

DO MODIFICATION AND INTERACTION WORK? – A CRITICAL REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON THE ROLE OF FOREIGNER TALK IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

By

JOHN PAUL O. DELA ROSA *

DIANA C. ARGUELLES **

* PhD Scholar, Faculty of Arts and Languages, Philippine Normal University, Manila, Philippines.

**Secondary School English Teacher I, Dapdap High School, Province of Tarlac, Philippines.

ABSTRACT

This critical review of literature provides a detailed description of foreigner talk as a simplified register and critically discusses findings entrenched in studies done about this SLA issue. The studies cited are classified as researches concerning foreigner talk that occurs in both natural and classroom settings. Based on the critical review, more research investigations have to be done to enrich the area of foreigner talk in second language acquisition and learning. The most important consideration is the need to conduct more researches that would validate both the positive and negative effects of foreigner talk in the process of acquiring and learning a second language as well as a foreign language like English. The emergence of significant concerns on the study of FT is also highlighted in this presentation which include how researchers regarded the effectiveness of both input modifications and interactional adjustments along with the occurrence of negotiation of meaning and the use of communication strategies in the SLA process. The paper also presents empirical data on the effectiveness of NNS-NNS interactions in second language learning in contrast with interactions occurring between Native Speakers (NSs) and Nonnative Ones (NNSs). Finally, the paper deals with what could be done to address the "inconclusiveness" of relevant research findings on foreigner talk.

Keywords: Foreigner Talk, Teacher Talk, FT Characteristics, FT Effects, Second Language Acquisition.

INTRODUCTION

The concept that highlights the adjustments native speakers employ in conversations has been mentioned in literary works of long time ago such as in C.S. Lewis' novel, *Out of the Silent Planet*. It was then Charles Ferguson who coined the term "foreigner talk" in 1969. He defined FT as one of the varieties of simplified speech which is used by native speakers when talking to foreigners. Foreigner talk is commonly regarded in a given speech community as an imitation of the way foreigners speak the language under certain conditions, and it is usually elicited more readily by asking for this kind of imitation than by asking the informant how he would speak to a foreigner (Ferguson, 1975).

What makes foreigner talk a simplified speech is a question on the quality of input native speakers provide for the nonnative interactor. Such phenomenon requires certain modifications intended to make the conversation simple

and easy to comprehend on the part of the Nonnative Speaker. Hence, when speaking to NNSs (Nonnative Speakers), the NSs (Native Speakers) may speak more slowly, pronounce every word clearly, and use short sentences and basic vocabulary. Research has to guarantee, therefore, that foreigner talk or linguistic simplicity, amounts to cognitive simplicity, or the question of how FT aids comprehension of nonnative hearers must be made clear.

According to Ellis (2009), the characteristics of foreigner talk are very similar to those found in other simplified registers such as learner language, caretaker talk, and pidgins. This suggests that FT reflects universal processes of simplification, knowledge of which constitutes part of a speaker's linguistic competence. On a relative note, Hatch (1983) considered three ways in describing foreigner talk; (1) regression (native speakers move back through the stages of development that characterized their own

acquisition of language until they find an appropriate level), (2) matching (native speakers assess a learner's current interlanguage state and then imitate forms they observe in it), and (3) negotiation (native speakers simplify and clarify in accordance to the feedback they obtain from learners in communication with them). The second was the explanation offered by Bloomfield (1933), but it seems unlikely, as it is probably asking too much of learners' interlocutors to measure simultaneously the learners' phonology, lexicon, syntax, and discourse with sufficient accuracy to adjust their own language output. The most likely explanation is (3), although (1) is also possible (Ellis, 2009).

Generally, the native speakers may adjust their speech to optimize the foreigner's comprehension in foreigner talk. These adjustments may be classified into "linguistic adjustments" and "conversational adjustments." Linguistic adjustments focus on the surface form of the sentence concerning the phonological, lexical, morphological, and syntactical features of the utterance. Ferguson (1975) figured out three major grammatical features found in the FT discourse, which include omission, expansion, and replacement. On one hand, conversational adjustment emphasizes the internal structure and content of utterances. It was found out that in conversational occasions, NSs attempt to lighten the NNSs' burden in a number of ways. For an instance, topics are dealt with simply and briefly, often initiated and highlighted by pauses. Also, when a misunderstanding causes the learner unintentionally to switch topics, NSs often accept the topic switch, repairing the discourse by treating the inappropriate response as a topic nominating. When learners show lack of comprehension, messages are repeated or abandoned altogether. Further, more yes/no questions are used than wh-questions. More significant questions than statements are used to initiate talk on new topics in the discourse with foreigners (Long, 1981; Freed, 1983).

As regards the functions of foreigner talk, Ellis (2009) asserts that it promotes communication, it signals, implicitly or explicitly, speakers' attitudes towards their interlocutors, and it teaches the target language implicitly. However, researchers have varying views on the role of foreigner talk

in second language acquisition. The differences on the results they drew out from their researches concerning the issue concretize the still inconclusive role of foreigner talk in aiding second language acquisition.

For an instance, Chaudron (1983) reported two ways to produce such simplified speech. One is through simplification and the other, through elaboration. He found out that linguistic simplification during foreigner talk discourse may sometimes counterproductively result in a heavier cognitive burden both for the speaker and the hearer that impedes the communication process. On the other hand, in elaboration, speakers may use a sentence to replace a difficult word or add information to help contextualize certain linguistic items. As such, elaboration may appear to be linguistically more complex on the surface, but it can be cognitively simpler for the learners.

On the contrary, in the Japanese literature context, the study of Oskarsson (2013) on the foreignness or the language of Westerners in Japanese fiction, "diversification" could be used. The results revealed that irrespective of genre and period, the Western characters' nationality was somehow marked linguistically, mostly by the use of loan words, but the language of the characters was only seldom portrayed as purposively simplified. As such, Western language is viewed as a source of "foreignness" or "exoticism." However, there were fictional works where the language of the Western characters is depicted in a way reminiscent of the results reported in studies of primary foreigner talk. Moreover, the use of personal pronouns and ellipses were more prevalent in the characters' sentences than in the sentences of Japanese characters.

