UC Riverside
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title
SPECIAL FEATURE ROUNDTABLE Preparing Applied Linguists for the Future

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6wv7q300

Journal
Issues in Applied Linguistics, 3(1)

ISSN
1050-4273

Author
Celce-Murcia, Marianne

Publication Date
1992-06-30

DOI
10.5070/L431005151

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

SPECIAL FEATURE ROUNDTABLE

Preparing Applied Linguists for the Future

Marianne Celce-Murcia
University of California at Los Angeles

INTRODUCTION

When the call appeared for abstracts to be submitted to the 1992 meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL), I proposed and subsequently organized a panel discussion on "Preparing Applied Linguists for the Future." At UCLA, my colleagues and I had just been grappling with this topic as part of an eight-year review process. I wanted to open up discussion of the topic and to elicit different perspectives from colleagues at other institutions where applied linguists were being trained. I was fortunate that Leslie Beebe (Columbia University), Craig Chaudron (University of Hawaii), Susan Gass (Michigan State University), Sandra Savignon (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), John Schumann (UCLA), and John Staczek (Georgetown University) all agreed to participate on the panel.

Because of the recent discussions at UCLA on the topic, I asked John Schumann, Chair of the Department of TESL & Applied Linguistics if he would make the opening statement for the panel. I also asked John to circulate a written summary of his remarks to the other panelists one month before the conference so that they could prepare responses to his opening statement as they saw fit.

To the editors of *IAL* I suggested that this topic might be a timely special feature if all the participants wrote up their statements. The editorial board of the journal agreed, and they further proposed that in response to the written statements from the panelists one graduate student from each of the institutions represented on the panel be invited to submit a commentary on all the faculty statements as well. Thus, this special feature was born.

I charged the panelists to think of how we should prepare applied linguists for the future: What background and skills will

Issues in Applied Linguistics ISSN 1050-4273
© Regents of the University of California
Vol. 3 No. 1 1992 131-172

future applied linguists need? What work should they be prepared to undertake? What type of doctoral program will best prepare them? The following statements from the six faculty panelists begin with John Schumann's remarks, since his opening statement had been circulated in advance and in various ways served as catalyst for the five other responses, which appear below in alphabetical order according to the name of the contributor:

JOHN SCHUMANN'S VIEW

Training Applied Linguists for the Future

John H. Schumann
University of California at Los Angeles

In this statement on training applied linguists for the 21st century, I will outline some of the thinking we have done at UCLA on this topic over the last several years. When our Ph.D. program in applied linguistics first began in 1978, there were four tracks in the program: language analysis, language education, language acquisition and language use. After basic preparation, students were required to take two courses in language analysis (essentially linguistics courses), two courses in language education, and two courses in either language acquisition or language use. From this breakdown it is clear that applied linguistics was viewed mainly as linguistics and education, augmented by studies of acquisition or use.

Over the years, what became obvious was that the program had very little to offer at the doctoral level in classroom language education. For M.A. TESL students there were courses in ESL methodology, reading in the ESL context, writing in the ESL context, literature in the ESL context, media for teaching ESL, materials development, and classroom language testing. None of these courses was designed for doctoral students, but those at the 200 (graduate) level could be taken by them to fulfill their language education requirement. At the same time, the language testing component began to become very sophisticated, offering such specialized courses as item response theory, structural equation modeling, and construct validity. These were advanced courses and did provide post-M.A. training in language assessment.

In 1989, the department began planning to convert the M.A. in TESL program to an M.A. in applied linguistics. In these discussions we tried to determine what tracks to include, given that the program was to provide research training in applied linguistics such that the graduates would be prepared for doctoral work in this field and ultimately for careers doing applied linguistics research in both educational and non-educational settings. Russ Campbell, who had been department chair in the past, suggested that perhaps a language education component wasn't necessary at all. The reasoning was that in order to

do applied linguistics research in education one would need to know how language is acquired, how to test language proficiency, and how to analyze interaction in language classrooms. Essentially, then, to do research in language education one needs to study language acquisition, language assessment, and discourse analysis. And indeed these areas constitute the very same knowledge and skills that are necessary to do research in non-educational settings, i.e., naturalistic language acquisition, language in the workplace, professional-client interaction, etc. We thus concluded that a component called "language education" did not have to be part of a program designed to prepare applied linguists as language education researchers. We have submitted a proposal to the university for an M.A. in Applied Linguistics program, with basic preparation in language acquisition, language assessment, and discourse analysis, and it is now being considered by the Graduate Council.

A second aspect of applied linguistics training that we deemed essential was that it be interdisciplinary. We wanted to avoid what is sometimes referred to as the "Newbury House Curriculum," in which students of applied linguistics focus mainly on the productions of other applied linguists. Instead we wanted to see our field as having a central concern for language acquisition and use to which we would apply knowledge from sociology, psychology, neuroscience, artificial intelligence, education, philosophy, linguistics, and other fields. We are now redesigning our Ph.D. curriculum with the idea that after rigorous M.A. training with required courses in discourse, acquisition, and assessment, the doctoral program will consist of perhaps one required course and then a thirty-two (quarter) credit sequence--designed by each student in consultation with his or her advisor--for which courses can be taken in any relevant department in the university.

The third aspect of our conception for the training of applied linguists involves establishing a laboratory system in which students are mentored in discourse, acquisition, and assessment apprenticeships. We are currently finishing the construction of a discourse lab, and space has been allocated for acquisition and assessment laboratories. However, we do not view space as constitutive of a laboratory. For our program, a laboratory is a community of scholars with varying degrees of expertise on a particular subject. The goal of such a community is to share expertise so that novices can become experts. This kind of training is frequently two-way because novices in particular areas often have expertise in one or more other areas of interest to the experts. Thus in these labs, faculty as well as students can benefit from working closely together on joint projects.

Over the past fifteen years, UCLA has focused its efforts on enhancing its function as a research university. It is now sharing that focus with a concern for the quality of instruction. The laboratory/mentoring system allows us to work on increasing instructional quality within a framework that encourages the conducting of research and the training of researchers.

One of the reasons that our program has moved in these directions is because the situation regarding practical teacher training in ESL in California and the United States has changed substantially in the last 15 years. When we first began our Ph.D. program in Applied Linguistics, there was a need to train

people who would become teachers and trainers of ESL teachers. Now there are programs all over California and the United States doing precisely that and many of the faculty members in these programs are our graduates. So, in many ways, our students are doing what we have done in the past, and it is time for us to do something new for the field.

When the AAAL organization was first established, applied linguistics was viewed as a field which related theory and practice, and its goal was to develop specific links between theoretical linguistic studies, educational research, and the planning and implementation of practical language programs. This made us sound essentially like the educational arm of the Linguistic Society of America and the research arm of TESOL. But I think a real applied linguistics has to get beyond simply seeking solutions to educational problems. I think we should be able to have an applied linguistics that in many of its enterprises is free from concerns about language education.

Finally, I think I should say that what I have presented here is a description of what UCLA is doing and a rationale for why we are doing it. We are not advocating that other universities go this route, but we think it is a legitimate approach which we should be free to choose and still remain applied linguists.

FACULTY RESPONSES

Applied Linguistics Training: What it Should Be and What It Shouldn't

Leslie M. Beebe
Teachers College of Columbia University

Applied linguistics is not simply linguistics applied to a practical concern outside linguistics--e.g., linguistics applied to education, to Bible translation, or to dictionary writing. It is not simply sociology, anthropology, psychology, neuroscience, artificial intelligence, philosophy, or any other "real" or "theoretical" field servilely applied to linguistics. It is a field in its own right, overlapping with lots of other fields which also exist in their own right. It is interdependent with other fields, not just dependent on them.

Applied linguistics is nevertheless a variety of linguistics. The study of language use and acquisition is still at the core of all our endeavors. At the 1973 summer Linguistics Institute held at the University of Michigan, I distinctly remember an important message communicated by William Labov, who maintained that sociolinguistics is linguistics and linguistics is sociolinguistics. Almost twenty years later, I still believe Labov was right. Sociolinguistics is linguistics and vice versa. The idea that language--an inherently social behavior--could be accurately understood if treated as separate from social interaction is an anomaly.

Applied linguistics is interdisciplinary. Not every published paper will take an interdisciplinary approach, but the field as a whole must involve interdisciplinary connections. The book I edited, *Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Multiple Perspectives* (Beebe, 1988), was first conceived of as a single-authored introduction to SLA that would improve on other books because it would emphasize SLA as a field properly understood only through diverse interdisciplinary perspectives. As I saw it, SLA had been viewed primarily as a branch of psycholinguistics, but in reality it was a field in its own right which was informed by perspectives from many fields. Soon I realized that the only way to do this book was to join forces with colleagues from many different disciplinary streams. No one person could be competent to write such a broad book with so many interdisciplinary views. Similarly, applied linguistics as a whole is interdisciplinary. When we train the applied linguists of the future, we must depend on the support of many fields--not because we are dependent, but because we are interdependent.

Applied linguistics programs should indeed encompass language acquisition, language assessment, and discourse analysis. However, I see discourse analysis as one aspect of the broader category of language analysis, which describes language knowledge and use. Future applied linguists must be competent to analyze phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, discourse, etc. if they are to have a full description of language as a background for studying language acquisition and language assessment. One could argue that these are linguistics, not applied linguistics, courses, but these areas are broad, and the two departments tend to offer different content--both kinds being valuable. Why should phonetic or grammatical analysis be in one department and discourse analysis in another?

We should be careful not to project the plan of one university which is necessarily based on its own resources and priorities onto the curriculum of other universities nationally and internationally. Diverse linguistic needs and resources will necessitate diverse programs in applied linguistics.

At the same time, it is my fervent hope that every program training future applied linguists will keep educational needs as one of its priorities. Since the 19th century, for example, high literacy rates have been correlated with economic success, suggesting that literacy is probably a determinant of national well-being and power. We should not, therefore, ignore such pressing educational needs as the promotion of literacy. I hope that a two-track system will not develop in applied linguistics programs whereby some institutions address so-called "practical" educational problems, such as literacy and ESL, and others address more so-called "theoretical" issues. Every applied linguistics program in the 21st century must be prepared to address social and educational issues of national and international concern.

Applied linguistics should serve the needs of society. "Should" statements are always "preachy" and controversial. I expect this statement may be considered a moral imperative, a given by some, and an inappropriate show of politics or religious fervor by others. So get out your six-shooters.

In the United States, applied linguistics does now and should continue to serve the needs of the nation. I do not mean that every applied linguistics

paper has to have an "applications to education" section at the end. I do not think it even has to have an immediate application to education or to any other field. It does not have to address the needs of so-called "underprivileged" populations. It does not have to tell teachers what to do on Monday. We need diverse research to meet diverse needs, and we cannot get diverse, brilliant, free-thinking research by mandating bureaucratically the way our best thinkers and researchers ought to do their jobs.

Yet applied linguists do hold expertise that is crucial to the future of multi-ethnic nations. I would submit, therefore, that we have a social responsibility as a group. In the United States, for example, W.-B. Olsen (1991) reports that there were over two million Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students in grades K-12 in the public schools in 1989-90. That number represented an increase of over half a million from the previous survey in 1985-86. In California's total K-12 enrollment in 1989-90, 18% were identified as LEP--better than one child in six. As for adult ESL students at or below high school level, W.-B. Olsen reports that there were 1.2 million nationwide in the 1989-90 survey. This was an increase of approximately 50% between 1985-86 and 1989-90.

