SSLA, **20**, 109–122. Printed in the United States of America.

REVIEWS

A DEVELOPMENTAL-FUNCTIONALIST APPROACH TO CHILD LANGUAGE.

Nancy Budwig. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1995. Pp. xxi + 224. $45.00 cloth.

This book concentrates on the way young children's speech may vary between the pronouns *I, my,* and *me* as the subject of a sentence. For example, one child in the study at 30 months of age alternated between *my* and *I* as the subject form, as seen in these two utterances (p. 73):

(1) *I like Anna,*
(2) *My like vanilla.*

The fundamental claim is that such variation is motivated and principled. The author writes:

> One might want to claim instead that the children were simply confused about the distinctions between various self-reference forms and thus might use them in free variation. (p. 58)

No one has ever claimed that children were "simply confused" when they made pronoun Case errors, and this book's lack of attention to opposing explanations for pronoun Case errors is a major flaw. For those interested in learning more about the phenomenon some important citations are Chiat (1981), Loeb and Leonard (1991), Powers (1995), Rispoli (1994), Schutze and Wexler (1996), and Vainikka (1994). Loeb and Leonard (1991), Powers (1995), and Schutze and Wexler (1996) hold that the child's inability to accurately assign Case leads to these errors as well as a host of simultaneously occurring phenomena such as inaccurate production of agreement and tense marking. Rispoli (1994) views these errors as the result of paradigm building.

Budwig attempts to tie these errors to a Neo-Piagetian framework, according to which ego-anchored children develop into non-ego-anchored children. Ego-anchored children vary in forms of self-reference between *my, me,* and *I.* Ego-anchoring is determined linguistically by the number of self-reference forms used by the child, and it is highly correlated with MLU (Mean Length Utterance). This leaves open the possibility that the changes seen in the data were caused by grammatical developments and not by cognitive developments. Moreover, pronoun Case errors occur with all the personal pronouns and in syntactic positions other than the subject position (Chiat, 1981; Powers, 1995; Rispoli, 1994). Budwig's approach simply cannot be extended to these errors.

Empirically, this book has disturbing characteristics. Although data were collected from six children, this book is based on the case studies of three children. The statistics are descriptive in nature, as the use of inferential statistics seems to have been eschewed. The result is a barrage of percentages, some of which are based on quite small samples.

The book was intended for those interested in first language acquisition. Relations to second language acquisition are remote. However, the phenomenon of pronoun Case error should be of interest to second language acquisition researchers. It remains to be seen whether pronoun

© 1998 Cambridge University Press 0272-2631/98 $9.50

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Case errors, so typical of the acquisition of English as a first language, are a phenomenon likely to appear in the acquisition of English as a second language by adults.

(*Received 19 August 1996*)

Matthew Rispoli
Arizona State University

REFERENCES

Chiat, S. (1981). Context-specificity and generalization in the acquisition of pronominal distinctions. *Journal of Child Language, 8,* 75–91.

Loeb, D., & Leonard, L. (1991). Subject Case marking and verb morphology in normally developing and specifically language impaired children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 34,* 340–346.

Powers, S. (1995). The acquisition of Case in Dutch. In M. Verrips & F. Wijnen (Eds.), *Papers from the Dutch-German Colloquium on Language Acquisition, Amsterdam Series in Child Language Development, 3,* 159–180.

Rispoli, M. (1994). Pronoun Case overextension and paradigm building. *Journal of Child Language, 21,* 157–172.

Schutze, C., & Wexler, K. (1996). Subject Case licensing and English root infinitives. *Proceedings of the Boston University Conference on Language Development, 20,* 670–680.

Vainikka, A. (1994). Case in the development of English syntax. *Language Acquisition, 3,* 257–325.

READING AND LANGUAGE PROCESSING. *John M. Henderson, Murray Singer, & Fernanda Ferreira (Eds.).* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 1995. Pp. iv + 351. $34.50 paper.

This volume sets forth an excellent overview of cutting-edge research in reading and language processing and illuminates many of the controversial issues related to human cognition. Readers will find, as an example, apt commentaries on the tension between connectionist modeling and the antecedent symbolic processing, and the subsequent efforts of researchers to resolve paradigmatic conflicts. As a result, several hybrid models, incorporating elements of a symbolic system and an activation-based connectionist mechanism, have emerged. Similarly, the logic and value of relevant research procedures are debated. Methodological scrutiny, in fact, is a prominent theme throughout the volume. Among other things, a variety of online measures, such as technologically enhanced procedures for eye-movement tracking, pupillometry monitoring, and moving-window display techniques, are discussed.