The previously cited study describes the occurrence of foreigner talk not only on actual discourses or conversations but also on literary pieces where NSs and NNSs are involved. Owing to the diffusion of FT in other forms of communication, foreigner talk is also a legitimate phenomenon inside the classroom. Hence, foreigner talk may not solely occur in settings where natural conversations or discourses happen. Henzl (1979) views the language used by the teachers in the classroom as a variety of FT and called it "foreign language classroom

register." Long & Sato (1983) also hold a similar viewpoint, and they named the FT occurring in the classroom as "classroom foreigner talk discourse." Such register bears features reflecting the inequality of the linguistic competence between speakers and hearers, as well as typical features of communication in the classroom setting.

From these descriptions and features given to foreigner talk, much have to be known about it further, especially on its potential role in helping speed up the second language acquisition process. With this said, empirical data from studies to support and falsify claims about the facilitative role of foreigner talk have to be reviewed and discussed. These research studies which began in 1970s have focused on the effects of foreigner talk, its occurrence and types. As this research area progressed, studies focusing on foreigner talk occurring inside the classroom were eventually highlighted. Hence, for the purpose of reviewing researches done, the following critical review is presented. The first part surveys and analyzes studies on the use of FT in naturalistic settings, while the second would center on the use of FT in the language classroom, an event which is identified as "teacher talk". The studies presented are a combination of both classic and contemporary studies in order to unearth how modifications of input and relevant interactions between native and nonnative interlocutors naturally and pedagogically affect the second language acquisition phenomenon at large.

1. Studies on Foreigner Talk in Naturalistic Settings

The kind of foreigner talk produced by native speakers of English was first described in the seminal study of Ferguson (1969). His pioneering research concluded that on the basis of the responses of native speakers to the kind of conversation they would have with less knowledgeable speakers of English, just like what they are able to watch from movies or television shows where an interaction between a NS and an NNS occurs, linguistic modifications, in lieu of message clarity and understanding, may occur. From then on, other researchers supported his claim that there really is a kind of register that is intentionally simplified and thus, intelligible on the part of the nonnative speakers of the language – that is, foreigner talk.

Katz (1977) investigated foreigner talk by studying a native Hebrew-speaking child learning English without being formally instructed. The participants were two children: a five year, six-month-old native speaker of Hebrew and a native English-speaking American playmate. The data were collected through bi-weekly tape recordings in natural settings for approximately eleven months. The analysis of the data revealed that the use of foreigner talk by the American playmate did not occur frequently and remained rather constant during the eleven-month period. With respect to the phonological and morpho-syntactic elements of the foreigner talk, they behaved distinctly over time. Finally, in analyzing the relationship between the American playmate's use of foreigner talk and the Hebrew child's English, the two systems changed over time but independently of each other.

The aforesaid study contradicts the notion that foreigner talk or simplifying utterances made by native speakers could help facilitate acquisition of a second language. In the case of the subjects of Katz (1977), who are both young children, the occurrence of foreigner talk was not identified as "frequent" on the part of the American playmate. What is significant to note in the study is that both the language systems used by the subjects changed over time in which the development of the Hebrew-speaking child in speaking the English language was not dependent on the amount and quality of input derived from foreigner talk. This may have been influenced by the ages of the subjects, since the American playmate was not cognizant or mature enough to arrive at the idea that he needs to "simplify" his speech, so that his playmate, who is a non-native speaker of English, would understand what he is saying.

On a relative note, Scarcella & Higa (1981) concluded that child non-native speakers receive a simpler input in a more supportive atmosphere. Hence, the native speaker speech addressed to them contains shorter utterances, involving fewer complex grammatical structures and fewer disfluencies, more simplified vocabulary, more imperative directives, and more clarification requests. This justifies the notion that "simplification" is triggered more by age than linguistic competence. Though such modifications or adjustments are apparent in most studies, the study of Katz

(1977) is an exemption since there were no adult native speakers providing extra linguistic input to the child non-native speaker, but a less knowledgeable young native speaker of English.

Freed (1978) also studied foreigner talk by researching the adjustments made in speech by native English speakers to non-native speakers of English. Freed analyzed the speech of eleven native English-speaking Americans talking to eleven nonnative speakers of English in a naturally-occurring conversation. The speech from the Americans was then compared to the same eleven American speakers to other native speakers of English. The results of the comparisons were then compared to the speech of mothers talking to their children. The speech samples were analyzed with respect to the complexity of syntax (sentence length and complexity, sentence type, etc.) and functional meaning in context. Thus, in lieu of its syntactic features, foreigner talk approximates baby talk. However, foreigner talk is more similar to native talk in its underlying functional intent.

Though the given study did not focus on the effect of foreigner talk on the process by which a particular group of learners acquire the second language, establishing similarities and differences among foreigner talk, baby talk, and native talk are deemed necessary to further qualify the former against other types of simplified registers. As stated by Ellis (2009), the foreigner talk (FT) used by native speakers when communicating with non-native speakers displays many of the characteristics of caretaker talk or "baby talk." Freed (1978) further suggested that the results of the study reflect a general difference in purpose: whereas the main functional intent of caretaker talk is that of directing the child's behavior, that of foreigner talk is the exchange of information. It should be noted, however, that when FT is addressed to young children, it appears to resemble caretaker talk fairly closely. Researchers who wish to study foreigner talk should consider the functional intent of the utterance more than the manner by which it was uttered (the tone, pauses, intonation, etc.) so that a clear picture of it will be established in accordance with FT's similarity with caretaker talk. This must be understood most especially if the subjects involved are a child and an adult interlocutor.

Hatch, Shapira & Gough (1978) conducted another study to analyze foreigner talk by examining the speech of native speakers to non-native speakers in three different types of environments. The first involved a native speaker who modified her speech to the extent that she "copied" the patterns of speech of the non-native speaker whom she was addressing. The second interaction involved the analysis of a teacher's speech to his students inside and outside of the classroom environment. The third speech environment involved examining the speech that native speakers used when speaking to nonnatives who had called them on the telephone.