It is said that one out of three people in New York City and in Los Angeles was born outside the United States and that the United States is currently experiencing the largest wave of immigration since the late 19th century. Immigrants are essential to our economy. We can expect a labor shortage as soon as we pull out of the current recession mainly because after the age of the "baby boom" we will enter the age of the "baby bust." We also have a skills shortage in this country. Along with needed unskilled laborers, skilled laborers (e.g., nurses, doctors, scientists, engineers, product designers, and computer software designers) are coming from immigrant populations. We need all of them. And they need us. As a result, language education issues have become central to our public discourse, and they are central to our nation's future. Presidential candidates are formulating future language policy positions. Our expertise is needed now. All of us should participate in the public debate, and all of us should contribute in some way to the solution of national and international language-related problems.

When I argue that applied linguistics should serve the needs of society, I do not endorse a prescription. I do not think that every professor has to be "practical." I do not think that applied linguistics has to be housed in a school of education. I do not think that every applied linguistics researcher has to study ESL needs, developmental writing, reading disabilities, or minority needs. But I do think that as faculty members of applied linguistics programs we must keep these kinds of concerns very sharply in our minds, and we must provide for them centrally in our curriculum. I also think that these concerns are part of applied linguistics. We must provide avenues for our graduate students to pursue these interests. We should not define ESL as "other." We should not see skill development as "other." We should not link research with theory and pose it against teaching and practice. There is classroom-centered research (linguistic and non-linguistic) which relates to research on teaching. We must avoid stereotypes and false dichotomies.

Above all, we must keep in mind that language and power are inextricably related whether we like it or not. Language is a gatekeeper. Language is a reflection of power, and it is a vehicle to get power. Language is a marker of social class, ethnicity, race, gender, age, and societal role. Call me a sociolinguist. Call me a child of the 60's. But let me make a plea that we all keep a social conscience when we train applied linguists for the 21st century. We made some great strides in the 20th century. Let's not stop now.

Applied Linguistics: How Interdisciplinary Can You Get?

Craig Chaudron
University of Hawai'i at Manoa

To consider how to prepare applied linguists for the future seems approximately similar to a question such as how to prepare engineers or doctors for the future. The range of possible areas of expertise is so vast that there is probably no one right answer. But as I will point out later, I think our problem is a greater one, owing to the entire lack of basis for applied linguistics study in education prior to graduate school. Still, the initial response strikes me as following a set of quick questions: For how distant in the future? Preparing for what purposes? Given what sort of constraints on resources, such as number and areas of expertise of the faculty? With what sort of incoming student expertise and education? Given how much time for preparation? Many other questions follow from these, but I will attempt briefly to offer a few comments on the problems responding to just these.

First, how distant in the future? This is a somewhat frivolous question, for evidently none of us is capable of predicting the forthcoming needs for trained experts in our field, short of a serious international survey of needs. All we can see now is that there are increasing calls for expertise in a very wide range of applications of knowledge about how language works (or doesn't) and how communication can be enhanced. These needs tend to define the main purposes for education and research, from the need for experts in cross-cultural communication, in language remedial education, in language planning for revival of dying languages, in foreign and second language curriculum research and development, in analysis of speech disorders, in second language acquisition, in computer programming, and even for teaching expertise in programs for applied linguists.

This de facto defining of what we might consider the primary focus of applied linguistics leaves us in something of a quandary, for I think we each tend unavoidably to favor one or another direction of research and educational interests, depending on which needs we have perceived to be most critical or which experiences and resources we have had most contact with. There is no higher authority.

Preparation for what purposes? I don't think we can talk cogently about such a broad topic unless we agree to narrow our thinking to one or another "branch" of applied linguistics. This is to say that if one takes the broadest view of applied linguistics, in which any language-related problems constitute the domain of study (to take the sort of definition proposed in my own journal, *Applied Linguistics*), we have to abdicate any responsibility for preparing applied linguists in any period less than perhaps a dozen years. How many of us can become competent in the theories and applications of the many disciplines that John Schumann has referred to in his opening paper within four or five years of study? For those increasingly few individuals who view this field as one of "linguistics applied" (see the exchange in *IAL*, 1990), it may be easier to envisage a solid period of three years or so of "core" preparation in theoretical and descriptive linguistics and then, for the applied linguist who is going to specialize in language teaching, a few "applied" courses such as a teaching methods course, something on second language learning, and a course in language research or testing; or for one who fancies applications in computer sciences or language planning, an entirely different line of applied courses. For the many who view the field to mean predominantly language education, on the other hand (see comments by Brumfit, 1980 and Widdowson, 1980), the core might look quite different, although some would suggest, as John Schumann appears to do in his statement, that this is already a step removed from the core preparation requirements of applied linguistics.

I am obliged in my own work to accept a wide variety of work as falling under the rubric of applied linguistics, and, therefore, I can appreciate many possible approaches to preparing students to be applied linguists. For example, according to the survey conducted by Gay Conklin (1991), involving a sample of 59 M.A. programs from the TESOL program directory, less than half of the responding programs appear to regard basic second language learning principles or sociolinguistics as important for their program requirements. Conklin also characterized program requirements into four types of knowledge provided in the coursework: content (descriptive knowledge about the English language itself), pedagogic (general pedagogic knowledge), pedagogic content (specific knowledge about language pedagogy), and support (knowledge about source areas, such as psycholinguistics, theoretical linguistics, etc.). Conklin also noted striking differences *within* programs in the distribution among these four categories as well. Thus, M.A. programs can differ wildly with respect to the emphasis of their required coursework. I am quite certain that one of the fundamental sources of this diversity has to do with my third question, Given what sort of constraints on resources, such as number and areas of expertise of the faculty? Inevitably, as programs dealing with applied linguistics have typically arisen out of, and in most cases remain highly dependent on, departments of English, linguistics, or education, their programs tend to reflect the emphases of the dominant department. In order to think about preparing applied linguists for the future, we must all consider how best to break free of such administrative and dependent disciplinary constraints and expand the faculty expertise in our programs to deal with the widest possible range of preparation called for.

On the other hand, as my title suggests, I do not think that any program to prepare applied linguists can include all possible disciplines. Choices must be made, in part based on the reality that students interested in studying in our field come to graduate school with incredibly diverse types of prior preparation in other disciplines. It is a sad fact of life throughout the world that basic studies in language structure, language learning, and language use not only are *not* a part of the public school curriculum, they are usually not even addressed in basic undergraduate education. Whereas the aspiring doctor or engineer has typically had substantial secondary and undergraduate coursework in biology, chemistry, mathematics, and physics, as well as many other highly technical subjects, applied linguistics graduate applicants have usually specialized in but one of the various disciplines whose principles inform our field.

Therefore, due to the limited amount of time available to provide graduate-level education, we have to limit ourselves in some way. In our case at the University of Hawai'i, our Department of ESL has inclined itself in recent years to confining its educational role to that of what we might call "second language studies" (not only English) in which virtually everything we teach, whether theoretical or practical, might be considered "applied" in some way. We believe that the study of second languages--their learning, use, analysis, and the teaching of them--constitutes in itself a sufficiently broad domain of research, theory, and practice to warrant a focused field of graduate education. Many individuals who consider themselves applied linguists may want to concentrate their studies in first language acquisition, communication, lexicography, computational linguistics, or neurolinguistics.

At Hawai'i, while our students have such options, the field of second language studies is expanding enough in its own right with theoretical models of learning and instruction, specialized research techniques and unique constraints on the applications of other disciplines' techniques, such that the range of courses in which we have expertise and research interests is in itself vast enough to fill our schedules each semester with many regular core and a large number of elective courses. For example, a core, an elective, and a seminar course in each of the five principal areas of the program are: (1) Second Language Analysis--English Syntax, Comparative Grammar and SLA, Text and Discourse Analysis for Reading and Writing; (2) Second Language Use--Sociolinguistics and ESL, Cross-Linguistic Pragmatics, Second Language Ethnography; (3) Second Language Pedagogy--ESL Teaching Practicum, Program Development in ESL, Issues in Pedagogical Grammar; (4) Second Language Learning--Second Language Acquisition, Applied Psycholinguistics and SLA, Task-Based Language Learning; (5) Second Language Research--Second Language Research Methods, Research in Second Language Testing, Advanced Second Language Research Methods. Our orientation is not merely to provide a certain amount of training in techniques and methods for teaching and research; rather, it is to inculcate understandings of principles and critical thinking abilities so that our graduates, when encountering diverse and unpredictable situations and problems, will be able to work out solutions and explore alternatives with the broadest perspective possible.

In the limited time of two to four years of study, I doubt greatly that any student can adequately prepare him or herself for the complexities and indeterminate demands of future work as an applied linguist, much less as a specialist in second language studies. In addition, we must accept the possibility that only a limited understanding of some of the main disciplines associated with our work can be achieved. The best solution to preparing applied linguists, therefore, is to provide a sufficiently balanced introduction to the various contributing disciplines but also a thorough grounding in the basic theories, research methods, and findings of whatever focal area we deem to have the highest priority in our particular institution, whether it be linguistics, second language studies, psychology, or whatever. The field will thus remain multidisciplinary as well as interdisciplinary, although it is my belief that some portions of the field, such as second language learning and teaching, are rapidly becoming "disciplinary." We have only to recall the status, hardly one hundred years ago, of the fledgling field of psychology or the then newly emerging field of linguistics, to realize that we may be on the forefront of a new era of coalescence and disciplinary evolution in applied linguistics.

Training Applied Linguists for the Future

Susan M. Gass
Michigan State University

In reading John Schumann's statements, I was initially struck by the sophistication of our discipline. In a short span of time (roughly 20 years or so) we have begun to come to an understanding of what it means to be an applied linguist and what it means to train applied linguists. What is perhaps especially striking is that most people who are doing the thinking about what should be in an applied linguistics program have not themselves had the benefit of training programs like the one John describes.

The term applied linguistics means different things to different people, so that a discussion of how to train people involves an agreement, or at least an understanding, of what it means to do applied linguistics work. If one looks at the topics which are included in the meeting handbook from AILA [the International Association of Applied Linguistics], or even from the 1992 AAAL meeting in Seattle, one can see a range of academic pursuits, including lexicography, discourse analysis, child language acquisition, second language acquisition, language teaching, and so forth. Some of these are more central to a European tradition while others are more central to a North American tradition. What seems to emerge, for me at least, is that applied linguistics is molded to fit the particular academic interests which are present in any given institution. It is for this reason that there will probably never be absolute agreement on what is appropriate in a training program--other than the agreement which exists in sub-areas of applied linguistics.

In our discussion, besides the issue of defining the field, there are two separate issues: one dealing with the M.A. and one dealing with the Ph.D. In thinking about an M.A. program, one has to first decide what one is preparing people to do with that degree and who the students entering the degree program are. The important questions to consider in this case are: is it intended as a terminal degree or not? Are the students straight out of a B.A. program or have they had a number of years of relevant experience, perhaps in the field of teaching? The program John Schumann describes is one which in his words is "to provide research training in applied linguistics such that graduates would be prepared for doctoral work in this field and ultimately for careers doing applied linguistics research in both educational and non-educational settings." In other words, UCLA is converting its M.A. in TESL to a degree program which is preparatory for Ph.D. work.

