

# language teaching

## surveys and studies

The international research resource for language professionals

Published by Cambridge University Press

<http://journals.cambridge.org/LTA>

*Language Teaching (LT)* is a long-established journal of Cambridge University Press, included on both the Social Sciences and Arts and Humanities Citation Indices. It is a quarterly, professional, peer-reviewed journal dedicated to providing critical reviews on key international research in foreign and second language education (including significant coverage of EFL/ESL) to its international readership of researchers and practitioners in the field at all levels of instruction. Each issue contains commissioned and uncommissioned review articles on various aspects of L2 teaching and learning research, and a number of other features.

We invite contributions to the following regular strands in the journal. IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, AND PREFERABLY AT THE PLANNING STAGE, CONTRIBUTORS ARE ENCOURAGED TO CONTACT THE EDITOR ([editorlanguageteaching@gmail.com](mailto:editorlanguageteaching@gmail.com)) TO DISCUSS THEIR PROPOSED PAPER AND THE STRAND FOR WHICH IT IS INTENDED.

**STATE-OF-THE-ART ARTICLES** A long-established and highly-regarded feature of the journal, each of these single-theme articles is accompanied by a review article on recent key books in the area under discussion.

**A LANGUAGE IN FOCUS** An article series surveying recent research on the teaching and learning of a particular language.

**A COUNTRY IN FOCUS** An article series surveying recent research on second language teaching and learning in a particular country.

**PLENARY SPEECHES** Keynote addresses and plenary speeches delivered at language teaching events and SLA conferences and lecture series around the world, giving readers an insight into current thinking and research agendas worldwide.

**SURVEYS OF PH.D./ED.D. THESES** A country-by-country overview of recent doctoral theses on mainstream topics.

**RESEARCH TIMELINES** A graphic presentation of key thought and research in the history of a particular area in SLA together with their representative bibliographical references. Designed to help the reader obtain an overview of the most significant bibliography in the area and spot the emerging tendencies, as well as monitor the development of research.

**THINKING ALLOWED** A space for contributors to present a personal stance either on a future research agenda or on the perceived current applications of research in the language teaching classroom.

**REPLICATION STUDIES** This section is exclusively dedicated to empirical research papers which specifically report on replication studies carried out in an area of language teaching and learning.

**RESEARCH IN PROGRESS** Recent and current work by research groups in institutions worldwide and reports from symposia.

The journal has an international circulation, mainly institutional and consortium subscriptions, and individual subscriptions, with a substantial proportion of its readership in North America (c. 25%), the EU (c. 30%) and Asia (c.35%). Its readers are predominantly teacher-researchers and students in foreign and second language learning and teaching.

## **Instructions and advice for contributors**

STATE-OF-THE-ART ARTICLES: pp. 3–4

A LANGUAGE IN FOCUS: pp. 5–6

A COUNTRY IN FOCUS: pp. 7–8

PLENARY SPEECHES: p. 9

SURVEYS OF PH.D./ED.D. THESES : p. 10

RESEARCH TIMELINES: pp. 11–12

THINKING ALLOWED: p. 13

REPLICATION STUDIES: pp. 14–15

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS: p. 16

SUBMISSION PROCEDURE: p. 17

CHECK LIST ON MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION AND FORMATTING

(ALL STRANDS): pp. 18–28

## State-of-the-art reviews

The state-of-the-art article is normally commissioned, subject to peer review, and its scope is negotiated between the author and the Editorial Board and its appointed referees. In general, the article is a comprehensive state-of-the-art review of recent and current research or development in one particular field within the scope of the journal, including an indication of future research needs.

A short PROPOSAL document provides a starting point, indicating to the reviewers how the author proposes to deal with the topic, and detailing sections, subsections, etc., as appropriate. The PROPOSAL should contain at least the following elements: rationale for the work, why it is needed and the perceived purview, suggested sections and sub-sections, a representative selection of the works to be cited, and a CV of the authors. The final product should feature a selective but broad bibliography of some 100 works, and should interest both informed specialists and those looking for an up-to-date introduction to the field under review. The PROPOSAL bibliography, however, should be enough of a representative selection of this final bibliography to enable referees to appreciate the promise of a review that takes in the obvious works and adds a variety of international works (countries as well as other L2s apart from L2 English if possible) to be reviewed, as our audience is a wide one.

