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This paper offers five perspectives on the multiple and possible relationships of second/foreign language (L2) teachers and researchers. It begins with an overview of traditions and transitions in the approaches, values, and concerns of L2 teachers and researchers. This is followed by discussions and illustrations of four of the five relationships, including (1) coexistence of teaching and research activities, centered on similar topics, through individual approaches and goals; (2) collaboration of teaching and research efforts, in shared collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, action research, and ethnographic study; (3) complementarity of teaching and research skills, toward theoretically motivated treatments, designed in a research context, then studied in the classroom; and (4) compatibility of teaching and research interests, with respect to cognitive and social processes of L2 learning, and material and activity selection for L2 teaching and research. The chapter concludes with a summary of a project on context-based L2 teaching and learning, which illustrates a fifth relationship, of convergence, across perspectives (1-4).

Introduction

Education is a field that is filled with questions and concerns that are of mutual interest to teachers and researchers. Increasingly, the scope, complexity, and urgency of such questions and concerns in the education of second and foreign language (L2) learners bring teachers and researchers together in relationships that integrate their activities, efforts, skills, and knowledge. These relationships are further evident among teachers and researchers in the traditions they share, the transitions they have experienced, and the collegial connections they have sought to nurture and sustain. This chapter therefore begins with a review of traditions and transitions in L2 education that have impacted teachers and researchers in their work with L2 learners.

Traditions in the Teacher-Researcher Relationship

Traditionally, L2 teaching and research have had their share of support-
ers and skeptics, the former arguing that theirs was a better method for teaching or for carrying out research, the latter often abandoning methods, or combining them eclectically. At the same time, they strive toward a more to be effective in any prescriptive sense; but rather that teaching and re- search can be viewed as complex efforts whose questions and contexts require problem-solving approaches, and whose implementation depends on the wisdom and experience of language educators. Teachers and researchers also share a tradition of values as to the im- portance of the teaching profession and the work of teachers and research- ers, in the wake of student needs, goals, and expectations. Their experiences with, and as, L2 learners have led them to hold strong regard for the contribution of L2 teaching and learning and the need for traditional educational institutions, which they value also, as they strive to be eclectically and integrative in their approaches, as they have turned to their predominant.

Finally, teachers and researchers are practical people, often guided by practical goals, with decisions drawn from observation, experience, reflection, and detailed analyses (see Ellis 1994, 1995; Howatt 1984; similar concerns with respect to the current, future, and potential success, to be taught, and so many questions to answer about L2 learning. Such concerns have led them through several transitions in their relationship, as will be noted in the following section.

Transitions in the Teacher-Research Relationship: Relationships of Application

Within earlier relationships of application, arguments configured largely around matters of whether, and in what way, application of one field to the an application should be made. Consideration was given as to whether teaching methods or resolution of teaching issues; or conversely, as to questions that could be examined in the classroom and applied to wider Ellis 1994, 1995; Lightrain & Spada 1993; Pica 1994a; Swain 1995 for fur- Early research on L2 learning was not related to questions about L2 teaching, but rather, concerned itself with studying the simultaneous ac- quisition of two languages by young children (See, for example, Leopold 1959-1949). During the late 1940s through early 1970s, however, there was a good deal of connection across the two fields, as quantitative studies were carried out to compare the impact of instructional methods on student achievement (reviewed in Levin 1972). Questions regarding instruction were also addressed through 'contrastive analysis,' as researchers worked within structuralist linguistics and behaviorist psychology to locate differences between forms in the L2 and students' native language (NL), believed to 'interfere' with L2 learning, and to develop lessons in accordance with these findings (Stockwell, Bowen & Martin 1965).

Throughout this period, teachers and researchers grew frustrated as they attempted to understand L2 development and its relationship to students' NL and to features universal to L2 development, and as they tried to explain why certain error patterns and acquisitional plateaus were resistant to instructional intervention. For many years, terms such as 'creative construc- tion' (Dulay & Burt 1974) and 'natural order' (Krasnoff 1977) domi- nated the field, reflecting the overall sense that teachers might better serve their students through activities in L2 communication and comprehension than by grammar practice and direct instruction, a point that had already been addressed by Newmark (1966) and others at a somewhat earlier time. There was also an uneasiness within the field of L2 research about its readiness to enter into a relationship with L2 teaching. As early as 1978, Evelyn Hach advised researchers to "apply with caution" the results of their studies to teaching matters (See Hatch 1978, and also Tornes, Swain, & Fathman 1976). This set the scene for another relationship, one of impli- cation between teaching and research.