The 15 chapters open with introductory remarks by the editors, outlining the book's organization and themes. The first 2 chapters by Buchanan and Bersner, and Daneman and Reingold address phonological recoding in word recognition. The following chapters by Pollatsek et al. (perceptual span) and by Henderson et al. (visual attention) serve as a preface to 4 subsequent chapters on syntactic analysis during sentence parsing. For example, Clifton et al. use the technique of eye-tracking in the succeeding chapters to explore modularity issues—that is, the extent to which parsing processes are guided by a syntactic module. The chapters by Spivey-Knowlton et al. and Just and Carpenter, on the other hand, concern syntactic ambiguity resolution within a constraint-based framework.

The remaining 5 chapters deal with text-level representations. Singer and Masson consider the construction of a propositional textbase and the extraction of a causal situation model from the textbase; Dixson et al. emphasize situational-level representation in their examination of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

memory for procedural discourse; and working from an episodic-memory perspective, Levy and her colleagues examine the transfer of reading fluency in changed and unchanged reading repetitions. Finally, the Moravcsik and Kintsch chapter focuses on the interplay among different levels of representation based on their construction-integration model. A closing chapter is provided by the editors, summarizing major conclusions and suggesting critical issues for future investigations.

The great strengths of the book lie in its thematic coherence, balanced topical coverage, and consistent quality of the work presented. It will serve as a valuable reference for those interested in the cognitive aspects of language processing. Although none of the chapters deal directly with bilingual processing, L2 researchers can gain considerable benefit from most, and perhaps all, of the content. As a case in point, because adult L2 learners are often confronted with demanding tasks well before they establish a solid linguistic foundation, an important question is how much limited knowledge impairs L2 processing performance. The constraint-based models described in the Just and Carpenter, and Spivey-Knowlton chapters provide a useful framework for exploring precisely such resource-limitation issues among L2 learners. As a second case in point, when L2 reading involves learning a new set of written symbols, lower level processing plays a vital role in accounting for individual differences in comprehension performance. Hence, L2 researchers must have a clear understanding of the fundamental operations involved in visual word recognition—a topic broadly considered in the 4 chapters dealing with perceptual processing. Similarly, inasmuch as the majority of adult L2 readers have prior literacy experience, its impact should be addressed in L2 research. The work by Levy and her associates demonstrates a specific method to identify the basic competence elements that are transferable across reading tasks, and it provides conceptual guidance in exploring prior processing experience effects. Finally, L2 processing, unlike L1 reading, involves two (and possibly more) languages, and we can, therefore, safely assume that the two sets of linguistic knowledge mutually interact. Little is known, however, as to how—and to what extent—cross-linguistic interactions occur during L2 processing. The parallel interactive models proposed by Moravcsik and Kintsch and others in the volume establish a conceptual basis for initiating systematic investigations on this important and uniquely L2 phenomenon.

Symbiotically, L2 researchers can make unique contributions to our understanding of cognition, because bilingual processing creates an extraordinarily rich natural experimental condition by allowing researchers to dissect linguistic and cognitive competence. They can test the validity of theoretical claims such as those presented here.

(*Received 5 November 1996*)

Keiko Koda
Carnegie Mellon University

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IELTS: A STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE ON READING COMPREHENSION. *Caroline Clapham.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Pp. xiii + 303. $52.95 cloth, $26.95 paper.

Can scores on L2 reading tests be interpreted as indicators of reading ability alone, or must they be considered indicators of the test takers' reading ability in addition to their knowledge

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the subject matter chosen for a particular test? This book reports the results of a large-scale study investigating this question through analysis of ESL/EFL learners' performance on subject-specific reading tests.

The first three chapters situate the research by examining previous work pertaining to the relative roles of language and background knowledge in language performance. Chapter 1 summarizes tentative conclusions from past research that motivated the current study. Chapter 2 reviews the L1 research investigating the role of background knowledge in text comprehension. Clapham's critical analysis of the evolution of schemata theory, which explores activation of background knowledge during text comprehension, highlights hypotheses relevant to investigation of language tests requiring text comprehension. Chapter 3 reviews L2 reading research, concluding with the salient questions emerging from the previous research: Because background knowledge affects reading, should English for Academic Purposes tests be targeted toward particular learners? What is the relative importance of background knowledge and language proficiency in test performance? Do their relative roles evolve as the learners' language develops?

Chapter 4 contains an informative history of the subject-specific tests used in the research, the Reading Modules of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). Like the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) in North America, in Britain the predecessor of IELTS was developed to assess the academic English ability of candidates applying for admission at English-medium universities. Clapham's research played a significant role in the evolution of this widely used test.