While I do not believe that applied linguistics is the same as TESL, I do believe that there are overlapping areas of interest and that each is important as part of an educational package. I do not see that one interest should necessarily substitute for the other. Ideally, they should run parallel to one another, but with different emphases. There are common elements to both kinds of emphasis (e.g., language acquisition, language assessment), but there are also areas of divergence (e.g., teaching methodology for a TESL degree or discourse analysis for an Applied Linguistics degree). I would also add that there are particular university constraints which might guide these decisions. For example, John Schumann mentions that UCLA is a research university. Michigan State University is not only an Association of American Universities institution but is also a land-grant university. This additional institutional identity has implications for the structuring of our programs.

At MSU we are in the process of attempting to deal with the problem of divergent interests by establishing an interdepartmental M.A. in Applied Linguistics. It is our strong belief, and one that we share with John Schumann, that the degree must be interdisciplinary. This degree program is not designed to supersede the already existing M.A. in TESOL but rather serves as a complement for those students in the foreign language departments who are eager for training in language learning/language teaching and for students interested in discourse analysis and sociolinguistics. Each of these programs shares a common core which includes language analysis and research methodology.

On the issue of a Ph.D. program, as I stated earlier, I am in complete agreement with the need to be interdisciplinary in our approach to training. Not many applied linguistics programs in North America have the luxury of allowing as many credits outside the department as the one John Schumann describes. I do feel, however, that this *is* important. A Ph.D. degree in Applied Linguistics needs to build on the base provided through an M.A. degree, a base which may be similar to what John Schumann describes or which might deviate to some extent. But once the M.A. degree is completed, a Ph.D. student needs to focus on *something*, that is, s/he needs to bring to the discipline of applied linguistics expertise from *some* perspective--this may be from linguistics, from sociology, from psychology, from education, or any of the others which John

Schumann suggests--and bring that perspective to bear on a specialization within applied linguistics.

An ideal Ph.D. program, in addition to expanding theoretical knowledge, should be one which offers a significant amount of hands-on experience, since applied linguistics is not an armchair field. All applied linguists must know how to analyze some bit of data, whether for the purpose of studying acquisition, the discourse of the classroom, or language in a professional context. One thing which does seem essential in an applied linguistics Ph.D. program, then, is an emphasis on language analysis. But equally as important is the need for a theoretical base to what we are doing. And that theory, at least at this point in time, comes from outside the field.

Let me end on a cautionary note. One does not want to relegate to secondary status the actual specialization of applied linguistics itself. That is, language acquisition, either first or second, language assessment, and discourse analysis are all areas with rich research traditions. We do not want to run the risk of relegating those domains to positions of secondary importance. The emphasis in a Ph.D. program should be on doing one of those areas from the perspective of some other area. Both must be dealt with in tandem.

Preparing Applied Linguists for the Future at the University of Illinois

Sandra J. Savignon
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Given our charge to consider the preparation of applied linguists for the future, I've chosen to consider, first, the intellectual thrust of applied linguistics and, second, the organization of applied linguistic programs.

The research agenda of applied linguistics deserves continued emphasis. The term "applied linguistics" has been used for so long to refer to language teaching that for many colleagues in departments of linguistics or languages (English and other, so called "foreign" languages), the term is the antithesis of scholarship and research. Young colleagues often feel well advised to avoid mention of applied linguistics in identifying their professional interests. Better to say one is a linguist, whether one studies philology, discourse, or language acquisition. The scope of applied linguistic research, language use as opposed to language as an idealized morphosyntactic system, is not well understood and suffers from fragmentation in established academic units. And yet a look at the program of the 1992 Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics in Seattle confirms the dynamic interplay of perspectives in research design. Language education, both native and nonnative, remains an important context for applied linguistic research. Discourse analysis, pragmatics, language policy, and native/nonnative language acquisition all offer research perspectives of potential value in addressing educational issues. But language education is clearly only one of many contexts for applied linguistic research.

The very recent emergence of a strong, independent AAAL organization affirms the coherence of a field that for understandable historical reasons has lacked organizational unity in most academic settings. Researchers with interests in language use hold appointments in departments of English, sociology, anthropology, French, linguistics, Spanish, Asian studies, speech communication, education, psychology.

This multidisciplinary nature of applied linguistics figures prominently in the preparation of applied linguists for the future. No single academic unit, even if it calls itself a department of applied linguistics, can presume to provide graduate students with the preparation they will need to participate in a range of applied linguistic research that is, by definition, multidisciplinary AND, I wish to underscore, multilingual and multicultural. In this connection, the white anglo North American composition of our panel of discussants gives a misleading impression of these world contexts for applied linguists, many of whom seek advanced training in the United States and the United Kingdom. Recognition of these world contexts is a cornerstone for shaping a quality program in applied linguistics.

The need for outreach and for interacting with related disciplines has been recognized and responded to in a number of ways at different institutions. In his description of the UCLA Program in Applied Linguistics, John Schumann has offered one solution: a common core of studies at the M.A. level followed by options at the doctoral level. The program in SLATE at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign offers another model. SLATE stands for Second Language Acquisition and Teacher Education. Our focus is not the broad field of applied linguistics but the subfield of second/foreign/multilanguage acquisition and teaching. The official description of the program reads as follows:

> The multidisciplinary Ph.D. concentration in Second Language Acquisition and Teacher Education (SLATE) is designed to provide advanced training for prospective teachers, researchers, and administrators concerned with second language learning and teaching. The SLATE concentration has the combined support of faculty members in a number of different departments in the University. Departments include the Departments of Educational Psychology and Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education and, in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Departments of English as an International Language, French, Germanic Languages and Literatures, Linguistics, and Spanish, Italian and Portuguese.
>
> The SLATE concentration is administered by an Executive Committee consisting of faculty members from the cooperating departments. The Executive Committee provides direction and guidance for general aspects of the concentration itself and for specific non-course-related interests, such as the SLATE seminar series.

In contrast with the UCLA program, SLATE has been developed as a doctoral program only. We seek to offer a coherent program of study for candidates from diverse backgrounds:

> Generally, candidates in the SLATE concentration whose Master's degrees directly involve second language learning and teaching will have sufficient background in second language learning and teaching. If candidates lack sufficient background, they may be required to take courses to meet this basic preparation. All students in the SLATE concentration will complete a required set of competencies. The competencies include linguistic theory, psycholinguistics and the psychology of language, sociolinguistics and sociocultural analysis, curriculum development, and research methodology. In addition, candidates must complete the Ph.D. requirements of their individual department.

Thus, a Linguistics/SLATE Ph.D. candidate would have a different, yet overlapping, set of course requirements from those of a candidate in French/SLATE, Education/SLATE, or Spanish/SLATE. Graduates are awarded a Certificate in Advanced Study in SLATE as well as a Ph.D. in their home academic unit.

Worth noting in this discussion of developments at UIUC is the recent emergence of a Center for Writing Studies. The center has been created in response to the need for professionals to address educational issues in the development of writing skills. With support from the Vice-Chancellor, a set of courses is being developed for a multidisciplinary doctoral program on the model of the SLATE program. As has been true for SLATE, faculty are being recruited from a range of academic backgrounds, including English and English as an International Language.

Will these programs prepare applied linguists for the future? If job placement record is a valid indicator, the answer is a resounding yes. SLATE graduates have been recruited by the University of Texas, Stanford, Columbia, Purdue, University of Maryland, and Georgetown, as well as UIUC. Graduates of the UCLA and other applied linguistic programs have been similarly in demand. Two recent UCLA graduates, in fact, now hold tenure-track positions at UIUC, and their names appear on the faculty lists for both SLATE and the Center for Writing Studies. The future of applied linguists holds both challenge and promise. Concentrated effort on the part of applied linguists today to bring coherence and definition to applied linguistic research and program development will prepare applied linguists of the future both to meet the challenge and to fulfill the promise.

Preparing Applied Linguists for the Future: The Georgetown Approach

John J. Staczek
Georgetown University

In his opening remarks to the AAAL panel, John Schumann has very neatly organized the field of applied linguistics into three stages: what the field was, what the field became, and what the field might become. In my remarks, I plan to comment on the validity of John Schumann's views of each stage, confirming them or adapting them on the basis of institutional traditions, of developing student and faculty needs, and of emerging professional demands of the cultures in which applied linguists live and teach and do their research.

Schumann takes a natural perspective, the UCLA perspective and how it has developed applied linguistics, suggesting that the 1978 developmental model was one that included a focus on four tracks: language analysis, language education, language acquisition, and language use. These areas fall properly into what many know as structure, process and methodology, second language acquisition, and the sociology of language. In 1978, when Georgetown's own linguistics program was about 18 years old, the focus was on language learning and teaching in a department that had specialists in methodology, testing and evaluation, psycholinguistics, language analysis (including contrastive analysis and history of the English language), and computational linguistics (machine translation and computer analysis of data). It was in 1968 that language in the context of its users, what we know as sociolinguistics, became a program at Georgetown, a program on more or less equal footing with what has been theoretical (general linguistics), applied linguistics, computational linguistics, and now sociolinguistics.

Unlike UCLA, Georgetown seemed to avoid the need to address the matter of language and education, perhaps because as a Jesuit and Catholic institution, whose tradition has been in the liberal arts and humanities, the process was less important than the discipline. Linguistics & Reading and Linguistics & Writing became staples of the standard applied program and reflected similar foci around the world. Nevertheless, thanks to the sociolinguists who introduced discourse studies, the focus in applied linguistics began to turn toward language use and function in all settings.

It was not until the mid-1980's that Georgetown, through several new faculty appointments, began to focus on language acquisition, variation, writing, and English in emerging new contexts. I have to confess that in a very traditional department of linguistics, it was difficult to introduce new perspectives in linguistics, new applications with which linguists could become engaged. On the more general level, sociolinguistics was one of those perspectives in linguistics; on a specific level, it was English for Specific Purposes and program administration. But at this specific level, we had to call the program administration aspects part of a seminar on ESP to have it run by our colleagues. For the last three years, both ESP and program administration

have been integral seminars in our doctoral program. English in the world context was also added. In a way, we mirrored the older UCLA pattern of language use and language education.

In 1982, a year not unlike the recent period during which the Berlin Wall disappeared and communism became unraveled, Georgetown made some university-level decisions to strengthen certain graduate programs and eliminate others. Linguistics was one of the favored departments and a proposal to develop excellence in applied linguistics with support from computational linguistics and sociolinguistics was advanced and approved. However, the department, with its 1983 resources, was not quite ready to undertake its new mission. Among the new tasks of that mission, more clearly elaborated in 1987, was the marriage of applied and sociolinguistics to the resolution of linguistic issues in teaching and learning contexts, that is, applied classroom discourse, the educational context that Georgetown so easily averted. It was not so much the faculty as it was student interest and student overlapping in courses that led to acquisition, participants, context, and function becoming the proper areas of student and faculty research. At this time, it also became evident to the applied program that our students were coming from settings in which they had taught English or a foreign language and that they returned to those settings to prepare others. Among the different kinds of courses we gave them, however late it must seem, were courses in applied research design, acquisition, English for Specific Purposes, and program administration. English for Specific Purposes--from needs to functions, to syllabus, to methodology, to discourse, to rhetorical styles--became an important organizing course that integrated applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. Program administration--from instruction to assessment, to materials development, to faculty development, to research, to institutional culture--became the norm for supporting teachers who were to become the trainers of others in other university settings.

