of these strategies can help them control and self-direct their own learning and develop their autonomy.

Language learning strategies are specific learning actions or behaviors that might or might not be observable. The latter type usually includes mental processes that cannot be captured by an observer (Wenden, 1987). Other strategies such as cooperating with others can be observed. However, some strategies are sometimes used outside the classroom so they cannot be documented easily by the teacher through observations (Oxford, 1990).

Whether observable or not in the students’ actions for the purposes of research, the teachability and learnability of these strategies is one of the most investigated issues in research. It has been shown that learning strategies are behaviors that could be learned, rejected, and modified. “They are a part of our mental software” (Wenden, 1987, p. 8) called “learner training”, “strategy training”, or “learning to learn training”, the teaching of learning strategies modifies and extends the teachers’ role (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989). The teachers’ role is to promote a learning environment that allows students to work on their strategies, train them to identify these strategies and assist their autonomy (Oxford, 1990). According to Wenden (1987), this increases the potential of their learnability and teachability, as shown in studies on strategy training programs, which have concluded that LLS are “readily teachable” (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989). In reference to explicit strategy instruction, Oxford (1989) notes that “strategy training is most effective when students learn why and when specific strategies are important, how to use these strategies, and how to transfer them to new situations” (p. 12).

Anderson (2005) recognizes how language learning strategies are related to success in accomplishing language learning tasks, stating that less successful learners do not progress in their tasks as more successful learners do due to the formers’ lack of strategy repertoires, strategy use, and awareness of such strategies. Green and Oxford (1995) connect progress, L2 skills, and the development of strategies by stating that “language learning strategies are specific actions or techniques that students use, often intentionally, to improve their progress in developing L2 skills” (p. 262). Oxford (1990) has argued that a greater emphasis should be placed on identifying effective language learning strategies and on teaching students how to use them successfully. Some researchers have reported the differences between successful and less successful learners based on the language learning strategies they use (e.g., Vann & Abraham, 1990; Vandergrift, 1997). They sum up that good language learners seem to be skillful in monitoring and adapting different strategies, demonstrating flexibility in using strategies to accomplish different language learning tasks.

Oxford (1990) explains how direct and indirect strategies can be used to develop each of the four language skills: listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Language learning strategies are usually connected to each other and do not happen in isolation from each other. Anderson ascertains how strategies are interconnected and views them as a “process” (2005, p. 757). Brown (2002) also gives teachers a practical guide about how to deal with language learning strategies in the classroom. Some research has shown that integrating strategy instruction into regular classroom instruction brings about effectiveness (Anderson, 2005; Cohen, 1998).

Furthermore, research has tended to focus on the use of specific strategies in language skill areas, including listening, speaking, reading and writing. Reading strategies of L2 learners have been the focus of some researchers (Anderson, 2003, 1991; Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002; Sheorey, 1999; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001). One of these attempts to investigate learning strategies was Mokhtari and Sheorey’s (2002) study using the Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) as a standardized instrument. Recently, the SORS was used by Anderson (2003) to measure metacognitive reading strategies used by EFL and ESL students while reading academic materials online. The adapted survey was called the Online Survey of Reading Strategies (OSORS), but the SORS classification was kept as global reading strategies, support strategies, and problem-solving strategies such as rereading difficult texts, and adjusting reading rate. To increase learners’ online reading abilities, Anderson (2003) finally recommends that teachers focus their students’ attention on the OSORS metacognitive reading strategies.

Many studies have focused on the advantages gained from linking the content of an ESL reading course to that of the mainstream course, aimed at benefiting from the discipline-based texts and focusing on developing reading skills by dealing with topics in the mainstream course (Benesch, 1988; Guyer & Peterson, 1988; Kasper, 1994). As found by Kasper (1996), discipline-based texts rather than literary texts have proven to benefit students more and improve their reading comprehension. Kasper explains this in the light of schema theory, arguing that discipline-based materials promote more elaborate schemata, provided that comprehension of literature is subjective in nature.
Therefore, focusing on introducing the English language literature including genres such as poems, stories, novels, etc. does not match the students’ needs. Choosing texts on themes from other disciplines can thus enhance the students’ objective sense and let them experience real life texts dealing with information and points of view that draw on their schemata. In addition, reporting on the impact of discipline-based content on developing English reading comprehension, researchers (Kasper, 1996) argue that such content encourages students to construct schemata and increase their metacognition of reading process, and also guides them to use more efficient comprehension strategies.

Additionally, the development of efficient reading strategies for students to use should allow for a sequence of instruction, including direct explanation, guided practice, independent use or practice, and group feedback (Kasper, 1996; Nist & Simpson, 1987; Shih, 1992; Weinstein, 1987). Nist and Simpson (1987) argue that group feedback following independent practice enhances self-regulated learning and reading comprehension by allowing self-monitoring and self-evaluating. However, Kasper (1996) claims that such an instructional sequence is insufficient to improve the reading performance of ESL students, arguing that the type of material is more critical and again pointing to the significance of discipline-based materials. We can conclude that group discussions form a scaffold to the reading input, and peer review of writing can also help students edit their work.

According to Baker and Boonkit (2004), in the reading process, reading strategies “are techniques and methods readers use to make their reading successful” (p. 302). Learners can employ such techniques in the reading process which include: “reading for pleasure in English, skimming and scanning, summarizing information, making guesses, prediction, making inferences, underlined words and phrases, and making notes” (Baker & Boonkit, 2004, p. 303).

Previous body of research has identified some of the skills needed to establish a balance between skills and language, which might as well be transferable from L1 if such skills are already well-developed there. These skills are: selecting what is relevant for the current purpose; using all the features of the text such as headings, layout, typeface; skimming for content and meaning; scanning for specifics; identifying organizational patterns; understanding relations within a sentence; using cohesive and discourse markers; predicting, inferring and guessing; identifying main ideas, supporting ideas and examples; processing and evaluating the information during reading; and transferring or using the information while or after reading (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998). Other skills might be developing private dictionaries and research charts, and questioning or challenging readings (Pally, 2001).

Flowerdew and Peacock (2001) identified a number of macro- and micro-reading skills that EAP students need to develop. The macro-skills include the ability to make use of learners’ existing knowledge to make sense of new material and fit new knowledge into their schema. Important micro-skills include recognizing logical relationships, definitions, generalizations, examples, explanations and predictions, and distinguishing fact from opinion. The purpose of this study thus is to examine the frequency of reading strategies among Iranian EFL male second year undergraduate students of psychology in EAP contexts.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The main research question guiding this study is:

To what extent do EFL male second year undergraduate psychology students’ reading strategy repertoires match their teachers’ recommendations of useful and effective strategies in EAP Contexts?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Twelve second-year male undergraduate EAP students majoring in psychology at the University of Tehran volunteered to participate in the study. They were asked to check how often they use reading strategies from 1 “Never” or “Almost never” to 5 “Always” or “Almost always” (Likert-scale inventory). Then the same questionnaire
was given to three faculty members of the psychology department who used to teach EAP courses to psychology students.

**Instruments**

In order to explore students’ exploitation of reading strategies, we elicited responses to the reading strategy section (the first 32 items) of Baker and Boonkit’s (2004) Reading and Writing Strategies Questionnaire (downloaded online, Appendix [A]). This questionnaire had been extensively used in learning strategies studies which is a testament to its reliability and validity. Nevertheless, to make sure that the reading section of the questionnaire would still yield consistent responses, we pilot tested it before the final administration and calculated its reliability ($r = .89$).

**Analysis of the data**

The data collected by the questionnaire were coded in a database using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, version 16.0. As the study sample was relatively small, it could not be considered for a significant statistical analysis. Therefore, the questionnaire items were classified according to Baker and Boonkit’s (2004) categorization of reading and writing strategies. Tables were generated to summarize the average use of strategies in each category. In reading strategy categories, Oxford’s (1990) means were used as cut-off points as to what was low, medium, or high use of strategies. As the scale was from 1.0 to 5.0, the averages ranged from 1.0 to 5.0. A low average use of reading strategies would be within the average range of 1.0 to 1.4, meaning it was never or almost never used. Means from 1.5 to 2.4 reported a low use of reading strategies as they were generally not used. If strategies were sometimes used, they were within the range of 2.5 to 3.4, and the use of strategies was medium. A high use of strategies would fall within the range of 3.5 to 5.0, but if strategies were usually used, the reported averages would be from 3.5 to 4.4. If they were always or almost always used, the averages would be from 4.5 to 5.0. Table (1) provides a picture of how quantitative data from the questionnaire collected from the students and teachers were analyzed using the mentioned cut-off points.

**Table 1: Analysis Key of Quantitative Data Collected Using Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Always or almost used</th>
<th>4.5 to 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually used</td>
<td>3.5 to 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sometimes used</td>
<td>2.5 to 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Generally not used</td>
<td>1.5 to 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never or almost never used</td>
<td>1.0 to 1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This section reports the results of Baker and Boonkit’s (2004) Reading and Writing Strategies Questionnaire administered to the EAP class and three EAP teachers of the psychology department. It involved reading strategies used in the process of reading which are classified into general reading behavior, pre-reading strategies, while-reading strategies, and post-reading strategies. Table (2) illustrates the means of students in reporting their reading strategies.

**Table 2: EAP Class Means in Reading Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class (n=12)</th>
<th>General Behavior Mean</th>
<th>Pre-Reading Strategies Mean</th>
<th>While-Reading Strategies Mean</th>
<th>Post-Reading Strategies Mean</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this EAP class, both the students’ general reading behavior and the pre-reading strategies were high as students indicated that they usually used them. On the whole, the means of every set of strategies indicated that students used most of these strategies in their reading habits.

The level of analysis of data obtained from the Inventory of Reading Strategies was taken further to compare the students’ positive and negative appropriation of strategies in their reading process as indicated by the students themselves and in comparison with their teachers’ recommendations in the inventory. A “POSITIVE USE” meant that the students only used the recommended strategies while a “NEGATIVE USE” indicated that the students used...
the strategies that were not recommended. So both the teachers’ recommendation and the students’ reported use framed the positivity and negativity of strategy use as explained earlier. Negativity should be understood here as the mismatch between teachers’ and students’ reported use of strategies. The teachers’ responses to the items as “Never” were coded as “Not Recommended” and “Sometimes” or “Usually” were coded as “Recommended” strategies. The students’ responses to the item as “Never” were dealt with as “Not Used”, and “Sometimes” or “Usually” as “Used” strategies. So, if a student reported using a strategy that his teacher had recommended (sometimes or usually), it was considered a positive use. If the student said he did not (never) use a strategy that was not recommended for use, it was still a positive use. On the other hand, if he reported using an item (sometimes or usually) his teacher had not recommended, it was considered a negative use. If he responded that he did not (never) use a recommended strategy, it was a negative use as well.

At this level of the analysis of the results, we considered the students’ use of strategies looking at the extent to which they used strategies as taught and recommended by their teachers. The results reported in this section reflect the students’ positive and negative use of strategies. Negative use of strategies is also emphasized here as it showed that students did not use strategies as they were expected to. The results revealed a match between the students’ and their teachers’ ratings as shown here as a positive use of strategies, but there was also a clear mismatch, which was considered a negative use of strategies. Tables (3) and (4) below present the percentages of negative and positive strategy use among EAP students as reported in their questionnaire responses, classifying the items into positive and negative strategies according to the analysis criteria explained earlier.

Table 3: EAP Students’ Negative Strategy Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Category</th>
<th>EAP Psychology Students (n=12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Strategy Use</strong></td>
<td>(n)=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reading Behavior</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Reading</td>
<td>8.33%, n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While-Reading</td>
<td>25%, n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Reading</td>
<td>16.66%, n=2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Negative and positive strategy uses for each strategy category were computed by dividing the number of reported negative or positive items by the total number of positive and negative strategies.
- “Negative” is a term that Baker and Boonkit (2004) used in their reading and writing questionnaire to mark items that they considered negative in reading and writing processes. However, it was used in this table to keep the same classification they have used in their questionnaire for ease of analysis.

Table 4: EAP Students’ Positive Strategy Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Category</th>
<th>EAP Psychology Students (n=12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Strategy Use</strong></td>
<td>(n)=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reading Behavior</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Reading</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While-Reading</td>
<td>8.33%, n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Reading</td>
<td>16.66%, n=2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table (3) above, in their reading processes, the students reported using the following reading strategies from the most negatively-used to the least: 1) while-reading (25%), 2) post-reading (16.66%), and pre-reading strategies (8.33%), indicating a major problem in while-reading and after-reading processes.

The reading strategies that were shown to be appropriated negatively by the EAP students were:
- asking about the purpose of texts (pre-reading);
- breaking sentences into words and phrases (while-reading);
- predicting while reading (while-reading); and
- making inferences (post-reading).
CONCLUSION
The research question of this study looked at the extent to which students’ reading strategy repertoires matched their teachers’ recommended strategies in EAP courses.

As shown in the study, students did not use strategies as intended, indicating a mismatch between what was reported to be useful to them by their teachers and their ultimate strategy use. “Sources of mismatch” between teachers’ intentions and students’ interpretations in task-based pedagogy were investigated by Kumaravadivelu (1991) who classified observations of such a mismatch into ten sources: cognitive, communicative, linguistic, pedagogic, strategic, cultural, evaluative, procedural, instructional, and attitudinal. In this study, a set of mismatches between the teachers’ recommended and practiced reading strategy repertoires and students’ reported strategy use repertoires were identified. As argued by Kumaravadivelu (1991), mismatches between teacher intention and teacher interpretation may be inevitable, but they need not be totally negative, and “a particular mismatch, if identified and properly handled, can give learners an opportunity to negotiate further in order to tease out a problem in their own way” (p. 106).

Even if there was a “negative use” (negative uptake) in reading strategy use, it could still be identified and more effective strategies could be scaffolded by teachers. The students’ uptake in strategy use was negative because it was contrary to the teachers’ strategy repertoires with regard to what the teacher felt would be useful for them.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PEDAGOGY
Teachers could use various inventories of reading strategies as needs analysis tools to help them diagnose students’ use of strategies and explain why students may not use some of strategies as taught in the course. The study indicated that students had some learning difficulties and instances of bad performance in mainstream courses related to their reading aloud, and slow reading. Students’ use of some reading strategies was shown to be negative, pointing to a mismatch between pedagogical goals and students’ strategy use. Therefore, teachers could address such learning difficulties and scaffold a positive use or uptake of strategies more often for particular students.

LIMITATIONS
In considering this study, it is also important to acknowledge some limitations:

1. Classroom observation was not possible to develop a full picture of the contexts of study. Thus we were outsiders in reporting this research, and the study reflected mostly teachers’ and students’ rhetorical accounts of their classroom activities.

2. Baker and Boonkit’s (2004) Reading and Writing Strategies Questionnaire was a de-contextualized inventory as it did not address a specific context for students to consider when they responded to the items. In a sense, it is best to provide students with a specific context so that they report the processes that they go through in carrying out these tasks.

3. It is possible that students responded randomly to the Likert-scale inventories used in this study, which made it difficult to envision how often students really used such strategies.

4. The Inventory of Reading Strategies was originally meant to reflect students’ reported strategy use, but teachers were also asked to comment on how useful strategies were to students and how often they should use them. As one of the EAP teachers commented, the inventory was meant for students or learners and not for teachers.

5. The study sample was small and insufficient for a significant statistical analysis. Also, the participants of this study were undergraduate students of psychology, and there may be some variations for students of other disciplines.
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## APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Reading Behaviour</th>
<th>English Reading Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I often read texts in my native language.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often read English texts.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pre-Reading: Before Reading A Text in English, I Do The Following:

| 3. I read the topic or heading of the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. I look at the pictures or graphs of the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. I think about the reasons why I am reading the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. I read the first sentence of the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. I try to predict what the text will be about. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. I ask myself about the author’s purpose for writing the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. I read the provided questions (if any) before I read the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

### While Reading A Text in English, I Do The Following:

| 10. I read the whole text quickly to understand the main idea. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. I translate the sentences into my native language for the main idea of the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. I check my predictions about the text while reading. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. I use the vocabulary and the structure to help me understand the main idea of the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. I must understand every word in the text in order to get the main idea. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 15. I split up (break) sentences into phrases or words for my understanding of the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 16. I take notes, highlight or underline the important points while I am reading the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 17. I use my background (world) knowledge to help me understand the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 18. I scan (read quickly) for the answers to some questions provided with the reading. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 19. I skip words if I don’t know their meanings. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 20. I guess the meaning of some words from context clues. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 21. I use a bilingual dictionary (translating from English to my native language) whenever I need to get the meaning of an unknown word. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 22. I use an English-English dictionary if I need to know the meaning of an unknown word. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 23. I predict what is going to happen next while reading. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 24. I read the text in detail. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

### Post-Reading (After Reading), I Do The Following:

| 25. I make inferences after finishing reading the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 26. I summarize the text after I finish reading it. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 27. I discuss what I understand with my friends or teacher. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 28. I go back to read the details of the text for the answers to understand questions on it. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 29. I use a dictionary after I understand the main idea of the text. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 30. I take notes on all the new words and phrases for my vocabulary bank. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 31. I apply the knowledge from some texts in my everyday activities. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 32. I give myself a reward when I have finished. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
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ABSTRACT
This study investigated the relationship between self-efficacy perceptions and English achievement test. The study participants were 138 Iranian female students in two separate schools. Eighty-eight participants were third grade middle school students, and fifty participants were third grade high school students. The students’ perception of self-efficacy was measured through a thirty-four item questionnaire called Morgan and Jinks student efficacy scale (MJSES) which was translated into Persian. English achievement tests that were publicly administered throughout the country simultaneously were also obtained from school authorities. The results of the study indicated the existence of a positive and significant relationship between middle school students’ self-efficacy and their English grades, and a positive and significant relationship between high school students’ self-efficacy and their English grades. The analysis also indicated that there is not a significant difference between middle and high school students with regard to the relationship between their self-efficacy and English grades.
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INTRODUCTION
Self-efficacy beliefs have gained increasing significance in educational research, particularly in studies of academic success. In this area, researchers have argued that students’ self-efficacy beliefs are correlated with students' academic performances and achievement (Bandura, 1981; Morgan & Jinks, 1999; Pajares & Schunk, 2001). In other words, learners who are more efficacious have higher scores than those of their less efficacious peers. In this paper, the researcher tries to elaborate on this relationship to add to the body of the research in this field.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
Social cognitive theory is an approach to comprehending human cognition, action, motivation, and emotion. This theory posits that individuals are able to reflect on their performances and control them and that they can manipulate their environments instead of just passively responding to them. Social cognitive theory also supposes that individuals’ actions are goal-oriented and are done on purpose which is guided by foresight. Meta-cognitive activities also play a significant role in this theory which implies that individuals are self-reflective and able to monitor their experiences and conducts. By regulating and controlling their environment, learners also exert direct control over their behavior and are capable of self-regulation.

Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara and Pastorelli (1996) believe that self-efficacy is derived from social cognitive theory. Bandura (1986) defines self-efficacy as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (p. 88).

The beliefs which individuals hold about themselves are important factors in regulating behavior. Therefore, behavior can be affected in two ways; either individuals engage in activities that they think they are confident and competent in or they refrain from tasks that they feel contrary. In fact, self-efficacy helps to determine how much effort, perseverance and resilience is put on an activity. It means that individuals with higher perception of efficacy have greater effort, persistence and resilience. Emotional reactions may also be determined by efficacy beliefs. For instance, people who have low self-efficacy perceptions believe that a task is hard and hence become stressful and
Self-efficacy beliefs are divided into three dimensions: magnitude or level, generality, and strength (Bandura, 1997). Magnitude or level is related to the number of stages of increasing difficulty that an individual feels he/she can handle. Generality of self-efficacy is whether success or failure experiences affect self-efficacy beliefs in the same situation or contexts. And, strength of self-efficacy points out to “the resoluteness of a people’s convictions that they can perform the behavior in question” (Maddux, 1995 p. 9).

There are two concepts that overlap with self-efficacy thus hard to be distinguished. The first construct is self-esteem. The most important difference between self-esteem and self-efficacy is that self-efficacy is not a personal characteristic (Maddux, 1995). Self-efficacy is pertinent to certain fields or even subfields of human behavior. Learners can have high levels of self-efficacy in a field such as mathematics, sports, or learning languages, but have low self-efficacy. They can also have high self-esteem and feel inefficacious in math and science. The joint factor between self-efficacy and self-esteem is that both of them are assessments. The outstanding disparity between them is that self-efficacy is the assessment of capability, and self-esteem is the assessment of self-worth (Epstein & Morling, 1995). The second construct that overlaps with self-efficacy is confidence. Bandura (1997) points out that confidence is “a nondescript term that refers to strength of belief but does not necessarily specify what the certainty is about” (p. 382). An individual can be confident that he will fail or succeed in math. Self-efficacy is the belief in one’s strength to accomplish specific levels of performance. Confidence is not related to the person’s strength or capability to perform at a certain level.

There are a number of factors which are believed to affect self-efficacy, such as goal setting, information processing, models, encouragement and feedback, socio-economic status, and culture and self-perception.

1. Goal setting: one of the important cognitive processes is goal setting which affects outcome. Individuals who possess a goal are more efficacious for obtaining that goal and work diligently to get it (Schunk, 1995).
2. Information processing: those students who believe they are unable to handle the material taught possibly possess a low sense of self-efficacy. However, those who consider themselves capable of understanding the material are likely to have a high sense of efficacy (Schunk, 1995).
3. Models: learners may become efficacious by watching peers. Watching others doing a task successfully enhances self-efficacy since it makes a proper basis for comparison. However, observing a peer fail will decrease self-efficacy (Bandura et al, 1996).
4. Encouragement and feedback: persuading learners they “can do it” or providing them with positive feedback raises students’ self-efficacy levels (Schunk, 1996). During feedback, convincing learners that their success is the result of their own effort enhances motivation and self-efficacy.
5. Socio-economic status (SES): SES is believed to influence self-efficacy in a number of fields. Tong and Song (2004) conducted a study on 102 low and regular SES Chinese college students. They indicated that the general self-efficacy scores of high socioeconomic-status students were significantly higher than those of their low socioeconomic-status peers.
6. Culture and self-perceptions: Klassen (2004) studied self-efficacy perceptions across cultural groups. He analyzed 20 articles conducted over the course of 25 years. The outstanding finding in these articles was that subjects from Asian countries with collectivist environments possessed lower self-efficacy beliefs than subjects from western countries with individualist cultures.

Maddux and Lewis (1995) offered a number of strategies for self-efficacy information. The first one is verbal persuasion which means encouraging learners to cope with their stress and to risk that might result in success. The second strategy is the use of imaginal and vicarious experiences. Maddux and Lewis (1995) define vicarious experiences as watching of live or taped models doing a task that learners think they are unable to do. Their definition for imaginal experiences is the meetings in which learners visualize themselves coping with a demanding task, such as second language learners having a presentation in front of a group of native speakers. Enactive experiences are almost defined like vicarious experiences but the only dissimilarity is that, in enactive experiences, learners actually do or practice the task alone or with help. The next strategy is the control of physiological and emotional conditions which is offered by Schunk (1996). It can be clearly noticeable when learners are not confident about their abilities in performing a task through observing their physiological and emotional state. Some of those states are sweating, anxiety, nervousness, and increased heart rate. Consequently, through deceasing emotional arousal like anxiety during performing a task, we can raise self-efficacy. Maddux and Lewis (1995) suggest some
strategies for decreasing emotional and physiological arousal among which are breathing techniques, meditation, and relaxation.

Many researchers (Bandura, 1981; Jinks & Morgan, 1999; Pajares & Schunk, 2001) believe that self-efficacy of students can predict their academic success. It is argued that highly efficacious students are confident about their performance, work very hard in order not to fail, do challenging tasks and believe that their failure is due to insufficient effort or lack of enough knowledge that they believe they are capable of (Magogwe & Oliver, 2007). Bandura (1986) further suggested that success plays a significant role in self-belief and can determine one’s level of achievement. Schunk (1995) highlighted that if students believe they are capable of performing better, they do not maintain low self-efficacy. Thus, Pajares (1996) asserted that “how individual interpret the result of their performance attainments, informs and alters their environment and their self-beliefs, which in turn inform and alter their subsequent performances” (p. 543). According to Pajares (2000), beliefs that learners build and develop and they consider them to be true are crucial factors in their success or failure in school. This would lead one to infer that research on achievement, on why students achieve or fail to achieve, and on why they do things they do in school should naturally focus, at least in great part, on students’ self-efficacy beliefs.

With regard to language learning, the pertinent research studies indicate practical support for strong effects of self-efficacy perceptions on this field too (Yazici, Seyis, & Altun, 2011; Yusuf, 2011; Huang & Shanmao, 1996; Templin, 1999; Templin, Guile & Okuma, 2001; Anstrom, 2000). Based on her study on the key variables in language learning, Cotterall (1999) considered self-efficacy as a crucial variable in success of language learners. If people have high positive self-efficacy about learning a second language, then they believe that they have the power and abilities to reach this goal. On the other hand, people with low self-efficacy feel that they do not have the power and abilities to learn a language, thus admitting failure from the start.

While there are many studies in the literature, (e.g., Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Yilmaz, 2010; Rahimi & Abedini, 2009; Mango, 2009), investigating the effect of self-efficacy beliefs on students and its relationship with different variables (e.g. learning strategies and proficiency), little attempt has been made to examine the variables as related to English achievement of Iranian middle school and high school students. That is why this study was designed to address this gap in the literature and focus on the relationship between Iranian female students’ self-efficacy beliefs and their level of schooling and their scores in English achievement test.

**Research Questions**

More particularly, the present research will answer the following questions:

1) Is there any relationship between the Iranian middle school female students’ self-efficacy beliefs and their grades in English achievement test?

2) Is there any relationship between the Iranian high school female students’ self-efficacy beliefs and their grades in English achievement test?

3) Is there any significant difference between middle school and high school Iranian female students regarding the relationship between their self-efficacy beliefs and their grades in English achievement test?

**Methodology**

This study was primarily a correlational research. This quantitative data collection method was used in this study to investigate the relationship between self-efficacy and English achievement tests of middle and high-school female students. Data were collected from a scale that is Morgan-Jinks student efficacy scale (MJSES) and from students' English achievement test.

**Participants**
The participants of this study were 138 middle and high school female students. There were three intact classes of third grade middle school female students with eighty-eight participants, and three intact classes of third grade high school female students with fifty participants. They were almost of the same age in two separate schools in east of Tehran. The middle school students were around 15 years old, and high-school students were around 18 years old.

**Instrumentation**

A brief survey were conducted to collect demographic information from students including name, gender, age and English language background before the main part of the study that is Morgan-Jinks Student Efficacy Scale (1999).

The Morgan-Jinks Student Efficacy Scale (MJSES) were used in this study to collect self-efficacy beliefs of students. Learners rated themselves in this survey. “The MJSES is a more extensive inventory that makes use of self-report grades as a dependent variable” (Morgan & Jinks, 1999, p. 225). This questionnaire consists of 34 items and these 34 items have been divided into 3 subscales which are talent, effort and context. It was selected because, as Morgan and Jinks (1999) indicate, the MJSES scale has undergone extensive development to assure validity and reliability. Morgan and Jinks (1999), in their original study to develop this questionnaire, reported the overall reliability .82 and the reliability of each of the subscales of talent, effort and context .78, .66 and .70 respectively. However, these items were slightly modified to fit into the needs of this study. Since the researcher believed that the students were not that much proficient in English, the items were also translated into the Persian language. To further assess the reliability of the self-efficacy survey, a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was computed. The internal consistency of the scale was .74. Therefore, this scale is considered reliable with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .74 since, generally speaking, a value of more than .7 is discussed that possesses an acceptable degree of internal consistency (Pallant, 2002).

In addition, grades of the students in their final English achievement test were collected to find the relationship of these grades with self-efficacy beliefs of students. In order for the data to be reliable, the researcher asked authorities of the school to provide him with students' grades which were administered to them all over the country simultaneously.

**Procedure**

Permission was obtained from school authorities and from students’ parents before distributing the questionnaire. The survey was distributed to the students to collect demographic information. Then, the researcher described the questionnaire to the students and he helped them with their problems while they were answering the items. The researcher stuck to the detailed procedure of the administration of the questionnaire as was dictated by the original authors in order not to disturb the reliability of the study. The students were enlightened that this questionnaire had nothing to do with their course grades so that they would be encouraged to answer the items honestly. The items were designed for a 4-point Likert-scale response. A certain behavior was stated and followed by a four-interval scale, each one corresponding to the extent to which the respondent believed the statement applied to her to him. An example is “I am a good science student” followed by really agree, kind of agree, kind of disagree, and really disagree. The participants were asked to circle one number that best represented the degree to which the corresponding statement applied to them. 1 represents ‘strongly disagree’, 2 ‘disagree’, 3 ‘agree’ and 4 ‘strongly agree’. Therefore, means above 2 represent positive self-efficacy beliefs, with higher results equating to stronger and more positive beliefs.

The Pearson r correlation was computed on the data received from the Liker-scale questionnaire and students’ English achievement grades to delineate the degree of relationship between the two variables. The two correlations were also changed into Z-scores to find out whether the difference between them was statistically significant or not. Before calculating the mean score of each subject, the values of some items (Items No. 5, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23 and 28) had to be reversed because they carried an opposite weight to the purpose of this study.

**RESULTS**

**The First Research Question**

Question 1: Is there any relationship between Iranian middle school female students’ self-efficacy beliefs and their grades in English achievement test?

Data obtained from the self-efficacy scale and the middle school female students’ English grades were used to answer this question. Eighty-eight students filled out the items. A Pearson correlation was computed on the scores obtained from both of these scores, and the results showed a medium correlation between the middle school students’
self-efficacy and their grades in English achievement test. There was a statistically significant positive correlation \((r=.30, p<.01)\) between scores obtained on the self-efficacy scale and students’ English grades. The results indicated that the Iranian middle school female students are also strongly efficacious with a mean of above two \((M= 3.18)\).

The descriptive Statistics and correlation between middle school students’ self-efficacy beliefs and their grades in English achievement test is summarized in table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English Scores</th>
<th>Questionnaire Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Scores</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.301*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questionnaire Scores</strong></td>
<td>.301*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**The Second Research Question**

Question 2: Is there any relationship between Iranian high school female students’ self-efficacy beliefs and their grades in English achievement test?

Data from the self-efficacy survey and those from the English achievement test were used to answer this question. A Pearson correlation was computed on scores obtained from the self-efficacy scale and those obtained from English test. The results showed a medium association between the two sets of scores. There was a statistically significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and English achievement test \((r=.41, p<.01)\). The coefficients of correlation found above rejected the null hypothesis and confirmed that there was a statistically significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and English achievement test. High school students were also strongly efficacious with a mean of 3.03.

The descriptive Statistics and correlation between high school students’ self-efficacy beliefs and their grades in English achievement test is summarized in table 2 below.
Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and the Correlation: High School Female Students’ Self-efficacy and English Achievement Test (N=50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English Scores</th>
<th>Questionnaire Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Scores</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.410*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questionnaire Scores</strong></td>
<td>.410*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Third Research Question

Question 3: Is there any significant difference between Iranian middle school and high school female students regarding the relationship between their self-efficacy beliefs and their grades in English achievement test?

Data from the first and second questions were used to answer this question. The researcher used the correlation between middle school students’ self-efficacy and their English grades on the one hand, and the correlation between high school students’ self-efficacy and their English grades on the other hand to see whether there are statistically significant difference between two sets of scores. In other words, the investigator tried to see whether the correlation difference between the first and second questions is statistically significant or not. The table 1 and 2 given above show that the correlation between middle school students’ self-efficacy and their English scores was \( r=30 \), while for high school students it was slightly higher, \( r=41 \). Although these two values seem different, is this difference big enough to be considered significant? To figure out whether the difference between these two values was significant, the researcher adopted the formula mentioned in “SPSS Survival Manual” (Pallant 2002). The two correlations obtained from the first and second questions were changed into Z scores by the means of “Transformation of r to z” table. Then, these values were slotted into the equation which is utilized to calculate \( Z_{obs} \) (Pallant 2002). The obtained value of \( Z_{obs} \) was -1.694. The next step was to determine if the \( Z_{obs} \) value is statistically significant. According to Pallant (2002), “If the \( Z_{obs} \) value that you obtained is between -1.96 and +1.96 then you cannot say that there is a statistically significant difference between the two correlation coefficients”. Therefore, the null hypothesis (no difference between the two groups) was not rejected since the value of \( Z_{obs} \) that is -1.694 was not beyond the specified values. The investigator could conclude that correlation difference between middle and high school students was not statistically significant.

DISCUSSION

Second and foreign language learners, instructors, and other language practitioners are completely cognizant of the existence of learning self-efficacy. Many research studies have been replicated investigating the association between self-efficacy and language ability in various contexts, sometimes they found a relationship, and other times failed to find one. In this study, the investigator tried to add to the body of existing literature about the relationship between self-efficacy and language ability. Previous studies indicate that there is a statistically positive relationship between students’ self-efficacy and language ability (Huang & Shanmao, 1996; Templin, 1999; Templin, Guile & Okuma, 2001; Cotterall, 1999; Rahimi & Abedini, 2009).

This study was conducted to investigate the relationship between self-efficacy and language achievement test in a foreign language environment. Data were gathered from 138 middle and high school students in Iran. A thirty-four item questionnaire was used to measure self-efficacy, and students’ English achievement grades to measure their English ability. Pearson correlations showed a statistically significant positive relationship between middle school
students’ self-efficacy and their English grades ($r=.30$), and a statistically significant positive relationship between high school students’ self-efficacy and their English grades ($r=.41$). The first and second correlations were changed into Z-scores to find the statistically significant difference between the two correlations. The analysis conducted showed that there is not a statistically significant difference between the two correlations ($Z_{obs} = -.694$).

There was a statistically significant correlation between students' self-efficacy beliefs and their English grades. However, when we calculated the coefficient of determination of correlations for the first two questions, the shared variance for the questions was 0.09 and 0.16 respectively. It means that there is not much overlap between the two variables. Self-efficacy beliefs help to explain nearly .09 and .16 per cent of the variance in respondents’ scores on the English achievement test. This is not a respectable amount of variance explained when compared with some other studies conducted in this field. When we take a closer look at the data, we can see that means of both questionnaire and English grades were high for both middle and high school students. The problem here is that self-efficacy beliefs contribute to high language ability in some students, but fails to do so in some other. So, according to the results of this study, at least in some cases, there is not a large correlation between self-efficacy and English achievement test and there may be some other factors which are more important than self-efficacy with regard to English proficiency. Therefore, considering success in English proficiency as a result of self-efficacy must be looked at cautiously.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Teachers and school or institute authorities have to strive to enhance learners’ perception of self-efficacy. Many studies have been conducted to enhance or alter students’ self-efficacy by a variety of methods. Schunk and his colleagues have offered some useful strategies that can be utilized in a classroom environment. Teachers have to set proximal rather than distant goals for students (Schunk, 1983), combine process goals with progress feedback (Schunk & Swartz, 1993), choose peers with similar characteristics as models (Schunk & Hanson, 1985; Schunk, Hanson, & Cox, 1987), provide effort attributional feedback for students’ improvement (Schunk & Cox, 1986), and make learners to self-evaluate (Schunk & Ertmer, 1999). These methods are considered to boost learners’ sense of self-efficacy. Therefore, teachers have to cultivate academic self-efficacy in their students. Pajares (2006) believes that this can be done through providing students with successful experience, nurturing optimism, and emphasizing students’ skill development. It is recommended teachers provide students with effective modeling practices and select peers for classroom models properly to make sure students view themselves as well in learning ability as to the models. Measuring students' self-beliefs can help authorities to have important insights about their students' academic motivation, behavior, and future choices. For example, a low self-efficacy perception can cause maladaptive academic behaviors, ignorance of courses and careers, and decreased school interest and achievement (Hackett, 1995). Students who possess low self-efficacy perceptions in a specific task are unlikely to choose that task, and they will more rapidly quit when they face difficulty.

The efficacy beliefs of teachers are also relevant to students' achievement. Efficacious teachers build a classroom environment in which academic objectives are met. There also exists emotional support and encouragement necessary to meet challenges and achieve academic mastery. All teachers strive seriously to nurture the self-beliefs of their students since it is apparent that these self-beliefs can have useful or harmful influences. Teachers who only consider teaching as nurturing their students' cognitive skills or who are of the opinion that cultivating their students' often-fragile egos is not their responsibility have to rethink their role as educators of children.

Due to the fact that, young children are incapable of having proper self-appraisals, they mostly count on the judgments of others to build their own confidence and self-worth. When parents and teachers give children challenging tasks and meaningful activities that can be performed successfully and support these efforts with encouragement, they help children to develop a powerful sense of self-efficacy. Parents play an important role in raising self-efficacy of students. Parental involvement and producing of congenial school environments will result in arousal of children’s interest in schooling and make them develop high academic self-efficacy. Both the home and the school have the burdensome responsibility of developing physical and psychological environment and of creating a friendly home and school environment, as these are necessary for raising the academic self-efficacy of the children.
The effect of self-efficacy on achievement does not end with schooling. Therefore, schools have the extra responsibility of preparing confident and efficacious individuals for future. As Albert Bandura (1986) has emphasized, “educational practices should be gauged not only by the skills and knowledge they impart for present use but also by what they do to beliefs about their capabilities, which affects how they approach the future. The students who develop a strong sense of self-efficacy are well equipped to educate themselves when they have to rely on their own initiative” (p. 417).