Chapters 5–10 provide the methodological details of a pilot study and the main study. The pilot study found little evidence of a subject-specific advantage for test takers who took a reading test within their subject area. The main study therefore used tests revised to increase the subject specificity of the texts. Each of the 842 subjects took two reading tests (one in their own subject area and one in another subject area), completed a questionnaire about their background knowledge, and took a grammar test. Analyses included item analysis, reliability, correlations among the reading tests, correlations with other language tests, analysis of variance to show differences in performance by different groups, and multiple regression analysis to show relative contributions of language and background knowledge to performance on the reading test. Other analyses probed the subject-specificity of the reading passages from the perspectives of the students who took the tests, subject area experts, and applied linguists attempting to make judgments about them.

Chapter 11 summarizes the findings: Students sometimes perform better on a reading test when texts are in their own subject area than they do on tests with texts in a different subject area, but this occurs only when the texts are sufficiently subject specific. The subject-specific advantage is evident when students are classified by their past study rather than by their future study plans. It was possible to develop subject-specific tests, and their subject specificity was reflected primarily in the texts rather than the test tasks. For the texts used, rhetorical functions seemed to be the best way of defining their degree of subject specificity, but additional work is needed on this question. It was not possible to classify students into well-defined groups on the basis of their background knowledge. Language proficiency and background knowledge both explained significant variance in the subject-specific reading tests. The effect of background knowledge on test performance was not the same at different levels of proficiency, and it played a greater role for intermediate learners than for advanced or low-level learners.

This book is an example of the best that applied linguistics can offer. It investigates a question significant for language teaching and testing by formulating hypotheses from cognitive psychology and L2 research and by employing current practices in validation from educational

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

measurement and language testing. The results offer insight into both the methods and substance of L2 reading research, particularly because they move forward the discussion of the role of background knowledge in L2 reading. As a result of this study, it is clear that future research needs to improve the ways in which background knowledge is assessed and to develop analytic methods for more accurate classification of texts on a continuum from general to subject-specific.

(*Received 6 November 1996*)

Carol A. Chapelle
Iowa State University

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL CHILD LANGUAGE RESEARCH FORUM. *Eve V. Clark (Ed.).* Hillsdale, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1995. Pp. ix + 247. $49.95 cloth, $22.95 paper.

This volume is a collection of papers presented at a conference at Stanford in April 1995. It has two sections: papers from a panel on Current Approaches to Phonological Development and papers from the general sessions. Eve Clark is to be congratulated for making the volume available so rapidly. It can still take years for some conference papers to make it to press and such delays severely limit the usefulness of such publications.

The first section on phonological development contains papers on both segmental and prosodic phonological development, and all of the papers will be of interest to L2 researchers because they focus on variability. Rice's paper, "Phonological variability in language acquisition: A representational account," argues that the more a segment is underspecified, the more likely the segment will vary. Levelt's paper, "The segmental structure of early words: Articulatory frames or phonological constraints?," is based on data from Dutch children and claims that although it had previously been thought that "unskilled" data could not be handled by theories that account for adult phonological systems, child data do in fact "fit" into the same system. For obvious reasons, some SLA researchers will welcome this line of reasoning from an L1 acquisition researcher. Fee's contribution, "Two strategies in the acquisition of syllable word structure," contains data from monolingual English- and Hungarian-speaking children. She argues for an identifiable pattern in the development of minimal words based on moraic theory. Finally, Demuth's paper tries to account for variability in the development of prosodic words. Also, a paper by Ohala discusses the role of sonority in cluster reduction in child language.

The second section of the proceedings reflects the continuing concern of L1 researchers with issues related to argument structure and the lexicon. A paper by Allen treats the acquisition of causatives in Inuktitut; Bowerman, de Leon, and Choi discuss spatial semantics and verb forms; and Brinkmann presents new data and analyses for the locative alternation in German. Pye, Loeb, and Pao present results of crosslinguistic acquisition of "breaking" and "cutting." The paper by Pye et al. is particularly interesting because they compare the acquisition of Chinese, English, and Ki'che' verbs and propose that Pinker's (1989) seminal contribution to a theory of argument-structure acquisition faces problems when crosslinguistic data are considered. Pye and his colleagues argue for a paradigm approach to alternations in verb forms. Research such as this will provide further important data for L2 researchers interested in the field of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

semantics-syntax correspondences, as well as for teacher trainers who might wish to provide some crosslinguistic background to prospective teachers of ESL.