In 1992, as the Georgetown linguistics program is rebuilding because of a host of orderly retirements, we have turned our focus on reconstituting ourselves with versatile scholars who have a sense of what linguistics is, of how it supports language teaching and learning, and of how it and other disciplines inform our knowledge of language use in a variety of settings.

Applied linguistics at Georgetown may become, in part, what John Schumann proposes that he and his colleagues desire for the UCLA graduate. I believe we want the same kinds of things, that we share the same desire to do more and better research on the teaching and learning process in the context of language use, and that we are looking to the computer as a tool to inform us about cognition, intelligence, and discourse. Moreover, what I see as equally essential is the preparation of the teacher, scholar, manager, and academic leader. That is to say, our applied linguists need to acquire the information that can enable them to use the science of language to solve the problems of users in a variety of contexts. Yet it is these same graduates of our programs who must learn the culture of our discipline, its expectations, and its evaluative mechanisms. While we may teach them to conduct research and communicate it to the professional community, we must also teach them how to lead and manage peers, to seek and manage fiscal resources to support their research, and

to learn to behave in a system that values independence for the advancement of knowledge yet values compromise and cooperation to get the general tasks done.

In other words, we need to add to our programs what economists and business professionals regard as useful to the planning, design, development, and evaluation of successful programs. These graduates, students in our programs, in our cultures, besides linguistics, acquisition, language use, research methods and the like, also need to know how to do the following: (1) how to design, plan, implement, and evaluate a budget, because fiscal and human resources drive academic programs and academic research; (2) how to request and justify instructional, research, and staff positions within established professional levels of remuneration; (3) how to recruit and develop new faculty; (4) how to make instructional assignments; (5) how to evaluate performance, curricula and materials, as well as student, faculty, program, and institutional needs; and, (6) how to participate in a culture of professionals (as coordinators, directors) who are responsible for advancing and communicating the knowledge of our discipline.

At Georgetown we are poised for change. In a department where retirement turnover is a fact of life (half the department in a period of three years), there is opportunity for development and change. And the change will certainly occur as applied linguistics changes in its broader and narrower foci.

Second language learning and teaching have been established areas of inquiry more recently informed by work in language variation and use; in the discourse analysis of settings, participants, and topics; in the language of power and politics; in the language of cross-cultural communication, including gender variation, male/female conversation, female/female conversation, and male/male conversation; in the anthropological, linguistic, and social views of the construction of self and society through language use. Taken together, these areas of applied inquiry remind us of the power of language, the extent of its use for a richness of purpose. In our efforts to understand users using language and language changing for user purposes, we confront an enormous body of data that requires analysis and description. We know more than we have ever known before in the history of man about what language is, and we are beginning to learn more what social and personal needs language serves.

Perhaps an area toward which we ought to organize ourselves and our research in applied linguistic inquiry, as other disciplines are now doing, is in the area of ethics and language use and the ethics of linguistic inquiry. Before continuing, I would like to relate what I consider an important anecdote to support my point about ethics and applied linguistics. I have had the good fortune to have been in the position of Acting Director of the Georgetown University Press since July 1991. The Georgetown University Press is a scholarly press. Among the Press's titles are several in the area of medical ethics. In early February 1991, I had the second good fortune to spend a few hours with the Reverend Kevin O'Rourke, a medical ethicist at the University of St. Louis. As an author whose work we publish, Father O'Rourke began to relate to me one of his most perplexing problems, that of assisting a patient in a dignified death. The patient is on full life support and shows no signs of cognition. She has a living will, the principle of which is not legal in

Missouri. Her attending physician, who is also a physician-lawyer, cannot be persuaded of his patient's right to choice. Fr. O'Rourke is in no way a Dr. Jack Kevoorkian, but like Kevoorkian he believes in the dignity of life and the dignity of death yet cannot persuade a physician-lawyer of the ethics of the patient's request under the circumstances.

Granted, our issues in applied linguistics are not of the same type; that is, they are not usually life-threatening. However, I propose that as linguists, we face another level of ethical issues as they relate to language use: to empowerment and to the development and protection of self in society. Like the physician who relies on language to understand symptoms and psyche so as to address individual health care needs and societal health care issues, like the attorney who relies on language to understand fact, intent, motive, and evidence so as to resolve issues of personal conflict or injury or to reformulate principles and laws to protect the citizens of a society, like the teacher who interprets language use so as to understand the view of a learner's self and the society that defines the self--just as all three of these practitioners are devoting some portion of their thinking and research to the implications for ethical practices in their disciplines, so too do we need to ask ourselves, as applied linguists, about the ethics of practice (teaching and research), of our procedures (data collection and interpretation), and of our outcomes (the dignity, rights, and protection of language users). We now talk of language as an instrument of power and authority, of intimacy and solidarity, of inclusion, exclusion, and affinities, of distancing and connectedness, of use and misuse, and not just of forms, function, and meaning, but of role. Layered within such uses of language is an ethics of our research practice that we must learn to uncover so that when we educate applied linguists to do applied linguistics, we do it with concern for all language users in society.

STUDENT RESPONSES

The following six statements come from graduate students who represent the same six institutions as do the panelists. The statements appear in alphabetical order according to the name of the author:

Facing the Future Now: Reflections from a Student of Applied Linguistics

Patricia A. Duff
University of California at Los Angeles

An essential part of academic life, I am learning, is the ability to tap into the wonders of the brain's frontal lobe and project oneself and one's research goals into the seemingly distant future. Reminders of this include: (1) deadlines for proposal submissions to funding agencies and conference organizers, sometimes a year in advance; (2) job interviews for academic appointments, at which candidates may be asked to outline 5-to-10 year research agendas as well as their visions for the host department's future; (3) departmental planning meetings dealing with the developments of M.A./Ph.D. curricula, courses, recruitments, tenure concerns, retirements, and so on; and (4) special features such as this, in which selected individuals consider what the future (21st century) has in store for applied linguists, or perhaps more accurately, what those individuals have in store for the future of applied linguists, based on the experiences, commitments, visions, and constraints of their respective institutions and on their own understanding of what applied linguistics is--or should be--all about.

Taking on the future is an ambitious task indeed, especially when one knows how quickly and unpredictably events and circumstances around us may change: budgets freeze; faculty members leave; new ones are hired; departments are shut down; the world order is reconfigured; immigration and demographic patterns are altered; unemployment threatens even those holding new applied linguistics doctorates; and previously non-existent or marginal issues become incredibly research-worthy, while formerly "hot" topics somehow grow cold.

And yet, such surprises, crises, and misjudgments notwithstanding, planning for the future is an extremely valuable, if daunting, enterprise. So, as an applied linguist with one foot already out the door of my host institution, UCLA, I would like to comment on the statements of the six faculty panelists. First, I will refer to John Schumann's opening remarks, drawing upon my own experience, and then I will note some commonalities across the panelists' responses. Finally, I will present some concerns that applied linguistics graduate students have as they now face the future.

John Schumann outlines a new vision for applied linguistics at UCLA, based in large part on historical developments. These include the established (elitist) priority of UCLA to be first and foremost a research institution, which has historically led to an institutional failure to support some its most promising education-oriented TESL/Applied Linguistics faculty members. Unfortunately, the emphasis on education and M.A.-TESL teacher preparation has been seen from "on high" as a liability, precluding substantial contributions to the research community.

It is no wonder that things are changing at UCLA, in light of this campus and systemwide bias, and in the wake of a number of early faculty retirements and some important new hires. But the programs represented by the

other panelists also seem to be changing, growing, and redefining their missions, for a number of related reasons. Obviously, what happens at each institution is inextricably linked to the history of the department and institution, its relationship to other associated departments, faculty expertise and turnover, and to the background, objectives, and numbers of students entering the programs, even to the geographical location and name of the program itself. A degree program in "Applied Linguistics" is, arguably, broader in scope than, say, "Second Language Studies" or "TESL," and therefore poses considerable challenges for the creation of a solid, coherent curriculum, even within one institution, but especially for one with relatively few faculty members and a dearth of other so-called "Applied Linguistics" M.A.-Ph.D. programs for comparison. It may thus be difficult to conceive of a universally valid scheme for "preparing applied linguists for the future," although a certain set of courses comes to mind as being valuable in any program preparing applied linguists (e.g., language analysis and research methodology).

Owing to the timing of my enrollment in the UCLA Program in Applied Linguistics (1987-1992), I experienced only the last phases of an earlier model (and group of faculty members) for the preparation of applied linguists, and only the preliminary stages of the prospective model.[1] Hence, I have not directly benefitted from the proposed curricular and pedagogical changes (e.g., a laboratory-based mentoring system), although as an introductory-course-weary Ph.D. student I would have welcomed many of them, particularly "hands-on" training and collaboration with other research assistants and faculty supervisors on significant (funded) research projects, which a laboratory or research center model would certainly engender.[2] Instead, I received a broad-based (even diffuse) education, with many other interesting and timely opportunities, including state-of-the-art courses ranging from neurobiology to testing to language socialization, and foremost among these was securing a research "laboratory" of my own, thousands of miles away: a set of experimental, secondary-level dual-language schools in Hungary, where I have worked in association with UCLA professor-mentors and Hungarian colleagues for almost three years, dealing with some fascinating problems and issues in that context.[3]

Was I exposed to the vestiges of research and professional preparation related to (second) language education at UCLA?[4] I hope not. Not when most of the applied linguistics jobs advertised this year have sought graduates with a breadth of expertise in various areas, including teaching methodology, skill-area (e.g., writing) instruction, teacher training and supervision, methodology for research in instructional settings, language testing, language analysis (including discourse) and acquisition, and are housed in departments or programs with either "education," "teaching," or "ESL" in their titles. Breadth in theoretical background and pedagogical experience as well as demonstrated research potential appear to be key. And yet, approaches to defining and studying education-related issues also appear to be changing (e.g., away from analysis of performance on decontextualized tasks in strictly quantitative paradigms), and future job descriptions are bound to reflect those changes as well.

Like the first cohort of graduates from the experimental schools in Hungary which I have studied (who will graduate in 1992, still uncertain about

prospects for university admission), students of the new model(s) of graduate education in applied linguistics must understand and be committed to the orientation of the program they choose, seek productive research (and service) opportunities, become current in issues in the field as a whole and accomplished in their own area of specialization, and then hope for the best. The ultimate criteria for judging a program's efficacy, for both the Hungarian dual-language school students and those in or about to enter M.A. and Ph.D. Applied Linguistics programs, are (1) graduates' satisfaction with their education; (2) graduates' ability to demonstrate/apply knowledge both of their areas of specialization and in other areas; and (3) their ability to secure *and* retain (e.g., with strong teaching, research, and publication records) appropriate academic (administrative or research) positions following graduation, assuming that that is their goal. Which universities and departments will accept them? Will they be encouraged to pursue their current interests? Will they be competitive with graduates from more traditional or mainstream programs? These are questions plaguing many students, in both Hungarian dual-language schools and American applied linguistics programs. Time alone will tell, but in the meantime the programs must be carefully monitored.