The analysis of the first interaction revealed the characteristics in the native speaker's speech such as deletion of the pronoun "it," use of verbs that were not inflected for tense, and use of nonstandard negatives. For the second investigation, omission of articles by the native speaker was apparent. The analysis of the conversations in the third investigation revealed that there was a general use of repetition, stress on important words, slower rate of speech, and the use of non-contracted verb forms.

The types of adjustments made by native speakers, as influenced by the linguistic environments where interactions occurred, were the foci of the aforesaid study. The findings of Hatch, Shapira & Gough (1978) proved that modifications along with other communication strategies emerge when NSs and NNSs engage in discourses where the former needs to simplify utterances in lieu of providing comprehensible or intelligible messages for the listener or receiver. Further, it is apparent among the three investigations that when there are less physical conversations (just like during a telephone conversation), more modifications and communication strategies are initiated by the native speaker. However, what needs to be clarified more in this study is the relative effect of these modifications and strategies on how the nonnative speaker understands the messages given to him/her. In this regard, an experimental or a longitudinal study involving the same variables and research settings is called for.

Alcon & Guzman (1994) studied interlanguage modifications in NS-NNS oral interactions, in which the languages in context were English and Catalan. The study

further attempted to test Swain's hypothesis which claims that negative feedback is vital for interlanguage development. The study involved nine Spanish speakers learning English as a foreign language and Catalan as a second language. Also serving as subjects were a Catalan NS and an English NS. The database consisted of nine taped L1 Spanish/L2 English NNSs interacting with the English native speaker, and nine taped L1 Spanish/L2 Catalan NNSs interacting with the Catalan native speaker. The study revealed that NS signals of non-understanding rather than NS clarification questions had an effect on learners' modification of their IL rules, while NS comprehension and confirmation requests did not.

Clarification questions on the part of a more knowledgeable interactor, as underscored in the study, are facilitative towards the modification of the NNSs' production, thereby producing a more comprehensible output. The need to be understood by the native speaker is the force that drives the nonnative interlocutor to restructure his or her utterances towards listener comprehension and interpretability. The results therefore support the claim that negotiation may be the means through which language items and structures are highlighted (Alcon, 1994; Plough & Gass, 1993). The role of negative feedback on language development also comes into play. As supported by White (1987), comprehension difficulties are what allow learners to notice that linguistic modifications are necessary – an idea that provides justifications among incomprehension, second language production, and language development.

In the effort to reconstruct NS/NNS communication, Lloret (2005) conducted a study on miscommunication between native speakers and nonnative speakers. The study further considers two important steps in a case of miscommunication: the negotiation/repair and the re-establishment of communication. The research presents eight interactions all in all. Seven of them service encounters, between NS and NNS from a Conversation Analysis (CA) perspective, focusing on what type of misunderstanding or non-understanding occurs, who initiates the repair and how, who actually repairs the miscommunication and how, and how participants

continue constructing the interaction after it is repaired. It was found out that the sources of miscommunication were mainly grammatical and most often lexical, based on content and the pragmatics of social interaction. The repair was said to be more successful when it was done close to the point of misunderstanding. Further, it was reported that repairs were done by both NS and NNS with clarification requests and confirmation checks were also used to repair sequence.

The study sheds light on the process by which NSs and NNSs could actually work hand in hand towards the repair of a communication sequence. Lloret (2005) further suggests that in order to help nonnative speakers to be socially competent interactors of a language, the need to incorporate the process of co-construction in their language training should be realized. Hence, the socio-pragmatic concepts of the communicative process must be given enough attention. The use of repair strategies could therefore be advocated not only to keep conversations going between two interlocutors, but also to resolve conversational troubles (Numata, 2009). In second language acquisition, engaging learners towards employing different strategies and tactics may make them improve the ways by which they learn the target language. As such, Faerch & Kasper (1983) noted that nonnative speakers' use of communication strategies and other suggested ones help solve a communication problem and champions a communicative goal.

In the Russian context, modern communication with foreigners is a rather complex phenomenon, which is different from other conversations. Hence, the study of Federova (2010) focused on the stereotypes and realities of Russian foreigner talk. The researcher found out that Russians tend to speak to foreigners using more formal and overcorrected utterances rather than through a simplified language. However, native speakers of Russian believe that a 'broken language' is more appropriate to be used when conversing with nonnative speakers. The choice of language is undeniably the result of a cultural perception that foreigners in the Soviet Union are on a relatively higher status than Russians. Therefore, linguistic adjustments in general are done by the Russians.

The socio-cultural aspect of foreigner talk in Russia connects to the reality that linguistic insecurities really do exist. In second language acquisition, interactions and communicative events between two interlocutors require novel exchanges coupled with negotiation of meaning and more interaction to keep conversations going. However, in the Russian context, modifications and adjustments do not come from a more competent speaker for that matter. The 'overcorrected' responses of Russians when talking to foreigners may yield both positive and negative results. While many researchers agree that monitor users are successful language learners (Krashen & Pon, 1975), studies also show that over correction on the part of the "over user" results to accuracy in written language, but fails to use what he knows in communicative speeches (Stafford & Covitt, 1978). On one hand, learners who are fully knowledgeable about conscious grammar alone most of the time possess very little acquisition, and at the same time, may be described as lacking competence in the second language (Krashen, 1981). Hence, among Russians, over correction on their part may relegate the natural process of foreigner talk discourse that relies heavily on interactional adjustments and modified inputs – a process that should involve both interlocutors and not only one.

Sato (2015) examined conversational interaction between second language (L2) learners and Native Speakers (NSs). While L2 interaction research has traditionally quantified interactional moves – the interactionist approach, the study examined various surface linguistic indices (e.g., MLUs, number of verb and noun types, and TTRs) and compared learner-learner vs. learner-NS interaction. Participants were eight Japanese EFL learners (three males and five females) and four NSs of English. The learners were university students who were either 18 or 19 years old. The four NSs were male university students whose ages ranged from 21 to 23. Their length of residence in Japan ranged from two (2) to four (4) years and none of them had any formal training or experience teaching English. The two-way information exchange tasks employed in the present study were picture description jigsaw tasks. In the tasks, participants each held three pictures and described them to their interlocutor. The present study employed CHILDES

tools to analyze the transcripts (MacWhinney, 2010), focusing on MLU (Mean Length of Utterance), types and tokens of words, TTR (type-token ratio), copula omissions, and the number of types of verbs and nouns (four learner-learner and eight learner-NS transcripts).