L2 researchers interested in the issue of the emergence of functional categories will find useful two papers on early word order. Using data from Hebrew NP and DP development, Armon-Lotem ("Locating parameters: Evidence from early word order") argues for two kinds of parameters: directionality parameters (which govern the position of complements and specifiers in relation to the head of the phrase) and checking parameters (which may or may not trigger constituent movement). She argues that the former are acquired before the latter. Boser's paper, "Verb initial utterances in early child German: A study of the interaction of Grammar and Pragmatics," argues for the Strong Continuity Hypothesis and maintains there is no stage in which CP is deficient in early child German. Instead, the child has to learn certain pragmatic conditions that license distinctions made in the adult grammar.

In sum, this volume provides a valuable sampling of current concerns in L1 acquisition research. It will be especially useful to scholars who are interested in the developments in L1 phonology and argument-structure development that may inform SLA research.

(*Received 30 December 1996*)

Alan Juffs
University of Pittsburgh

REFERENCE

Pinker, S. (1989). *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION: A DIALOGUE WITH THE BAKHTIN CIRCLE. *Marcia Moraes.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1996. Pp. xii + 159. $39.50 cloth, $12.95 paper.

Marcia Moraes has made a contribution that will be of interest to many bilingual educators in the United States. Her book is an attempt to examine and critique contemporary bilingual education as it is generally conceptualized in the United States within the framework of a critical Marxian, poststructuralist perspective grounded in the work of Mikhail Bakhtin and Valentin Voloshinov. Thus, *Bilingual education: A dialogue with the Bakhtin circle* seeks to bring together two fields that have been, until this time, relatively unconnected. There is a great deal to be said for such undertakings, and both those interested in critical pedagogy and those involved in bilingual education have much to learn from one another.

The book itself is divided into five chapters. The first chapter, entitled "The Bakhtin Circle and Language," provides an overview of the Bakhtin Circle's views on language (including discussion of the constructs of sign, consciousness, utterance, understanding, and communication), as well as on the nature of language (including an intriguing analysis of the debate between Voloshinov and Saussure on "What is language?"). For many bilingual educators and others interested in SLA, this chapter will provide a good starting point for understanding the nature of poststructuralist discourse on language. Chapter 2 deals with the historical context of bilingual education in the United States, and Chapter 3 addresses the contemporary research

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

literature on bilingual education. These two chapters contextualize the remainder of the book with respect to bilingual education in the United States, but they are somewhat superficial for anyone familiar with the issues, as most readers of *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* would be. The fourth chapter, entitled "Language and its multiple voices," provides discussion of dialogue, dialogic pedagogy, critical/radical pedagogy, and dialogic-critical pedagogy. Finally, Chapter 5 is devoted to expanding the debate between "English-only" and "English-plus."

Taken as a whole, this book offers a perspective on the issues surrounding bilingual education that has rarely been articulated among bilingual educators. Much of what Moraes says is, nonetheless, commonly believed and accepted by many bilingual educators. Having said this, though, by far the greater contribution of this work may be for those whose primary interest has been in areas related to critical pedagogy but who are not particularly familiar with issues in bilingual education. For these readers, this book may provide both background and insight into issues related to language and educational approaches dealing with language than can lead to better, more thoughtful and productive discourse and dialogue between bilingual educators and those interested in critical pedagogy. The fact that the book appears in the *Teacher Empowerment and School Reform* series (edited by Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren) and contains a foreword by Peter McLaren may well contribute to this dialogue.

(*Received 18 October 1996*)

Timothy Reagan
University of Connecticut

CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC: CROSS-CULTURAL ASPECTS OF SECOND-LANGUAGE WRITING. *Ulla Connor.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Pp. xv + 201. $47.95 cloth, $18.95 paper.

This volume charts the development of contrastive rhetoric (CR) over the past 30 years. Although CR has not attempted to identify developmental stages of L2 writers, it is essentially the study of transfer: the influence of L1 writing conventions and cultural and cognitive dimensions on L2 writing. Major strengths of this book are its critical review of the literature, concise definitions, and documentation of the progression of CR from narrow L2 text-based analyses to the inclusion of multiple approaches.

Section 1 contains three chapters that provide an overview of the early phases of the field and its subsequent development. Chapter 1 defines key terms and presents a theoretical model of the new CR. Chapter 2 consists of two parts. The first discusses the limitations and biases of Kaplan's early work in its historical context. The second part maps the growth of the field in conjunction with process and social construction paradigm shifts. Chapter 3 provides a useful contemporary critique of Kaplan's reduced but popular view of rhetoric, as well as a critique of his strong linear bias toward text analysis and concludes with a review of the most important CR work in eight languages.