Transition from Application to Implication

Throughout the eighties, researchers continued to look toward the pos- sibility of application, however, and to carry out research that was educa- tionally relevant. Their efforts led influential publications, perhaps the most crucial of which was that of Long (1983a). Entitled "Does instruction make a difference?", this meta-analysis of existing studies on the impact of L2 teaching validated the classroom as an appropriate and advantageous con- text for L2 learning, the work of teachers as critical to the success of the learner, the input and interaction they could provide as necessary to affect and sustain the learning process. In subsequent years, researchers continued to warn against direct appli- cations of research on L2 learning with respect to the design of L2 teaching; however, they also wrote about its implications in this regard (See the col- lation edited by Hylenast & Pluemann 1983 and later; Crookes 1992; Long & Crookes 1993, for example). Along similar lines, L2 research was often discussed with respect to its use as a resource in instructional deci- sion making (beginning with Lightrain 1985, and later, Ellis 1994,
Lightbown & Spada 1993; Pica 1991; and Swain 1995). Questions also arose
as to the necessity to look for relationships of application between "L2 teaching and research, since over the years (See Shawcross Smith 1994).
Within the field of L2 teaching, however, recent years have brought a
greater interest in research. Current methods texts often refer to studies on
for example, H.D. Brown 1994; J.D. Brown 1995; Nunan 1991, and the chap-
toward research as part of the knowledge that they require as professional
research conferences, take courses in language learning, study for advanced
programs, and carry out research within their
classrooms (See Bailey & Nunan 1996).
Taken together, these various perspectives and activities for L2 teach-
ing and research depict a relationship that does not preclude "application;" What they suggest, however, are additional ways in which the two fields
following sections. The chapter ends with a discussion of a fifth relation-
ship.

Relationships of Coexistence, Collaboration, Complementarity, and
Convergence: An Overview

Distinctions and connections can be seen in the nature, focus and ac-
tivities of the teacher-researcher relationship. Four relationships are par-
ent, in which teachers and researchers hold similar interests, but have
different goals, and work independently in their teaching and research.
Second, the relationship of collaboration of efforts of teachers and research-
ers finds them at work on mutual interests and concerns, with an emphasis
on action research and ethnographic approaches, as they share in the col-
ledge.

Two further teacher-researcher relationships are also well developed, together to address questions of language learning that are theoretically
fine-grained micromanagement or large scale, multi-layered studies, and involve
materials and approaches that are teacher and researcher-designed, then
iblity can be seen in teacher and researcher interests in the linguistic, cog-
materials and activities that can be used effectively for both teaching
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Each of these relationships can also be examined within the context of
distinctive factors and important needs. For example, the relationship of
coexistence between teachers and researchers has arisen within the context of
of little need for new relationships between L2 teaching and learning, due
to already established relationships with other fields, e.g., educational policy,
pedagogical theory, and theoretical linguistics (Shawcross Smith 1994).
Conversely, the relationship of collaboration has grown out of a call for
relevant research on recurrent classroom issues and interest in
contextualized, activist studies (See van Lier 1988). The relationship of
complementarity has been nurtured by shared questions about roles of class-
room methods, materials, and activities in L2 learning and retention that
require careful, micro-level implementation and examination, or massive
efforts to evaluate policy change and educational reform. The relationship of
compatibility reflects mutual interests among teachers and researchers
that have been focused on the role of linguistic, cognitive, and social pro-
cesses in L2 learning, and on the need for effective, authentic materials in
learning and research. Further discussion of each of these relationships
follows below.