Most of the panelists highlighted the interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, even "disciplinary" nature of applied linguistics as well as the advantages of working alongside colleagues in other disciplines. This point is indisputable. However, cross-disciplinary collaboration also depends on individual institutions and evolving relationships across and within departments. In the extreme case, sending students out for specialization in other disciplines, yielding low class enrollments and high overhead in the source/host department, might tempt financially strapped administrations to slash funding, perhaps even the departments themselves. For a department to appear somehow redundant or expendable within a university system would be disastrous. Furthermore, we do not yet know whether those who manage to get first-class specialist training in other disciplines will want or be able to return to applied linguistics departments (or compatible/equivalent programs) later on. They may be too specialized for small, conventional TESL/applied linguistics-type programs (or even for mainstream journals), while lacking a degree from the specialist department they may be considered inappropriate for positions there. Will such students become the academic homeless? Or will tolerant, new interdisciplinary programs (which seem to be on the increase) house them in the future?

Several panelists underscored the accountability of programs to society and its various language-related ills. I agree fully that in both educational and other sectors there are a host of relevant and interesting research questions which need to be addressed and crucial services which need to be rendered. One would hope that many future applied linguistics students and graduates will choose to focus on important "real world" issues in addition to more abstract, intellectual issues, though I do not mean to suggest that the two are mutually exclusive. But to do this, they must be equipped with the requisite skills to work responsibly in applied areas and should be encouraged to ask questions of interest, not only to themselves but ideally to society and their field as well.

Finally, questions not dealt with by the panelists are: What do aspiring applied linguists see as their own future needs and goals? Where do they want to be placed? Which sorts of issues do they want to deal with and in which countries or communities? Are they confident that on the basis of their graduate-level education they have the resources and experience to deal with the range of future challenges awaiting them? And what exactly are those challenges? Perhaps a continuing survey of recent and future graduates and their perceptions regarding their own preparation as applied linguists would be timely and useful to both planners and students and would give a voice to those most directly affected by developments in our field.

Preparing Applied Linguists for the Future: A Need for Collaboration

Rebecca D. Freeman
Georgetown University

In his opening statement, John Schumann suggests that "a real linguistics has to get beyond simply seeking solutions to educational problems." To expand the field, the new UCLA Applied Linguistics program he describes will prepare graduate students to do interdisciplinary research of language-related issues in any setting. Professors Savignon, Chaudron, Gass, Staczek, and Beebe all agree that applied linguistics encompasses more than language teaching and learning, and that graduate programs must emphasize interdisciplinary research. However, the specifics that they each address illustrate a range of concerns for and contributions to the future development of the field. I will comment on each professor's response by adding my perspective as a former graduate student in an M.A. TESOL program, and, currently, as a Ph.D. candidate in the sociolinguistics concentration of the linguistics program at Georgetown. My response is informed by my experiences as an ESL teacher in a variety of contexts and as a researcher who uses an interdisciplinary approach to undertake research in multilingual and multicultural education settings.

Sandra Savignon and Craig Chaudron both maintain that the field of applied linguistics is too broad for one graduate program to adequately prepare students for research and practice. According to Savignon's statement,

> No single academic unit, even if it calls itself a department of applied linguistics, can presume to provide graduate students with the preparation they will need to participate in a range of applied linguistic research that is, by definition, multidisciplinary, AND, I wish to underscore, multilingual and multicultural.

As a result, the multidisciplinary SLATE program at Illinois, which emphasizes both research and teacher training, is limited to the subfield of

second/foreign/multilanguage acquisition. Chaudron mentions numerous practical considerations, including administrative and disciplinary constraints, number and expertise of faculty, time, and academic preparation of incoming students, that together force a program to be more limited in scope. In his statement, he suggests that

> The best solution to preparing applied linguists, therefore, is to provide a sufficiently balanced introduction to the various contributing disciplines but also a thorough grounding in the basic theories, research methods, and findings of whatever focal area we deem to have the highest priority in our particular institution, whether it be linguistics, second language studies, psychology, or whatever. The field will thus remain multidisciplinary as well as interdisciplinary, although it is my belief that some portions of the field, such as second language learning and teaching are rapidly becoming "disciplinary."

In the case of the Department of ESL at the University of Hawai'i, the emphasis is on second language studies. While I agree that the SLATE program and the ESL program that Savignon and Chaudron respectively describe are legitimate responses to the challenge of providing graduate students with interdisciplinary training in the theory and practice of language teaching and learning, I disagree that the constraints they discuss necessitate a more limited program.

As a graduate student, especially in a field as young and growing as applied linguistics, I do not expect any graduate program to take full responsibility for teaching me all of the information I need to become a researcher and practitioner in the field. Rather, a program should provide graduate students with the means to take responsibility themselves for solving whichever language-related problems interest them. Chaudron has suggested providing students having little or no background in applied linguistics with "a thorough grounding in the basic theories, research methods, and findings of whatever focal area we deem to have the highest priority in our particular institution." However, I think this approach may unnecessarily bias students toward pursuing the research agendas of their professors and following them uncritically in the same research paradigm, resulting in a state of affairs which may not contribute to the evolution of the broader field of applied linguistics.

Chaudron's observation that second language teaching and learning are rapidly becoming disciplinary is representative of what I consider an institutional problem that will have to eventually be addressed. Researchers in distinct disciplines who are investigating similar language-related problems find themselves segregated in their departments, making dialogue and collaboration unnecessarily difficult and rare. Instead of encouraging the emergence of new disciplines, I think a more productive approach for an applied linguistics program to take, given present-day institutional constraints, would be to provide a forum, perhaps in an introductory course, in which students and teachers could collaborate in their attempt to answer the question "What is Applied Linguistics?" Similar

in concept to the laboratory system that Schumann describes for UCLA, this forum would ideally provide students with an understanding of the scope of the field, the kinds of questions that researchers ask, and an introduction to the theories and methodologies of the various contributing disciplines. This dialogue would also provide students the opportunity to critically reflect on existing research paradigms and how they together can offer triangulation of perspectives. Several of what Chaudron identifies as constraints on programs could then be reconceptualized as assets. For example, given that most applied linguistics graduate students begin with little or no background in linguistics, and given that numerous disciplines contribute useful insight and methodologies that linguists have not traditionally employed, students who have not already been indoctrinated into one paradigm tend to be more open to new perspectives. In addition, many of the students, because of undergraduate backgrounds in one or another of the contributing fields, have expertise which can be drawn on. Furthermore, as students are encouraged to take a more interdisciplinary approach, they will demand more interdisciplinary training, which will force institutions to restructure themselves to make collaboration across disciplines easier.

Michigan State University's approach to the broadening scope of the field is to offer parallel but distinct graduate programs: an M.A. in TESOL, and an M.A. and Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics. Both programs require courses in language acquisition and language assessment, but as Sue Gass says, "There are also areas of divergence (e.g., teaching methodology for a TESL degree or discourse analysis for an Applied Linguistics degree)." She suggests that sociolinguistics and discourse analysis are thus required only for those students interested in applied linguistics but are not necessary for TESOL degree students.

Gass's description of Michigan State's M.A. TESOL program reminds me of the M.A. TESOL program I graduated from in 1986, and, according to Conklin's (1991) review of M.A. TESOL programs (cited by Chaudron), is not uncommon. That program emphasized teaching methodology and the structure of the English language. Given the lack of attention to sociolinguistic factors, my training implied that teaching in any context was the same and that there was no variation in the English language. Through my experience of teaching ESL to radically different populations with distinct needs in a variety of contexts, I have learned that consideration of sociolinguistic factors, including who the students are, where they come from, what their needs are, etc., is crucial to developing appropriate curriculum content and classroom organizations that enable students, regardless of background, to participate. I found that my TESOL training in methodology and English structure did not prepare me at all for the diverse populations and contexts I would later encounter.

John Staczek's description of the evolution of Georgetown's applied linguistics concentration indicates his agreement with Schumann that there is no problem in training students to do interdisciplinary research on language-related issues in any setting. Through my training in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis at Georgetown, complemented by my training in ethnographic research in an anthropology program, I have developed an interdisciplinary approach to analyzing how language functions in any context. While there is no emphasis in the sociolinguistics concentration on educational research, because of my own

background and interests, I have chosen to do applied sociolinguistic research in educational settings. Although the traditional emphasis in the applied concentration has been on language and education, my peers in that program are also doing applied sociolinguistic research in areas such as language and gender, language in the Gay community, World Englishes, and cross-cultural differences in speech acts. It seems that the boundaries between concentrations are becoming more and more blurred.

I am in complete agreement with Staczek and Beebe's concerns for future applications of linguistic research. Staczek's statement that

> [w]e now talk of language as an instrument of power and authority, of intimacy and solidarity, of inclusion, exclusion, and affinities, of distancing and connectedness, of use and misuse, and not just of forms, function and meaning, but of role

describes the kind of expertise that Beebe maintains "is crucial to the future of multi-ethnic nations." This recognition of the constitutive nature of language must inform any applied linguistics or sociolinguistics program. Like Staczek, I think we need to concern ourselves with the ethical implications of our research practices, procedures, and outcomes, and, like Beebe, I think we have a social responsibility to use our expertise to influence policy and promote social change.

In conclusion, I think that this dialogue between universities, and among students and professors, represents what is necessary to push the field of applied linguistics forward. Collaboration across disciplines and across generations will bring new perspectives, including a broader range of research insights and methodologies so that we can forward our understanding of the social world. Given the general move in the social sciences toward the social constructivist paradigm in which language figures prominently, I expect that as applied linguists, we will be increasingly called upon to share our expertise.

A Response to the Panel on "Preparing Applied Linguists for the Future"

Linda Lane
Teacher's College of Columbia University

The statements from the six faculty panelists reveal both a remarkably unified view of applied linguistics, given its youth and interdisciplinary nature, and a desire to strengthen the independence and scholarship of the field. I would like to address three topics raised by the panelists: first, the issue of core curriculum; second, future directions for applied linguistics; and third, the interdisciplinary nature of the field. From my point of view as a graduate student in a doctoral program in applied linguistics, these issues prompt three

questions: What should any applied linguistics student know? What should an applied linguistics student expect to do professionally? and How can applied linguistics students gain the interdisciplinary perspective demanded by their specialization?

The extent to which the panelists agree on what constitutes a core curriculum in applied linguistics reflects a view of what the field is. I had given this question little thought, knowing only that the applied linguistics program at Columbia Teachers College was the one in which I could receive training in my interest, acquisition of second language phonology and second language speech perception. Once in the program and taking courses, I was struck by the enormous range of inquiry and endeavors that fell within the boundaries of applied linguistics, and I wondered whether there was anything dealing with language use that could not be called applied linguistics. Reading the various descriptions of core curricula or requirements at the institutions represented by the panelists was for me like the proverbial turning on of the light bulb--*this* was what applied linguistics was. Moreover, taken together, the descriptions shaped a foundation that seemed exactly right: an applied linguist should know about the structure of language (referred to in the statements as language analysis or linguistics), about the acquisition of language, and about the use of language in context. One or more of these areas is basic to any of the interdisciplinary perspectives applied linguistics can take, and together they form a core which distinguishes applied linguistics from most departments of English, linguistics, or TESL. These three areas--structure, acquisition, and use of language--are mentioned by all the panelists as important requirements in their programs.