The results indicated that learners and NSs were comparable in terms of the amount of production but the NSs' speech contained more grammatical and lexical variability with a larger mean proportion of copula omissions. Foreigner talk was found out to be correlated with learners' errors. When learners' output in the two conditions was compared, it was found that learners produced more verb (but not noun) types with larger MLUs and TTRs in the peer interaction context.

What is interesting in the study of Sato (2015) is the finding that FT was significantly correlated with a type of errors in learners' speech. The result suggests that the proportionally more a NS produced FT, the more the paired learner produced the same ungrammatical utterances, indicating that learners were susceptible to this ungrammatical input. Combining these results of copula omissions, several possibilities are conceivable. First, NSs' copula omissions were not prompted by learners (the source of FT was NSs) and thus NSs' assumptions or intuitions, if any, which arguably had them produce FT, were in fact incorrect. Hence, FT does not seem to hold strong theoretical or practical benefits for L2 learning, considering also Meisel's (1980) finding that L2 learners often feel frustrated and insulted when addressed in FT. Important to note with regard FT results are, however, the means and standard deviations of the scores as well as the linguistic focus (i.e., copula omissions) among other types of ungrammatical utterances. Due to the low frequencies and limit in scope, the discussions surrounding FT remain tentative. In addition, the data were not obtained from a classroom setting where NSs are more cautious of their utterances, holding a special social role; therefore, the result should not be directly transferred to the discussion of teacher talk.

A more recent study of Alfallaj (2016) looked into the foreigner talk and communication strategies through a sociolinguistic investigation of interactions with foreigners in

Saudi Arabia. He found out that in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA), as observed from formal interviews and interactions, communication was at a grave loss as neither of the native and foreign populations of the country could arrive at a language that acted as a facilitator rather than a barrier in communication. Through examining foreigner talk discourses among the study's participants, the researcher found out that natives who are in constant contact of 'foreigners' needed training in linguistics in order to communicate well with the latter and contribute constructively towards building the image of KSA. In the current situation, there is an atmosphere of suspicion and miscommunication leading to loss of image and, at times, finances to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

It was deliberately recommended in the study that ESL/EFL teachers directly advise their students to use positive communication/interaction strategies along with foreigner talk, and eliminate negative ones. This is to provide an optimum remedy as regards the communication gap that exists between the Saudis and their foreign counterparts. From this recommendation, it can be seen that foreigner talk and communication strategies play an important role in shaping not only the process of learning a language, but the economic landscape of the country as well. This is very relevant since KSA is now turning into a global economic hub where people around the world convene, and in which the need for a common language like English is heeded. Thus, in a macro-level perspective, the use of foreigner talk to ease interaction and communication and how it affects other societal functions may serve as an emerging theme among researches concerning language education and the later effects of acquiring another language through simplifying discourses and conversations.

2. Studies on Foreigner Talk in Classroom Setting

After the pivotal study of Ferguson (1969) unfolded the existence of foreigner talk, another kind of simplified register, former studies focused on how foreigner talk occurs in naturalistic settings, and later on, towards its effect on language acquisition in both ESL and EFL contexts. However, along with the proliferation of studies on foreigner talk occurring in natural settings is the emergence of research works dealing with foreigner talk in various

pedagogical contexts. These studies focused primarily on the relationships among the foreigner teacher's linguistic input, the interactional structure between teacher and student, and the process of second or foreign language acquisition. Following are reviews of studies that deal with the role of foreigner talk in the classroom context.

Gaies (1976) studied foreigner talk in the classroom by investigating the classroom speech of a group of teachers in English as a second language in an attempt to determine whether these foreign language teachers' classroom language was syntactically different from their speech among linguistic peers. The participants in this study were eight teacher-trainees who were enrolled at Indiana University in 1975. Among the participants were three highly proficient nonnative English speakers who had previously taught English in their native countries. The five remaining participants were native English speakers all of whom had teaching experience. Each participant's speech was recorded three times during a ten-week session in Fall of 1975. This data was collected at the beginning, at the middle, and at the end of the ten-week session. In addition to the classroom taping, the weekly meeting of the practicum class was taped so that samples of the language which the subject used with each other – that is, among linguistic peers – could be obtained. The results of the study revealed that the classroom speech used by the subjects differed from the speech they used among peers in that it was characterized by more syntactic simplification. In addition to this finding, the study concluded that the syntactic complexity in teacher classroom speech increased as the level of proficiency of the students increased.

The study presented, similar to the findings among studies about foreigner talk in naturalistic settings, proved that foreigner talk or simplifications on utterances inside the language classroom also occur. Specifically, the differences on the syntactic features of the teachers' utterances were examined. The kind of register that transpired among the subjects of the study may be classified as "teacher talk" or "teacherese." According to Ellis (1985), the study of teacher talk parallels that of foreigner talk. Just like Gaies (1976), Henzl (1979) also

compared the language that teachers used when teaching pupils of different levels of proficiency. There were adjustments in pronunciation, in lexis, and in grammar. Aside from the syntactic modifications that occurred in the former study, interactional adjustments also occur. The effects of teacher talk on the second language learning of students taught were not gauged in this study. As such, the study kept its focus on the purpose of studying teacher talk – to investigate the type of language used by teachers in language classrooms and the type of language they used in subject lessons (Ellis, 1985).

Chaudron (1983) examined foreigner talk in the classroom in attempting to determine if, in fact, foreigner talk facilitates learning. The subjects of the study were the teachers of beginning ESL university students. Teacher speech was analyzed using five discursive phenomena – vocabulary, anaphoric reference, questioning, topic clarification, and topic elaboration.