In general, the article is a comprehensive, state-of-the-art review of recent and current research or development in one particular field within the scope of the journal, including an indication of future research needs. It might also include some discussion of research methods and approaches relevant to the area in focus (e.g. recent trends, debates or controversies in researching the particular area). The article should be written in a style that is accessible to a broad readership and should interest both informed specialists and those looking for an up-to-date introduction to the field under review. Care should be taken to avoid making the text read merely as a list of research encountered. We remind authors of the need to make full use of the opportunity for synthesis that these state-of-the-art articles offer to point out contradictions and omissions – as well as agreement – in the research they review and not hold back from providing a more critical view of what has been done, in what way, and, crucially, the way the data have been obtained. It might be obvious in such a survey of research, but it is important to remember that many read these papers not only for an up-to-date and detailed overview of what is happening but also to be informed of where outcomes and/or conclusions have not been as useful as might have been expected and where improvements, new research agendas, better research methodologies and so on might help (or have helped) move the field forward. Such criticism should not be confined only to the ‘Future directions/research’ section of the paper. Finally, authors should pay attention to the way the local/national context of the research reported on has been understood and interpreted wherever appropriate or significant. Research does not exist in a vacuum, and it is often tempting to report only on outcomes and perhaps underestimate the extent to which local/national policy and education systems, research agendas or even financing may impact what is going on.

The final draft article is required about ten months ahead of publication to allow for the peer review process, which is intended to judge the paper’s suitability for both an informed and less ‘expert’ audience, and to feed in constructively to an enhanced final version. The Editor appoints at least three reviewers with particular interest and proven experience in the field in question to assist in the process. The names of all readers are printed annually in the volume corresponding to the publication.

A full-length article is normally AROUND 18,000 WORDS, INCLUDING REFERENCES. Please inform the Editor prior to the final draft if you feel that you are likely to exceed that limit significantly. Occasionally, if there is sufficient material to warrant double the normal length, an article may span two issues of the journal as Parts 1 and 2.

The article includes a list of references of all and only works which are either discussed or merely mentioned in the text. Such a list, of about 100 works, represents a selective but broad bibliography of the subject. It may include online publications and conference proceedings. All online publications must be CAREFULLY CHECKED for their online status prior to delivery of the final draft and confirmed at proofs (see example references below).

In addition to positive assessment by reviewers, acceptance of an article is conditional on its not previously having been published or being considered for publication elsewhere.

## A language in focus

This article is normally commissioned and is subject to peer review, and its scope is negotiated between the author and the Editorial Board and its appointed referees. In general, the article is a comprehensive critical survey of recent research on the teaching and learning of a particular language (L2), including an indication of future research needs.

A short PROPOSAL document provides a starting point, indicating to the reviewers how the author proposes to deal with the topic, and detailing sections, subsections, etc., as appropriate. The PROPOSAL should contain at least the following elements: rationale for the work, why it is needed and the perceived purview, suggested sections and sub-sections, a representative selection of the works to be cited, and a CV of the authors. The final product should feature a selective but broad bibliography of some 100 works, and should interest both informed specialists and those looking for an up-to-date introduction to the field under review. The PROPOSAL bibliography, however, should be enough of a representative selection of this final bibliography to enable referees to appreciate the promise of a review that takes in the obvious works and adds a variety of international works.

The guiding principal is to give our international readership a good idea of what is happening in the recent field of a particular L2 in terms of second language acquisition and language teaching research. Our idea is, in this way, to bring to the attention of our wide L2 readership research work that needs to reach a larger audience, aware as we are that perhaps too much of what is published and viewed these days is based on exclusively L2 English applications and there is very often an implied assumption in many papers that one-size-fits-all in methodological terms for all languages, when this is clearly not the case. We also feel that the journal needs to serve practitioner more completely by providing periodic information about, and keeping in touch with, what people are doing in terms of research on other languages than their own.