Teacher-Researcher Relationship of Coexistence and Collaboration

In their relationships of coexistence and collaboration, teachers and re-
searchers are somewhat polar in their intentions and efforts. Coexistence, in particular, can be noted throughout the early years of teacher-re-
searcher relationship, as discussed above, as language teachers often looked
to theories of pedagogy to meet instructional goals. The notion of a rela-
tionship with L2 research suggested, at that time, the application of lin-
guistic methods of contrastive analysis to drills and exercises for the lan-
guage classroom. Researchers also looked to other fields, particularly lin-
guistics, to inform their early concerns and methods, focused as they were on
abstract rules of grammar and complex operations of language struc-
function. The nature of their questions at that time brought little motivation for
forging a relationship with teachers, nor for discussing the need for any.
Such a relationship of coexistence endures to date, as can be seen in
publications on the teaching of L2 grammar and studies on its learning. The
former often reflect pedagogical and linguistic decisions about learning
proficiency, based on principles of linguistic complexity or frequency, or
the communicative utility and importance of particular structures. The lat-
er are often carried out with respect to structures and processes such as
noun phrase heads or pro drop parameters, or deep to surface structures,
uncommon to the lexicon of L2 teaching, and unlikely to be used among
students and teachers in L2 classrooms. In this way, pedagogical guide-
lines and lesson plans on sentence constituents and construction (such as those
found Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman 1983; Dart 1992; and Davis 1987)
have been able to exist along side of research on universal grammar and
language learning (for example, Eubank 1991) without a threat to the integrity of teachers and researchers in their respective fields. Many teachers approach, and relationships with other fields, that there is no need to explain a lack of a relationship between them.

Teacher-Researcher Relationships of Collaboration

A much different relationship between L2 teaching and research is seen when teachers and researchers collaborate on common interests and concerns, through ongoing research and ethnomethodological study of classrooms, growth of the often expressed need among L2 educators for greater research, often revealed, for example, when teachers enrolled in graduate and in-service courses report an academic interest in course content, coupled with educators also note that the studies they read are seldom designed to solve the problem that arises in their classrooms, as these matters tend to be highly contextualized within the societies and communities in which they work (See Van 1988 for review and commentary). These are some of the reasons why, as Crookes (1993) suggests, language educators have continued to turn to research on their own classrooms. This enables them to sort out the different ways in which research can, and upon, and modality, provocation, and collaboration with researchers in these efforts, for the following section will illustrate.

Teachers and researchers often work together on case studies of individual students. The dilemmas they produce often have larger implications for instruction and promotion of L2 learning (See, for example, Mackintosh & OMalley 1993; Kretz-Peyton, Jones, Vincent & Greenblatt 1994; Peyton & studies, as L2 teachers and researchers work together to address questions. Here, collaboration may extend beyond that of teacher and researcher, to school and community (See Edelesky 1986; 1991; Hornberger 1994; Freeman 1996; Rosand in Schacht & Gass 1996).

Teacher-Researcher Relationships of Complementarity

The fields of L2 teaching and research have also displayed an increased concern in their respective fields, many teachers have thus been established in their concerns and relationships with other fields, that there is no need to explain a lack of a relationship between them.
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is leading toward a more complete picture of L2 learning and retention through processes of intervention, assigned and initiated in the research context, and extended into pedagogical contexts through short-term, classroom experiments and longer interventional studies.

In classroom experiments that illustrate such complementarity, theoretically grounded learning materials and strategies are selected or developed by researchers. The researchers then work with participating teachers toward classroom use of these materials and strategies, followed by research carried out in their classrooms on their impact on students' learning. Often the materials and strategies are chosen through joint efforts of the researchers and teachers. Working together to respond to mandates from policy makers and administrators within the context of large-scale curricular change. In keeping with procedures for experimental design, control and comparison groups of other teachers and students also participate. One of the earliest experimental efforts of this kind is exemplified in work of Long, Brock, Crookes, Deicke, Potter & Zhang (1994), who provided L2 teachers with training on how to prolong the amount of wait time they gave English L2 learners to respond to their questions, then studied the impact of this instructional strategy on qualitative features of student response.