These implications suggest that future research must be focused on the creation of congenial school and home environment, development of teaching skills, and educational practices that are aimed to nurture self-efficacy while at the same time to encourage the adoption of a mastery goal.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

One of the limitations of this study was that the number of schools and classes from which the data were collected. In addition, the participants of the present research were all female students in the same district of Tehran. Also, it was not possible for the researcher to randomly select the students, so he chose intact classes. Therefore, it was difficult to generalize the finding of this research to the entire population of students in Iran. Another limitation of this study was the administration procedure. Some of the students did not cooperate with the researcher and they did not take the questionnaire seriously. This may have deviated the results of the study. Last but not the least, the use of questionnaire as the only means of data collection has its own limitations. Although questionnaires are widely used as a data collection procedure in conducting studies, it cannot be used as the only source of the information. However, questionnaire is the only instrument available for collecting self-report data.
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ABSTRACT
This article aims at investigating the similarities and differences between first language (Arabic) and second language (English) acquisition in the context of Arab Learners of English ALEs. The author compares and contrasts the target languages (Arabic and English) to identify the similarities and differences in the acquisition of L1 and L2. The analyses of the linguistic items taken from L1 and L2 indicate that there are similarities and differences in the acquisition of both Arabic Language as an L1 and English Language as an L2. It is also indicated that L1 has positive and negative impact on the acquisition of L2 as well.
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INTRODUCTION
Ervin-Tripp (1974, p. 205) came to the conclusion that the first and the second language learning is similar in natural situations. Others, such as Taylor (1983, p. 146), found credible evidence that second language learners use many strategies similar to those used for learning a first language. He found that elementary and intermediate students of ESL use overgeneralization and transfer in learning the target language. When he examined the students’ errors, he found that “reliance on overgeneralization is directly proportional to proficiency in the target language, and reliance on transfer is inversely proportional”. In other words, early learners transfer and later learners overgeneralize.

This article presents the first and second language acquisition theories aiming at finding the similarities and differences in the acquisition of L1 and L2. This paper is divided into five main sections: section one is the introduction, the literature review is presented in section two, section three is the analysis and the discussion, the conclusion is presented in section four, and finally, the references are in section five. The following section presents the literature review.

LITERATURE REVIEW
First, a comparison is made between first and second language acquisition. In this comparison, similarities will be presented first, followed by differences between acquiring the L1 and the L2.

Similarities between First and Second Language Acquisition
Ervin-Tripp (1974) challenged the idea that it is not logical to develop a similar theory for first and second language acquisition. She explained that the notion that L1 and L2 acquisition have little in common theoretically has been based on two common misconceptions: the first one is that; the foundation for the L2 is built largely from a transfer
of the rules of the L1. The second misconception is that only the L2 is constructed from prior conceptual knowledge within the learner.

In a discussion of the first misconception, Newmark (1983) argued that learners, who have a need to perform before they are ready, will revert to the L1 syntactic rules more as a result of ignorance than of interference. Their dependence on L1 seems to occur predominantly at the beginning of the acquisition process when there is an intense desire to communicate. Sometimes beginners’ level learners will use not only the L1 structures with the L2 words, but the L1 words as well.

According to the second misconception, researchers agree that the L1, like the L2, is constructed from prior conceptual knowledge. Bruner (1978, p. 247) referring to the L1, observed that “language emerges as a procedural acquisition to deal with events that the child already understands conceptually and to achieve communicative objectives that the child can realize by other means”.

Similar to Ervin-Tripp (1974), O’Grady (1999) mentioned that, if the human brain is equipped to handle language, then certainly this ability is not confined to the L1 only but it can be for the L2, the L3 and so on. In a study of American children learning French in Geneva, carried out by Ervin-Tripp (1974) to show that the brain uses many similar strategies for L2 acquisition, she mentioned that the subjects in her study used three sources for acquiring French. The first source was peers (where they interact in and out of the classroom); the second source was school (where content-area subject matter was taught in French); while the third source was home (where there is exposure to parents who often spoke French to servants and to the mass media)

Richard-Amato (2003, p. 31) confirmed learners may depend quite heavily on first language knowledge to communicate in the target language at first, but they begin to work within the framework of the target language once they are able to form hypotheses about the new language. He also found that learners make errors mainly due to overgeneralization of the newly acquired structure.

In an attempt to investigate the reason behind overgeneralization and transfer, Richard-Amato (2003, p. 31) mentioned that Taylor pointed out that overgeneralization and transfer are the result of the necessity to reduce language to the simplest possible system. He (Taylor) also referred to Jain’s (1969) observation that this phenomenon, overgeneralization, represents an effort to lessen the cognitive burden involved in trying to master something as complex as language. It can be concluded from what is mentioned above that the second language learner like the first language learner, attempts to “regularize, analogize, and simplify” in an effort to communicate.

**Differences between first and second language acquisition**

In general, because second language learners are usually older when they start acquiring a second language they are more developed cognitively than first language learners. Marinova-Todd, Marshall, and Snow (2000) suggested that old learners appear to have distinct advantages in several areas: they tend to learn more quickly than first language learners, they have greater knowledge of the world in general than first language learners, they have more control over the input they receive related to L2 than first language learners, they have the ability to learn and apply rules which facilitate the acquisition process, they already have a first language from which they can transfer strategies and linguistic knowledge.

Some researchers do not support this: Richard-Amato (2003) pointed out that being older may not always be advantageous in learning a second language; Long (1990) mentioned that it seems that older learners have some maturational constraints affecting the language acquisition process; MacIntyre and Charos (1996) mentioned that old learners may find themselves afraid to make errors; Newmark (1983) commented that old learners may have poor attitudes and lack motivation, depending on their feelings and their condition in learning L2; Schachter (1974) and Kleinmann (1977) added that older learners may avoid using certain structures altogether because they are not part of their first language repertoire.

To sum up, the similarities between first and second language acquisition appear to lie in the process itself, and the important differences between first and second language acquisition development appear to centre on affective
factors, cognitive functioning abilities, and certain kinds of knowledge. In the following, the differences and similarities between Arabic language and English language will be presented.

**Differences and similarities between Arabic language and English language**

Kharma and Hajaj (1997) mentioned that most common errors committed by Arab learners of English, especially in writing, are related to the sentences: punctuation, capitalization, word order, expansion, and the use of verb in forming the tenses. For the sake of efficient discussions in section 3, in this section these related problems are presented, in general to give an explanation for the differences and similarities between the structure of linguistic items in L1 and L2.

**Types of mistakes:**

In this section the researcher presents two main types of problems that face Arab learners of English in learning English language as L2. The first one: Problems arise from Arabic interference, which cause (interlingual mistakes). The second one: Problems attribute to the English language itself (Non-Arabic background) which cause (intralingual mistakes).

Types of mistakes committed by Arab learners of English are many and varied. Mistakes are originated in Arabic language will be listed under “Sources of Difficulty” in each sub-section below, but few examples will be given as an introduction, followed by detailed discussion in section 3.

**Statements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of mistake</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omission of be and have.</td>
<td>* Ahmed in the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* The book with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb-subject instead of Subject-verb.</td>
<td>* Was the man a doctor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition of the subject as a pronoun.</td>
<td>* The only son in the family he creates a lot of troubles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of subject-verb agreement.</td>
<td>* There is no machines in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong word-order.</td>
<td>* They were drinking enjoyable their tea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Negation:**

Not the man doctor.
He does not gone.

**Questions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of mistake</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrong word order.</td>
<td>* Can ride the children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty with do.</td>
<td>* Why we learn English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of wrong verb form.</td>
<td>* Have they never go to a restaurant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong question tag.</td>
<td>* You visited him, isn't it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commands:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of mistake</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omission of do.</td>
<td>* Not play here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of no instead of not.</td>
<td>* No play here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use don’t let's instead for let’s not</td>
<td>* Don't let's go away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exclamations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of mistake</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omission of verb.</td>
<td>* How beautiful the girl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences in forming the simple sentence in English language and Arabic language
Kharma and Hajaj (1997) mentioned that there are differences in sentence type and structures in both English and Arabic. For example:

a) Arabic belongs to a family of languages, the Semitic family, the members of which have little in common with the Indo-European Languages to which English belongs.

b) All sentences in English—a part from the imperative and question forms that require yes-no answers—have an explicit subject at the beginning, while Arabic has two types of sentences:

1. Nominal sentences beginning with noun.
2. Verbal sentences beginning with verb.

c) Strictly speaking, Arabic has just two tense—one indicating finished time or past action and another indicating unfinished or present (and future) action. Such tenses as the present perfect are non-existent in Arabic.

d) An Arabic grammar has three parts of speech: noun, verb and adjective. Whereas English includes heterogeneous groups each of which belong to a different part of speech in English.

e) Arabic is an inflectional language with
- Prefixes, infixes and suffixes to denote
- Gender (masculine and feminine)
- Case (genitive, subjective and objective)
- Number, tenses etc.

**Major sentence types in L1 and L2**

For the purpose of explaining the problem of interference, and for convenience I will use the following terms will be used to refer to the major sentence types:

a) Statements (including negatives): in which the subject is always present and preceded the verb, e.g. The boy will visit his aunt.

b) Questions: which are marked by one or more of the following:
1. **Yes-no** answers. e.g.
   Will you visit us today? Yes, I will.
2. A question word at the beginning e.g.
   Who came here yesterday?
3. Arising intonation, e.g.
   You will speak to the boss?

c) Commands or imperative: in which the subject is implicit or understood, E.g. take this with you.

d) Exclamations: e.g. What a lovely day!

e) Social formulas, e.g. How do you do?

**Cross-linguistic influence of L1 in Acquiring L2**

Mourssi (2013c) mentioned that transfer is one of the most important elements which affect interlanguage forms. Investigating it can lead to a better understanding of the source/origin and the development of interlanguage. Researchers were doubtful about the issue of transfer, but some of them have said that it is related to language acquisition and should be discussed. Lado (1957) believed that people rely on their first language when they learn the target language. On the other hand, other researchers Dulay and Burt (1974, p. 24) said that transfer has nothing to do with interlanguage.
In general, Odlin (1989, p. 6), and Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991, p. 5) mentioned that “the study of transfer, or crosslinguistic influence, is peculiar among language acquisition and the phenomenon of language use”. In particular, Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008, p. 4) argued that crosslinguistic influence refers to the influence of one language on another in an individual mind. They illuminated several areas of meaning and crosslinguistic influence which had not been carefully looked at before. Mourssi (2013) referred that Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) presented interesting findings and an analysis of the relationship between language transfer and SLA. Based on Odlin’s (1989) claims, and Jarvis and Pavlenko’s (2008) findings, the researcher found the positive and negative impact of L1 in the acquisition of L2 in the context of ALEs.

The Importance of Grammar in Learning L1 and its Impact on Learning L2
Mourssi (2013a, 2013d) mentioned that prescriptive Arabic grammarians think that grammar is the only element which shows how language is used. They also view the traditional grammar of any language as a set of rules, and the major concept in learning language is to learn its grammar first. According to them, the most common and appropriate learning strategy of learning is memorization, which is reflected in the way they learn L2. They think that memorization helps learners to achieve the tasks required in learning the target language better than any other strategy. This affects the methods of teaching followed by teachers of English for Arab learners who try to achieve the objectives of the target task in a proper and a suitable way which matches learners' attitudes. Similarly, it affects the way Arab learners of English acquire a second language in general and second language grammar in particular. This view is also reflected in the SLA research done based on samples taken from Arabic speakers of English (Mourssi, 2012b, 2013b).

Learning English (as an L1 or L2), grammar can be viewed in different ways. Hymes (1972) states, English speakers need to know the rules of grammar with the rules of language use in order to communicate in a language. Dickins and Woods (1988, p. 630) believe that the role of grammar is to convey and interpret meanings. While Fuller and Gundel (1987, p. 70) suggest that grammatical rules (patterns that are studied by syntacticians and morphologists) were basically designed to help people get their meaning across clearly and accurately.

Furthermore, Mourssi (2013) referred that a number of linguists claim that grammar is essential for appropriate communication. Lock (1996, p. 267) posited that language is a resource for communication and claims that grammar lies at the heart of communication and is not an optional add-on to communication. Similarly, Leech and Svartvik (1982, p. 4) viewed grammar as the focal part of language which relates to phonology and to semantics as well. Harmer (1991, p. 23) believed that knowledge of grammar is essential for competent users of a language. Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) asserted that grammar is one of three interconnected dimensions of language which include: grammar, semantics and pragmatics.

Similar to the perspectives offered by Arab language grammarians, Klein (1986) postulated that in order to learn a foreign language, learners should have the ability to analyse the linguistic input in the target language. More recently, Gao (2001, p. 326) describes grammar as a catalyst for second language accuracy and fluency.

Ismail (2010, p. 143) demonstrates that Arab learners of English had positive views about the use of the CCCC grammar model, which is presented in four stages: Confrontation, Clarification, Conformation, and Consolidation. The author also highlighted certain students' beliefs about the importance and the positive influence of explicit grammar teaching for learning the conventions of sentences and utterances. In the following section, discussion will be presented.

DISCUSSION
In this section, a detailed explanation for each types of mistake related to Arabic language as an L1 will be presented first, followed by a comparison between L1 and L2. First, types of mistakes related to L1.

Types of mistakes related to Arabic language
Statements
Where ALEs commit different types of mistakes which include: omission of be and have, verb-subject instead of subject-verb order, repetition of the subject as a pronoun, lack of subject-verb agreement, and wrong word-order (Kharmo & Hajaj, 1997). These types of mistakes will be presented one by one in the following.

Omission of be and have
Sources of difficulty: This kind of mistakes is frequently made by Arab learners of English in the earlier stages more than advanced stages of learning. It is caused by the absence in Arabic nominal sentences in the present tense of an equivalent of the English verb to be.

* The boy active. 
* With me a book.

**Verb-subject instead of subject-verb order**
This is very common mistakes committed by ALEs. We get sentences like these:

* Reads the boy his lesson. 
* Laugh the boy.

This also applies to the first two patterns when the verb be is in the past and future.

* Was the man a doctor. 
* Will be the boy a man.

It is worth mentioning that the intermediate students are committing a few mistakes due to Arabic interference because the mistakes occur in translation from Arabic into English. For example:

* I was agreed with you. 
* Was giving the lecture.
* left us and ran away.

**Repetition of the subject as a pronoun**
This mistake is probably due to the fact that every verb in Arabic is considered to have a subject, especially in nominal sentences where the predicate is a verb.

* Amal and Farah they were here an hour ago. 
* The only daughter in the family, as I mentioned before, she creates a lot of troubles for her parents. 
* My parents, if they have enough money, they will travel to the UK.

**Lack of subject-verb agreement**
This is an area where one does not expect any mistakes from an Arab Learners of English ALEs in whose language agreement between subject and predicate /verb permeates the whole language and covers: Numbers as in English, Gender and Case. For example:

* Children does not care about their future. 
* This reports contains the all the details. 
* Women has the right to elect. 
* The girl were on her way back home. 
* They reads a story every weekend.

This kind of mistakes (in the last example given) may occur due to the fact that the (s) of the simple present tense is associated with the (s) of the plural, and the inflectional area which is often disregarded or forgotten.

In the first three examples, the mistakes may be explained in terms of coordinated elements. Also, it might be explicable if the subject and the verb were far apart from each other. For example:
* The flight between Muscat and Cairo were run per week. 
* The young boy who was standing with his brother were talking on the phone.

Wrong word-order
* He can learn from how to win. * I took from him his ball. * My friend has also a bike.

Negation: Source of difficulty
a) Negation patterns in English and Arabic differ widely, and has not impact on the process of learning English negation by Arab Learners of English in particular. The following mistakes occur due to Arabic interference (in early stages).


b) Mistakes may be common to many other linguistic group learning English as a foreign language.

* He don’t go. * He doesn’t goes. * He do not goes. * He did not goes. * He went not. * He not takes/took his breakfast. * He is may (be) studying at home.

c) Certain type of negations that may constitute some difficulty to Arabic-speaking students.

No has the Arabic counterpart /la/
I have some money. 
لدي بعض النقود/ indi ba'du nuqudin/ 
I have no money.
لا نقود لدي/ la nuquda indi/ 
(Literally: *No money with me)

Nobody/ No one lost his book can have the Arabic equivalent:
لا أحد فقد كتابه/ la ahada faqada kitabahu/ 
(Literally: *Nobody/ no one lost his book)

But is more commonly rendered as:
لم يفقد أحد كتابه/lam yafqid ahadun kitabahu/ 
(Literally: *Not (+ past) lose any body his book)

Questions: Sources of difficulty
Comparison of question patterns in English and Arabic reveals the following differences.
a) A big problem is word-order, especially when there is an auxiliary verb or be or a modal in the English statement:

Yes_No questions:
* Can ride the children? * Has been the teacher looking………?

Wh questions:
* What her fate will be? * Where the boys are going?

b) The use in English of the operator do, and its absence in Arabic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of mistake</th>
<th>Yes-no questions</th>
<th>Wh-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Inversion without do</td>
<td>*Go you to school every day?</td>
<td>*What bought the girl?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Omission of do</td>
<td>*Know the girls many games?</td>
<td>*Why ran the girl to school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Redundant do</td>
<td>*Do I must study this lesson?</td>
<td>*Why we learn English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Did Maha was eating an apple?</td>
<td>*What Nabil and Isam bought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Who did want to eat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*What do they have found?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) As elsewhere, the Arab Learners of English are liable to use the wrong verb form in the formation of questions. For example:

* Does he knew the answer? * Has the teacher been look at their notebook?
* Do the boy know the answer? * Is the teacher teaching?

d) The Arab Leaners of English are usually confused about question-tags, and he may use only one (isn't it- alaysa kadalik?) in all cases.

Commands: Sources of difficulty

It seems that the problem with commands lies in the formation of the negative, where there are three areas of difficulty.

a) Omission of do:
* Not play here. * Not eat too much.

b) Use of no instead of not:
* No play here. * No smoke cigarettes.

c) Use of do not let's for let's not:
* Do not let's go away. * Do not let's be late.

Exclamations: Sources of difficulty

a) The main mistakes that occurs here is the omission of the verb:
* How beautiful the girl! * How fine the boy.

b) Another mistakes occurs when how (used with adjectives and adverbs) is confused with what (used before noun), especially when the noun preceded by an adjective.
* How a long journey! * How a beautiful girl!

Social formulas

“Social formulas are simple acts of communication whereby people establish and maintain friendly relation with one another.” Both English and Arabic employ a wide variety of social formulas (Kharma and Hajaj, 1997). Example: How do you do?

There is no special problem for Arab learners of English in this area except differentiating between friendly and formal formulas. Its solution depends on mastery of the forms and using them in the appropriate context.