The second section's five chapters delineate CR's interfaces with a related discipline. Chapter 4 discusses the interface with four major approaches to composition studies—rhetorical, expressionist, cognitivist, and social constructionist—illustrating how each has contributed to a progressively richer and more complete understanding of L1 and L2 writing. Chapter 5 examines the role of the three major schools of text linguistics—the Prague school, systemic linguistics,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and "the new school of discourse analysis"—all of which focus on how specific grammatical phenomena interact to create texts. Chapter 6 surveys literacy studies within anthropological, educational, and applied linguistics frameworks. Of particular interest here is the rejection of value orientation theory because it is "too formalistic and ethnically oriented" (p. 103) and too stereotyped. Chapter 7 explores common issues in translation studies and CR, such as the nature of L1 transfer and the theoretical issue of L2 target audience acceptability versus L1-based adequacy. Chapter 8 examines genre-specific CR research. Findings are reviewed in three domains: student writing, academic writing, and professional writing. This chapter concludes with a review of case studies that focus on the acquisition of discourse conventions and topic appropriateness within the context of interactions with professors, supervisors, and colleagues.

Section 3 consists of two chapters that explore the implications of 30 years of CR. Chapter 9 reviews methodological problems and advances, charting a movement from narrow error analyses of L2 student texts to the incorporation of multiple approaches, more native-speaker researchers of languages other than English, larger data sets, more accurate descriptions, and increased concern for control of variables such as genre, content, and author proficiency levels. Chapter 10 considers implications for teaching. Text linguistics, for example, demonstrates differences in reader expectations; process studies highlight different attitudes toward peer feedback and teacher-student roles; and genre-specific studies suggest that lack of awareness of cross-culture differences is "the main cause preventing nonnative writers' success in the international community" (p. 169). A discussion of writing assessment issues and suggestions for future research round out the chapter.

My only serious quibble with this book is its premature rejection of value orientation theory. Although Connor rejects value orientation theory for other than a periphery role, she cites numerous studies that rely on cultural values. Perhaps the most telling example is when she cites research that indicates "two sets of values are simultaneously at work in the writing of a scientific report: those common to the academic community and those held in esteem in the writer's national culture" (p. 50). I agree with Connor that one should exercise caution in applying Hofstede's (1984) value dimensions to CR (e.g., uncertainty avoidance or individualism-collectivism); however, as Fox's (1994) work on student-teacher tutoring indicates, value orientation theory need not be applied stereotypically. Furthermore, given the recognition that it is necessary to understand culture-specific communication patterns (p. 113), the field of intercultural communication that continues to refine value theory has much to contribute; uncertainty avoidance, for example, has become the basis for a major theory in intercultural communication (e.g., Dodd, 1995).

Despite this criticism, Connor has provided an excellent, wide ranging, and accessible introduction to CR which is must reading for anyone, expert or novice, interested in the effect of L1 literacy and culture on written communication.

(*Received 3 December 1996*)

Dave Mosher
Michigan State University

REFERENCES

Dodd, C. (1995). *Dynamics of intercultural communication* (4th ed.). Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark.
Fox, H. (1984). *Listening to the world.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LEXICAL ISSUES IN LANGUAGE LEARNING. *Birgit Harley* (*Ed.*). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995. Pp. iv + 318. $29.95 paper.

Although the lexicon has traditionally been regarded as one of the three essential elements of language learning, the other two being phonology and syntax, it has often been almost ignored, or perhaps more accurately, taken for granted, whereas phonology and especially syntax have received most of the attention of theorists and teachers alike. However, there is now a growing awareness that lexical knowledge is both more complex than it appears and also more fundamental to learners' overall knowledge of a given language than previously thought. The volume under review is a good introduction to the complexities of lexical learning and a valuable guide for those who are interested in doing empirical research in this area.

The collection contains nine empirical studies, divided into three parts: Three deal with the bilingual lexicon, two with psycholinguistic factors, and four with lexical acquisition and communication tasks. In addition, there is a comprehensive introduction by the editor which explains the organizing principle of the collection—to bridge the gap between psycholinguistic and pedagogical perspectives—and which also provides some theoretical and historical background for each of the studies. The studies are directed toward a general audience of language acquisition and teaching professionals, so they do assume a basic knowledge of linguistics and research methodology; however, none of the studies are technically abstruse.

The first section addresses the perennial question of whether bilingualism is detrimental to children's development. In the first article, Pearson, Fernandez, and Oller show that this issue is partly determined by how one counts the data: Should words be counted as conceptual units—in which case many bilingual word pairs will be counted only once—or should they be counted according to sound-meaning pairings—in which case many conceptual units will be counted twice? The authors defend their decisions and tentatively conclude that bilingualism is not detrimental to children's development. Umbel and Oller ask the same question regarding Hispanic bilinguals and also conclude that bilingualism per se is not detrimental, though it is often accompanied by sociolinguistic factors that may confuse the issue. Finally, Segalwitz investigates the effect of advanced L2 skills on L1 automaticity, concluding that L2 skills may negatively affect processing speed but not necessarily automaticity.