Perhaps the most exciting developments toward complementarity are taking place in Canada, through classroom experiments on immersion programs and work in experimental classrooms in English as a second language (See, for example, Lightbown 1992). In immersion classrooms, researchers have examined the immediate and long term impact of instructional materials and strategies, designed to assist the learning of difficult L2 structures. Hickey (1989), for example, provided teachers with functional materials that had been created to assist learning of two French verb forms for past time reference which posed considerable difficulty for students. These were the imperfect, or habitual past, and the passive compose, or specific past. The teachers incorporated these materials into their teaching over an eight week period. Hickey then studied the impact of the teachers' instruction by comparing students' learning in these classes with that of students in control groups.

Using a slightly longer period of research, Day and Shapson (1991) provided teachers with a curriculum of classroom activities, strategies, and materials. The materials, both functional and form-focused in scope, had been prepared by teams of teachers and researchers, with support from school administrators and policy makers. In both the Hickey and the Day and Shapson studies, researchers were able to observe participating classrooms in the months that followed these interventions, to monitor the presence of the targeted structures in teacher input. This information helped to explain results of subsequent testing on student retention.

Another illustration of complementarity can be found in a series of experiments, again in Canada, in which researchers have tracked the impact
of theoretically motivated instructional strategies as they are employed by teachers in classrooms for English language learning (See, for example, Lightbown & Spada 1990). Of particular interest have been the ways in which students’ learning of the rules and structures involved in adverb place-features is organized. These same strategies can be the formal treatment because of their resistance to teaching. During the treatment period, participating teachers used instructional intervention and corrective feedback for adverbs and questioned their regular teaching style and format to set the context for the treatment. Teachers and research undertook within the scope of the project. L2 teachers and researchers, as policy makers from ministries of education, school boards, and administrations, become involved in the teachers, researchers, and curriculum specialists might be recruited to develop classroom materials and strategies, with application to experimental groups. These group efforts are policy makers may be inconsistent with those of the teachers, researchers, conflict might arise. This has long been a concern among many educators, most recently among those who write within the perspective of critical pedagogy (See, for example, Pennycook 1989, 1990).

Teacher-Researcher Relationships of Compatibility

Many of the relationships between language teachers and researchers are formed outside of the kinds of collaborative or complementary undertakings described above. Such relationships are more fluid and informal, as they are shaped by a combination of language learning, classroom instruction, and the social and political contexts through which they carry out their work. Such compatibility of interests and activities often goes unnoticed because the relationships are seen as part of their respective fields.

Numerous cognitive processes are of mutual interest to teachers and researchers. Among the most prominent are the learner’s comprehension, planning, and production of message meaning, the learner’s ability to attend to language form as it shapes message meaning and to use feedback toward modification and accuracy. Of growing interest to teachers and researchers are the cognitive aspects of learner motivation toward language learning, including the role of effort and attention to learning processes and outcomes. As teachers and researchers note that the cognitive processes of L2 learning are difficult to separate from its social dimensions, they maintain a mutual interest in various forms of communication and interaction, ranging from collaborative dialogue to instructional intervention, and a concern for the ways in which learners and interlocutors negotiate meaning and engage in conversational revision and repair. Each of these cognitive and social processes will be discussed below.

Interest in Cognitive Processes

Both teachers and researchers have held a long and abiding interest in the process of comprehension as it relates to successful language learning (See, for example, Long 1985). With respect to teaching, comprehension-based methods and materials have been advanced in a variety of ways. Some have been studied experimentally (See, Postovsky 1974; Gary & Gary 1980), while others have been developed and disseminated in an independent classroom context (See, for example, Total Physical Response (TPR) (see Asher 1969). Perhaps the most widely known comprehension-based method is the Natural Approach, a variation of Communicative Language Teaching, whose roots are situated in the efforts of two individuals, Stephen Krashen and the late Tracey Terrell, the former one predominantly a teacher educator and researcher, the latter, predominantly a foreign language teacher, both of whom brought extensive background and experience in teaching and research to their work on L2 learning (See Krashen & Terrell 1983).