Comparison between L1 (Arabic Language) and L2 (English Language)
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**Statements**

**Statements in English language**

In English the basic statements sentence patterns are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Subject be Adverb</td>
<td>John is there / in the garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Subject be Complement</td>
<td>John is kind. (adjective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John is a doctor (noun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Subject Linking Verb Complement</td>
<td>John looks sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Subject Intransitive Verb</td>
<td>The boy laughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Subject Transitive Verb Direct Object</td>
<td>The boy reads a lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Subject Transitive Verb Direct Object adverb</td>
<td>The boy put the book in the desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Subject Transitive Verb Direct Object Complement</td>
<td>They made him a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Subject Transitive Verb indirect Object Complement</td>
<td>She gave me a present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - There be Subject Adverb</td>
<td>There is a man at the door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - It be Adjective that</td>
<td>It is important that you come on time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statements in Arabic**

**a)** The first two patterns are:

- **(Subject be Adverb)**)
  
  Ahmed is in the house. 
  
  أحمد في البيت/ahmadu fi-l-baiti/  
  (Literally: Ahmed in the house.)

- **(Subject be Complement)**)
  
  The boy is active. 
  
  الولد نشيط/al-waladu nasitun/  
  (Literally: The boy active.)

  In the past, future, infinitive, gerund forms and often in the form of participle, the verb be appears in Arabic (it acts as auxiliary and belongs to a special group of verb called أفعال ناقصة)

**b)** The third pattern (Subject Linking Verb Complement):

Ahmed looks sad. 
 أحمد يبدو حزينًا/ahmadu yabdu hazinan/  
 OR يبدو أحمد حزينًا/yabdu ahmadu hazinan /

**c)** The same apply to the fourth sentence pattern (Subject Intransitive Verb)

The boy laughs. 
 الولد يضحك/ al waladu yadhaku/  
 OR يضحك الولد./yadhaku al waladu/

**d)** The fifth pattern (Subject Transitive Verb Direct Object) has a variant with the verb have. In Arabic the verb (أملك/ Amaluk/ (own) is used,

I have (own/ possess) a book. 
 أملك كتابًا/amliku kitaban/

**e)** Sentence patterns 5 and 6 – (Subject Transitive Verb Direct Object Adverb) are also quite similar in English and Arabic, except that in Arabic the verb may begin the sentence:

* e.g. The boy is reading his lesson.*

The school gave Aziz a prize. 
 المدرسة أعطت عزيزة جائزة/al-madrasatu a'tat' azizan ja?izatan/
h) As for sentence 9 (there be Subject Adverb) the Arabic equivalent, (يوجد /yujadu/), of there is/are is not frequently used in the surface structures.

There is a man at the door.

/ yujadu rajulun bi-l-babi/

i) The impersonal pronoun it in English have a counterpart in Arabic, but it doesn't follow exactly the same English pattern.

It is important that you arrive on time.

/ inna-hu min-al-ahammiyyati bi makan an tasila fi-l-waqt-l-munasib/

(Literally: * It's of great importance that you arrive on time)

Negation

Negation in English

a) English contains an auxiliary or model verb, e.g (be, have, shall, will, must, may, etc.) is negated by inserting the negative participle not after the auxiliary verb, e.g.

John is playing football.  
John is not playing football.

b) Statements with one finite verb (other than be) it is negated by inserting the auxiliary do and not before the verb, e.g.

John plays football.  
John doesn't play football.

We come to school every day.  
We don't come to school every day.

c) The verb be is always negated with the participle not only.

Mary is a clever teacher.  
Mary is not a clever teacher.

3.2.2.2 Negation in Arabic

a) Not in English has several substitutions in Arabic, namely:

/ la/, / ma/, / laysa/, / lam/, / lan/

b) Arabic employs no counterpart for do

c) The negative particle is always placed before the verb in verbal sentences and before the subject in nominal sentences.

ةﺓاﺍﻟﻜﺮ ﻷﺤﻤﺪ ﺑﻴﻠﻌﺐ ahmadu yal'abu-l-kurah/  
(Ahmed is playing/ plays football)

/ أﺤﻤﺪ ﻷﻠﺒﻌﺐ ﺑﻠﺖ/ ahmadu la yal'abu-l-kurah/  
(Literally: *Ahmed not plays/ not is playing football)

d) The particle/laysa/ is employed in nominal sentences.

Whereas / ma/ and / la/ use in both types of sentences.

/ lam/ and / lan/ negate only the verb and indicate time-reference.

/ أﺕﺄﻟﺕ أﻨﻭﺭ ﺑﺮﺕﺎ ﺟальн/ akala anwaru burtuqalatan/  
(Anwar ate an orange)

/ ﻷﻤل ﺑﺄﻟﺕ أﻨﻭﺭ ﺑﺮﺕﺎ ﺟальн/ lam ya?kul anwaru burtuqalatan/  
(Literally: * Not (+past) eat Ahmed an orange)

Questions

Questions in English

The major types of question in English: These are tag-question, consisting of an operator, plus pronoun with or without a negative particle.

a) Did you take the book?  

b) Did you take the book or the pen?
c) Who took the book?  
d) Who did you meet?  
e) When (Why/ how) did you go to see john?  
f) The lesson hasn't finished, has it? The lesson has finished, hasn't it?  

These are declarative question, which are exceptional types of yes-no questions.  
g) You have got the book? They will be there. I suppose?

**Questions in Arabic**  
The previous questions are similar to their counterparts in Arabic, e.g.:  

a) هل أخذت الكتاب؟ /hal akadta-l-kitaba/?  
   (Literally: *Take you the book instead of did you take the book?)  

b) هل أخذت كتابا أم قلم؟ /hal akadta-l-kitaba am qalaman/?  
   /akadta kitaban am qalamn/?  
   (Literally: Took you a book or a pen? Instead of did you take a book or a pen?)  

c) من أخذ الكتاب؟ /man akada al-kitaba/  
   (Literally: who took the book)  

d) لم ينته الأمر أليس كذلك؟ /lam yantahi-darsu,alaysa kaddalik/?  
   (Literally: * Not (+ past) end the lesson, isn't it?  

e) أخذت الكتاب؟ /akadta-al-kitaba/?  
   (Literally: took you the book instead of did you take the book?).  

**Commands**  

**Commands in English**  
Kharma and Hajaj (1997) mentioned that in English, commands are type of statement sentence which have no explicit grammatical subject and have an imperative finite verb (the base form of the verb). In English commands follow the same order as in statement sentence. We find the following patterns:

1 – Verb adverb  
   Go away  
2 – Verb Complement  
   Be reasonable  
3 – Verb Object  
   Take it  
4 – Verb Object adverb  
   Take it to the water  
5 – Verb Object Complement  
   Take him prisoner  
6 – Verb Indirect Object Direct Object  
   Give him another drink  
7 – Verb  
   Jump  

-To make the pattern negative we add (don't going)  
   e.g. don't go away  

-Also, we can add to the pattern (let us or the negative let us not)  
   e.g. let's go away.

**Commands in Arabic**  
In Arabic, the statement sentences follow almost the same pattern except the nominal sentence where the verb /Kun/ (be) is used  

a) (Be ready.)  
   كن مستعدا! /kun musta 'iddan/!  

b) (Take this.)  
   خذ هذا /kud hada/  

To make the pattern negative, we add (no) la:  

/la ta?kud hada/  
   (Literally: no take this)  

- The Arabic equivalent to the (let us) pattern is realized by (li) meaning (let us)  
   /li nadhab li-s-suqi/ (literally: let us go to the market – place)  

**Exclamations**  

**Exclamations in English**
Exclamations resemble (wh) questions but are not followed immediately by a finite verb. In English the commonest exclamations – words are what and how e.g. What a beautiful dress.

Exclamations in Arabic
In Arabic it is expressed by ( ni ma ) ( how good ), ( bi sa ) ( how bad ) ( ma ) ( how)

- نع الرجل عمرو
/ni'ma-r-rajulu 'amru/

- How good the man Amro instead of How good Amro is!

/ bụsa ma sana'a a mru/

- How bad what did Amro instead of how bad is what Amro did?

CONCLUSION
The analyses of the linguistic items taken from L1 and L2 indicate that there are similarities and differences in the acquisition of both Arabic Language as an L1 and English Language as an L2. It is also indicated that L1 has positive and negative impact on the acquisition of L2 as well. It is also concluded that Foreign Language Learners depend on their first language when they analyse the linguistic items of target language. Finally, it is concluded that the similarities and the differences indicated in the acquisition of L1 and L2 shows the importance of grammar as an essential element in the acquisition of Arabic Language as an L1 and English Language as an L2.
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ABSTRACT
This paper is a state of art on the spread of English language around the world resulting in different varieties known as World Englishes (WE) with the review of its origins and states of change until the neo-colonial era. When considering the growth of English, the imperial power of some countries having English as an imperial language is considered influential (Pennycook, 2007). Also, a number of models for the varieties of English, the most significant of which is Kachru's, are discussed in this paper. The last part of the paper reviews the implications of WEs in ELT.
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INTRODUCTION
English language has expanded dramatically around the globe during the past decades. When considering the growth of English, the imperial power of England and more recently the US, English as an imperial language itself, and decolonization must be taken into account (Pennycook, 2007). Each of these issues will be reviewed in this paper.

There are different varieties of English which can be seen and heard today: Indian English, Australian English, Singapore English, British English, American English, Irish English etc. Kachru discusses these varieties of English (World Englishes) in terms of some diasporas; Two main types of which were the first diaspora as a result of the immigration of the English to settler colonies in Australia, North America, and New Zealand (where English was brought in by the native speakers from Europe), and the second diaspora in British colonies such as Africa and Asia where the language was adopted from different users of English who weren’t often native speakers (Kachru, Kachru, & Nelson, 2006; Kachru, 2011).

There is a "naming Disease" (Anchimbe, 2009, p. 274) related to the interpretation of the term “World Englishes”. While some scholars refer to English as a lingua franca and a subcategory of English as an international language which is itself an alternative terminology to ESOL (English for speakers of other languages) (Halliday, 2009), some others (e.g. Trudgill & Hannah, 2002 cited in Jenkins, 2006) believe that international English is the local Englishes spoken by nonnative speakers and a great many also put the native speakers in this category. Researchers sometimes use "English as a lingua franca" for "English as an international language" to avoid confusion. Bolton (2004) describes three different though interrelated interpretations of the term World Englishes: 1) it can be regarded as an umbrella term including all varieties of English around the world also sometimes called “World English”, “international English”, or “global English”, 2) in a narrower sense, it can refer to the specific new Englishes in Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean also called “nativized”,” indigenized”, “new Englishes”, or “institutionalized English” (see the outer circle model of Kachru’s), and 3) it may refer to the Kachruvian approach to the study of English.
Another problem is related to the notion of Standard English (SE) to distinguish between native and nonnative speakers of English and also referring the compromised superiority over other varieties of English. Some scholars critique the SE as it is underestimating local norms and being monocentric by relying too much on American or British norms. Halliday (2009) claims that while nativeness vs. non-nativeness has been refuted by some researchers, it still serves as a basic criterion for labeling English speakers around the world.

**ORIGINS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

Estimating the exact birth date of a language is impossible to a great extent since languages undertake numerous alterations and a variety of variables are associated with the evolution of different languages. In addition, almost always languages have a mutual influence on each other (Kachru et al., 2006). By all these, Kachru et al. elaborated on the origins of language in his *Handbook of World Englishes* extensively in terms of four Diasporas. Like High German, Low German, Dutch, Faroese, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, and Icelandic, and Gothic English, now extinct, which belong to the Germanic family of languages, English is a member of this family as well. The root of Germanic languages goes back to Proto-Germanic, which was not a written language. Moreover, Romance and Germanic belong to the Indo-European family of languages. A number of other languages are also Indo-European such as Northern India, Persian, the Slavic languages, Greek, Armenian, the Celtic languages. Indo-European languages seem to date back at 3000 BC, located in Eastern Europe, just north of the Black Sea (Ukraine) (Kachru et al., 2006). People from the original Indo-European tribe emigrated east (into Persia and India), north (to Russia and the Baltic regions), and west (to Greece, Italy, Western Europe, and the British Isles). Always looking for new lands, the Germanic tribes emigrated to the Western Europe and settled in northern Germany, the Low Countries, and southern Scandinavia and England. The Celts had to assimilate to Germanic languages and the ones who didn’t adopt Germanic languages moved west and south into Cornwall and Wales and Scotland. That’s why today’s Irish (Gaelic), Welsh, and Scots Gaelic, are believed to have remained from the first inhabitants of England i.e. Celts. Germanic invaders had contributed to an Anglo-Saxon language, Old English (also known as Anglo-Saxon) dating back to 450–1150 (Kachru et al., 2006). Old English contained of a lot of inflections and conjugations, three genders, a lot of subcategories of nouns, verbs, and adjectives, and four cases.

Early Modern English was created at the same time as the Age of Discovery. At the age of discovery, Britain attempted to rule the whole world by discovering new areas. Ships and tools were more advanced than before and in order to communicate with new people of the discovered lands, a lighter language with less complex morphology and sounds (e.g. the velar fricative [x], spelled gh) was derived from the Old English resulting in Modern English that we have today. Using more of monosyllabic words, simpler morphology, and easier pronunciation are the major characteristics of modern English.

**CHANGES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

Change in one language occurs so stealthily that is only noticeable during long time periods and across generations. Though, it must not be forgotten that languages change *constantly* (Hudson, 2000). There are three commonly known periods of change in the history of English language: Old English (until about 1100), Middle English (from 1100 to about 1500), and Modern English (1500 until present).

Like most languages, Modern English differs from the old one in various aspects. One way to find out how different an old version of a language such as English was, one can refer to the literature of that language. Another important factor affecting change in languages is the influence that they have on each other. According to Kachru et al. (2006), English has adopted not-originally-Germanic new words from:

- the other languages in the same region such as Latin or Celtic (e.g. *York*, *bin*),
- languages with high prestige such as Latin (e.g. *mile*, *pit*, *cheap*, *wine*),
- religious language: with the arrival of Christianity in Britain in 597, English vocabulary was influenced significantly (e.g. *bishop*, *human*, *angel*, *grammar*, *elephant*, *talent*, *rule*),
- Scandinavian languages, prior to the Norman Conquest, through Viking sailors (e.g. *law*, *die*, *rotten*, *odd*),
- the Romance and Celtic languages. The fact that only Germanic has the strong/weak division, irregular verbs, among Indo-European languages, is due to the effect of Celtic and Romance languages (e.g. English place-names with -by which are Danish in origin: Rugby, Derby).

Hudson (2000) lists eight causes of language change some of which may affect languages at the same time:
1. Ease of articulation, which seems to be the reason for some phonological changes in languages such as assimilation, deletion, alternation, insertion, dissimilation, metathesis, and chain shifts.
2. Expression of new meanings, for the expression of new things, events, and ideas sometimes some words or grammatical features are borrowed from other languages.
3. Desire for novelty is the reason most jargons and the slang were born.
4. Regularization, associated with human children’s language learning capacity and creativity aspect of language.
5. Redundancy reduction.
7. Obsolence of meaning, in that obsolete meanings disappear from language when they are not used anymore.
8. Language contact which is, unlike all the above changes, an external cause. Intimate and long contact with one language often results in extensive language change (p.424). For example, a great number of French words came into English after the Norman conquest of Britain and the resulting contact between English and French languages. On the other hand, the use of English as an international language has affected a lot of other languages around the world.

Widdowson (1994) asserts that speakers of English in the postcolonial societies may change and localize English at the grammatical level to fit it into their own contexts and local needs and whereby to own the language and keep away from the norms of native English speakers. Colonizing groups had various attitudes toward spreading English in their colonized societies (Anchimbe, 2009). If the colonizing groups were reluctant in passing their language to their colonies, the colonized people would have no access to the language and inevitably had to fit it to their purposes. This is how some Pidgins and Creoles were invented. Under the reverse situation, learning the colonizing language would be a mean to convey democratic ideas resulting in the advent of new native varieties of the language in such areas. Although exposure to English during colonialism was based on political factors, the use of English was also influenced by the ecological and sociocultural situations of colonized groups.

**USAGE DOMAIN OF LANGUAGES**

The usage domain of English is perhaps the main reason for the dominance of English over Welsh, Scottish and Irish in England. There are two important kinds of usage domain for languages. The first domain is "H", used for High languages, which is the variety of language used in formal, written, official, legal, and formal domains such as standard French or standard Arabic. The second domain is called “L”, for Low languages, which is the everyday language used in informal settings, family and friends. There is usually a conflict between two languages to gain the domain power to be the High language. There seems to be different reasons why a language is regarded as the High language e.g. greater force of arms or economic power, strength as a result of more population, novelty coming with a new language and culture. The less powerful language is the Low language (substratum) and the high language becomes the superstratum language. In most cases, after some time, the substratum language fades away leaving some shades (Kachru et al., 2006). For instance, the Indo-Europeans immigrated into India from Europe and displaced the Dravidian languages of Indians with Sanskrit and pushed the Dravidians southward traces of which have remained today. The reason is that the Indo-Europeans were more advanced with a higher culture, and regarded as more powerful and H language. Meanwhile, the effect of L languages on the H languages must not be overlooked (e.g. words for transferring alien concepts such as canoe), although it is far smaller than the influence of H on L.

In the Middle Ages, among English, Latin, French, Welsh, and Irish, Latin was one of the H languages. As an advantage for all H languages, Legal and religious documents were almost always written in Latin, and its translations were found in other languages. Around 1400, English was regarded as the H language in England due to its power in trade and transportation as well as its population, and political control. However, French and Latin had the full control of H functions, the language of law and religion. Later, by the fifteenth century English was regarded as the language of law.
MODELS OF ENGLISH VARIETIES
Traditionally, a distinction has been made between ESL (English as a Second Language) countries, where the language has official status, EFL (English as a Foreign Language) countries where this is not the case, and ENL (English as a Native Language) countries. However, this model has recently been criticized due to its limited application in a context of multilingualism.

Kachru coined the term "World Englishes". The term "English languages" goes one step further than "World Englishes" or "EIL" and implies that varieties of English have already progressed into different languages. Meanwhile, Kachru points out that the English varieties still have more similarities than differences to "mother" English.

There are alternative models presented by Gorlach (1990) and McArthur (1987) cited in Bauer (2002). The former model goes from the most widespread variety of English (in the center) to the most local varieties (round the rim of the center). The latter is rather similar but the difference is that unlike Gorlach's model, the hub of the circle is seen as being a standard in this one. McArthur also includes creoles like Tok Pisin along with other regional varieties. Instead of showing origins and influences, these models portray a set of differing standards for English holding the common heritage of world English at the hub. They fail to show that there are two very different types of English i.e. varieties spoken primarily by native speakers of English and varieties originally spoken by second-language learners of English (Bauer, 2002).