In general, the article is a comprehensive, state-of-the-art review of recent and current research or development in the L2. It might also include some discussion of research methods and approaches relevant to the area in focus (e.g. recent trends, debates or controversies in researching the particular area). The article should be written in a style that is accessible to a broad readership and should interest both informed specialists and those looking for an up-to-date introduction to the field under review. Care should be taken to avoid making the text read merely as a list of research encountered. Thus, we remind authors of the need to make full use of the opportunity for synthesis that these state-of-the-art articles offer to point out contradictions and omissions – as well as agreement – in the research they review and not hold back from providing a more critical view of what has been done, in what way, and, crucially, the way the data have been obtained. It might be obvious in such a survey of research, but it is important to remember that many read these papers not only for an up-to-date and detailed overview of what is happening but also to be informed of where outcomes and/or conclusions have not been as useful as might have been expected and where improvements, new research agendas, better research methodologies and so on might help (or have helped) move the field forward. Such criticism should not be confined only to the ‘Future directions/research’ section of the paper. Finally, authors should pay attention to the way the local/national context of the research reported on has been understood and interpreted wherever appropriate or significant. Research does not exist in a vacuum, and it is often tempting to report only on outcomes and perhaps underestimate the extent to which local/national policy and education systems, research agendas or even financing may impact what is going on.

A full-length article is normally AROUND 15,000 WORDS, INCLUDING REFERENCES. Please inform the Editor prior to the final draft if you feel that you are likely to exceed that limit significantly. Occasionally, if there is sufficient material to warrant double the normal length, an article may span two issues of the journal as Parts 1 and 2.

The article includes a list of references of all and only works which are either discussed or merely mentioned in the text. Such a list, of about 100 works, represents a selective but broad bibliography of the subject. It may include online publications and conference proceedings. All online publications must be CAREFULLY CHECKED for their online status prior to delivery of the final draft and confirmed at proofs (see example references below).

In addition to positive assessment by reviewers, acceptance of an article is conditional on its not previously having been published or being considered for publication elsewhere. The final draft article is required about ten months ahead of publication to allow for the peer review process, which is intended to judge the paper's suitability for both an informed and less 'expert' audience, and to feed in constructively to an enhanced final version. The Editor appoints at least three reviewers with particular interest and proven experience in the field in question to assist in the process. The names of all readers are printed annually in the volume corresponding to the publication.

## A country in focus

This article is normally commissioned and is subject to peer review, and its scope is negotiated between the author and the Editorial Board and its appointed referees. In general, the article is a comprehensive critical survey of recent research on second language teaching and learning which has been published in a particular country. Preference should be given to significant work which is representative of research on the teaching and learning of a L2s in the target country and which is NOT published internationally, but rather has appeared in local, national publications, conference publications and books - but which are accessible to an outside reader in some form or other. We aim, in this way, to make local, country-specific, research on language learning and teaching available to a wider international readership.

A short PROPOSAL document provides a starting point, indicating to the reviewers how the author proposes to deal with the topic, and detailing sections, subsections, etc., as appropriate. The PROPOSAL should contain at least the following elements: rationale for the work, why it is needed and the perceived purview, suggested sections and sub-sections, a representative selection of the works to be cited, and a CV of the authors. The final product should feature a selective but broad bibliography of some 100 works, and should interest both informed specialists and those looking for an up-to-date introduction to the field under review. The PROPOSAL bibliography, however, should be enough of a representative selection of this final bibliography to enable referees to appreciate the promise of a review that takes in the obvious works and adds a variety of international works.

The guiding principal is to give our international readership a good idea of what is happening 'locally' in a particular country and this is why preference is given to 'national' publications. However, one can no longer refer to notions of LOCAL only in the geographical sense. In a purely geographical sense, 'local' might refer to the place of publication where 'local' is research that is published or presented in national and not in international journals, and especially to research published in languages other than English to other languages of wider communication – such as Spanish, French or German. The distinction between 'international' and 'local' might also refer to the quality, scope and relevance of the research to issues and topics which are under discussion internationally. From this point of view many countries have 'global' scholars who occasionally publish in local outlets and many 'local' researchers who succeed in having their work published in international journals. What then is important perhaps is not so much the place of the publication but the fact that the researchers often write for an international audience when dealing with local data and issues. Banning this work from consideration because it is not 'local' in some puristic sense would produce a highly distorted view of research in the review. In such situations, authors may emphasise locally focused research carried out by international scholars and, at the same time, place the main accent on the research work carried out by local researchers that is not widely accessible.