In examining teacher speech with respect to the aforementioned areas, Chaudron (1983) drew the following conclusions. First, in choosing vocabulary, teachers tended to use “simple” words and circumlocutions. Second, with respect to anaphoric reference, teachers used pronouns such as *it*, *they*, etc., instead of repeating noun phrases. This approach of modifying speech patterns to accommodate a beginning student led to much confusion on the part of the learner. Third, in the area of questioning, teachers attempted to preface a topic with a global question and then use specific questions to refer to the global question. Results showed that the global question or main idea got “lost in the shuffle” to the extent that the learners could not remember the global question. Fourth, in attempting to clarify certain topics, teachers tried to be causal in their approach. This strategy was unsuccessful in facilitating learning. Finally, on elaborating a certain topic, teachers seemed to paraphrase frequently, which confused the learners in the end.

The study of Chaudron (1983) gave a different perspective on the role of foreigner talk in second language learning. As traced from the results, the adjustments made by the teacher to make input more comprehensible to the

learners on five discursive phenomena that involved vocabulary, anaphoric reference, questioning, topic clarification, and topic elaboration, basically did not facilitate learning but made the learners confused. Hence, Chaudron (1983) found out that linguistic simplification may sometimes counterproductively result in a heavier cognitive burden both for the speaker and the hearer, and tends to impede the communication process. As such, when the speaker wants to make a sentence shorter, additional rules may be needed to reduce the number of surface elements. Thus, it may complexify the derivational history of the sentences and, if too much information is lost in the reduced sentences, it could also increase the perceptual complexity. In other cases, modifications or adjustments made by the language teacher may have taken effect not at the onset but on later language use.

According to Gass & Varonis (1994), interaction with the opportunity for modifications may affect later language use. Moreover, Chaudron's study may illustrate the idea that not all structures (even discursive phenomena) may be positively affected by foreigner talk in learning the second language. Sato (1986) concluded that conversational interactions such as those that occur in foreigner talk discourse might be “selectively” facilitative of linguistic development. With all these research findings, it is necessary to conduct further empirical studies to better qualify the claim that foreigner talk in the classroom facilitates later linguistic development and is selective in nature. Also, these studies would support and later on contradict the notion that FT really helps facilitate second language acquisition.

What Chaudron had found in the study further strengthened the claim of Issidorides & Hulstijn (1992) on the relationship between FT and L2 learning. The researchers tested the effect of ungrammatical FT on L2 learners' comprehension, investigating how English and Turkish learners of Dutch understand ungrammatically simplified input (grammatically wrong word order) in comparison to more grammatical and complex sentences. In contrast with the positive effect of modified input, they found that more complex input did not impede comprehension, which implies that learners may not

necessarily require FT to comprehend the given input.

A more different context was dealt with in the study of Jungmi (2003) on the negotiation of meaning between NNS-NNS interactions focusing on synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC). The main purpose of the study was to verify that interactions between nonnative speakers in synchronous CMC could contribute to second language learning focusing on negotiation of meaning. The data composed of chatting scripts from September 2002 to June 2003. The study was able to verify that interaction in synchronous CMC could facilitate second language learning through meaning negotiation, which plays a main role through the use of various types of strategies. The participants' adoption of paralinguistic features seemed to help synchronous CMC to be fluent and smooth. These strategies will enable English learners to become actively involved and play a vital role in leading a peer group conversation among NNSs in synchronous CMC.

A different approach towards studying negotiation of meaning, occurring in a synchronous, technology-mediated communication between non-native speakers in South Korea justifies the utility of both CMC and negotiation of meaning in facilitating SLA. More importantly, the result of the study supports the idea that NNS-NNS interaction serves a crucial function for NNSs rather than NS-NNS discourse (Varonis & Gass, 1985). The researchers even suggested that NNS-NNS interaction provides learners with a non-threatening forum within which to practice developing language skills and also an opportunity to receive input that learners could have made comprehensible through negotiation. Further, Park & Nakano (2001) pointed out that interactions between NNSs can enhance English proficiency as well by giving examples from an analysis of synchronous communication activities. This therefore provides a new perspective as regards communication in second language learning – that is, more than the role of foreigner talk, where possible inequalities between interlocutors exist, NNS-NNS interaction is more acceptable and effective in a relatively different communicative situation.

Numata (2009) investigated how L2 learners use

communication strategies and negotiation strategies during two types of communicative tasks and how well different CSs and NSs work in terms of resolving communicative problems and figuring out the correct forms. It examined previous taxonomies of CS (Bialystock, 1983; Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Tarone, et al., 1983), in order to develop the one that best fits the study. Hence, it further explored on which types of strategies can be the most beneficial for learners in classroom instruction. The interaction between the task type and CS and negotiation strategy use to examine how task types affect the use and effectiveness of communication strategies. Occurrences of CSs were identified and the types of CSs were coded using tape-recorded interaction of two classroom tasks. The findings indicated that learners of Japanese at intermediate and advanced levels used both communication strategies and negotiation strategies in order to maintain communication in NNS/NNs interactions. Some CSs may be effectively used to maintain conversations, but further investigations were suggested to determine the role of CSs on L2 acquisition.

The distinction as regards the effects of both communication strategies and negotiation strategies for L2 acquisition is a question of what to capitalize in the communicative event inside the classroom. As suggested by the researcher, since negotiation of meaning seems to be more effective in the classroom, it is best to introduce instruction in NSs at the very beginning in the context of Japanese language instruction. The aforesaid research highlights the important role of negotiated interactions among nonnative speakers. As such, L2 learners must be acquainted with how effective communication through negotiation of meaning is facilitated. However, the result of the featured study does not supplant the use of communication strategies in second language acquisition. For an instance, Numata (2009) recommended that CSs be used for communicating with native speakers to sustain conversations; however, they may not be very helpful in Nonnative Speaker/Nonnative Speaker Interaction.

Quitevis (2009) had a research study entitled, "Code-Switching in Teacher Talk in Tertiary Math, English, and

Science Courses: Teachers', Students', and Administrators' Attitude Towards It." It specifically identified the extent to which teacher-respondents code-switched in their classes, the type of conversational functions of code-switching in teacher talk during classroom discussion, and the attitudes of teachers, students, and administrators toward their use of code-switching in classroom discussions. Participants in the study were college students, teachers and administrators of a state university in Southern Philippines. The results revealed that code-switching from English to Cebuano is prevalent in the classes observed. Teachers code-switched for pedagogical and social purposes and as regards the attitudes toward code-switching, students, teachers, and administrators agree on the use of English and Cebuano in the classroom and have positive attitude towards CS in the classroom.