The discussion of the future of applied linguistics and the future for applied linguists focuses on two related issues which are aimed at increasing the independence and prestige of the field. Several of the panelists state that research efforts in applied linguistics need to be expanded and improved; in addition, the appropriateness of the traditional close association between applied linguistics and education departments (especially teacher training) has been questioned. Although all of the panelists included as an important aim of their programs the training of researchers in language acquisition or education and the training of language teachers or administrators of language programs, several express the desire that applied linguistics loosen its traditional ties with the field of education and concentrate instead on expanding and improving research efforts. John Schumann states that many aspects of applied linguistics should be "free from concerns about language education," and this reorientation away from the field of education is reflected in UCLA's decision to convert its M.A. in TESL to an M.A. in Applied Linguistics, a degree intended to prepare graduate students to enter a doctoral program which trains them to become applied linguistics researchers, rather than teachers or teacher trainers. John Staczek mentions the desire to "do more and improve research on the teaching and learning process in the context of language use." Sandra Savignon emphasizes the need for an expansion of contexts for applied linguistics research, adding that because of its association with teacher training, applied linguistics has been viewed by some as "the antithesis of scholarship and research." Indeed, the programs described reflect this distancing of applied linguistics and education: only half the

panelists specifically mention a core component of language pedagogy and teaching methodology. Leslie Beebe, on the other hand, expresses her desire that applied linguists continue to keep educational needs as one of its priorities.

I would like to comment on the "research" and "education" issues from my perspective. First, I am already an ESL teacher. I did not enter the doctoral program in order to learn how to teach but to learn how to do research in my particular area. In that context, my experience has taught me that acquiring the tools for doing research needs more emphasis than it has been given. A single course in statistics or design is not adequate for many types of linguistic data. In my own case, after two design courses and three statistics courses, I am hopeful (though still not certain) that I will be able to complete my research and analyze my data. I fully agree with Susan Gass that every applied linguist should be able to analyze language data; however, in addition to a solid foundation in linguistic analysis, the applied linguist also needs a solid background in research design and data analysis. I believe that providing for this background will do as much to improve the quality of research as expanding research contexts beyond educational matters. I also believe that an emphasis on research will lead to the development of appropriate theoretical models; as Gass states, these currently come from outside applied linguistics and, in many cases, are inappropriate for language use.

The question of how closely applied linguistics should be tied to education or whether teacher training should be one of its aims is, I think, an issue that must be decided at each institution; as Beebe suggests, the diversity reflected in applied linguistics programs is a strength. In any case, as long as language acquisition and language use are part of the basic domain of applied linguistics, research in these areas will often have either potential or actual implications for language teaching and learning. It is also likely that many graduate students in applied linguistics will be employed as teachers of language or trainers of language teachers. At Columbia, there is a growing awareness that the quality of foreign language teaching needs to be improved, and that coordinators of language teaching (as opposed to literature teaching) should have a background that includes the domains of applied linguistics. It is not at all surprising to me that graduates of Illinois' SLATE (Second Language Acquisition and Teacher Education) Program are in such high demand.

Thirdly, I would like to bring a graduate student's perspective to the panelists' statements about the interdisciplinary nature of applied linguistics. That applied linguistics is interdisciplinary accounts for the richness of the field but also poses problems for programs which train applied linguists. My experience with courses in other departments (e.g., speech pathology, psychology) has been somewhat disappointing: the lower level graduate courses are generally broad enough to touch on areas of interest to an applied linguist; the more advanced courses, however, are directed almost exclusively toward those majoring in that department. Although it may not be practical to have "interdisciplinary" courses, it may be possible to offer short seminars by faculty members from other departments that address relevant areas of their field from the perspective of applied linguistics. Another approach might be an expanded sort of mentoring system like the one described by Schumann at UCLA.

Finally, I would like to see an "Introduction to Applied Linguistics" course, which would survey as broadly as possible the disciplinary and interdisciplinary areas of applied linguistics, offered to both graduate and undergraduate students. Because applied linguistics is so interdisciplinary, scholarship in the field requires not only the depth of a specialization but also familiarity with the breadth of the field. Such a survey would make students aware of areas with potential relevance to their own specialization and, at the same time, would promote recognition of the field as a field in its own right.

Renaissance People or Tomatoes?

India Plough
Michigan State University

At issue in this panel discussion is the varying conceptions of what constitutes the prototypical applied linguist. Neither the necessary nor the sufficient conditions of what it means to be an "applied linguist" are totally agreed upon. Further compounding this vagueness is that not only is the list of peripheral disciplines relevant to applied linguistics continuing to expand but also what were once considered to be core disciplines may now be peripheral and vice versa. Additionally, a definitive set of criteria for distinguishing one from the other is lacking. What are the implications of this state of affairs for the goals of graduate students?

It is first necessary to state what I believe to be our short and long-term goals, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Obviously, our immediate objective is to obtain the Ph.D. degree within a reasonable length of time. While working toward that goal, we also want to keep our future marketability in mind. Superimposed on these is the constant maintenance of professional integrity by conducting well founded research and thus ensuring the survival and expansion of the field.

Is it possible to achieve these goals within the programs of applied linguistics described by the panelists? As graduate students, we are expected to be researchers, students, and teachers. I do not think it is reasonable to assume that quality work *in a reasonable length of time* will result if these categories are expanded to include multiple disciplines. For example, my required coursework (which does not include the classes I audit) will most likely continue a year beyond that of my classmates as a result of my attempt to incorporate several disciplines within my own program while preserving a core concentration in Second Language Acquisition.

Given my coursework, it should be obvious that I do not advocate a graduate student restrictively following a single perspective. Once valid connections between our field and other disciplines have been shown to be relevant, those connections cannot be ignored and severed. For the benefit of our profession and for our own marketability, it is incumbent upon us to keep abreast of the advancements in those various disciplines which contribute to our

field, even if our particular institutions do not offer specific courses in those areas. This is not to say that we must or can be experts in every discipline which comprises our field. However, if we choose to delve into another area, it is essential that we possess a clear understanding of the principles with which we are dealing. Erroneous analyses or poorly designed projects and the premature conclusions and overgeneralizations which might be made based on those analyses and projects rob a field of credibility. They also hinder progress in a field, since future research based on them may be misdirected and ill founded.

Just as uninformed research would be disastrous to applied linguistics, so would it be if too many of us decide to concentrate on more well established disciplines and pursue careers in those areas. This observation relates to our ultimate goal, namely, the survival and expansion of the field. Perhaps we should emphasize that our field, however ill-defined at present, can provide unique and viable contributions to other disciplines. And, somewhat ironically, it could be that through our interactions with other academic areas, we will not only arrive at a clearer definition of what constitutes applied linguistics but also attain relatively independent status.

The Selection and Justification of Training Programs in Applied Linguistics

Peter J. Robinson
University of Hawai'i at Manoa

A Language of Criticism

Was the recent colloquium on training applied linguists for the future an assumptional debate (Kuhn, 1970) adequate to the problem it intended to address? I think not, though one continues to be needed. The faculty position papers in this special feature fail to deal with the complexity of the issue of applied linguistics course design on two counts. Firstly, and I will deal only briefly with this, no papers, apart from Craig Chaudron's, cite literature from any domain and most rely on anecdote and intuition to justify their argumentation. One respondent, Leslie Beebe, enjoins us to call her "a child of the sixties" as part of the support, one supposes, for the position she adopts. Another, John Staczek, devotes a large portion of his reply to an anecdote about the ethics of medical practice and suggests applied linguists should beware of unethical research. A third, Sandra Savignon, quotes extensively from her department's program descriptions. While information about course requirements is important, this could have been condensed and time devoted to other issues.

What are the other issues? I take it that course design, in any sphere, is a theoretical activity that takes place within an educational context. Why not, then, refer to concepts from mainstream educational theory or analogous issues in the validation of scientific theory in general: e.g., Laudan (1986), whose ideas about the problem-solving value of theory could usefully be applied to

debate about the role of applied linguistics research departments in the larger community; Manicas (1987), whose discussion of realist philosophy of science could be extended to research in the applied linguistics domain as well as its aims and limitations; or Laclau & Mouffe (1985), whose analysis of the hegemonic structure of political ideologies could usefully be applied to a historical examination of why certain departments (e.g., Michigan, Edinburgh, UCLA) achieved the leadership they did in applied linguistics, then declined, and so on. The panelists' general failure to refer to secondary sources suggests to me an unwillingness on their part to think through the larger context of the debate and leaves us as respondents and readers without the sophisticated discourse and frames of reference necessary to do justice to the topic. What we need, in other words, is a language of criticism--not anecdote, injunction, and personal preference.

The Training Process

Secondly, the debate seems insufficiently complex on another count, since course content is treated as the most important issue (as in previous discussions of the "interdisciplinary nature of applied linguistics," e.g., Brumfit, 1980). However, this, for me, is a secondary, dependent issue. Arguments over what constitutes relevant course offerings are meaningless unless situated within arguments about *who* are selected to take them and *what* they are expected to do upon exiting from training. Little reference was made by any of the participants to these issues: the selection of candidates and the justification of course content in light of candidates' eventual purposes. We need facts about both of them to determine course content. Course design is, or should be, based on observational phenomena, i.e., facts about the nature of the clientele for training programs and about specification of the clients' purposes in taking training programs, as in all ESP courses. Sadly, none of the panelists, apart from Chaudron, report on efforts to document observational phenomena of this kind, but such efforts are essential if we are to legitimize discussions about course content, with which most of the panelists' discussion was taken up.

Candidate Selection

Training applied linguists is a complex process consisting of three interrelated problematics--who to select, what to offer them in terms of curricular options, and how to test them at the end of the program. The final stage in this process, I suggest, is hegemonic with regard to the other elements; it involves assumptions, which deserve to be properly documented and debated, about what the relevant areas of professional activity and modes of inquiry are, and how expertise in them is developed by the courses offered to students. Further, given that places in graduate programs are in short supply, decisions about who to accept should also be made with reference to these assumptions. For example, have applicants shown prior interest in these areas and are they likely to be able to fulfill the exit requirements and their eventual professional responsibilities

effectively? The following model illustrates the interrelationship among these stages:

candidate selection -------> course offerings -------> exit to purposive domain

Entry to the University of Hawai'i's Ph.D. program in Second Language Acquisition is competitive, with only 5-10% of applicants being successful, up to a maximum of five students per year. Admission decisions are based on five factors: GRE scores, completion of a rigorous M.A., academic references, relevant scholarly publications, field experience, and a statement of purpose explaining how the applicant would utilize her or his training. Since the Ph.D. program began three years ago, there are now nine students enrolled. These nine have M.A.'s in ESL, TESOL, speech pathology, linguistics, applied linguistics, and education. Our policy is not to restrict the interpretation of relevant M.A. degrees to these fields, but to consider applicants from such diverse fields as anthropology, linguistics, and psychology. However, there are limits on what one could consider relevant (literature would not be), and this is an interesting area of assumptional debate. Of the nine students, five have had substantial overseas experience in teaching English, two have had some experience, one has been involved for some time in bilingual education, and one has done research in, and practiced, speech pathology. There are limits, too, on what one would consider relevant experience, and again this is an interesting matter for debate.