The final article might also include some discussion of research methods and approaches relevant to the area in focus (e.g. recent trends, debates or controversies in researching the particular area). The article should be written in a style that is accessible to a broad readership and should interest both informed specialists and those looking for an up-to-date introduction to the field under review. Care should be taken to avoid making the text read merely as a list of research encountered. Thus, we remind authors of the need to make full use of the opportunity for synthesis that these state-of-the-art articles offer to point out contradictions and omissions – as well as agreement – in the research they review and not hold back from providing a more critical view of what has been done, in what way, and, crucially, the way the data have been obtained. It might be obvious in such a survey of research, but it is important to remember that many read these papers not only for an up-to-date and detailed overview of what is happening but also to be informed of where outcomes and/or conclusions have not been as useful as might have been expected and where improvements, new research agendas, better research methodologies and so on might help (or have helped) move the field forward. Such criticism should not be confined only to the 'Future directions/research' section

of the paper. Finally, authors should pay attention to the way the local/national context of the research reported on has been understood and interpreted wherever appropriate or significant. Research does not exist in a vacuum, and it is often tempting to report only on outcomes and perhaps underestimate the extent to which local/national policy and education systems, research agendas or even financing may impact what is going on.

A full-length article is normally AROUND 15,000 WORDS, INCLUDING REFERENCES. Please inform the Editor prior to the final draft if you feel that you are likely to exceed that limit significantly. Occasionally, if there is sufficient material to warrant double the normal length, an article may span two issues of the journal as Parts 1 and 2.

The article includes a list of references of all and only works which are either discussed or merely mentioned in the text. Such a list, of about 100 works, represents a selective but broad bibliography of the subject. It may include online publications and conference proceedings. All online publications must be CAREFULLY CHECKED for their online status prior to delivery of the final draft and confirmed at proofs (see example references below).

In addition to positive assessment by reviewers, acceptance of an article is conditional on its not previously having been published or being considered for publication elsewhere. The final draft article is required about ten months ahead of publication to allow for the peer review process, which is intended to judge the paper's suitability for both an informed and less 'expert' audience, and to feed in constructively to an enhanced final version. The Editor appoints at least three reviewers with particular interest and proven experience in the field in question to assist in the process. The names of all readers are printed annually in the volume corresponding to the publication.

## Plenary speeches

LT publishes suitably adapted keynote addresses and plenary speeches delivered at language teaching events and SLA conferences and lecture series around the world, giving readers an insight into current thinking and research agendas worldwide.

In the first instance, speakers and conference sponsors are invited to submit an extended abstract of the intended speech to the Editor so that the Board of the journal may decide whether it is within the current purview of *LT* and thereby agree to a submission for full peer review.

This strand in the journal began in 2007 and has already included over 40 contributions from both international conferences and lecture series from around the world, including the AAAL, CAAL, and ALANZ conferences and various university lecture series. We feel that many of these speeches are of fundamental interest to a wider community than those present at such events and those that read the proceedings if these are published. However, as it stands, relatively few of our international readership will hear about them unless they are published in some other form. In a research survey journal such as ours, it is also an opportunity for speakers promptly to inform a large international readership of what work they are currently undertaking and how this may feed into the wider picture. In many cases, this might also imply the speech in question has a certain ‘shelf-life’, and we aim is to publish the written up version in print by a maximum of 18 months after the original event. However, space has also been negotiated with CUP on their advanced access (‘First View’) platform, whereby the Press is able to publish papers online in a citable form (each paper has its own *doi*. number) well in advance of its appearance in print. In practice, this means a paper can be officially published and seen by the readership within one month of the final manuscript having been accepted by the Editor and its appointed referees and the proof copy approved.

Many speeches presented at conference start life as unscripted notes or *Powerpoint* presentations. This may present one of the challenges of writing to this strand in the journal as we ask that the tone of these contributions be generically different from the surrounding more formally presented research papers in the rest of the journal. Indeed, most speeches in the series so far have first seen the light of day as unscripted *Powerpoint* talks that are subsequently written up with this request in mind. However, there are different ways of going about this task. Our wish to differentiate the tone of these papers from the surrounding ones is mainly aimed at achieving reader-friendliness and attempting to capture something of the original delivery in the written up text. This is not to be translated into too informal and chatty a tone with an excess of verbal ‘fillers’ - rather something that helps place the reader more in the position of the original listener on the day.