Though one of the foci of this critical review of literature is to describe studies done about foreigner talk inside the classroom (teacher talk for that matter); still, the study of Quitevis (2009) had a differing research trajectory. The study did not describe foreigner talk as a register to help learn the second language faster inside the classroom; rather, she focused on the use of code-switching during classroom discussions. Teacher talk was touched in the research study, but on a more personal level, since results were just limited to conversational functions of teacher talk as perceived by the teacher-respondents. Making the research more empirically verifiable such as employing an experimental type of research focusing on the effects of teacher talk to language learning of tertiary students, would make it more relevant and may better add body of knowledge to foreigner talk.

Maleki (2012) studied the effects of pre-modified input, interactionally modified input, and modified output on 80 EFL learners' comprehension of new vocabularies. The subjects were randomly assigned into four groups of pre-modified input, interactionally modified input, modified output and unmodified (control) groups. Each group included 20 students. Statistical analyses were conducted through a one-way ANOVA and Turkey test. The findings revealed that the participants in interactionally modified input group achieved the highest comprehension scores

than their peers in other three groups ($P < 0.05$). On one hand, modified output group outperformed both pre-modified input and control groups. There was no significant difference between pre-modified input and control groups and both of them obtained the lowest comprehension scores.

The study stressed on the importance of teacher-student interaction in language learning and teaching in which the teacher directs and guides the students to have the best understanding through his/her clarifications. Hence, what works better for the participants in comprehending new vocabulary words is their active interaction with their teacher in a modified input condition. The group that had better interaction with their teacher outperformed those who had not and only interacted with their peers. Clarifications and repairs may had been tolerated during the interaction between the teacher and the students that led to better comprehension of the target items. This further supported the idea, from research findings of other SLA researchers, that repetition through interaction increased comprehension (Pica, Young & Doughty, 1987) and that of Ellis (1995) which concluded that learners receiving input through interaction would achieve higher levels of L2 comprehension than those exposed to other types of input.

The study of Kawaguchi & Ma (2012), attempted to probe the effect of interaction on learners' grammatical development. The study began with the task-based interaction between traditional native-nonnative interaction, as well as interaction between second language learners themselves, where corrective feedback and negotiation of meaning were taken into consideration. The study revealed the positive effect of nonnative learners' interaction of meaning and uptake of corrective feedback on their learning of grammatical items. The results also showed that traditional native-nonnative interaction may be beneficial for pronunciation and vocabulary acquisition rather than grammar learning. However, in-depth analysis remained inadequate on how much uptake of corrective feedback triggered in the interaction was obtained, and what were possible corresponding factors that may affect the uptake.

The aforesaid study features the effects of interaction on

specific language development. According to Braid (1995), most SLA studies revealed the nature of NS-NNS/NNS-NNS interaction, but they did not reveal the effect of interactions on grammatical development, nor did they consider the relationship between interactional and grammatical structures. The studies further identified the specific areas of language development where interactions are most beneficial. In the study of Kawaguchi & Ma (2012), traditional NS-NNS interactions were found to be more facilitative in pronunciation and vocabulary learning than grammatical development. This eventually means that the input coming from interactions involving both nonnative speakers may contribute towards the acquisition of different grammatical structures. Once again, as underscored by Braid (1995), interaction has structural characteristics that are relevant to the acquisition of specific grammatical structures, thus reinforcing the facilitative effect of interaction on language development for the benefit of the learner.

Gharbavi & Iravani (2014) made a discourse analysis of teacher talk and answered the question, "Is teacher talk pernicious to students?" Further, their study analyzed teacher talk's quality and quantity within the framework of the communicative approach. The data consisted of a typewritten script of an audio-taped lesson of the communication which took place during classroom interactions. The kind of teacher talk analyzed was benchmark in terms of its alignment or congruence with some authors' pedagogical recommendation and language learning theories. The finding indicated that the teacher was not successful in creating a genuine or an authentic form of communication. Teacher talk was repetitive and monotonous and it followed the IRF sequence which allowed the teacher more turns and talk. It was also not consonant with theories of second language acquisition such as interactionist, functionalist, and cognitive perspectives. Moreover, the talk was found out to be hurtful and stressful, and it could block learning opportunities.

The foregoing study gives attention, this time, to the role teacher talk plays and teachers' choice of words, towards creating an enabling environment for language learning.

The finding clearly showed that the teacher talk produced by the participants was "pernicious" to language learning success. Such judgment may be due to the fact that in the analysis of the audio-taped recordings of classroom discussions, teacher talk dominated the entire classroom discourse. The monotony as regards the ways teachers delivered language concepts and their full adherence to the IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) structure, a pattern of discussion between the teacher and the learner, also adds to the ineffectiveness of the teacher-student communication. The dominance of the teacher talk, without active participation from the learners, breaks the relevance of turn-taking rules towards functional discourse (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Hence, functional discourse must be honed in the language classroom since one of the most critical aspects of communication in the classroom is negotiation of meaning, which clearly has a positive impact towards facilitating comprehension, and in turn, contributing to successful communication (Ziad, 2013).

3. What Needs to be Done Further on Foreigner Talk Research?

Based on the reviews of researches or studies done about foreigner talk in both naturalistic and classroom settings (teacher talk), a lot can be observed and noted on what needs to be done to further concretize data on the role of foreigner talk in assisting second language acquisition and learning.

Both groups of classic and contemporary studies on foreigner talk and teacher talk also focused on two important aspects of the SLA issue-modifications and interactions. Specifically, the roles of modified input and interactional adjustments in second language learning provide for the advancement of SLA researches which have traditionally been on 'nurture' and 'nature' distinctions, advanced by the social-interactionist and nativist camps, respectively (Muho & Kurani, 2011). Though a lot of researchers supported the positive effects of modifications, repairs, and interactional adjustments among second and foreign language learners' acquisition, there is still a need to further qualify results drawn by investigating more factors that can lead to the facilitating effects of modifications and interactional adjustments in both natural and

classroom settings of SLA. Generally, there is a strong necessity to determine the selective nature of both processes (modification and interaction) on language development. The potential of strengthening NNS-NNS communication and negotiation of meaning may also provide significant data on the standpoint of what works effectively in second language acquisition.