The psycholinguistic section addresses two issues: Which lexical features determine the learnability of various words and which techniques enhance memorization. N. Ellis and Beaton identify two crucial lexical features: phonological/orthographic fit with L1 and *imageability*, the ease with which a given word's conceptual referent can be recalled. They make a compelling argument for separating these aspects of lexical learning in theoretical models and argue that lexical knowledge is dispersed in the mind. They then go on to explain and empirically examine the application of keyword techniques for language learning, coming to the interesting conclusion that "keyword techniques are effective for receptive learning, but that repetition is superior for production" (p. 156). Wang and Thomas also address the efficacy of keyword mnemonics and conclude that the technique is not effective for long-term memorization, although it does enhance short-term recall. However, as they point out, they used experimenter-selected rather than learner-selected keywords, and they cite evidence that learner-selected keywords may be more effective.

The final section examines the effects of various interactional environments on learners. R. Ellis, Tanaka, and Yamazaki report on their study comparing premodified and interactional input. Their results show significant advantages for interaction; however, as they acknowledge, the effect may have been due to extra time rather than interaction per se. Luppescu and Day

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

examine reading, dictionaries, and vocabulary learning and conclude, contrary to their own hypothesis, that dictionaries are beneficial. Danan reports on her study that compared the effects of reversed subtitling, normal subtitling, and dual coding on students' vocabulary acquisition. Surprisingly, she found reverse subtitling to be the most effective, though dual coding was also promising. Finally, Poulise and Schils examine the influence of task and proficiency level on compensatory strategies for lexical comprehension. They develop a descriptive taxonomy of strategies, distinguishing conceptual from linguistic strategies, and then report on their study, which shows task to be the most important variable in the learners' choice of compensatory strategies.

I found this to be an interesting and informative collection, and I recommend it to anyone working on the acquisition of the L2 lexicon.

(*Received 3 December 1996*)

Nevin Leder
Michigan State University

LANGUAGE, EDUCATION AND SOCIETY IN A CHANGING WORLD. *Tina Hickey and Jenny Williams (Eds.).* Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1996. Pp. viii + 287. $59.00 cloth.

This is a selection of papers from a conference hosted by the Irish Association for Applied Linguistics at the Marino Institute of Education in Dublin in June 1994. In an introductory paper, Rosamond Mitchell calls us to "defend and develop the professionalism of language teachers" (p. 17), which Mary Ruane amplifies to counter pessimism among language professionals arising from a feeling of a lack of control over "issues on a wider agenda" (p. 27). On the same theme, John Edwards calls for sociopolitical engagement with ethnic-minority-language situations (p. 34) and Helen Ó Murchú calls for empowerment of the "lesser used language communities" (p. 44) in a supportive response to Edwards' keynote address.

Papers on language management follow. Bernard Spolsky argues his position on Israeli state language policy, Sean Farren notes the acceptance of Irish in Northern Ireland under the heading of "cultural heritage" (and the paper makes the reviewer wonder if peace will be the death of Irish), and Muiris Ó Laoire revisits Ireland with an interpretation from Israel of the ideologically induced expansion of the use of Hebrew in the family domain for which "it did become socially desirable to speak Hebrew" (p. 69): For what purpose would an Irish family "make a conscious effort to change the language in the home to Irish" (p. 70)? Two papers from Russia end this section. Anneli Sarhimaa presents a nutshell history of trends of use and planning for Karelian during this century and concludes on the note that it may be too late to revitalize Karelian. But her pessimism is balanced by Svetlana Ter-Minasova's enthusiastic litany of obstacles to be overcome in foreign-language teaching in today's Russia.

Other papers deal with a wide variety of topics including Anglo-Nigerian Pidgin, Guatemalan linguists' training, Dutch-French bilingual pronunciation, and Dutch-Turkish; three other papers on the study of translation advocate attention to prototype theory, cognitive science, and the media. Still other papers treat topics such as medical texts (Gibbon), cultural content in language teaching (done soul-searchingly by Mathúna on Irish and Heffernan in Canada), post-Sinclairian

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

discourse analysis, databases, LSP theory, motivation, the mental lexicon, strategy training, and extensive reading.