Kachru (1985) proposed a model of concentric circles (the “Inner,” “Outer,” and “Expanding” Circles) to describe the spread of English worldwide based on the historical context, status, and functions of English around the world. In his model, Kachru takes some sociolinguistic aspects of English in postcolonial societies into account as opposed with standardization, codification, and linguistic creativity. The Inner Circle demonstrates the societies where English is the first language e.g. the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The Outer Circle shows the postcolonial Anglophonic contexts such as Nigeria and Zambia in Africa, and India and Singapore in Asia. The Outer-Circle is a multilingual community in which English is only one of the languages spoken as an official, co-official, legal, or educational language. English language functions within a non-English culture as a second language (ESL), resulting in the advent of significant variations in English. The Expanding Circle refers to those areas where English is an international and a foreign language (EFL) e.g. English in Japan, Korea, Saudi Arabia, and China (Kachru et al., 2006). He also made a distinction between genetic nativeness and functional nativeness in terms of range (functions of English in societies) and depth (English use by people from different levels of society basilectal varieties to the acrolect).

The Inner Circle societies provide norms such as text books (norm providers) and the Expanding-Circle societies accept these norms. Some Outer-Circle societies such as India and the Philippines sometimes try to establish local norms and hence are called norm-developing. These circles share a number of characteristics and the status of English in each area might change over time.

The Three Circles Model (Kachru, 1985)

Although Kachru’s model was criticized for emphasizing on nations and overlooking some areas and simplifying linguistic diversity (Jenkins, 2003), it was quite influential in discussing varieties of language. Modiano (1999) proposed the model of "English as an International Language " (EIL) with centripetal Circles emphasizing on English proficiency as opposed to the geographical view of world Englishes. Higgins (2003) claims that the use of English
in outer-circle countries such as India, Malaysia, and Singapore is not clear because it is different from interlanguages and at the same time different from native varieties. She believes that in categorizing people in terms of English language, we ought to consider their linguistic properties rather than their social identities.

McKay (2011) makes a distinction between a monolithic model of English versus a pluricentric model. In the former the native speaker is an authority and code while in the latter model, the most remarkable proponent of which is Kachru, language contact necessarily entails language change and it is natural to have different varieties of English as a result of its vast spread. This shows that we the identity of nonnative English speakers must not be overlooked as being only the norm and standard consumers of native speakers.

INTERNATIONAL VS. INTRANATIONAL VARIETIES
It is also possible to examine the distinction between second and foreign language considering a pair of concepts advocated by members of the East-West Center in Hawaii: intranational and international languages (Smith 1981 cited in Stern, 1983). The main purpose of the distinction between these two concepts is to show that countries like Britain or America cannot claim to own the English language and have proprietary rights to determine standards of the language. Unlike international language vs. intranational language distinction, the second vs. foreign language learning distinction shows that there is a specified speech community or communities for each reference or contact group. English can be referred to as an intranational language when it is learned and used for wider communication within a country for educational, commercial, and political purposes. For example, English has the status of an official language in Nigeria or Zambia without specified reference group. Also French in Ivory Coast holds the same intranational function (Stern, 1983). On the other hand, when English is learnt in many countries across the world without reference to specified English-speaking territories and as a means of international communication, it is regarded as an international language.

Closely related to the intranational vs. international varieties of English is the concept of "linguicism" employed by Phillipson (1997). He asserts that we can have intralingual and interlingual Linguicism. Linguicism can exist among and between speakers of one language it is called intralingual . For example, when one dialect is privileged and regarded as the ‘standard’; and when Linguicism exists between speakers of different languages and is regarded as a standard variety or a variety with high prestige, it is called interlingual. For example, when one language such as Cantonese remains as a mere dialect unsuited for a range of literate or societal functions comparing with English as the language of modernity and progress. Both of these two types of linguicism lead to stigmatizing, downgrading or vanishing a language.

LINGUISTIC IMPERIALISM
Phillipson (1997) defines linguistic imperialism (LI) as a theoretical construct to show linguistic hierarchization, why some languages happen to be used more than others, what structures and ideologies are used more than others, and what structures and ideologies facilitate this processes, as well as the role of language professionals. He also regards Linguistic Imperialism as a subtype of linguicism. Linguicism draws upon the sociology of language and education in a way that languages can contribute to unequal access to societal power. In this sense, language is used as a means to hold and transfer power. There are organizations and budgets which are specialized to achieve this goal. For example, the British Council are exercising ‘English Language Imperialism’ to maintain the global status of British English as opposed to the spread of American English (Phillipson, 1992).

Phillipson's use of the term ‘linguicism’ demonstrates a biased system through which a scheme of linguistic hierarchization holds people in their assigned positions based on language use (Jambor, 2007). In other words, linguistic power facilitates the maintenance of hegemony. Cultural, economic and political dimensions mainly shape Kachru’s inner/periphery circles of language speakers – relationship and the inner circle countries seem to have political, economic and cultural influences on the outer and expanding circles. Linguicism may be overt or covert, conscious or unconscious.

Knowles cited in Jambor (2007), defined language imperialism as the transfer of power (either military or economical) and some aspects of the dominant culture from a dominant language to other peoples. In most cases this
transfer may not be imposed by the dominant language culture: rather, it may be demanded by the inferior group as a source of prestige, high status, or perceived beauty. Some of the most successful imperial languages are Latin, Arabic, and English. Traditionally, languages were spread due to a superior military power, but recently, economical power is regarded as the source of power.

According to Philipson (1997), much of his inspiration for linguistic imperialism was drawn from Western scholarship, work in peace and development studies, education and social theory, and work on language in the French empire. Also he was inspired by some thinkers and authors at the receiving-end of imperialism such as many African and Indian sociolinguists. Meanwhile, he extracted some ideas from the human rights law against racial, sexual, and linguistic discriminations. Therefore, Philipson is one of the proponents of the smaller language speakers' right such as indigenous language speakers.

STANDARD ENGLISH
It is likely to assume that varieties of English are new versions of the standard language spoken by native speakers of English. However, some of these varieties are chronologically older than some native Englishes such as Indian English being older than New Zealand English. Due to some facts like the ones mentioned above, Standard English seems to be a controversial issue.

Randolph Quirk is regarded among the first scholars who coined “varieties” of English referring to the English “standards” (Kachru et al., 2006). He believed that English does not necessarily belong to the native English speakers. English in one area cannot exclusively be regarded as more correct than in the other areas because there is no established and accepted criterion for the priority of English in one area over another.

Trudgill (1998) emphasizes on communicability instead of Standard English which depend mostly on societal prejudices according to Anchimbe (2009). By communicability, Trudgill means English can be spoken in any accent only if it is comprehensible. She also emphasizes on degrees of accent tolerance at the onset of communication and later adaptation and accommodation. All native speakers of English can be regarded as the native speakers of non-standard dialects; hence, it is not unacceptable to regard them as the L2 speakers just like non-native speakers.

On the other hand, Bolton (2006) reports that Standard English should be defined in an endonormative way rather than exonormative (determined from outside). He further mentions that the use of non-standard varieties of English may lead to a lack of intelligibility. Ur (2010) believes that the need to have codification for an international variety of English in grammars and dictionaries is inevitable. ELT teachers and textbook writers need criteria for teaching and designing materials out of the most common features of English around the world. However, due to the variety of divergent dialects and accents within a native language, it looks impossible that we be able to create a united set of standards (Trudgill, 1998).

Some members of the Outer Circle such as Kachru (1985) have started challenging the exocentric norms and rethinking the question of standards. English is used by people of Outer and Expanding Circle for the purpose of interacting with others from outer and expanding circles. In most of the interactional situations, no one from the Inner Circle is even involved or even relevant (Kachru, 2011). By all these, there is still a dominance for English and American varieties of English. The reasons for this dominance can be political, military, economic, success, and cultural influences and powers of English native speakers like the Latin and the Roman in the past (Crystal, 1997). According to Crystal (2003) cited in Crystal (1997), English language has spread around the world in such a way that it cannot be regarded as owned by any single nation. In line with Crystal, Phillipson (1992) considers a more comprehensive view of power called imperialism or linguistic imperialism. He attributes the dominance of English to imperialism and asserts that scientific imperialism, media imperialism, educational imperialism, cultural imperialism, and linguistic imperialism are all different types of imperialism being expressed by language. As a result, English as a lingua franca represents the linguistic imperialism and dominance around the world. Linguistic imperialism is also associated with racism, sexism, capitalism, and linguicism.

In order to make the best of English in areas where it penetrated into, it is needed to be localized, domesticated, and regionalized to that community's need instead of the standard variety. Nativization or indigenization is a kind of adaptation taking place when a language, like English, is used in a different context and fits to its needs in a way that a distinct variety emerges after some time (Richards & Schmidt, 2002).
The issue of the Standard English is closely related to the idea of nativeness vs. non-nativeness which was coined after colonialism in the 1960s and 1970s bifurcating English speakers into two categories: the norm-setter and the norm-receiver respectively. The native speaker’s variety of English is often considered as the Standard English. However, since the non-native varieties have the native speakers of their own, this dichotomy is not accepted as it was in the past (Anchimbe, 2009). Seidhofer (2005) states that English functions as a global lingua franca but as a consequence of its international use, English is also shaped by its nonnative speakers as much as by its native speakers.

In SLA, when one accepts the notion of the native speaker, he or she must have inevitably accepted that only authentic and naturally occurring language should be taught because only native speakers are authentic and can teach English this way (Widdowson, 1994). On the other hand when the emphasis is put on the context of learning in SLA, because the non-native speaker is familiar with the context of language learning, native speakers do not gain the advantage. Linguistic imperialism or native speakerism impose that the native-speaker is the ideal norm and criteria for EFL/ ESL learners. This way, native speakers, who are only a very small minority nowadays, become the authority while many nonnative speakers who happen to become the majority are excluded and underestimated. Also, native speakers themselves speak in various accents and dialects which can be difficult to understand. That's why a native speaker with any ethnic accent may not be an appropriate model for non-native speakers. Even if native speakers can be true models and norms for learning English, in EFL situations, it is not feasible to employ a native speaker teacher and as it is apparent that the majority of EFL teachers are nonnative (Ur, 2010). On the other hand, Ur (2010) believes that it can be discouraging for EFL learners to try hard to become a native speaker because it is impossible to gain an exact native like proficiency no matter how competent they are. In return, Ur (2010) suggested that EFL or ESL teachers should be fully competent without emphasizing on their nativeness or non-nativeness.

NON-STANDARD VARIETIES
Sometimes the term stigmatized varieties is used for varieties other than the Standard language to show social dialects for different groups such as poor or working class, ethnic or racial groups (e.g. African American Vernacular English), regional varieties, and pidgins and Creoles (Tollefson, 2007). They are called stigmatized varieties because they are considered to be unattractive and the deficient versions of the standard. English, like other languages, changes “systematically, pervasively, and constantly” (Hudson, 2000; p. 452). Some factors which affect the change in speech communities are: the population size, the degree of social relationships, removal from general standards, and subordinate bilingualism (Hudson, 2000).

Vernacular language is another term used for non-standard varieties. It generally describes the mother tongue of a socially or politically minority group in the context of a more powerful group with a different language. In order to emphasize linguistic autonomy and a parallel position, the term indigenous is sometimes used instead of Vernacular to refer to the language of the native inhabitants of a particular region (King, & Benson, 2008). The term ethnic group is also sometimes used in Africa for local languages and the term ethnic minority is used for the same related concept in Asia.

Pidgin and creole
Yule (1985) defines a pidgin as "A variety of a language which developed for some practical purpose such as trading among different languages with who had a lot of contact."(P. 233) Thus, pidgins have no native speakers. When a pidgin develops beyond its role as a trade language and becomes the first language of a social community it is called a creole e.g. Hawaii . Creole develops as the first language of pidgin speakers. Unlike pidgins, creoles have a large number of native speakers e.g. a French based creole spoken by a lot of people in Haiti or English based creoles used in Jamaica. Creoles may evolve as a result of the Creolization process; however, some members of a society may try to use fewer creole forms (decreolization) which is called the post creole continuum.

WORLD ENGLISHES AND ELT
Application of language varieties and the Standard English in ELT classes can be confusing and must not be taken for granted. The relationship between WEs and ELT in ELT is connected with the medium of instruction in the
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classroom, the implicit economic and social value of standard varieties of English, the notion of native and nonnative speaker, and globalization which affects language policies.

Phillipson (1992) mentions the role of language pedagogical practices and ELT specialists in the “hegemony” of English. ELT professionals play important role in the progress and spread of English around the world. According to Tollefson (2007), in choosing the language variety to be used in ELT classes, we must consider two points: first, the variety used by teachers and students as the medium of instruction in the classroom and second, the target language variety of the learners. Most textbooks are either American or British English (as standardized varieties) oriented. In such areas, teachers often teach the British or American Standard English found in textbooks while they speak in the local variety and accent different from the so called standard (Anchimbe, 2009).

Other related issue is the medium of instruction which can be the use of English, bilingual approaches in ELT classes, or non-standard varieties. Auerbach (2000) found that using L1 in the classroom is beneficial at the beginning stages of second language learning for learners with little English knowledge, motivates the weak students who had experienced several language learning failures, improves retention and progress, aids communicative and learner-centered approaches, and is culture friendly. Due to some political reasons, medium of instruction in most ELT settings is standard varieties which are often regarded as the varieties of the upper middle class, while other varieties (stigmatized varieties) are believed as Low languages leading to educational and employment failure of their speakers (Tollefson, 2007).

There is a negative attitude toward including stigmatized varieties in ELT classrooms in that they are assumed to hinder English language learning. Brown (2001) states that a native speaker teacher is better at understanding EFL textbooks which are generally written in one of the Standard varieties of English. Also, there is a negative attitude toward nonnative teachers and underestimating their abilities in comparison with native speaker teachers. On the other hand, adhering to the standard varieties of English leads to the overestimation of errors and overcorrection in the classroom.

Kachru (2011) adds that the American, Australian, British, Canadian and New Zealand norms are different from each other in many ways yet they can interact with each other pretty well. Also it has been observed and documented that varieties (accents or dialects) in different areas of the pluricentric communities such as England cannot always understand each other. It doesn’t seem to be possible to impose a standard for all the English speakers around the world based on the Inner Circle norms while the Inner Circle communities include some variations in their regional and social dialects the same as the Outer and Expanding Circles.

Incorporating World Englishes (WE) in ELT profession can also influence the EL teacher training. EFL teacher trainees should be aware of world varieties of English in their training programs. Some language and literature departments such as universities in India and several universities in the USA (e.g., African-American, African, Asian-American, Indian or South Asian) have incorporated WE literatures (such as various Spanish, French, or Arabic) in their undergraduate curricula.

CONCLUDING REMARKS
In addition, assigning exocentric norms can be a great danger to mutual intelligibility. Smith (1992), cited in Kachru (2011), claimed that the more the exposure to different varieties, the more accommodation strategies to these variations in accent, lexicogrammar and discoursal strategies will take place. Internet and media play significant role in this vein. A number of dictionaries have been published incorporating the impact of different varieties in wider dissemination e.g. Encarta World English Dictionary included East Africa, Hong Kong, Hawaii, Malaysia-Singapore, South Africa, South Asia, UK Black English and US African-American English in 1999; The Macquarie Dictionary in 1997 included lexical items from South-East Asian Englishes (Kachru, 2011).

Interlanguage analysis was the major concern in the past with little attention to the learning processes, individual variables, learners’ identity and the social context of English language learning. Recently, student identity constructing in the second language has become an issue (McKay, 2011), part of which can be the inclusion of ethnic varieties in the classroom to make students feel at home and help them build self-confidence.

When one particular group’s discourse dominates other groups and make them feel inferior or deficient (McKay, 2011). When compare themselves with native speakers of English as ideals, English learners and bilingual teachers feel inferior and this makes them incapable of participating in most new methods of language learning and teaching like critical thinking.
REFERENCES


BIO DATA

Parviz Maftoon is Associate Professor of teaching English at Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran. He received his Ph.D. degree from New York University in 1978 in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). His primary research interests concern EFL writing, second language acquisition, SL/FL language teaching methodology, and language syllabus design. He has published and edited a number of research articles and books. He is currently on the editorial board of some language journals in Iran.

Laleh Toupa Esfandiari is currently a Ph.D. candidate of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Science and Research, Tehran, Iran. She is an English language teacher and supervisor with the work experience of over 12 years. She is also a simultaneous interpreter and a travel agent. Her interested research areas are Individual Differences, BICS and CALP skills, and the neurobiological bases of language learning.
PROPITIOUS MULTIPlicity OR SPLIT AND CONfrontation? TWO RADICAL FEMINIST READINGS OF THE STORM BY MCKNIGHT MALMAR

Sonia Sarvipour, Ph.D. in English literature
Email: sarvipour@yahoo.com

A. Hossein Joodaki
University of Lorestan, Khorramabad, Iran

ABSTRACT

Whether looked at as a heaven-sent privilege bestowed on feminism as multiplicity, or a many-headed monster within, that incarnates as a widening gap that wastes feminists’ enormous energies in confronting each other, diversity and difference appear as an indispensable element deeply rooted in feminism. The long-standing titles as liberal feminism, radical feminism, Marxist feminism, Psychoanalytic feminism, echo-feminism and Postfeminism, to mention only some out of a longer list, can attest to the diversity. It permeates the feminist space so inclusively that it leaves almost no recess intact, splitting, among others, postfeminism into postmodern and third-wave feminisms, and radical feminism into the hardly reconcilable offshoots of radical-libertarian feminism and radical-cultural feminism. Focusing on two antithetical readings of The Storm, this article attempts to show how radical-libertarian and radical-cultural feminisms diverge in their encounter with a wide range of phenomena covering from sex and gender through family to literary criticism.
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INTRODUCTION

Umbrella terms can hardly contain the rich diversity that continues to live, grow and develop underneath, almost indifferent to, and sometimes even, unconscious of the attempts made and energies spent to impose unity, homogeneity and sameness. Diversity seems to be everywhere, and multiplicity feeding on diversity and difference, is as omnipresent. It penetrates deep down the schools, isms, outlooks, policies and agendas for action. Religions are not immune to its influence, philosophies cannot duck its glaring gaze and approaches cannot stand its forking advances.