*Language Teaching* is a refereed journal and the manuscript is sent to two or three external readers (who might include members of the *LT* Board) for feedback into any final version. Please also remember that these speeches are not intended to be academic research papers in terms of content or presentation: Whilst we expect a correctly referenced, coherently argued paper and original in its main thrust, we might also expect them at times to be provocative and spontaneous. They are not, by their very nature, as ‘rigorous’ in a number of aspects as academic papers. Authors are specifically told that they can ‘adapt’ what was said on the day but should not attempt to write an academic paper reworked from that original speech. As a consequence of this stipulation, authors will not be able to make large revisions to the submitted speech which then may involve them in producing a speech which is substantially different from that original address.

The normal maximum length for this strand is 6500 words WITH references and tables/figures.

## Surveys of Ph.D./Ed.D. theses

*LT* publishes country-by-country overviews of recent doctoral theses on mainstream topics. Authors are asked to present a **critical** review of selected PhD and/or EdD theses within very defined areas which they think best transmit the main thrust of work in SLA and AL currently being carried out in the major institutions in the target country during the period chosen. It is important that specific institutions are not favoured over others in your selections. Authors should be as fair as possible both in the criterion(a) for selection, the institutions selected, and in the selection itself. Bear in mind that you are describing the production of your country of choice and this will be read by an international readership. We are a peer-reviewed journal and referees from the target country will be asked to review the draft paper. The basis for the selection will be explained in the introduction to the paper.

In order to help size the paper down to a manageable database the following suggestion is made to all authors:

1. Select the most important current themes in the scholarship of the country for the specific period chosen.

THEN

2. Within these topics, select the best doctoral scholarship that would have the greatest potential for improving language learning and teaching. Across the topics, this might come to a total of 15-25 best dissertations (doctoral theses), possibly more as needed.

In this way, we make sure that the theses chosen enter totally within the main thrust of the journal, which is foreign language teaching and learning. You may use Richard Johnstone's *Annual Review* headings to find the main topics you choose or you may identify your own. Please also bear in mind the need to cast your net as wide as possible in order not to be seen to favour two or three institutions in particular.

A minimum of 10000 words and a maximum of 12000 words with references is allotted to this strand. As regards authorship, a number of approaches have been taken so far in this series: multiple authors may be needed, as reading a dozen+ PhD/EdD theses will be no mean feat, and will require a range of expertise. Others have recruited recent doctoral and masters graduates to author (individually or possibly in teams) some of these summaries. The initial search might perhaps be done by the main author/s. Subsequently, and depending on what is found, he or she could 'delegate' specific theses to co-authors, who would also be able to recommend whether they are significant and representative enough to be included or not.

As regards the format of the piece, it should be akin to the narratives in literature review chapter in theses, in that most of the space in such a chapter is devoted to narrative summaries of key studies, and the narratives are typically LONGER AND MORE CRITICAL than what appears in a dissertation abstract. Some authors in the series have also gone on to send the critical summary to the thesis authors themselves for them to agree to the basic content expressed. The theses surveyed must also each have clear indications in the references about where they can be accessed by the outside reader.

## Research timelines

The state-of-the-art (SoA) reviews (see above) are, by their nature, long texts (typically over 18000 words), designed to reward a close reading and written to address recent research critically and selectively and include the discussion of trends, debates or controversies in researching the particular area. *LT* provides an additional service to readers with different needs and objectives through the research timelines, which present a more global, historical view of a particular aspect within the field and help readers understand and follow these key developments in a more reader-friendly, ‘time-oriented’ way. Indeed, the research timelines should add to the cumulative effect of the other very original, specific, and helpful research-survey formats of this journal.