If the disjointed enumeration of contents by the reviewer now disturbs you, then the medium is indeed the message about the book under review. Despite the attempt to deal with issues of concern to applied linguists in the several papers placed first in the book, the collection of conference papers as a whole does not succeed in coherently presenting central challenges to applied linguistics, which apparently was its main aim (p. 6). However, there are papers of value to the wider applied linguistics community. Britt-Louise Gunnarsson interestingly reviews the development of text genres within and across national writing communities, taking her research team's work on Swedish, German, and English medical texts as prime examples. Andrew Cohen masterfully demonstrates through self-reporting techniques that immersion has internal and external behavioral components that require management. His paper has implications for the avoidance of self-deception in immersion programs; for example, in situations of continued use of a formerly colonial language in regard to whether students think in the colonial-foreign language. Finally, Brian Tomlinson in his discussion of visualization by L2 readers helped me recognize the importance of seeing, but it saddens me to realize that there is still a need to argue for the desirability of universal mother-tongue literacy as is done in the final paper by Roland Walker.

(*Received 30 January 1997*)

Björn H. Jernudd
Hong Kong Baptist University

BECOMING BILINGUAL: LANGUAGE ACQUISITION IN A BILINGUAL COMMUNITY. *Jean Lyon.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 1996. Pp. x + 271. $79.00 cloth, $24.95 paper.

Much of the existing literature on the bilingual language acquisition of preschool children consists of single-child case studies conducted by parents who are trained linguists. Such parents had usually made special efforts to cultivate bilingualism in their children.

Lyon's book (number 11 in the series Bilingual Education and Bilingualism) reports on the Anglesey Project, an innovative longitudinal study of language acquisition in preschool children up to age 3. The parents in Lyon's study were nonlinguists living on Anglesey Island in North Wales, a bilingual Welsh-English community, who were "naive about language development and haphazard in the way they related linguistically to their children" (p. 211).

The two primary issues that Lyon, a clinical psychologist, sought to address were: "1) To examine how very young children become bilingual. 2) To discover what features in the infant's background predict early childhood bilingualism." The project combined data from two written questionnaires sent 3 years apart with an in-depth case study of 10 children.

The "Language Background Questionnaire" (QI) was sent to the mother of every baby born on Anglesey in 1988–1989. On the basis of their answers, each couple was assigned to one of five categories (Welsh-speaking, Welsh-speaking mother, Welsh-speaking father, Mixed, English-speaking) that, despite the questionnaire name, described couples' current language usage rather than background or ethnicity, although some wordings in the text cause confusion about this. For instance, "mixed" couples are repeatedly defined as "both parents with both languages

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in their background" (pp. 7, 77, 94), and one couple's current language usage was called "mixed" even though their child heard Welsh only "from one set of grandparents" (p. 124). Lyon states that she did not use the "mixed" group in all analyses (p. 75), although she does not discuss why this decision was made or in which analyses this group was not used. She also does not explain how the questionnaires were interpreted in order to categorize couples.

In the next phase, two families were chosen from each language background category for closer study (i.e., 10 children total). Eight tape recordings were made of mother-child interaction (and one of father-child interaction) from age 15 months to 3 years. Lyon calculated the percentage of these interactions that took place in Welsh, English, and "Common Language"—that is, preschooler vocabulary shared by both languages. An appendix lists 163 "Common Language" words.

The "Language Development Questionnaire" (QII) was sent to every couple who had responded to QI, when their child turned 3. QII was designed to assess the degree of bi- or monolingualism of the larger pool of children not analyzed in the 10 case studies. The 124 couples who returned both questionnaires formed the basis for most of the calculations.

In terms of predicting children's bilingual development (her second research question), Lyon examined three issues: the family's "language background" category, parental language attitudes, and language usage with the child. Lyon concludes that parental attitudes (as reported in QI) are the least accurate predictor of successful child bilingualism, followed by the family's language background (from which one could successfully predict the children's language in two thirds of the sample). Maternal language use with the child was by far the best predictor of language development in the child, with paternal use also making a significant, though much smaller, contribution.

To address the question of how young children become bilingual (her first research question), three theories of bilingual language acquisition are evaluated. Lyon ultimately argues that her data are compatible with the Sequential Model in which "children need to reach an optimal level in one language (probably Stage 3) before they begin to acquire the second. Thence the two languages progress, with one usually remaining a little ahead of the other" (p. 229).

In spite of some difficulties with the "language background" typology and the handling of "mixed" couples, this is on the whole a well-designed, thought-provoking study and a highly readable book.

(*Received 13 February 1997*)

Kevin J. Rottet
Indiana University

LANGUAGE PROGRAM EVALUATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE. *Brian K. Lynch.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Pp. vii + 194. $47.95 cloth, $19.95 paper.