Feminism for one harbours a rainbow of principles, assumptions, concepts, terms, guidelines, descriptions, definitions, positions and finally, labels. Essentialist feminism, anti-essentialist feminism, liberal feminism, radical-libertarian feminism, radical-cultural feminism, black feminism, Marxist feminism, socialist feminism, multicultural feminism, global feminism, psychoanalytic feminism, postmodern feminism, third-wave feminism which also drags behind such labels as first-wave and second-wave feminism, as well as pre feminism, care-focused feminism, ecofeminism and finally posfeminism all serve as labels that are devised by diverse feminist thinkers and critics to shed light on an aspect of feminism interconnected to the other aspects as it may be, refuses total identification with them. In her Feminist Thought, Rosemarie Tong, well aware of the diversity and multiplicity enveloping the feminist space, asserts that,

Since writing my first introduction to feminist thought nearly two decades ago, I have become increasingly convinced that feminist thought resists categorization into tidy schools of thought. Interdisciplinary, intersectional, and interlocking are the kind of adjectives that best describe the way we feminists think. There is a certain breathlessness in the way we move from one topic to the next, revising our thoughts in midstream. (Tong, 2009:1)

The multiplicity discernible at the heart of feminism is neither limited to, nor stops at the level of, the categories listed above. It further divides each category into conflicting branches. Ecofeminism, as an interdisciplinary aspect of
feminism moves further into other three branches of spiritual ecofeminism, transformative ecofeminism and global ecofeminism. So is radical feminism. Defining its borders against liberal feminism’s emphasis on “eliminate[ing] discriminatory educational, legal and economic policies” (Hole and Levine, 1971:81), and laying emphasis, instead, on uprooting family and organized religion as powerful means in the hands of the patriarchal system to oppress women, radical feminism appears to be a unified body of theory and practice. However, that is only a mirage. Further investigation into the nature of radical feminism proves that it is deeply divided within. The gap between the two main branches of radical feminism, namely radical-libertarian and radical cultural feminism is so wide over such core concepts as sex, gender, reproduction and motherhood that reconciliation between the two is hardly in perspective.

True that the proper domain of feminist activity and theorizing is social, political, economic and natural life; however, none of these aspects of life can dispense with literature. Neither can literature manage without them. Hence, the feminist tackling of life questions will bear its implications on literature, just as its interaction with literature will both reflect its view of social and political life and leave behind its imprints on them.

The storm by Kathleen M. Monroe engages in questions like sex, gender and family which prove to be fundamental questions to both branches of radical feminism and the ground on which most of the controversy and heated debates between the two branches occur. Thus, reading the story from their viewpoints can pinpoint the bones of contention, the points of departure and the multiplicity that lurks behind the mirage of unity. The comparison and contrast will hopefully show how each branch constructs its version of truth; how and why disagreements arise between the two, and how the storm can metaphorically represent real life situations and question that of interest though they are to the practitioners of branches, illicit conflicting responses and answers from them. Arguments offered by outstanding radical feminists such as Kate Millett, Shulamith Firestone, Marilyn French, Mary Daly, Margaret Atwood and Adrienne Rich serve as the ground in which this article embeds its assertions.

**ANDROGYNY VS. FEMALENESS**

Concerning gender, the radical-libertarian and radical-cultural feminists do not cultivate the same assumptions; on the contrary the ideal gender women should finally assume is a point of departure between the two main branches of radical feminism. Each has its own agenda, argument, and reasons to support its argument against the other. Radical-libertarian feminists call for androgyny while radical-cultural feminists support femaleness as the gender women should come to have if they are to defy the patriarchal system.

As a forerunner of radical-libertarian feminists’ direction on the question of gender, Jorgen Freeman in a then heretic step enthusiastically admired, for her androgynous qualifications what the patriarchal hegemony would consider as a ‘Bitch’.

What is disturbing about a Bitch is that she is androgynous. She incorporates within herself qualities defined as “masculine” as well as “feminine” A Bitch is blatant, direct, arrogant, at times egoistic. She has no liking for the indirect, subtle, mysterious ways of the “eternal feminine”. She disdains the vicarious life deemed natural to women because she wants to live a life of her own (Freeman, 1973: 52).

Not all radical-libertarian feminists adopted exactly the version of androgyny that Freeman was professing. They made some changes to it. However all agreed that androgyny is a guaranteed way to help women shun the patriarchal yoke. Represented by Alice Echols, all radical-libertarian feminists were convinced that whatever physical dissimilarities may differentiate women from men, they do not determine one’s gender; rather, gender is a social construct heavily depending upon the current ideology and power structure that penetrate into a surety’s texture. “Women” can simultaneously assume a feminine as well as a masculine gender (Echols, 1983: 445). In line with Freeman and Echols observations, Sula he Firestone, an outstanding radical libertarian feminist, also called for androgyny. Defining male Psychology and response as “objective, logical, extroverted, realistic, concerned with the conscious mind (the ego) , rational, mechanical, pragmatic and down-to – earth , stable” and female response to reality as “ subjective, intuitive, introverted, wishful, dreamy or fantastic, concerned with the subconscious (the id), emotional, even temper a mental (hysterical)” (Firestone , 1970 : 175), she encourages women to construct for themselves an identity that bridges between the two genders, leading to an androgynous identity that can harbor conflicting and contradictory masculine and feminine traits.

Radical-cultural feminists such as Marilyn French and Mary Daly, on the contrary seem to reproduce the male/ female binary opposition in their writings, albeit Privileging feminine gender over the masculine gender which is the favorite gender canonized by Patriarchy. For instance, in her Beyond Power, French equates femaleness with “Love and compassion and sharing and nutritiveness [sic]” (French, 1985:443) as opposed to the masculine values of hatred and possessiveness and struggle and competition and selfishness and ego centrism, and thus asks for a feminine
gender that would put right the wrong that masculine line gender has done the world. Not necessarily the same but closely related with gender is the question of sexuality and consequently that of a family based on heterosexual love and natural reproduction to which now this article turns.

HETEROSEXUAL LOVE, ENCOURAGED? DISCOURAGED?

In their attempt to develop their ideal female identity which thanks to its superiority to the now-dominant masculine identity will both promote women’s status and build a far more desirable world for both men and women to live in, the radical-cultural feminists tried to enhance the borders that separated women from men to create a female space within which women would rather turn to themselves than directing their love, energy and attention outside, to men. In a typical move a group of feminists called Radica lesbians offered a sketch of their desirable self-referenced identity which can display their position regarding sex, gender, family and related questions. Only women can give each other a new sense of self. That identity we have to develop with reference to ourselves, and not in relation to men. This consciousness is the revolutionary force from which all else will follow, for ours is an organic revolution. For this we must be available and supportive to one another, give our commitment and our love, and give the emotional support necessary to sustain this movement. **Our energies must flow toward our sisters, not backwards towards our oppressors.** As long as women’s liberation tries to free women without facing the basic heterosexual structure that binds us in one-to-one relationships with our oppressors, tremendous energies will continue to flow into trying to straighten up each particular relationship with a man, how to get better sex, how to turn his head around-into trying to make the “new man” out of him, in the delusion that this will allow us to be the “new woman.” This obviously splits our energies and commitments, leaving us unable to be committed to the construction of the new patterns which will liberate sex, gender, family and related questions.

Thus, radical-cultural feminists reject heterosexual love in favour of lesbianism and auto-eroticism because heterosexuality signifies nothing more than “male sexuality” (Echols, 1984:59) to them. It underlies all sorts of woman oppression because it confines each woman individually within the space of a “one-to-one- relationship” with a man who is, by what can be inferred from the quotation above, stronger and also thanks to his firm connection with other men who control the whole system, defeats, and overpowers her and exploits her as an object rather than treating her as an equal partner. By generalization, to radical-cultural feminists, what goes on in heterosexual love, goes on in and permeates all aspects of heterosexual life in a heterosexual family. A woman snared in her “one-to-one relationship with {her} oppressor” is objectified and exploited in all levels and the objectification will be a multi-dimensional one. The result will be an economic, social, political, cultural, educational, and psychological oppression of women universally.

Concerning sexuality, radical-libertarian feminists adopt radically different positions from that of radical-cultural feminists. One representative voice heard among others is that of Gayle Rubin.

From Rubin’s point of view sex is allowed in all its imaginable forms in chiding among others casual sex, heterosexual, homosexual and bisexual intercourse. She believes that taboos and prohibitions enveloping sex must be eliminated.

**Sex is not simply a name for “sins, disease, neurosis, pathology, decadence, pollution or the decadence, pollution or the decline and the decline and fall of empires” (Rubin,1984 :278) ;rather, whatever form it takes, sex is a great – source of pleasure and the undeniable right of every woman to experience.** As Tong (2009:67) puts it: “For Rubin, all sex was good; no judgments should be made about the rightness or wrongness of any form of sex.”

Although they encouraged heterosexuality among other forms of sex as an experience to enjoy if that was what women would choose, radical libertarian feminists were severely against natural reproduction, motherhood, giving birth and establishing a traditional family consisting of a man, a woman and their children born through pregnancy and biological motherhood. Rather, they insisted on artificial reproduction; reproduction only for pleasure. In addition, there will be no need of a man and a woman as the building block of a reproductive family. Rather, a woman can choose to have her artificially-gestated child with another woman, with a man and another woman, with two men or whatever combinations they choose.
Radical–cultural feminists, on the other hand, for all their insistence on “femaleness” and independence of man, refuse reproductive technology. In what seems a paradoxical move, they turn to natural reproduction as the only sources of power women have to exert on men in their fatal struggle. A typical radical–cultural feminist on the question of reproduction, Azizah Alhibri writes that Technological reproduction does not equalize the natural reproductive power structure—it inverts it. It appropriates the reproductive power for women and places it in the hands of men who now control both the sperm and the reproductive technology that could make it indispensable …. It liberates them from their humiliating dependency on women in order to propagate. (Alhibri, 1984:266)

Both as a source of power and a source of deep natural pleasure, motherhood and natural reproduction are estimated high in the topography of radical-cultural feminism. According to Adrienne Rich, “In order to live a fully human life we require not only control of our bodies… we must touch the unity and resonance of our physicality, our bond with the natural order” (Rich, 1979: 31). The Paradox lies in their simultaneous flee from men and their craving for pregnancy which is possible only through dependence on men. Thus, traditional families consisting of a wife, a husband and the children seem inevitable.

THE STORM: THE WINDY BATTLEFIELD OF CONFLICT AND CONFRONTATION

The Storm, a short story by Mcknight Malmar depicts a family, newly constructed and apparently firms enough to stand the storms that usually uproot families. Jannet, the newly-married wife loves her husband, Ben, wholeheartedly. Romantic, hetero-sexual love seems to have permeated the whole family atmosphere and the young couples have their residence in a big mansion far from the maddening crowdedness of urban life.

All is calm and quiet except for those occasions on which Ben receives a letter. Jannet is never so curious or suspicious to inquire into the identity of the one who writes and sends Ben the letters and that remains a mystery until near the end of the story. However, she notices how the reception of each letter upsets Ben and makes a disturbed and absent-minded creature out of him for almost a week and how the whole family atmosphere changes by the unwelcome arrival of each letter.

One day, Ben, the stingy husband, in a generous move buys Jannet some books, biscuits, confectionery and a ticket to send her on a journey to her sisters. Jannet is supposed to spend a month there, but the kind-hearted, loving and devoted woman can hardly tolerate so long away from her husband. Therefore, she decides to go back a week sooner than Ben expects her, without letting him know about it to give him a big lovely surprise. She arrives on a harsh stormy evening, pushing her way through the strong wind and rain which wets her from top to toe. When the wind slams the door behind Jannet, to her astonishment, she finds out that the lights are turned off. She calls Ben, but there is no response. She picks up the phone to call her much-missed husband, but she finds out that the phone is disconnected. Finding herself lonely and miserable in that dark, isolated, cold mansion, she goes to cellar to find pieces of wood and timber to set a fire with. Opening the trunk, she faces a dead woman put in a sitting position inside.

In her great terror and fright, She rushes out to wish desperately Ben hand been there. She is able to hear strange sounds and once, even to see behind the window what looks like somebody’s face. She nearly dies of terror. After some time, to her great relief, Ben is there, tired, immersed in the rain and gasping. She tells him about what she saw in the basement; while Ben refuses all she says in the name of hallucination, taking her to the cellar even to show her there is nothing in the trunk. Nothing is there of course, no dead body, and they go back to the dining room. In the meantime, she suddenly notices a ring Ben is wearing exactly like the one she saw the dead woman in the trunk had. Understanding what is at stake in a moment of epiphany, she screams. Ben tries to strangle her with his hands, but she is lucky enough to escape from the psychological storm inside the house and take refuge in the terrible storm outside which terrifying as it is, proves to be much safer than the murderous storm within.

Among the numerous aspects of The storm that might prove of interest to a feminist interpretation, the questions of identity and heterosexual coupledom, the questions of identity and heterosexual coupledom from a radical-libertarian as well as a radical-cultural feminist point of view are at the center of examination here.

The story receives a considerable amount of its intense effect from the distinction Malmar makes between male and female identities. Developing a masculine identity, Ben is active, strong, intelligent, practical, selfish, egoistic, capable if planning and plotting as well as realizing the plans and plots he makes, independent, cruel, rough, unfaithful, assertive, pragmatic, logical, objective and aggressive. Jannet on the other hand, seems to be exactly Ben’s antithesis in many respects. The feminine identity she represents can be described as passive, weak, gullible, dull, whimsical, unselfish, sacrificing, caring, thinking of no plans and no plots against others and therefore putting
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none to practice, dependent, kind. Loving, gentle, careful, cowardly, faithful, easily deceived, emotional, committed to her life and love promises, impotent, psychologically paralyzed, unable to enquire into the nature of events and people, timid, impractical, introversive, intuitive and subjective.

The mere distinction Malmar makes between feminine and masculine identities together with the deep hatred for man and the inclusive support for woman she is capable of engineering to be elicited from the reader, will be received with open arms on the part of the radical-cultural feminists. They will probably foreground such desirable feminine aspects of Jannet’s personality as faithfulness, kindness, care, emotionality, honesty, commitment and devotion to compare with Ben’s unfaithfulness, dishonesty, indifference, betrayal, lack of devotion, coldness and hateful cruel nature and to show a clear image of feminine supremacy over masculine meanness and inferiority of nature.

However, a group of radical-cultural feminists will probably condemn Jannet (and even Malmar, for creating this Jannet) for her lack of intelligence, assertiveness, curiosity, strength, detachedness, will to power and independence of personality. She should not have been so credulous and gullible as to play the part in Ben’s plot that he had determined for her. She should not have been so devoted and simple-minded as to do no inquiry into the identity of the one who sent the letters to Ben.

The uprooting attack by radical-cultural feminists on Jannet (and through the creation of Jannet on Malmar) will focus on her choice of a man as the target of her care, energy and love. She should have, instead, turned her attention, care and kindness toward her sister. Instead of making love with Ben, she should have practiced lesbianism. If her life is engendered; if she is nearly murdered; if she finds out that she has been gullible enough to be sent on a planned journey and if she loses a family life to which she was devoted wholeheartedly, that’s because she invested her care and love and energy in the wrong place.

The paradox rises when radical-cultural feminists simultaneously call for women’s turning away from men and their preservation of the power to reproduce naturally. Their emphasis on sisterhood, lesbianism and concentrating their energy on their female mates leads one to logically infer a deep hatred of heterosexuality and an absolute avoidance of living a heterosexual family life. However, to one’s deep astonishment, this is not the case. Radical-cultural feminists insisted on women’s reproductive power, probably not aware of the consequences. To naturally reproduce, a woman needs a man’s sperm, and that can lead to women’s eternal dependence on men; what does not fit the radical-cultural feminists’ demand for ‘female ness.’ Adrienne Rich, an outstanding radical-cultural feminist, had a husband and two children, born naturally to realize radical-cultural feminist, traditionally enough had a husband and two children, born naturally to realize the walking paradox that lives in the heart of radical-cultural feminism.

Therefore, in a radical-cultural feminist approach to The Storm Jannet will be simultaneously condemned and admired for her choice of living with Ben. Thus paradoxically, her escape from Ben’s house both rescues her from being murdered and introduces her to a storm that deprives her from the power of producing new life which according to radical-cultural feminists is the only advantage women have to help them in the back-breaking struggle for power with men. In addition to her deprivation of Ben who could serve Jannet as the father of her would-be child, escaping from Ben’s house into the storm deprives her, a weak, timid, depending, miserable woman, from the protection and support a man’s presence could offer her.

Radical-libertarian feminists will oppose radical-cultural feminists in many respects. Setting androgyny as an ideal for identity construction, they will find little in Jannet to admire, in sharp contrast to radical-cultural feminists indeed. A Jannet to admire from their point of view would be one who could combine desirable feminine qualifications with admirable masculine traits. Intelligence, rationality and practicality should have been combined with love, care and consideration, for instance, to set forth a model for women to follow. Malmar’s story therefore reproduces the same identities that patriarchy has been producing for thousands of users. The storm, from this view point takes side with the patriarchal system by reconstruction and nature. Women represented by Jannet in The Storm are timid, credulous, gullible, weak and in want of constant protection and support. Therefore, they should not interfere in affairs that need courage, intelligence, strength and independence. The public sphere with all its social and political space will accordingly belong to men while women should be driven to the “womanish”, space which fits their particular identity structure. That is exactly what radical-libertarian feminists will try to eliminate not reproduce as The Storm does.
In sharp contrast to the radical-cultural feminist view, radical libertarians will neither criticize nor condemn Jannet for directing her love and energy toward a man. She is free to choose the way she satisfies her desires and discharges her energy. Turning to sisters is only one among many other legitimate choices. She could have turned to autoeroticism as well. She could have chosen casual sex or even to have sex with people for younger or older than her. She could have chosen to have her family life even with two men instead of one, or with two women, or a man and a woman, or any other possible combination. Therefore, Malmar will be exempted from the charge of reproducing a form of married life which has always served, as radical-cultural believe, as a site for woman oppression.

Again, contrary to the radical-cultural belief, Jannet’s escape from Ben’s house, representing a space controlled by men, should not be considered as depriving her from the only source of power she has, namely, the power to give birth. Rather, it frees her from a stable, powerful anchor which has always served as a crucial component of male superiority and female inferiority. Dependence upon men for their sperm and caring a fetus inside one’s womb for nine months together with the paralyzing responsibility of taking care of the baby are exactly the interlinked roots of all discriminations against women. Jannet is so lucky she did not get pregnant by Ben. Out of the house which could function as a place for stifling natural motherhood and biological reproduction, she is free now to enjoy a life not bound to the crippling responsibility of bringing new life to the world. She could instead hope that one day technology could give her a child without the torment of motherhood or wifehood.

