

Editorial

It is the ongoing mission of *Issues in Applied Linguistics* to publish scholarly research that reflects the diversity of the interdisciplinary field of applied linguistics. We strive to publish research that challenges or deepens previously established knowledge. Our aim is also to publish work that forges new pathways and makes new interdisciplinary connections. In this issue, the articles represent several different areas of applied linguistics, including language acquisition, multilingualism, language assessment, and talk in institutional settings. Each author builds on existing work in applied linguistics to find new ways of understanding language phenomena in the world.

Andrew Wong challenges previous experimental studies of children's lexical acquisition by analyzing the process of introducing lexical items as a collaborative activity between adult and child in "Explicit Introductions in Lexical Acquisition: A Case Study." Wong examines a number of conversational exchanges in which new words are introduced and shows that there are many types of introductions of lexical items that go beyond the strategies of labeling, anchoring and explanation which are commonly examined in experimental research. (e.g., Callanan, Repp, McCarthy and Lapzke, 1994; Markman and Wachtel, 1988; Tomasello and Barton, 1994). By analyzing conversational exchanges to locate strategies for lexical introductions, Wong is able to account for the acquisition of the comparatively less studied word categories of verbs, adverbs, adjectives, and prepositions, and his findings suggest that the order of acquisition of lexical items may be due in part to the types of introductions used.

In "L2 Influence on L1 in Late Bilingualism," Aneta Pavlenko synthesizes work in an emerging body of research concerned with the influence of a second language on speakers' first language competence in late bilingualism. (e.g., Major, 1992; Seliger, 1996; Waas, 1996) Specifically, Pavlenko's review of research in the areas of phonology, morphosyntax, lexis, semantics, pragmatics, rhetoric, and conceptual representations suggests that borrowing, convergence, shift, restructuring, and loss result from the effect of L2 acquisition and use on speakers' L1 competence. Pavlenko suggests this body of work is especially important because it urges researchers to rethink the common view that L1 systems are stable and impermeable. Pavlenko's work challenges the simple binary distinction between native and nonnative speakers common to traditional SLA research (e.g., Davies, 1991; Firth and Wagner, 1997; Kramsch, 1997) and contributes to an ongoing body of inquiry into broadening these notions. Finally, this article supports the view that the complex, mutable linguistic repertoires of multilingual speakers are important to investigate in order to better understand language development in general.

Nathan Carr takes on an ongoing debate in the field of language assessment concerning the relative strengths of analytic versus holistic composition rating scales in "A Comparison of the Effects of Analytic and Holistic Rating Scale Types in the Context of Composition Tests." Carr uses multiple regression and exploratory factor analyses to evaluate both methods, and finds that since different rating scales measure different constructs, they cause the meaning of the test score to vary with the rating scale used. In this study, use of an analytical rating scale caused the exam to primarily emphasize the receptive modalities of reading and listening, whereas use of the holistic scale resulted in an emphasis on the productive modality of composition. Carr concludes that an analytic rating scale can potentially provide more useful information if test scores are considered in terms of their component subscores, but that ultimately, a decision to use the holistic or analytic scale should depend on how the construct is defined and whether a single score or component subscore will ultimately be reported.

In "Collective Participation as a Resource in Multiparty Broadcast Interactions," Arja Piirainen-Marsh and Heidi Koskela examine the ways panel participants in a Finnish educational talk show align themselves in different kinds of associations through talk. Within a conversation analysis framework, the authors investigate both verbal and nonverbal practices as resources for invoking, establishing, and negotiating the relevance of participation as members of collective units. Collective units in these data are based on participants shared common experiences, ethnic or national identity, or membership in social relationships. The authors find that hosts in talk shows design their questions so that collective units are invoked as being relevant for subsequent talk and that guests not only display, sustain, and negotiate the relevance of these different associations, but also form other spontaneous associations through their interaction. This study adds to a body of research that brings to light the ways in which the resources of social and cultural identities are used to organize participation in multiparty interaction. (e.g., Goodwin and Goodwin, 1990; Lerner, 1993; Maynard, 1986; Schegloff, 1991) While grounded in broadcast interactions, this work has broader implications for understanding how diverse identities are constituted in multiparty interactions across a variety of multicultural social contexts in today's world.

December 2000

Leah Wingard
David Olsher

REFERENCES

- Callanan, M. A., Repp, A., McCarthy, M., & Lapzke, M. (1994). Children's hypotheses about word meanings: Is there a basic level constraint? *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 57, 108-38.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285-300.
- Goodwin, C. & Goodwin, M. H. (1990). Context, activity and participation. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (Eds.), *The Contextualization of Language* (pp. 77-99). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA*, 112, 359-369.
- Lerner, G. H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text*, 13(2), 213-245.
- Markman, E. M., & Wachtel, G. F. (1988). Children's use of mutual exclusivity to constrain the meanings of words. *Cognitive Psychology*, 20, 121-157.
- Major, R. (1992). Losing English as a first language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76, 190-208
- Maynard, D. W. (1986). Offering and soliciting collaboration in multi-party disputes among children (and other humans). *Human Studies*, 9, 261-285
- Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 44-70). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Seliger, H. (1996). Primary language attrition in the context of bilingualism. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 605-626). New York/San Diego: Academic Press
- Tomasello, M., & Barton, M. (1994). Learning words in nonostensive contexts. *Developmental Psychology*, 30, 639-650.
- Waas, M. (1996). *Language attrition downunder: German speakers in Australia*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.