It was Krashen, in fact, who made the term, ‘comprehensible input,’ serve as the context of the L2 learning process. According to Krashen, when learners understand message meaning, they direct their attention to access unfamiliar words and structures encoded therein, and thereby build their grammar for the L2 (See, for example, Krashen 1981, 1983, 1985). Recent studies of learners engaged in comprehension suggest that simultaneous attention to form and meaning is difficult and frequently unsuccessful (Van Patten 1990). The argument has been made that it is actually learners’ ‘incomprehension’ of L2 input that is what enables them to draw their attention to L2 form and meaning. This has been shown in studies on learners’ attempts to comprehend the meaning of messages encoded with relative clauses (Doughty 1991), locatives (Loschky 1994), and pre- and post-modifiers (Pio 1994b). Pinpointing the exact role of comprehension in the learning process will continue to pose challenges. As such, it will no doubt maintain an important place among the processes of mutual interest to L2 teachers and researchers.

Message planning and production have also captured the interest of teachers and researchers. Interest in the planning process has been shown
in the teaching of L2 composition and writing which emphasizes the preci-
sion needed for communication of message meaning, as attained through
Johnson & Rosen (1989; Zamel 1983). Researchers have been especially inter-
ess in the ways in which planning and production processes draw on learn-
message meaning, which, in turn, has a positive impact on their L2 learn-
(Crookes 1984; Ellis 1987).
Production has long held a prominent place in language classrooms, in tasks
message planning. However, production has not gained
researchers had regarded learner production as insufficient to the learning pro-
was believed to be critical (see again, Krashen 1985). As the L2
might play an important role in activating and sustaining cognitive
able to compare their own production with L2 input, and "notice the in
in classroom instruction in Brazil. (See Schmidt & Frota 1986).
The contributions of production to L2 learning, thereby providing an en-
been a consistent feature of L2 teaching. Classroom experiments have back,
can facilitate the awareness of rules and help them distinguish in
Other classroom-oriented studies have shown how production can draw
Motivation has long been of interest to language teachers and research-
cently, however, researchers have identiﬁed two key factors that regard motivation as a cog-
Schmidt (1991), who have conceptualized motivation in terms of learn-
activities. According to these researchers, this deﬁnition of learner involvement in L2 learning
from teacher views and observations about what constitutes motivation
The cognitive process of attention has recently captured the interests of

researchers, particularly with respect to the learners' need to notice rela-
tionships of L2 form and message meaning. This learning process has been
incorporated into a variety of constructs such as "consciousness raising
(Rutherford & Sharwood Smith 1985), "noticing" (Gass 1988; Schmidt 1990,
and "focus on form" (Doughty 1991; Doughty & Williams 1998; Long
1991a, 1992b, 1993). Among teachers, the process of attention finds comp-
atability with the notion of language awareness, illustrated, for example,
the work of Stevick (1976). A methodologist, Stevick wrote about the
learners' need for attentiveness and involvement toward L2 input. In more
current work, the notion of attention can be located in a perceptualization
of grammar learning as sensitivity to rules and forms in relation to com-
munication of meaning (see Nunan 1993). The scope of interest in language
awarness as a classroom construct is further evident throughout the vol-

Interest in Social Processes

The social processes of language learning have been a consistent focal
point in the field of L2 teaching, particularly in its methods, materials, and
classroom practices that emphasize communication as a goal of L2 learn-
ing and the process toward which that goal is accomplished. Communica-
tive interaction has also been at the forefront of theory and research, for its
role in generating the cognitive processes discussed above, and in activat-
ing conditions claimed to play a role in successful language learning.
Among the social processes of mutual interest and implementation
shared by teachers and researchers, peer interaction and collaborative dia-
ologues have held major importance. Both of these practices emphasize the
work of L2 learners and other learners as they interact in conversational

groups and dyads, and have been discussed extensively throughout the
broad range of education, particularly within the context of a classroom prac-
tice known as cooperative learning. (Ragan 1986; Slavin 1982)
As L2 researchers have shown, the support provided through peer ac-

tivities offers learners a context for L2 learning through which they can
understand linguistic input, produce output, and respond to feedback
to modified production (See, for example, Doughty & Pica 1986; Ellis,
The study of peer conversational interaction has also drawn attention to
the differential contributions of input from native and non-native speakers
to the cognitive and social processes of L2 learning (See, again, Gass
as well as Planu, 1977; Wong Fillmore 1992). Such research can help to inform
decisions as to classroom management and professional development of