Studies that investigated foreigner talk in both naturalistic and classroom settings (teacherese) are all dated. Others are even as old as the time when the field of second language acquisition started to proliferate. For this reason, more updated researches could be done (through replication for an instance) to test the validity of the results identified from cited studies in the 21st century landscape. The differing characteristics of language learners and speakers of the past and of today, would surely count as a research opportunity to provide contrasting analyses on the use of foreigner talk as a simplified register and as a source of pre-modified input and interactional adjustments during conversations or during instructed SLA.

For foreigner talk studies in accordance with spontaneous or untutored SLA, encompassing other domains of the sociolinguistic domain such as those discourses that occur in the business work setting, in the hospital, in the immigration office or even at embassies, and the like, may be investigated. This would give interesting data concerning the behavior, quality, and quantity of foreigner talk that emerges in these unique sociolinguistic settings.

In connection with foreigner talk in the classroom (teacher talk), researches to be done must go beyond describing the types of modifications or adjustments made by the language teacher to accommodate this simplified register in the classroom. Indeed, what is more important to note is the effect that teacher talk incurs to the learning of a second or a foreign language. Though there are researches discussed in this review of literature that support and contradict the believed-to-be "facilitative" role of FT in both language acquisition and learning, more empirical studies have to be initiated to provide a clearer picture of foreigner talk as an instigator of effective SLA process. Results would in turn benefit language teachers by way of affirming the need to modify input and do interactional

adjustments to help facilitate understanding of messages or utterances and later on, the acquisition of L2 rules and structures on the part of the language learners. The development of other language skills in general may also be correlated with the amount of foreigner talk given to language learners.

Identifying which linguistic setting (naturalistic or classroom) helps trigger the positive effects of foreigner talk in second language acquisition could substantially make provisions as regards the implicit and explicit teaching of this simplified register. To do this, more experimental, longitudinal, and comparative studies have to be conducted. This would also include broadening the scope of the research population from university or tertiary students to learners under the elementary and secondary levels. Considering learners with special needs and how teachers make sense of foreigner talk when teaching them may also be dealt with. Finally, it is utterly imperative to conduct researches that would eventually confirm the negative effects or drawbacks of foreigner talk in the second language acquisition process.

Conclusions

The need to understand foreigner talk as a unique phenomenon in second language acquisition necessitates research efforts from applied linguists and language educators. The many literatures and limited studies illustrating the role of foreigner talk in SLA and in language learning should propel more empirical investigations, since most of the findings remain inconclusive even up to this date. The varying results that linked to the positive and negative effects of input modification, interactional adjustments, and communication strategies which all occur during foreigner talk discourse, are raw data that future SLA researchers may work on. Describing the features of foreigner talk such as its cognitive mechanisms is enough to conclude that this type of simplified register really exists in both naturalistic and classroom settings. However, what is needed to be determined are research-based conclusions that would qualitatively and quantitatively convey that foreigner talk is effective or not in acquiring or learning either a second or a foreign language. Therefore, just like the field of SLA itself,

foreigner talk remains as a “black box” that would later be unearthed as relevant SLA researches progress over time.

Acknowledgment

The researchers would like to thank Dr. Cecilia M. Mendiola of Philippine Normal University, Manila, for her insightful remarks and helpful comments that gave more academic value to this paper. Also, thanks all the researchers who responded to calls when the authors needed to add recent studies to this paper.

References

- [1]. Alcon, E. (1994). “Negotiation, foreign language awareness and acquisition in the Spanish education context”. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics*, Vol.10, pp.83-96.
- [2]. Alcon, E. & Guzman, J. R. (1994). *Interlanguage Modifications in NS-NNS oral Interactions: A Study in an English and Catalan Language Learning Context*. Retrieved from <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/1958106.pdf>.
- [3]. Alfallaj, F. S. S. (2016). “Foreigner talk and communication strategies: A socio-linguistic study of interactions with foreigners in Saudi Arabia”. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol.6, No.1, pp.40-45.
- [4]. Bialystok, E. (1983). “Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies”. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*, pp.100-118. New York: Longman Inc.
- [5]. Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt.
- [6]. Braid, S. M. (1995). “Reconsidering the Role of Interaction and Input in Second Language Acquisition”. *Language Learning*, Vol.45, pp.141-175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00965.x>
- [7]. Chaudron, C. (1983). “Foreigner talk in the classroom”. In H.W. Seliger & M.L. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*, pp.127-143. Rowley MA: Newbury House Publishing, Inc.
- [8]. Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [9]. Ellis, R. (1995). “Modified oral input and the acquisition of word”. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol.16, No.4, pp.409-441.
- [10]. Ellis, R. (2009). *Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [11]. Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. New York: Longman.
- [12]. Federova, K. (2010). *Russian Foreigner Talk: Stereotype and Reality*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/15271512/russian_foreigner_talk_stereotype_and_reality.
- [13]. Ferguson, C. (1969). “Towards a characterization of English foreigner talk”. *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol.17, pp.1-14.
- [14]. Ferguson, C. (1975). “Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity: A study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk and pidgins”. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- [15]. Freed, B. (1978). *Foreigner Talk: A Study of Speech Adjustments made by Native Speakers of English in Conversation with Non-native Speakers*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- [16]. Freed, B. (1983). “Foreigner talk, baby talk, native talk”. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Vol.28, pp.19-39.
- [17]. Gaies, S. J. (1976). “The syntax of ESL teachers' classroom language”. *Summer Conference of Second Language Learning and Teaching*, State University of New York College at Oswego, Oswego, New York.
- [18]. Gass, S. & E. Varonis (1994). “Input, interaction and second language production”. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol.16, pp.283-302.
- [19]. Gharbavi, A. & Iravani, H. (2014). “Is teacher talk pernicious to students? A discourse analysis of teacher talk”. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol.98, pp.552-561.
- [20]. Hatch, E., Shapira, R. & Wagner-Gough, J. (1978). “Foreigner-talk' discourse”. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol.39, pp.39-59.
- [21]. Hatch, E. (1983). *Psycholinguistics: A Second Language Perspective*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- [22]. Henzl, V. (1979). “Foreigner talk in the classroom”.