CONCLUSION

_The Storm_ as a literary text reveals part of the conflicts and contradictions among the two subdivisions of the same feminist branch to verify the claim that feminism is a space rich with diversity and multiplicity especially if one notices the fact that the story could also metaphorically represent real life situations over which feminism divides and diversifies. Certainly, difference, diversity and even confrontation could be viewed from opposing stances. It can be read as a sign of dispersion which signifies the loss of energy in internal conflicts anal the nullification of attempts on the part of those who should have enhanced them. But it can also be interpreted as a sign of richness and the vital flexibility of an approach which is not unaware of the contradictions and paradoxes in the nature of life itself. In the long process of understanding the nature of life, an approach should probably be flexible and therefore multiple and paradoxical if it is to stay.
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ABSTRACT
The Designs for Knowledge Evolution (DKE) model was originally proposed by Schwartz et al. (2005) in the domain of statistics learning. In this study, the researcher examined the DKE model in the domain of second language (L2) learning. The researcher applied the DKE model by having 1st and 2nd hand experiences of clicking on words and writing rules. Experimental design was implemented. The study found that adding 2nd hand experience of writing rules improved learning. In addition, the findings also suggest that the implementation of the full DKE model by obtaining both 1st and 2nd hand experiences in our learning activity can eliminate the learning gap between Easterners and Westerners. By examining the DKE model in this experiment, it is proposed that, in a language learning environment, learners provided with both 1st and 2nd hand experiences will get better learning results than those provided with only 1st-hand experience. Instead of implementing traditional instruction methods in English as a second language (ESL) classes, teachers can adapt the DKE model and let students first acquire their 1st and 2nd hand experience before lectures to foster better L2 learning results.
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INTRODUCTION

Importance of the study
Motivation for better learning
Cognitive psychology has its limitations on the realm of narrowly defined experimental conditions in research-oriented studies and thus also on the applicable capacities for complex classroom learning (e.g., Cobb, 1992; Lave, 1988). Therefore, the Designs for Knowledge Evolution (DKE) provides not only theoretical framework construction but also practical application capabilities that are designed and developed to be helpful for learners to understand deeper and learn better (Schwartz, Martin, & Nasir, 2005).

Exploring the DKE in the domain of L2
When Schwartz et al. (2005) proposed the DKE model, they intended to provide an integrative prescriptive learning theory to solve some methodological isolationism problems that Cognitive Psychology research usually has, such as isolation of cognitive mechanisms and isolation of learning outcomes. In their studies, however, the DKE was only implemented and later tested in the domain of statistics learning and teaching. Although Schwartz et al. (2005) mentioned several studies to help form this integrative approach of the DKE model, they merely used statistics learning and instruction as an example to show the effectiveness and advantages that learning may emerge with the DKE. The previous studies of the DKE model have shown the powerful effect that DKE has on statistics learning (Schwartz et al., 2005). Children can deeply understand the concepts of central tendency and variability through the DKE-designed instruction. Furthermore, children who learned these concepts by using the DKE model could outperform college students who have just taken the introductory statistics course in many of these concepts (Schwartz et al., 2005), even in transfer tests that are held several weeks later than the instruction. Therefore, the present study further examines the DKE model to find if it also fits the complex learning of second language (L2). As L2 learning has become an increasingly global trend in today’s education, it is important to help instructors effectively teach, and learners substantially learn, a second language (e.g. Chaudron et passim, 1988; Lave, 1996;
Harklau, 2002, in Zamel & Spack (Eds.), 2002). By exploring the DKE in the domain of L2 learning, the study hopes to extend the work of DKE in the domain of mere science-related learning to the domain of language learning to benefit ESL and L2 learners and teachers.

**Exploring DKE induced by multimedia**

The concepts and tools of multimedia learning have been widely adopted in many learning and teaching circumstances (Mayer, 2001) and have been discussed with many arguments (e.g. Salaberry, 2001; Salaberry, 2000). For example, with the advances of computer technology, educators largely utilize and discuss computer-assisted language learning (CALL) to aid L2 learning. Some researchers argue that technologies may not have achieved equal extents of pedagogical benefit in the realm of L2 learning and teaching (Salaberry, 2001). Traditionally, we may use multimedia to convey and receive 1st-hand knowledge, such as listening to a paragraph or to some vocabulary pronunciation on a tape cassette, and 2nd-hand knowledge, such as grammatical rules using a PowerPoint presentation. With the trend of using technologies in language learning, it is not clear what kind of role multimedia plays in the DKE model. This study also intends to explore the DKE with multimedia-triggered 1st- and 2nd-hand experiences.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The objectives of the study are: (1) to explore multimedia-induced first-hand experience and second-hand experience; (2) to test the DKE model in the domain of language learning; specifically, the researcher would like to test the DKE model by examining if, for a given time in a language learning environment, learners provided with both first-hand and second-hand experiences will get better learning results than those provided with only first-hand experience; (3) to provide empirical evidence to support the DKE model in the domain of second language learning; and, (4) to further discuss the applications and implications of the DKE model in L2 learning.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**What is DKE?**

**Origin of the DKE**

Schwartz et al. (2005) proposed their integrative prescriptive theory that the development of understanding has something to do with the co-evolution of different types of knowledge in response to outside situational stimulation. They argued that for better productive teaching practices, the development of methods and measures that yield prescriptions of learning is essential. And when human beings learn complex ideas (e.g., a complex system, a language, or statistics), multiple cognitive mechanisms and resources get involved because they integrate processes and resources to help with their learning.

**Knowledge evolution**

The basic assumption is that human beings’ movements from one environment to another help evolve an understanding that can keep on adapting. Therefore, Schwartz et al. (2005) asserted that people’s learning should be from both direct experience and communicated experience, and should not be from only either one of them. Learners should not only be able to apply what they have learned but also to evolve new knowledge necessary for the new contexts. As the “goal of school-based instruction should be to prepare students to adapt and learn in the future” (Bransford & Schwartz, 1999, cited in Schwartz et al., 2005, p. 4), this DKE model should be emphasized in today’s instructional practices in order to strengthen student’s learning at transfer adaptation abilities.

**First-Hand and Second-Hand Theories**

The theories of the acquisition and application of first-hand knowledge emphasize direct experience whereas the theories of the acquisition and application of second-hand knowledge emphasize descriptions of experience, which is communicated knowledge.

**First-hand experience**

Many people encourage first-hand experience for learning. For example, First Hand Learning, Inc. (retrieved 2007) has been promoting first-hand learning for over 10 years. First-hand learning is learning from direct experience. People figure things out themselves by perceiving the real phenomena around them and thus first-hand learning requires close engagement with the environment. Since learners have their congenital inquisitiveness and curiosities to delve into the world they are interacting with, learners use their own knowledge construction and analytical abilities to connect with the environment. Observations, analyses, and interpretations are important features. Therefore, first-hand learning allows learners to come up with meanings and even questions they may have and, later
on, investigate to find possible answers themselves. For the acquisition of first-hand experience or knowledge, people interact with the phenomena directly. They use a lot of perception and action and tend to get more individualistic, direct, and personal experience. Examples of first-hand theorists include Piaget who did research on children’s abstracted understanding and Shepard and Cooper (1986) and Kosslyn (1980) who have largely contributed to imagery studies where perception is emphasized. First Hand Learning, Inc. (2007) states that with first-hand experience, “learners acquire and retain new knowledge most effectively,” since this type of learning “makes people think for themselves rather than relying solely on the authority of teachers and textbooks” (2007). Schwartz et al. (2005) argue that first-hand theories are very important to learning, since “no amount of reading is sufficient to learn to drive a car” (p. 7).

Second-hand experience
For the acquisition of second-hand experience or knowledge, people interpret experiences or descriptions, and often in the absence of original referent (Schwartz et al., 2005). Second-hand information is often presented in a communicable symbolic structure form. Anderson’s (1983) research on how people internalize second-hand experience from declarative knowledge (such as words) to procedural knowledge (such as actions) is an obvious example of second-hand theory. As a huge amount of people’s knowledge is from second-hand experience, such as reading books, listening to tapes, or watching films, the second-hand theories are also very important to human learning. For prescribing instruction, though, it seems we need to provide the situations where people are able to experience a circumstance, and not just the reading part of the circumstance.

Interaction of first-hand and second-hand experiences
Schwartz and Black’s (1999) study of liquid pouring from different glasses shows that there can be dissociation between the cognitive processes of first-hand and second-hand experiences and the division of them may be of advantage or disadvantage to learning, especially cognition and learning of complex knowledge or systems. In Schwartz and Black’s (1996) another study of determining the last gear’s clockwise or counterclockwise turn when the first gear’s turning was given in a chain of gears, it reveals the interaction of participants’ first-hand knowledge and second-hand knowledge. It is obvious that, in this study of gears turning, when people learn they generate first-hand knowledge with perceptual-motor content such as hand gestures to figure out their mental representation of gears’ turning directions; and then they induce the second-hand knowledge of the parity rule where they simply count the number of gears presented. Furthermore, both first- and second-hand experiences are imperative just as perception and communication (Schwartz et al., 1995) are both critical to gestural simulation and rule induction. Clearly, from gestural simulations to rule-based descriptions, both first-hand experience and second-hand experience get involved and even more, intertwined, so that the learning and development of complex ideas can be yielded. Therefore, deep understanding postulates both first-hand and second-hand experiences and thus we ought to combine the two in our instructional design.

Features of DKE
From Schwartz et al. (2005) and the AAA Lab at Stanford University (Complex Learning: Designs for Knowledge Evolution, Retrieved Jan 1st, 2008), the features of DKE can be synthesized to the following points: (1) Learners yield a certain model that can respond to a given situation where they can perceive the differences and create a structured account from what they perceive. (2) Learners examine their models and see what in the models still survives. (3) Learners produce and adapt new models to fit the new context. (4) Learners collocate with their models to further examine useful values that survived.

METHODOLOGY

Participants
Participants were 49 non-Spanish speaking adults (14 men and 35 women) currently enrolled as graduate students at Teachers College Columbia University, Baruch College City University of New York, and New York University. The mean age of the participants is 26.43 years (SD = 2.78). They were conveniently sampled through friends and various TC-Columbia University mailing lists, and then they were randomly assigned to two groups: the experimental group (1st + 2nd hand group, n1=24) and the control group (1st hand group, n2=25). In terms of their native language, 10 speak Mandarin Chinese, 34 speak English, and the rest stated that their native languages are Taiwanese, Japanese, Korean, or American Sign Language. In this sample, 26 participants stated that they can speak
Design

Learning activity section for 1st and 2nd-hand experiences

In the experiment, the researcher designated a learning activity section in the multimedia instruction of a Spanish vocabulary learning lesson, and it is before the lecture. The section includes 1st hand experience or both 1st hand and 2nd hand experiences. The 1st hand experience in the learning activity has both perception and motor components where the participants listen to the words’ pronunciation (and thus with the perception component) and they actively get involved in making pronunciation by clicking words listed on the screen (and thus with motor component). Specifically, in the learning activity session, participants in both 1st hand group and 1st + 2nd hand group were asked to press each of the 15 Spanish word buttons presented on the screen, to listen to the words, and to practice each pronunciations.

The 2nd hand experience in the learning activity involves symbolic and communicative components where the participants interact (and thus being communicative) with the multimedia-conveyed information and they were asked to use words and symbols (thus symbolic) to represent the knowledge they have acquired from the above experience. Specifically, the 1st + 2nd hand group participants were asked to come up with pronunciation rules in respect of these distinct words and to write down the rules in a given Rule Sheet, whereas the 1st hand group participants, without being given a Rule Sheet, were just asked to listen to the pronunciations without doing any further actions. Yet, both groups had a full 10-minute period before they went on to the lecture section. We need both the mechanisms for developing the first-hand knowledge or both first-hand and second-hand knowledge.

Rationale for the Design

Many researchers have suggested that using multimedia approach to language learning can help with vocabulary acquisition, reading, and with producing information (e.g., Bransford, Goin, Hasselbring, Kinzer, Sherwood, & Williams, 1986; Bransford, Kinzer, Risko, & Rowe, 1989; Leu & Kinzer, 2003; Glaser, W.C., Rieth, H. J., Kinzer, C. K., Colburn, L. K., & Peter, J., 2000; Salaberry, 2000; Salaberry, 2001). Therefore, for the instrument and the instruction in this design, PowerPoint presentation slides were intertwined with multimedia components. In this design, the reason for a part in the measure (the 5th part on the posttest) asking people to actually pronounce the word, rather than merely testing specific memory for the word pronunciation rules, is based on the knowledge that deep understanding not only involves basic memory, but also has to do with the abilities to perceive, plan, act, and transfer (Schwartz et al., 2005).

Materials

Materials and apparatus

The materials used in the study included a demographic survey, the Rule Sheet, a learning activity (see Graph 1 for the sample page of the learning activity computer screen), a multimedia-induced lecture (see Graph 2 for a sample page of the lecture program), the retention posttest, and the interview questionnaire.

Graph 1: The Sample Page of the Multimedia-induced Learning Activity Computer Screen
The Rule Sheet is a plain sheet of paper with a big table of 3 rows and 2 columns. The headings for those 2 columns are Rules and Example Words. On the page of the learning activity computer screen, there is a table of 3 rows and 5 columns, listing 15 Spanish words in total. The clear instructional heading of “Click on each word to hear it!” is on the top of the page. Participants could hear the clear pre-audio-taped pronunciation of each word they clicked on. These 15 words, Juego, Ganador, Ojo, Genio, Jirafa, Gozo, Gusto, Gimnasio, Gasto, General, Gesto, Jardin, Cajero, Goma, and Gitano, were selected by the researcher and colleagues who have learned Spanish pronunciation rules and the pronunciation sounds were recorded by a Spanish female native speaker. For both groups, participants had 10 minutes for the learning activity session. The instructions were clear and explicit. For example, for the 1st + 2nd hand group, participants received the instructions: 1. Click on each of these Spanish words and listen to how they are pronounced. Listen to the words more than once if necessary. 2. Using the worksheet provided, create a set of rules to describe how the “j” and “g” letters are pronounced in Spanish. 3. In this session, you have 10 minutes. The multimedia-induced lecture was entirely PowerPoint-designed slides. There were 20 slides in total. The instruction for the lecture was also clear. In the beginning, there was a slide stating: 1. Now you are going to have a lecture about some Spanish pronunciation rules. 2. In this session, you have 15 minutes. Both 1st + 2nd hand and 1st hand groups received exactly the same lecture for 15 minutes. In the lecture slides, there were clear headings, rules’ explanations, and practicing example words with multimedia components. On the retention posttest, the highest possible score with all correct answers is 40 and the lowest possible score with all wrong answers is 0. There are 5 main sections of questions with 40 questions in total. All the answers were graded on a true/false (correct/ incorrect) format. The retention posttest was timed and given to participants in both groups for 7 minutes. The apparatus used were IBM compatible Dell laptops with 13.3 inches monitor. Earphones were tested to ascertain their proper functions before use.

The embodiment of first-hand and second-hand experiences
The study was designed to allow participants to obtain first-hand and second-hand experiences via multimedia. The embodiment of first-hand experience in this study was the perception and clicking part where participants were asked to look at the screen, to choose a Spanish word listed on the page, then to listen to the pronunciation of the word clicked. The embodiment of second-hand experience in our study was the communication and symbol generation part where participants were asked to not only look at the screen, choose a word, and listen to the pronunciation, but also to write down any possible rules they might generate on the Rule Sheet.

Procedure
Prescreening
The study was introduced to participants as research about the characteristics of language learning. Each participant was told that he or she would be filling out a demographic survey, learning something in a new second language using a computer, receiving a brief quiz (posttest) about the materials that they have just learned, and finally filling
out another questionnaire. They were told to try to do their best to learn. From the demographic survey, the researcher made sure that all the participants did not know anything about Spanish and have not learned Spanish at all through pre-screening. Also, the researcher ascertained that all participants can use a computer mouse which is necessary for the study. The experiment took place in a lab room at Columbia University.

Process
Before the experiment, the participants were first given the pre-screening demographic survey to fill out for 5 minutes. Those who can speak any Spanish or have learned any Spanish were excluded from our study. Secondly, both groups of the participants did a learning activity for 10 minutes. In this 10-minute time period, the control (1st hand) group participants were asked to click on those 15 Spanish words on the computer screen to hear their pronunciations as well as to practice pronouncing the words whereas the experimental (1st + 2nd hand) group participants, in addition to doing what the 1st hand group participants were asked to do, were asked to use the Rule Sheet to write down any rules they might have perceived or generated. Thirdly, a lecture of 15 minutes about the pronunciation rules of Spanish letters was introduced and given to both groups through a designed PowerPoint presentation instruction on the computer. Fourthly, trained graduate research assistants administered a posttest for both groups’ participants for 7 minutes. All the above sections were timed to ensure equal time spent for both groups.

And finally the researcher interviewed the participants individually for around 10 minutes when they filled out the questionnaire. Participants were asked to try their best to learn those rules from the lecture and to answer the posttest questions. Data were collected for around eight months.

RESULTS

Quantitative data analysis

Descriptive statistics
Table 1 shows that with the random assignment of the experimental design of the study, there were no significant differences between participants in the 1st + 2nd hand group and the 1st hand group. There were 24 participants (49 per cent) in the 1st + 2nd hand group and 25 participants (51 per cent) in the 1st hand group. Among the 1st + 2nd hand group participants, 19 of them were women (38.8 per cent) whereas among the 1st hand group participants, 12 of them were women (32.7 per cent). There was no significant difference in gender between these two groups (Cramer’s V = .168, df = 1, p > .05). Among the 1st + 2nd hand group participants, 6 of them (12.2 per cent) whose native language is English whereas among the 1st hand group participants, 5 of them (10.2 per cent) whose native language is English. There was no significant difference in whether their native language is English or not between these two groups (Cramer’s V = .060, df = 1, p > .05). In terms of age, the 1st + 2nd hand group participants had a mean age of 26.42 (SD = 2.10) and the 1st hand group participants had a mean age of 26.44 (SD = 3.34). There was no significant difference in age between these two groups (F(1, 47) = .001, p > .05).

| Table 1: Descriptive statistics of number, gender, and native language between two groups |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
|                      | Experimental Group |                             | Control Group |                             | Cramer’s V | p-value |
|                      | Frequency | Percentage |                      | Frequency | Percentage |                      |
| N                    | 24        | 49.0       | 25                    | 51.0      |           |                      |
| Gender (F)           | 19        | 38.8       | 12                    | 32.7      | .168      | .240                 |
| English              | 6         | 12.2       | 5                     | 10.2      | .060      | .675                 |

DKE model
Table 2 and Figure 1 show that the 1st + 2nd hand group participants outperformed the 1st hand group in posttest scores by 2.67 points (t(37.74) = 2.83, p = .007). The 1st + 2nd hand group participants had a mean of 38.75 (SD = 2.27) out of 40 and a range of 8. The 1st hand group participants had a mean of 36.08 (SD = 4.10) out of 40 and a range of 14.
Table 2: Descriptive statistics of age and posttest between two groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>t (37.74)</th>
<th>F (1, 47)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>26.44</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>36.08</td>
<td>2.83**</td>
<td>7.855**</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

Figure 1: Box-Plot of POSTTEST Scores between two groups

There was also a practical significance in the magnitude of the treatment. As the Eta square is .143, the effect size (ES), a measure of the strength of the relationship between these two variables, can be considered medium to large, according to the standard set by Cohen (1988 & 1992) and Judd and McClelland (1989). The Cohen’s d = .806 and the ES r = .374 also suggest a large effect size by Cohen’s (1988) standard. Therefore, the implementation of the full DKE model with the acquisition of both first-hand experience and second-hand experience during the learning activity has yielded significantly higher posttest results than that with the acquisition of only first-hand experience. This provides evidence for supporting the full DKE model in multimedia-induced language learning and instruction environment.