Of particular interest to L2 researchers has been a social process known
as the negotiation of meaning (Long 1993b; Pica 1994). During negotiation, for purposes of mutual message comprehension. In so doing, they adjust and to convey their own message meanings. To accomplish these ends, about their message incomprehensibility. This in turn can lead to modified input both directly (Doughty 1991; Pica, Young and Doughty 1987), and by participation in negotiation also provides learners with feedback on their offers from a context in which to modify and schematicize their own. Their use of vocabulary and phraseology (Long 1996; Pica et al. 1989), and particularly to signal requests and open questions (Larsen-Freeman & Long 1992; Pica 1993, 1994b, 1998 for overviews). Much of the research on negotiation carried out in experimental class-rooms and classroom-like contexts has been implicitly (as defined ex- tant implications for research on classroom management and analysis. Yet, research consists of negotiation, despite the presence of communication of various kinds, across different groupings of teachers and students. Rather, classroom communication is more typically characterized by transmission of play ‘questions’ whose answers are already known to the teacher (see, for example, Long & Sato 1983; Pica & Long 1986). Thus, the process of communication has continued to enjoy compatibility of interest between the fields of L2 teaching and research, but its actual-ization has been quite different within the research and classroom context. This is why, as will be discussed in the following section, there is much engage learners in communication as they also activate their participation in negotiation.

Interest in Processes of Implementation

A growing area of compatibility between teachers and researchers is found in their work in communication tasks in work with L2 learners. By participants in the exchange and in communication toward classroom activities, communication tasks provide learners with a context for meaningful, purposeful learning and language use (Long & Crookes 1993; Prabhu 1987). As instruments for data collection they can be used in a variety of ways. For example, communication tasks can be target-ed toward the generation of input, feedback, and output conditions to assist researchers in their study of L2 learning (Crookes & Gass 1993; Long & Crookes 1993; Pica; Karagy & Falodun 1995). In addition such tasks can be used to obtain samples of specific, highly complex grammatical features that can be avoided during informal classroom communication or conversational interaction (Mackey 1994, 1995). Finally, they can be tal-lered to encourage conversation that requires structural forms and features, whose impact on learning can then be monitored (Day & Shapson 1991; Doughty 1991; Harley 1989; Linnell 1995).

The communication tasks considered most helpful for L2 learning are those that enable learners to create a learning context for themselves. The most helpful tasks are therefore tightly constrained with respect to the ele-ments of information exchange and outcome; as such, information exchange is required among all task participants, and only one goal is possible as a result of such exchange. In that way, the execution of the task can succeed only if each participant holds information that must be shared among oth-ers in order to effectively accomplish its purpose. This insures, as closely as possible, that in carrying out the task, learners will work together to achieve message comprehensibility, by providing each other with input, feedback and modified production, as needed for communication, and, in turn, as a basis for their learning.

Classroom communication tasks currently in use fall somewhat short of addressing learner needs for L2 learning. Typically, they involve partici-pants in decision-making and opinion-sharing that do not require unani-mous participation in the exchange of information, nor accomplishment of one particular goal or outcome. As such, one or two learners may domi-nate the communication process, while others become distracted or inact-ive (again, see Pica, Karagy & Falodun, 1995 for review and analysis of relevant studies).
including grammar oriented communication tasks and dictogloss activities, as described below.
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Thus far, the most successfully designed grammar oriented communicative tasks involve learners in communication that focuses their attention specifically on grammatical areas that are resistant to purely communicative tasks. Researchers have found such tasks difficult to design, however, because measuring them is assumed to guarantee that learners will focus on the specific example, in a study on learner communication during a story task. There, actions and attempts to describe the story are focused on activities of noun pre- and post-modification (Ahn, see Fica et al. 1996).