International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.17, pp.159-165.

[23]. Issidorides, D. & Hulstijn, J. (1992). "Comprehension of grammatically modified and nonmodified sentences by second language learners". *Applied Psycholinguistics*, Vol.13, No.2, pp.147-171.

[24]. Jungmi, K. (2003). *A study on Negotiation of Meaning in NS-NNS Interactions – Focusing on Synchronous CMC*. Retrieved from <http://www.paaljapan.org/resources/proceedings/PAAL8/pdf/pdf019.pdf>.

[25]. Katz, J. T. (1977). "Foreigner talk input in child second language acquisition: Its form and function over time". *Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum*.

[26]. Kawaguchi, S. & Ma, Y. (2012). "Corrective feedback, negotiation of meaning and grammar development: Learner-learner and learner-native speaker interaction in ESL". *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, Vol.2, No.2, pp.57-70.

[27]. Krashen, S. & Pon, P. (1975). "An error analysis of an advanced ESL learner: The importance of the Monitor". *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, Vol.7, pp.125-129.

[28]. Krashen, S. D. (1981). "Second language acquisition and second language learning". Retrieved from <http://testing.greenlitex.com/sites/mmea.greenlitestaging.com/files/Second%20Language%20Acquisition%20%26%20Learning%20by%20S.%20Krashen.pdf>.

[29]. Lloret, M. G. (2005). *Reconstructing NS/NNS Communication*. Retrieved from <http://manoa.hawaii.edu/lllea/spanish/faculty/marta-gonzalez-lloret/>

[30]. Long, M. (1981). "Questions in foreigner talk discourse". *Language Learning*, Vol.31, pp.135-137.

[31]. Long, M. & Sato, C. (1983). "Foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions". In *Classroom-oriented Research on Second Language Acquisition*. H. Selinger & M. Long, (eds., Rowley, MA: Newbury House. pp.268-285.

[32]. Mac Whinney, B. (2010). *Language Development: Cognition, Biology and Methods*. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9780470880166.hlsd001014/abstract>

[33]. Maleki, Z. (2012). "The effects of pre modified input,

interactionally modified input, and modified output on EFL learners' comprehension of new vocabularies". *International Journal of Higher Education*, Vol.1, No.1, pp.128-137.

[34]. Meisel, J. (1980). "Linguistic simplification". In S. Felix (ed.), *Second Language Development: Trends and Issues*, pp.13-40. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

[35]. Muho, A. & Kurani, A. (2011). "The role of interaction in second language acquisition". Retrieved from <http://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/4696>.

[36]. Numata, M. (2009). *The Effects of the Use of Communication and Negotiation Strategies on L2 Acquisition*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA.

[37]. Oskarsson, E. (2013). *Foreigner Talk or Foreignness – The Language of Westerners in Japanese Fiction*. Retrieved from <http://www.najaks.org/?p=916>.

[38]. Park, K. J. & Nakano, M. (2001). "Interlanguage pragmatic features of Japanese and Korean learners of English". *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, Vol.5, No.1, pp.153-174.

[39]. Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). "The impact of interaction on comprehension". *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol.21, No.4, pp.737-758.

[40]. Plough, I. & Gass, S. (1993). "Interlocutor and task familiarity: Effects on interactional structure". In Crookes, G. & Gass, S. (eds), *Tasks and Language Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice*, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

[41]. Quitevis, C. C. (2009). "Code switching in teacher talk in tertiary Math, English, and Science courses: teachers, students, and administrators attitude towards it". Retrieved from <http://www.cnuictballo.weebly.com>.

[42]. Sato, C. J. (1986). "Conversation and interlanguage development: Rethinking the connection". In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation and Second Language Acquisition*, pp.23-45. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

[43]. Sato, M. (2015). "Density and complexity of oral production in interaction: The interactionist approach and an alternative". *IRAL 2015*, Vol.53, No.3, pp.307-329.

[44]. Scarcella, R. & Higa, C. (1981). "Input, negotiation

and age differences in second language acquisition". *Language Learning*, Vol.31, pp.409-437.

[45]. Schlegloff, E. A. & Sacks, H. (1973). "Opening up closings". *Semiotica*, Vol.8, pp.289-237.

[46]. Stafford, C. & Covitt, G. (1978). "Monitor use in adult second language production". *Review of Applied Linguistics*, pp.103-125.

[47]. Tarone, E., Cohen, A. D., & Dumas, G. (1983). "A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: a framework for communication strategies". In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*, pp.4-14. New York: Longman, Inc.

[48]. Varonis, E. M. & Gass, S. (1985). "Variation in native speaker speech modification to non-native speakers". *Studies in Second Language Learning*, Vol.7, pp.35-37.

[49]. White, L. (1987). "Against comprehensible input: The input hypothesis and the development of second language competence". *Applied Linguistics*, Vol.6, pp.95-110.

[50]. Ziad, A. (2013). "The negotiation of meaning: Contributions to second language acquisition". Retrieved from <http://www.moroccoworldnews.com/2013/05/89533/the-negotiation-of-meaning-contributions-to-second-language-acquisition-sla-2/>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

John Paul Obillos Dela Rosa is a doctoral student taking up PhD in Linguistics (Applied Linguistics) at Philippine Normal University, Manila, the National Center for Teacher Education in the Philippines. Currently, he is a Secondary School English Teacher I at Dapdap High School, Department of Education, Province of Tarlac, the Philippines. His research interests include Contrastive Rhetoric, Second Language Acquisition, Sociolinguistics, and English Language Teaching.



Diana Catura Arguelles is a Secondary School English Teacher I at Dapdap High School, Department of Education, Province of Tarlac, the Philippines. She is an MA candidate, finishing her thesis at Tarlac State University, the Philippines. Her research interests include Second Language Acquisition and Discourse Analysis.