Lynch, drawing on his experience of evaluation, in particular the Reading English for Science and Technology (REST) Project, aims to provide a "thorough theoretical background for the evaluation of language education programs" and "the necessary range of theory and practical techniques" (p. xi), and he highlights contributions for "program evaluation . . . in the development of applied linguistics as a field of research" (p. x).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In chapter 2 Lynch provides an historical overview of evaluation of language education programs in the 1960s and 70s (one wonders why not the 80s and early 90s) and from epistemological and procedural perspectives presents the background to the "paradigm dialog" that underpins evaluation research. In chapter 3 he examines validity from positivistic and naturalistic viewpoints, drawing out differences in terms of impact on validity. Chapter 4 then presents a range of different designs suitable for evaluation within the positivist tradition, whereas chapter 5 focuses on naturalistic designs considering some evaluation models (e.g., illumination, goal-free). To support preceding chapters, detailed examples—derived from positivistic (chapter 6) and naturalistic (chapter 7) research paradigms—are provided and analyzed. The possibility of combining research paradigms is examined in chapter 8, in relation to the evaluation of REST. The concluding chapter 9 presents a summary of main issues.

A central focus for Lynch is the nature of the relationship between "evaluation research" (used interchangeably with "evaluation," but see Mackay, 1991; Mitchell, 1990; Norris, 1990; Rea-Dickins, 1994) and "research" (in applied linguistics). He does not set out the criterial features for each, which would have helped in clarifying certain ambiguities within the text. His account is written largely from an evaluation research position; this has various consequences.

In many evaluation (vs. evaluation research) contexts, there are constraints that render it impossible to adequately control key variables for the effective implementation of a positivistic design or to account for the extraneous variables (e.g., variable exposure to the English language) in establishing causal relationships between educational inputs and outputs. Yet, much of the discussion (especially chapters 4, 6, and 8) takes for granted a program context that allows for tight control, for example, the availability of reliable and valid pre- and post-tests. In how many language-education programs is this actually feasible?

The emphasis on evaluation research overshadows a developmental interpretation of evaluation, long respected in mainstream education, in which evaluation is an integral part of decision-making for curriculum action in the short (and longer) term. Without diminishing the extremely valuable and detailed analysis of the paradigm debate, in particular chapter 3 on validity, less emphasis on positivistic designs would have allowed for more analysis (at which Lynch is very good) of concerns important to the less well-charted territories of ethnographically influenced and participatory evaluation (raised in chapter 7) and of issues of more practical significance to the teacher and would-be evaluator. Lynch himself asserts that evaluations should have a "very practical focus: to inform decisions about language programmes" (p. 175), but no examples are provided of how evaluation findings can become actionable and built into existing program mechanisms.

One audience for the volume is "language teachers" (p. xii), but this begs the issue of how much time and resourcing the average program has for evaluation. Lynch worked with both evaluation and testing expertise as well as taking a personal interest in the evaluation of the REST, culminating in a Ph.D. thesis, several articles, and this book. I would not regard this as typical of evaluation contexts. Hence, much of the book is premised on, and is a justification for, a wide-ranging and quality piece of evaluation research. However, overall, I find it is the title that presents something of a problem, not the volume itself.

Some program evaluations are little more than armchair musings—ones in which no underlying rationale or no systematicity of design exists, with obvious consequences. What Lynch's work firmly demonstrates is the need for evaluation to be systematic at every stage of the design and analysis process. This is the main strength of the volume, in addition to the carefully worked examples provided throughout. The issue of program evaluation research feeding into applied linguistics presents an interesting dimension. My view is rather of a symbiotic relationship between the two, but the fact that I shall include this volume in bibliographies for courses

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in curriculum evaluation, research methodology in ELT, and language testing confirms Lynch's position on the need for a sound research base for work within applied linguistics.

This book is lucidly written and well organized, with incisive introductions and conclusions at the beginning and end of each chapter, as well as plenty of evaluation examples to support the theoretical positions presented. It is an important contribution for novice researchers in different fields of applied linguistics.

(*Received 8 July 1996*)

Pauline Rea-Dickins
University of Warwick

REFERENCES

Mackay, R. (1991). How program personnel help maximise the utility of language program evaluation. In S. Anivan (Ed.), *Issues in Program Evaluation in the 1990's* (pp. 60–71). Singapore: RELC.

Mitchell, R. (1990). Evaluation of second language teaching projects and programmes. *Language, Culture & Curriculum, 3,* 3–17.

Norris, N. (1990). *Understanding educational evaluation.* London: Kogan Page.

Rea-Dickins, P. (1994). Evaluation & English language teaching. *Language Teaching, 27,* 71–91.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198271051 Published online by Cambridge University Press