None of the panelists discussed selection criteria in any detail. Staczek mentions that the norm for Georgetown is to accept students with second language teaching experience. Savignon mentions that M.A. work in second language teaching and learning is preferred but not essential, while Gass also mentions the need for an M.A. in applied linguistics. Most striking, to me, is John Schumann's proposal that M.A. training at UCLA itself serve as the prerequisite for entry to Ph.D.-level research, since this appears to rule out decisions about acceptance based on the criteria of post-M.A. experience and publication effort. Also, it appears to limit UCLA's Ph.D. entrants to those students who have completed the M.A. there. The consequence of this, it seems to me, is to restrict intake to specialists in UCLA's approach to applied linguistic study (which is not the only approach) and to deny to those working in "the field" who were trained at the M.A. level elsewhere the chance to compete for entry to the Ph.D. program. Such a policy is at odds with Hawai'i's policy, which is to encourage applications from graduates from a range of relevant disciplines, and, I suspect, it is also at odds with the policy of the other departments represented at the colloquium. I was surprised that it provoked no reaction from the other participants.

Training Purpose

Why are applied linguists being trained? Schumann observes that one need which UCLA responded to in the past was "to train people who would become teachers and trainers of ESL teachers." Schumann then goes on to claim

that because there are now more programs in California and the U.S. as a whole fulfilling the same function, "it is time for us to do something new for the field." It is hard to follow the destructive logic of this argument. The Harvard Business School, to draw an analogy, is hardly likely to close because M.B.A. programs have proliferated throughout the U.S. in recent years. Further, that there are more university departments involved in training ESL professionals is surely an argument in favor of maintaining the flow of qualified personnel to staff those departments in the future. There certainly seems to be a demand for trained applied linguists with expertise in these areas, as a glance at the job opportunities section of the *TESOL Newsletter* and *LSA Bulletin* will show. With what justification, then, has the UCLA department decided to ignore this demand in favor of doing something "new"? Perhaps the new direction Schumann speaks of will be to train applied linguists in areas for which there is no demand.

Other participants comment on the diversity of practical applications that applied linguists need to be trained to address. Chaudron comments that, short of a serious international survey of needs all that can be said is that "there are increasing calls for expertise in a very wide range of applications." Staczek speaks of "the need to solve the problems of users in a variety of contexts." Most participants, apart from Schumann, though, see educational concerns as core issues: Beebe speaks of pressing educational needs, such as "the development of literacy," as areas in which applied linguistics can work, while Staczek observes that a large part of applied linguistics training at Georgetown has been oriented to preparing graduates "to become trainers (of teachers) in other university settings." Savignon notes that, at Illinois, the development of a writing center was a response to "the need for professionals to address educational issues in the development of writing skills."

While I accept that it is possible for applied linguists to work in very diverse settings on diverse topics, it appears from the comments of most of the participants that educational settings and topics are focal. Such a focus argues for a role for courses in pedagogy to supplement courses in other applied domains such as language use, acquisition, and analysis, even at the Ph.D. level. At the very least, trained applied linguists need to be aware of some of the constraints on implementing research findings in tutored settings.

What are individual students' purposes in taking Ph.D. programs? At the University of Hawai'i, seven of the nine students in the program see themselves teaching applied linguistics at the graduate level, in a university or college of education, when they graduate. One sees himself taking an advisory position in teacher education. Another sees herself working in an advisory capacity outside a university setting, developing government-funded educational projects.

An issue not addressed by participants (but of great interest to graduate students themselves) is the assessment end of the training process. And here I would like to make a suggestion. Typically, assessment of graduate students is made through indirect measures of ability to function as applied linguists in research settings. These measures are usually performance on comprehensive exams and completion of the Ph.D. dissertation. Perhaps we need to accompany

these indirect measures with more direct performance measures of ability to function in the applied linguistics setting, and these would, of course, be largely domain-specific. To take the majority of students in the Hawai'i program who wish to teach applied linguistics upon graduation, three performance measures that come to mind are the ability to give papers at conferences, the ability to get research published in refereed journals, and the ability to teach applied linguistics at the university level. How might credit for performance on these tasks be integrated into the overall assessment procedure? This, again, is an interesting area for debate, but one not covered during the colloquium.

Course Content

Most of the debate at the colloquium focused, as in previous discussions of the topic, on the interdisciplinary nature of applied linguistics and the need to offer courses on a wide range of topics. I have already indicated that I feel this focus to be misplaced, since course content can only be realistically determined in the context of prior decisions about who to accept and what the purposive domains of trained students are. One danger, as Sue Gass points out, is that "applied linguistics is molded to fit the particular academic interests which are present in any given institution," for example, ESP and gender issues at Georgetown or language and power at Columbia. Ideally, a department of applied linguistics would be able to offer internal courses and seminars in all the core areas (language use, analysis, pedagogy, and acquisition) without referring students to other departments. The advantages of this situation, which is largely true of Hawai'i, are that the relevance of feeder disciplines (e.g., linguistics, psychology, philosophy) to applied issues is continually demonstrated. Secondly, internally offered courses provide richer contexts for student discussion since applied linguistics students' concerns are more similar than the concerns of students from non-interdisciplinary departments, such as linguistics or psychology.

The position I have just argued, it should be noted, is opposite to the position taken by Schumann. Schumann reports that future Ph.D.-level applied linguistics training at UCLA will consist of only one course taken internally. Other courses would be taken outside the department. While this would definitely provide students with the opportunity to be as interdisciplinary as they want, one wonders how cohesive the coursework students take will prove to be and whether their focus will remain on applied linguistics issues, since the faculty teaching them will not have been trained in applied linguistics. One wonders, also, whether a department offering such a one-course program could properly be called a department of applied linguistics at all.

Preparing Applied Linguists for the Future

Allison Smith
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

In his statement on training applied linguists for the future, John Schumann states that "we should be able to have an applied linguistics that in many of its enterprises is free from concerns about language education." He describes how the M.A. TESL program at UCLA is being converted into an M.A. in Applied Linguistics which does not include a component called "language education." The reasoning given for this change is that an applied linguist only needs to know how language is acquired, how to test language proficiency, and how to analyze interaction in language classrooms in order to do research in language education.

However, John Staczek, as part of his argument, states that the preparation of an applied linguist as teacher, scholar, manager, and leader is essential. This position, unlike the previous one, which only considers the applied linguist as researcher, more closely resembles what I consider necessary for the training which ought to occur in an applied linguistics program. Of course, as Craig Chaudron mentions, it is difficult, if not impossible, to train applied linguists fully in two to four years of graduate study. Yet, defining the scope of applied linguistics too narrowly in the core of an M.A./Ph.D. program can lead to the deemphasizing of important aspects of applied linguistics.

A more integrated approach considers language education course work, such as curriculum development/evaluation and language testing, to be an integral part of applied linguistics and would require students to have at least one course specifically related to language education in the core requirements of an M.A./Ph.D. program in applied linguistics. Even if students do not plan to do this type of research in the future, they are at least introduced to a practical area of applied linguistics which is too often ignored to the detriment of language classroom research. As Leslie Beebe states, though not all applied linguists need address their research to it, we must provide for practical language education in our applied linguistics curriculum.

As a candidate both for the Ph.D. in Linguistics with an emphasis in Applied Linguistics and for a certificate of advanced doctoral study in SLATE (Second Language Acquisition and Teacher Education) at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, I have taken a core of courses that introduced me to interdisciplinary areas of applied linguistics (as described by Sandra Savignon) and have also been able to focus on the interaction between language acquisition research and language education. The SLATE program required core includes classes in language analysis (either syntax or phonology), language acquisition (psycholinguistics or the psychology of language) language use (sociolinguistics or the sociology of language), research methods for language analysis (both quantitative and qualitative), and language education (curriculum development across a variety of languages). Because SLATE is a doctoral-level certificate, I was able to complete the Ph.D. from a linguistic perspective while taking

advantage of the multidisciplinary, multicultural, and multilinguistic nature of the SLATE program.

A student in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Illinois who is not pursuing a SLATE certificate but who is working on an applied linguistics emphasis is usually not encouraged to take the language education or research methods courses. In my opinion, this creates an applied linguist who has not been introduced to a major part of the applied linguistics field. Not all applied linguists want to do language education research, but it is certain that they will encounter this type of research in applied linguistics journals and at applied linguistics conferences; it is necessary, therefore, for them to have at least some familiarity with what is occurring throughout their discipline.

Something is missing in the UCLA stance which conceives of an applied linguist as only needing to take language acquisition, language assessment, and discourse analysis in order to undertake or understand language education research. The goal of this research, as Beebe states, is, or should be, to address social and educational issues of national and international concern. Applied linguists should indeed be trained to view the big picture. But leaving language education courses out of the core curriculum of an applied linguistics program allows applied linguists to ignore the applications of their research. Certainly, as Beebe states, not all research needs to or should have a section on pedagogical applications. However, the opportunity to apply research always exists. If some applied linguists are trained without a single course specifically geared to language education, they will have difficulty understanding that other applied linguists want to apply research to actual classroom settings. To illustrate this gap, here is a short anecdote from a seminar talk I heard as part of the SLATE seminar series. After the invited applied linguist presented his model of what may occur in the brain as someone acquires a second language, he opened the topic to discussion. One applied linguist from the Spanish SLATE program asked, "How does this apply to the second language classroom?" The answer was: "I am not interested in that. Applied linguists are just not interested in that." However, the student who asked the question, as well as other applied linguists in the audience (including me), **were** interested in **that**.

Thus, the core requirements of any applied linguistics program, whatever the emphasis, should include basic classes in the areas of language analysis, language acquisition, language use, and language education. As applied linguists, we realize that our field is still growing and forming itself into an independent discipline. In order for this to happen, however, applied linguists must be trained, at the very least, to understand, if not to research, how linguistics and applied linguistics support language teaching and learning.

I am also concerned about how applied linguistics programs train students with regard to professional concerns. Even if students are trained to be researchers and not teachers, the reality of our field is that they will be both after they finish their degrees. Indeed, all the faculty members of the panel are themselves both teachers and researchers. I have been part of a mentor-protégée relationship which has helped me tremendously to gain expertise in areas of professional concern, such as participating in conferences, writing grant proposals, and serving on departmental committees. Yet, though most applied

linguistics students have academic mentors, they do not always receive this type of professional assistance. Two ways mentioned by the panel members to provide for this type of training are the UCLA laboratory model and the Georgetown classes in E.S.P. and program administration. Certainly these types of practical training must be part of every program in preparing applied linguists for the future. From our first days as applied linguistics students, we need to learn about joining and participating in professional organizations. We need to learn how to write abstracts, curricula vitae, and grant proposals. We need to learn what is expected of us on departmental committees and how to evaluate candidates for jobs. We need to learn how to develop course materials, evaluate curricula, train and supervise teachers. All of these are responsibilities we will face in our future and thus they need to be incorporated into the applied linguistics curriculum whether formally or informally. Some of this training can be achieved by requiring students to take education courses, by including students on departmental committees, and by awarding supervised teaching and research assistantships to students. However, in most departments, these essential professional skills are usually acquired through a hit-or-miss method, if they are acquired at all.

Since applied linguistics is a new and growing field, programs to train applied linguists in the future will no doubt change and grow as the field changes and grows. My foremost concerns at the moment, however, are that the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary nature of applied linguistics be reinforced in the core courses of M.A./Ph.D. programs and that more attention be paid to developing the professional requirements of graduate students who will one day be professional applied linguists.