Cultural variation

Since the research team members had noticed the basic difference in participants’ test-taking attitude as well as test results between Easterners and Westerners during the experiment and the posttest, I further examined the possible cultural variation by differentiating participants’ cultural background. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on the posttest score data, with cultural background (i.e. native language being western or eastern) as a between-subjects factor and treatment groups (i.e. 1st hand group or 1st + 2nd hand group) as a within-subject factor. Figure 2 and Table 3 show that there was a significant interaction between cultural background and treatment groups, $F(1, 48) = 16.48$, $p < 0.001$, consistent with the observation that the difference between the cultural background’s native language spoken (i.e. being Westerners or Easterners) was large for the 1st hand treatment group but not as much for the 1st + 2nd hand group. Therefore, though the full DKE model seemed to work for both Easterners and Westerners, it in fact fitted better for Westerners. The findings suggest that when provided with both 1st and 2nd hand experiences, Westerners whose native language is mainly English can perform a lot better in the retention
posttest than provided with only 1st hand experience ($t(47) = 4.81, p < .0001$). Easterners whose native language is mainly Mandarin Chinese, however, showed an insignificant higher posttest score ($t(47) = 1.28, p = 0.207$) with 1st and 2nd hand experiences ($M = 39.00, SD = 1.85$) than with only 1st hand experience ($M = 37.65, SD = 2.60$). For Westerners, the large effect size (Cohen’s $d = 2.704$) also showed the significant difference between treatment groups in that 1st + 2nd hand participants obtained a much higher retention posttest mean score ($M = 38.00, SD = 3.35$) than 1st hand participants’ retention posttest mean score ($M = 29.80, SD = 2.68$).

### Table 3: T-tests of both groups between Easterners and Westerners on posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Easterner</th>
<th></th>
<th>Westerner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st + 2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>t(47)</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Score</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>37.65</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p < .001$

Again, these findings provide support for the idea that obtaining both 1st and 2nd hand experiences in learning activity can eliminate the learning gap (with respect to L2 learning retention outcomes) between Easterners and Westerners. Therefore, the full DKE model indeed has its effectiveness on L2 learning and teaching.

### Qualitative data analysis

Since the qualitative data collected by the open-ended interview questionnaire, the researcher uses content analysis techniques suggested by Krippendorff (2004), Neuendorf (2002), and Weber (1990) to classify and explore the textual material to reduce it to more relevant, analyzable, and manageable data. With two raters analyzing the data, the inter-rater reliability is calculated. The Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient $\rho = .95$ (Student’s $t(47) = 20.86, p < .001$) indicated high degree of agreement among raters.
Impact of DKE

From our interview questionnaire, we have found that the 1st + 2nd hand group learners in general reported and stated positive feedback toward the learning activity with both first-hand and second-hand experiences. The 1st hand group learners, on the contrary, merely mentioned more about the lecture. The importance of the DKE model learning activity therefore is obvious.

“For example, when asked if there are any things that participants remember the most during the activity or lecture or test, many 1st + 2nd hand group participants mentioned the learning activity and its impact. Many have shown their deep processing of the information presented and come up with their possible pronunciation rules generated during learning activity. Examples of their mentioning the learning activity, the revelation of deeper processes, and the positive effects of the impact are: “I make assumptions first.” “Helpful because it gives you a chance to learn on your own, and if you are not able, it still helps you familiarize yourself with the material for learning portion.” “I was somehow able to predict what I would be studying in the activity.” “Pre-activity is self-exploration.” “[the pre-activity]…gives me confidence. It can also help me memorize the rules better.” There are also some other advantages of the DKE model instruction design, as one participant said, “I like the interacted way of learning another language…I have more positive emotion during learning.” Another said, “I enjoyed learning this lesson. Inspired me to want to learn Spanish.”

1st hand group participants mostly mentioned a certain pronunciation rule that they remember the most, multimedia-designed lecture, and other parts of the lecture, such as summary. One said, “The summary of the rules.” “…It organizes the rules, helping me memorize what I have learned.” Another mentioned the lecture, saying “The explanations of the rules of pronunciation.” Many stated in regard to multimedia interfaces and designs, “The PowerPoint is interesting.” “Pictures associated with words….makes me understand the meaning of the words.” “Pictures… it makes easier to figure out their meanings.” Though one 1st hand group participant stated, “I realized I always look for rules in language learning.” we should note that they still perform worse in posttest than 1st + 2nd hand group participants. We see the drawback of the emergence of the confusion of direct instruction without first developing 2nd hand experience in the learning activity time. One control group participant stated, “There are pronunciation examples [that] don’t fit the rule.” Another doubted, “Exceptions? Because the sounds didn’t reflect what was taught.”

“Do you think the pre-activity [learning activity] is helpful or unhelpful for your learning? Why?”

When the above question is asked, we get all positive answers from both groups. For example, some 1st + 2nd hand group participants said: “It’s helpful. Because I extract these rules by myself correctly, if any. I could memorize these rules easier through deep processing.” “Help myself to focus on the pronunciation difference.” “It’s helpful since I can find the rules by myself.” “Yes, a lot. If there weren’t the pre-activity [learning activity], I wouldn’t be able to pronounce the words. It forces me to memorize words in a short time.” “Yes. Let me use my way to interpret.” “I had to explore and figure out how to come up with the rules in the pre-activity [learning activity]. It helps when I go through learning in the lecture part… Learn how to categorize the pronunciation rules and that is considered useful for future learning. And the memory will last on by self-categorizing the rules.” “Yes! Made me more ready for the new information.” “It was helpful because it was like a quiz. A quiz helped me to feel curious about the correct pronunciation.” Even 1st hand group participants liked the learning activity. One said, “It’s a warm-up that helps me get prepared to learn.” Another said, “Listening and reading are helpful for learning.” Still another one said, “Help me say, speak a new word.” Yet, the 1st hand group participants’ responses mainly are about the benefit of the repetition of clicking, reading, and saying out loud those words presented in the learning activity.

“For you, was there any benefit to creating the pronunciation rules before you went through the lecture?”

To further probe the benefits and/or drawbacks of creating the pronunciation rules in pre-activity before learners go
through the lecture, we asked 1st + 2nd hand group participants if there was any benefit, or interfering effect on their experience of the lecture, to creating the pronunciation rules before they went through the lecture. We have found that all participants, except one, thought there were many positive benefits. One said, “I can guess and think first.” The influence is significant in terms of deeper processing which leads to better retention: “Helping me to learn faster.” “I was able to have a schema to sort out the rules in my mind beforehand.” “I was able to test my hypothesis, and confirm my guess….Some of them was not right, but still it was impressive for me that I was able to memorize them well.” “Let me think first…. Help me use my words to get the idea.” Some participants mentioned the learning activity’s benefit in attention. “It helped me listen and pay attention to the words without any instruction of rules.” “It helps me focus on the pronunciation in the lecture learning part. And it deepens my memorization when I go through the later activities.” In sum, 1st + 2nd hand group participants think it is beneficial to come up with their own rules first and have positive feedback toward the obtainment of both 1st and 2nd-hand experiences before the lecture. They said: “It kept the rules fresh in my memory. Since I had to write them down, I think I remembered them easier.” “I feel I am better at self- learning now.” “Learn from hearing before learning the rule.” “Rules are to be remembered. It’s easy to apply on new tasks, easier than ‘remembering’.”

**Impact of Multimedia**

The impact of multimedia-induced instruction is also evident. As mentioned above, many participants also mentioned their impressiveness of multimedia-conveyed information when asked the following question.

*Are there any things that impress you (that you remember the most) during the activity/lecture/test? Why?*

Many participants mentioned the PowerPoint’s dual channel multimedia nature and its effectiveness of helping learners learn. “The PowerPoint is friendly using and helps us learn. I like to use it.” “We learn language not from textbooks.” “The rules are taught in a clear way, especially with the software….I can practice the pronunciation by clicking the word on the screen… Because that makes my learning more effective.” Some also mentioned why the design of this multimedia-based PowerPoint instruction is effective. “Lecture is with various examples with pictures…the design helps long-term memory.” “PPT well done.” “Pretty pictures.” “Cute pictures… Maybe because of the color.” “The lecture… was clearly presented. It was presented in a logical way. So I was able to remember just a few key rules.” “You can click the words to hear the sound.” “They are interactive.” “Combine real pronunciation in the text.” In sum, benefits of multimedia-based instruction are its multimedia nature of dual channel stimulation (Mayer, 2001) as well as its influence on memorization of vocabularies in a new language, as one participants stated, “I liked the format- colorful and easy to use and …. I enjoyed learning it because it was a quick way to learn a few things about the language.”

**Rule generated on rule sheet**

19 out of 24 1st + 2nd hand group participants (79.17 per cent) got all 3 correct rules generated in the learning activity. The 3 possible rules that could be generated were: Spanish j sound (/h/) and g sounds (/h/ and /g/). They also provided correct sample words from the 15 words provided on learning activity screen. Those who did not get all correct rules were either missed one to two of the pronunciation rules or failed to include correct sample words. The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is small ($\rho = .024$, $p = .912$) for correct rules generated and their posttest scores. Therefore, there is no association between how many correct rules generated in the learning activity and their posttest scores. An example of correct rules generated is in Graph 3.
DISCUSSION

Multimedia-induced instruction
Teacher’s use of technology
There have been discussions about teachers’ problems in using technologies to teach language learning (e.g., Kinzer & Leu, 1997). This reveals the fact that teachers may lack the ability to fully use some types of multimedia technologies (Maloch & Kinzer, 2006) and many of them are unfamiliar with, reluctant of, and even afraid of new technologies (Personal communication with Wen-Zao University President, Dr. Lee, Wen-Ruey, on Jan. 5th, 2007). Therefore, use of technologies for instruction should be carefully examined if teachers are to effectively use multimedia-based instruction and materials to help students obtain first- and second-hand experiences for better L2 learning.

Motivation for learner’s acquisition of first- and second-hand experiences
From participants’ responses and feedback, we see multimedia-induced stimuli and instruction not only help learner with better perception and understanding, but also enhance learner’s motivation of learning and their acquisition of first-hand and second-hand experiences. The finding is in line with Mayer’s (2001) in that the stimuli from sounds, images, and other means of channels combined (such as haptic channel, tasting channel...etc.) motivate learners more than single-channel stimulus does. Therefore, how to effectively design the instruction by applying the multimedia principles (Mayer, 2001) to facilitate L2 learning will be a reasonable next research focus.

DKE model revisited
The importance of DKE
A critical aspect of first-hand experience is one’s ability to perceive. One is ought to differentiate macro or micro things from one another by noticing the key features of their similarities and differences. By using DKE model, we create an environment of pre-activity where learners learn to perceive first to enhance their first-hand knowledge acquisition, so that students may be able to perceive the foci of points that teachers can or intend to guide students to perceive. Therefore, Schwartz et al. (2005) used a powerful approach to distinguishing contrasting cases to help with people’s noticing ability. Learners may not be able to tell the differences at first when presented with contrasting cases, but with time and practice, they start to “notice the features that identify the original” (Schwartz et al., 2005, p. 21). Future development of contrasting cases in language learning deserves study and emphasis. As to the aspect of second-hand experience, one is ought to effectively generate, communicate, and memorize the symbolic rules. By using DKE model, we see that learners can come up with better retention results from the interaction of the stimulus of first-hand knowledge in learning activity. The design can encourage learners to develop more precise and complete second-hand description, and alert them to the importance of communicable knowledge. I argue that with carefully designed learning activity where first-hand experience is obtained along with second-hand experience, the learning process throughout the whole instruction will reach a deeper level of learner’s cognition, understanding, and learning in L2 learning.
In terms of the importance of the use of both 1st-hand and 2nd-hand experiences, it is clear that learners need both, and it is just like teachers should provide both. Therefore, an instruction with carefully designed DKE model will certainly facilitate learning.

**The effect of pre-lecture activity for L2 instruction**

From this study, it is also clear that the well-designed pre-lecture activity (learning activity) has a powerful effect on L2 instruction. One insight from the study is the class time change for teachers. The East Asian language teachers’ traditional method of repetition of vocabulary words, rules, or materials in preview or review sessions before lectures can be altered to be a vivid first-hand and second-hand experience provision session for students according to the DKE model. Meanwhile, with the implementation of DKE model in L2 learning, teachers can sit back and relax to observe the class dynamics and the development of learners’ acquisition of these experiences during the session as students are perceiving, making actions, and communicating before the lecture part of the instruction.

**Cultural variation between Westerners and Easterners**

It appears that there exists cultural variation in the DKE model posttest results between Westerners and Easterners. Westerners seem to benefit more from the full DKE model. Thus, the study adds to the literature of cultural comparison studies in that Westerners and Easterners are indeed different in how they learn a L2 in a multimedia-induced instruction environment and maybe in how they face retention tests. The findings provide support for the idea that obtaining both first- and second-hand experiences in a designed pre-lecture learning activity can eliminate the possible learning gap (with respect to L2 learning and retention outcomes) between Easterners and Westerners. Therefore, the full DKE model has its effectiveness on L2 learning.

**Why did DKE work in L2 learning?**

The DKE model, from this study, basically provides a theoretical basis for L2 instruction using multimedia design. L2 learning, like other science learning in other domains, requires real understanding, deep information processing, and knowledge transferring construction. As Schwartz et al. (2005) suggested that the goal of DKE is “to unite the mechanisms of perceptual learning for developing first-hand knowledge with model building for developing second-hand knowledge” (p. 21), I argue that DKE model should definitely work in L2 learning since L2 learning also features the need of both first-hand experience and secondhand experience components. Language is for communication and thus the adaptation of language environment using the knowledge learned should certainly fit the DKE model’s evolution assumptions.

Moreover, the goal of learning should not be merely finding the correlations or mappings between the two. Instead, it should be to seek “how the two forms of knowing can complement one another to make a more profound and multi-faceted understanding” (Schwartz et al., 2005, p. 21). Therefore, the DKE model appears to be a promising framework that can integrate different forms of our knowing. It also provides a way for learners to get ready for future learning. As long as educators prepare the activities that help students perceive important aspects of L2 learning data along with the activities that encourage the development of different adjusting models (Schwartz et al., 2005), these activities can prepare learners for future learning.

**CONCLUSION**

From the results of this study, it can be concluded that the implementation of the full DKE model with the acquisition of both first-hand experience and second-hand experience during the learning activity has yielded significantly higher posttest results than that with the acquisition of only first-hand experience. Specifically, obtaining both 1st and 2nd hand experiences in learning activity can eliminate the learning gap (with respect to L2 learning retention outcomes) between Easterners and Westerners. It is also found that the learning activity session of an instruction as well as the well-designed multimedia-based instruction are both important contributors to the effectiveness of L2 learning. This study provides evidence for supporting the full DKE model in multimedia-induced language learning and instruction environment. Apparently, the full-DKE model which consists of a learning activity session that allows learner’s acquisition of both firsthand experience and second-hand experience lets learners process the information longer and deeper. And thus it makes learners learn more effectively in terms of retention results of the materials being learned.

After testing the DKE model in the domain of language learning, we also conclude that by implementing the DKE model, for a given time in a language learning environment, learners provided with both first-hand and second-hand experiences will get better learning results than those provided with only first-hand experience. Educators and learners should apply the DKE model to their L2 teaching and learning.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Not all forms of technologies are proper for language instruction. A study by Kinzer, Sherwood, and Loofbourrow (1989) showed that technologies using simulation software may not yield better retention results than expository texts for 5th grade children. There was a significant result in retention scores favoring the expository-text group. They proposed some possible disadvantages in computer simulation instruction, and they include: reading from computer screens and the difficulties of animation in computer simulations of knowledge acquisition for the children. We should therefore be aware of the future designs for DKE using technologies for certain target audience. As situated learning may be the next generation instructional tool and method for language, researchers have to further study and illustrate what types of technologies may be appropriate to help with the emergence of learner’s 1st and 2nd hand experiences in language learning. Due to the limitation of time, the study was not able to be carried out over a longer period of time for more participants (for better power for more variables’ investigation) and for better instrument and measurement development (eg. the inclusion of more contrasting cases in PowerPoint as stimuli in pre-lecture learning activity). Ideally, we are ought to recruit more participants for some other interesting variables’ investigation and to carefully collect participants’ retention transfer data after 2 weeks of the treatment. Also, we ought to design and develop pre-tested reliable and valid instrument and measure for the testing of DKE model. However, the statistically significant results undoubtedly encouraged us in believing in the model’s influence in L2 learning.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

We can look at a group with only second-hand experience and compare all three treatment groups to see if the DKE model is indeed better for learning and to see if there are differences between the group that has only the first-hand experience and the group that has only the second-hand experience. However, from a cognitive learning perspective, providing only second-hand experience in the beginning of an instruction may not be appropriate as argued by many researchers (eg. Bransford et al., 1989; Bransford & Schwartz, 1999, …etc.), especially before the first-hand experience.

Further exploration of the DKE model’s transfer mechanisms and learners’ usage of transferring knowledge in a new environment when they evolve their knowledge and skills will be beneficial to reveal DKE model’s power of knowledge evolution. With the development of distant learning technologies (Leu & Kinzer, 2003), the application of DKE model for language learning in information and communication technologies (ICT) may be interesting to further investigate should we value the impact of multimedia learning in online learning environment.

Unlike mere scaffolding in which a successful one is measured through the performance of a task, DKE model in L2 can further prepare people to learn in the future because it offers mechanisms to aid “future learning and adaptation beyond the performance of the original task” (Schwartz et al., 2005, p. 18). Therefore, a better and more precise measure may be our next task as it will increase the validity of DKE model in L2 learning.

During our data collection, principal investigator and the trained graduate assistants have found that there exists this cultural variation in test taking and responding between westerners and easterners. After conducting analysis of variance, it appears that the DKE model is better for Westerners. One has to be cautious about interpreting the results. Would it be just the measurement issue (i.e. test design)? Or are there other reasons that lie behind for Easterners or Westerners? As some researchers (eg., Chen & Stevenson, 1995; Stevenson & Stigler, 1992) have argued that Easterners may be very good and well-trained test-takers, it should be interesting to see if Westerners and Easterners perform differently under the DKE model mainly because of their different test-taking attitudes, skills, and strategies.

To see if there are differences in cultural or language backgrounds, in the use of technologies, and in the interaction of applications of DKE, we will have to build on the study by having a more complex design of 2x2x2, more participants, and more refined instrument in the future.
REFERENCES


From websites:


The next issue to be published in June 2013