A second type of grammar oriented communication task, known as the decision making, and opinion exchange in order to complete grammar formally adapted from grammar exercises, text items, and textbooks that are never their origin to the field of L2 teaching. Indeed, the reported effectiveness of these tasks for language learning provides a rationale for modifications for use with student pair work in problem solving and discussion on grammatical focus. (see Swain 1995). In the dictogloss, learners are presented with an oral text. There are several options available to teachers. First, a text might build an argument through its use of the text as the focus of a lesson or by the learners take individual together to reconstruct the text. As a result, they compose various individual sentences that their classmates. What makes these three types of tasks especially exciting is that they have great relevance for both teaching and research contexts and concerns. Developing tasks that focus learners' attention on L2 grammar in the interest of communication is one of the most challenging areas of work around the teacher-researcher relationship.
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which teachers and researchers have found increasing compatibility. Indeed, this enterprise appears to be moving teachers and researchers toward yet another relationship, in which there is convergence with respect to teacher and researcher interests, activities, efforts, and goals. Such a highly focused relationship of convergence of teachers and researchers, moreover, can be counterbalanced by another, very expansive view, one which integrates the relationships of coexistence, collaboration, complementarity, and compatibility, reviewed so far. It is this approach to convergence that can be seen in the relationships described and summarized below.

Teacher-Researcher Relationships of Convergence

A project is currently underway which illustrates convergence across the four relationships described above. As such, it brings teachers and researchers together as they focus on issues and interests of considerable compatibility, collaborate in classroom implementation of new instructional formats, engage complementarily in teaching and research, and yet coexist with other professional educators whose work takes them in different directions across school and university settings.

The purpose of this project is to identify and understand the scope and contributions of subject matter, content-based approaches to L2 instruction, in light of concerns about their sufficiency in meeting learners' needs to access meaningful, comprehensible L2 input, and to modify their production of output in response to feedback.

In its simplest terms, Content-Based Second Language Teaching (CBLT) may be defined as the integration of the L2 and subject matter content in teaching processes as well as in learning outcomes (as in Brinton, Snow, & Wesche 1989). Many language educators view CBLT as yet another variety of communicative language teaching. Indeed, the two approaches have much in common procedurally, with respect to their mutual emphases on the use of authentic and actual materials and interactive activities in the classroom. However, the goal of CBLT is for students to learn content as well as language; thus, content is sustained across numerous class meetings. On the other hand, communicative language teaching is directed primarily toward L2 learning. As such, it need not be bound to a sustained content area, but can be re-structured within or across class meetings on the basis of notional, functional, or situational categories, as needed.

Much of the current confidence in CBLT as an approach to L2 instruction has been based on the widely held view that CBLT provides opportunities for students to keep up with classmates in mainstream subjects, to learn the L2 skills they need to master subject-matter content, and to do so in ways that are of interest, relevance, and importance to their academic and professional goals. Thus, there is an expanding application of this approach to L2 instruction.
However, concerns about the effectiveness of CBLT for both L2 teachers and L2 learners have emerged, these being largely voiced by teachers and researchers concerned, but do so in ways that are highly compatible. While teachers and specific purpose content, researchers question whether the content is sufficiently adequate to the teaching of language and, therefore, relevant to the teaching and learning process. De- concerns regard, in part, as they lose relevance to the matter of classroom adequate subject pool.

Against this backdrop of research, the researcher's concern about the compatibility of teaching and learning processes as well as exemplary related to the project, for example, subject-matter-specified content teachers are pursuing, research coming, and working complementarily in teams (as in Pica, Wazhurn, & Evans, 1998; Shah, forthcoming).

Research, questions in the various ongoing and completed studies within skills in CBLT classrooms also provides a context for learners to access on the comprehensibility and accuracy of their output, (2) produce output, and (4) develop a sense of language between L2 form and meaning within extensively in Lightbrow and Spada (1993), Long (1996), Pica (1998), and whether CBLT interaction offers learners a context that is similar to, or less or more in the same way consistent and grammatical features. The data have been collected from various sources, such as the output, input, and form-meaning conditions identified above. A notable L2 input in the form of words, and their meanings, often through teacher responses to requests, and a low incidence of teacher or peer nega-
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