CONCLUSION

Has this discussion, prompted by the panel, been useful? I feel it has, even though the outcome is not in any way definitive, because important questions and issues were raised. First, I'll comment on the statements made by the panelists and then on those from the graduate students.

At the most general level, Beebe raises the issues of social and educational responsibility in applied linguistics, and Staczek raises the issues of professional ethics and the professional preparation of future applied linguists. We all need to consider to what extent these concerns can and should be addressed in our academic programs and to what extent these are personal, individual matters.

Chaudron and Gass both refer to institutional constraints and mention that local foci and needs will inevitably color any present or future program designed to prepare applied linguists. We should, I

think, welcome the diversity of program offerings that results from these differences. On the other hand, Chaudron quite rightly suggests that we "all consider how best to break free of such administrative and dependent disciplinary constraints and expand the faculty expertise in our programs to deal with the widest possible range of preparation called for."

Continuing with organizational concerns, Savignon reminds us of the multidisciplinary, multilingual, and multicultural nature of applied linguistics and argues, "No one single academic unit, even if it calls itself a department of applied linguistics, can presume to provide graduate students with the preparation they will need to participate in a range of applied linguistic research." These are academic and administrative concerns that applied linguistics programs must address as creatively as possible so that we can achieve Savignon's proposed "coherence and definition to applied linguistic research and program development."

Finally, in a matter relating more specifically to training or curriculum, Gass rightly says that any ideal program should offer "a significant amount of hands-on experience, since applied linguistics is not an armchair field."

The student responses give us a different perspective along with a sense of urgency and immediacy. Duff provides three "ultimate criteria" for judging programs in applied linguistics: (1) satisfaction of the graduates, (2) graduates' ability to demonstrate/apply knowledge, and (3) graduates' ability to secure and retain appropriate professional positions upon completion of their studies. In a similar vein, Robinson proposes three performance measures for judging graduates of applied linguistics programs: (1) the ability to give papers at conferences, (2) the ability to get research published in refereed journals, and (3) the ability to teach applied linguistics classes at the university level.

With regard to curriculum, Lane argues for training in research design and statistics as well as for an introduction to applied linguistics, "which would survey as broadly as possible the disciplinary and interdisciplinary areas of applied linguistics." Turning away from specific courses or specific programs, Plough raises the need for graduate students to become autonomous learners when she notes, "For the benefit of our profession and for our own marketability, it is incumbent upon us to keep abreast of the advancements in those various disciplines which contribute to our field, even if our particular institutions do not offer specific courses in those areas." This is certainly a positive response to the local

limits and constraints of any particular program, which several of the panelists noted.

Smith appropriately reminds us that many applied linguists are indeed interested in how research might relate to or be applied in the second and foreign language classroom. If an applied linguist, when asked about the language teaching applications of his research says, "I am not interested in that," this is his or her own position. Fine. However, for such an individual to say "Applied linguists are just not interested in that" is certainly unwarranted given the importance of educational applications--and other types of applications--that most of the panelists and the graduate students have noted.

I am not as negative about this exchange of views as is Robinson, who I feel misrepresents some of the panelists--especially Schumann--on several counts. I want to point out the two most glaring misrepresentations of Schumann. First, Schumann's proposals do not limit entrance to the UCLA Ph.D. program to students who have completed M.A.s at UCLA; as a matter of fact, most UCLA Ph.D. students presently come from other institutions and represent a range of disciplines. Second, Schumann does not state that UCLA Ph.D. students take only one course in the department and do all other coursework in other departments; UCLA Ph.D. students simply have the freedom and flexibility to take courses in other departments if such courses best serve their research objectives. Each student's individual study plan is regularly negotiated and renegotiated with the student's faculty mentor.

Finally, I agree with Freeman, who concludes that "this dialogue between universities and among students and professors, represents what is necessary to push the field of applied linguistics forward. Collaboration across disciplines and across generations will bring new perspectives." Issues have been raised and points and counterpoints have been made which suggest that the AAAL panel and this special feature are merely the beginning of an extended dialogue about how to prepare applied linguists for the future. I thank John Schumann and the five responding panelists for their thoughtful statements, and I thank the six graduate students who gave us their perspectives on the panel's thoughts because, in some important sense, a program in applied linguistics is only as excellent as the graduate students it attracts and admits.

It is now appropriate to open this debate even further and to ask other applied linguists, both professors and graduate students, to identify problems and issues in the preparation of applied

linguists that were not brought to light in this special feature. To this end, the editors of *IAL* welcome responses for inclusion in future issues of the journal.

NOTES

[1] I should note, however, that I also benefitted enormously from a solid M.A.-level education in TESL/SLA at the University of Hawaii during the 1980's.

[2] Besides being pedagogically commendable, such a system would, in principle, take care of several past practical problems: (1) lack of space, funding, and equipment to support collaborative work in the department; (2) lack of high-level courses designed for advanced graduate students (also grounds for having students pursue advanced courses outside the department); and (3) a 10-week "quarter" system making it very difficult for individuals to complete substantive independent research projects in one term.

[3] I am indebted to Russ Campbell of UCLA's Language Resource Program for this opportunity; other students have been able to get practical and research experience in language education programs in Mexico, China, Korea, and now Armenia (to name just a few countries) through this program.

[4] Incidentally, Russ Campbell (personal communication) has never been in favor of scrapping productive research in the domain of language education, but rather suggests that research in (second or foreign) language education *not informed by* a sound knowledge of acquisition, assessment, and discourse may be weak in its theoretical underpinnings, design, and analysis, and therefore be of limited usefulness to the field. However, this does not mean that research in language education (yet undefined in this special feature) *necessarily arises from* a concentration in one or more of these three subdisciplines; it draws from, builds upon, and goes beyond them.

REFERENCES

Beebe, L.M. (Ed.). (1988). *Issues in second language acquisition: Multiple perspectives*. New York: Newbury House/Harper & Row.

Brumfit, C. J. (1980). Being interdisciplinary--Some problems facing applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 1* (2), 158-164.

Conklin, G. (1991). The knowledge base of graduate TESOL programs. Unpublished manuscript. University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Department of ESL.

IAL (*Issues in Applied Linguistics*). (1990). Special Feature Roundtable--Defining our field: Unity in diversity. *1* (2), 149-166.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy*. London: Verso.

Laudan, L. (1986). Scientific change: Philosophical models and historical research. *Synthese, 69*, 141-223.

Manicas, P. (1987). *A history and philosophy of the social sciences*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Olsen, R.E. W.-B. (1991). *Report of the 1991 limited English proficient (LEP) Student enrollment survey*.

Widdowson, H.G. (1980). Models and fictions. *Applied Linguistics, 1* (2), 165-170.

Contributors

Leslie M. Beebe received her Ph.D. in Linguistics from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. She is currently Professor of Linguistics and Education in The Applied Linguistics and TESOL programs of Columbia University Teachers College. In 1990-91 she served as President of the American Association for Applied Linguistics. She has edited *Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Multiple Perspectives* and co-authored *English in the Cross-Cultural Era: The Social Rules of Speaking and TESOL*. She has also published widely in the areas of sociolinguistics and second language acquisition. Her research interests have traveled from phonetics and phonology through syntax to discourse analysis. Her current focus is on cross-cultural pragmatics.

Marianne Celce-Murcia is Professor of TESL & Applied Linguistics at UCLA with specializations in English grammar, discourse, and language methodology.

Craig Chaudron holds a Ph.D. from the University of Toronto and is Associate Professor and chair of the Department of ESL at the University of Hawai'i. He has taught ESL and applied linguistics in Denmark, Canada, Japan, Spain, and at several universities in the United States and has published research on second language acquisition, classroom interaction and teacher talk, and second language research methods. Currently, he is co-editor of *Applied Linguistics*, and his 1988 book, *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*, won the MLA Kenneth Mildenberger award in 1989.

Patricia A. Duff, a Ph.D. candidate in Applied Linguistics at UCLA, is completing her dissertation on language socialization in dual-language school classrooms in Hungary. She has taught ESL and applied linguistics in Canada, Korea, Japan, China, and the United States, and has published research on SLA and second language education in several journals and edited volumes.

Rebecca D. Freeman is currently a Ph.D. candidate in the sociolinguistics concentration of the Linguistics Department at Georgetown University. Her dissertation research takes an interdisciplinary ethnographic/discourse analytic approach to multilingual, multicultural classroom interaction, and it emphasizes how equal educational opportunity can be provided to students in U.S. public schools regardless of their background. She is also currently incorporating an ethnographic/discourse analytic perspective in her own ESL teaching, becoming a researcher of her own practice. She holds an M.A. in TESOL from New York University and has had considerable ESL teaching experience in a variety of contexts.

Susan M. Gass is Professor of English and Director of the English Language Center at Michigan State University. She received her Ph.D. degree in 1979 from Indiana University and has published widely in the area of second language acquisition. She has served as President of the American Association for Applied Linguistics and was Chair of the Task Force for the Future of AAAL.

Linda Lane is a doctoral student in the Program of Applied Linguistics at Teachers College of Columbia University. She is also a faculty member in Columbia's American Language Program and director of the Columbia University Humanities Center. She is the author of the forthcoming Longman book, *The Sound of English.*

India Plough is a Ph.D. student at Michigan State University. Her areas of concentration are second language acquisition, syntactic theories, and sociolinguistics, and her dissertation topic is *The Role of Indirect Negative Evidence in SLA.*

Peter J. Robinson is a doctoral candidate in Second Language Acquisition in the Department of ESL at the University of Hawai'i. He holds a B.A. in Modern English Studies from the University of Wales, Cardiff and an M.A. in Applied Linguistics from the University of London Institute of Education. He has taught ESL and EFL in the U.K., the Middle East, North Africa, and the U.S.A. and has taught courses in applied linguistics and second language learning at the Universities of Pittsburgh and Hawai'i. At Hawai'i, he is a past member of the Ph.D. in SLA admissions committee and a current member of the Ph.D. in SLA policy committee.

Sandra J. Savignon holds a Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is now Professor of French and of English as an International Language at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where she is also director of the multidisciplinary doctoral program in Second Language Acquisition and Teacher Education (SLATE). She is the founding editor of the Addison-Wesley Second Language Professional Library and has served on the editorial boards of *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* and *The Canadian Modern Language Review.* She is currently President of the American Association for Applied Linguistics. Her publications include *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice* (Addison-Wesley, 1983), a winner of the Modern Language Association of America's Kenneth W. Mildenberger Medal for a distinguished research publication in the teaching of foreign languages and literatures.

John H. Schumann is Professor and Chair of the Department of TESL & Applied Linguistics at UCLA. His research interests include the investigation of variable success in second language acquisition from the social psychological, psychological, neurobiological, and linguistic perspectives. He has developed the Acculturation/Pidginization Model for second language acquisition.

Allison Smith is a doctoral candidate in Applied Linguistics and a candidate for a Certificate of Advanced Study in Second Language Acquisition and Teacher Education at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Her research interests center on the interaction between second language acquisition research and second language pedagogy. She has presented and authored papers on topics ranging from how ethnicity affects the syntactic complexity of written argumentative discourse to how computer grammar checkers influence the acquisition of second language revision strategies.

John J. Staczek is Associate Professor of Linguistics and Acting Director of the Georgetown University Press. His research interests lie in syntactic variation, lexical variation, discourse analysis and variation, program administration, bilingualism, language planning, language maintenance, and language death.