The research timeline continues the traditional research survey ethos of *Language Teaching*. The objective is to provide a distinct approach to such a survey: GRAPHICALLY SUMMARISING through the timeline presentation the main shifts and movements and key research in the history of a particular aspect together with the representative bibliographical references. While our SoA reviews have a similar objective in terms of providing the reader with an authoritative and critical description of key RECENT research, the two strands go about things in totally different ways and - crucially for our readership - with different audiences and different needs served. The objective of the SoA is for the author to provide a critical address of key thought and research in a particular aspect and this is normally limited by space to the previous eight to ten years’ work. The research timeline, however, is an historical overview and would be expected to take in a much greater period, but in a way which merely highlighted key research and thought rather than engaged in description and discussion and critical address of recent events. It would, in this sense, be the starting point for a reader to delve deeper into more critical address of the area. It will make it possible to spot the emerging tendencies, as well as actually monitor the development of research and learn quickly about the main ‘players’.

It is suggested a maximum of around 40-50 key works be included in a timeline and each must be followed by its respective entry in the references column. The referee(s), who will see this anonymously, will doubtless also have their ideas of what should or should not go in - particularly when we are dealing with a limited number of works upon which to be commented so succinctly. The final outcome, however, is with the author to decide as the expert whether such recommendations have had the historical importance and ‘reverberation’ (and citations is one of the most important criteria for this of course) to be included in such a summary. The key to inclusion is how far the timeline author is convinced of, and can justify, the historical relevance of a piece of work to be cited.

There is a maximum word limit of 5000 words including the short introduction. It is important to understand that the timeline is NOT a mere collection of unrelated bibliographical references accompanied by summaries of each paper. The text entry/annotation itself should indicate clearly why the work is significant and, in as many cases as appropriate, indicate how it fits in with the flow of work that has gone before and after it. Thus, ideally, the finished product should help a reader understand from your timeline the context of ideas and their development - and by extension, a sense of the ratio of transitory to long-term ideas and meaningfulness. In this sense the text will be well-signposted throughout in relation to the historical importance of each work and how later or previous work fits in with it – in other words. we are looking for clear signposts in the annotations of how work progressed and evolved from what went on previously in practical and theoretical terms. The reader should - wherever appropriate - perceive development and continuity between the events and work highlighted.

The timeline should be prefaced by a short introduction which should include the criteria for selection of the work and the delimitation of the area chosen; obviously here we run the risk in this timeline - as is the case in our other reviews – of opening the debate as to exactly who ARE the main ‘players’ who have contributed to significant shifts and movements in a particular domain in the field. But as with all our reviews you will need to stick your neck out here and

justify your selection. That is why the kind of introduction suggested is going to be useful, not as a defence but rather as a rationale.

## Thinking allowed

This new strand in the journal provides a space for contributors to present a personal stance either on future research needs or on the perceived current applications of research in the classroom. Like much of our current content, it echoes the historical uniqueness of this journal in terms of its rich and expert critical overview of recent research in the field of L2 teaching and learning. However, this new strand takes such research as its starting point and attempts to look forward, using these findings both to debate their application in the language learning classroom and also to suggest where research is best directed in the future. Thus, the objective of both papers is eminently practical: contributors to the RESEARCH AGENDA will present suggestions for what research might usefully be undertaken given what is currently known or what is seen to be necessary. In the RESEARCH INTO PRACTICE papers there will be critical appraisal both of what research is, and is not, getting through to the language learning classroom and practical suggestions made for improving such outcomes.

In the RESEARCH AGENDA, a recognised authority in the particular area sets a (personal but generalisable) research agenda for the next ten to fifteen years or so. *LT* has traditionally, in its SoA reviews, limited its purview to what has been done and by whom. However, many of our readers are students directed to the publication by university faculty not only for them to find out what has been done but also to work out where their projected research might fit in with a current or future agenda and, thereby, be more attractive as a contribution and, indeed, a publishable paper for journals in our field. Many also wish to find a niche for themselves and read the journal to trigger interest in some as yet perhaps unconsidered research area. All the contributors to this section are also asked specifically to highlight key studies which merit or require suitable replication and explain why (i.e., the need for more data or from different variables to determine better validity, reliability and generalisability of the original study). *Language Teaching* has been associated for some years with the promotion of such research work, and this is a good opportunity to underline its importance to the field with some practical suggestions.

The RESEARCH INTO PRACTICE paper will attempt to answer a need for a critical review which informs the readership about what exactly IS managing to get through or is succeeding in being taken up, or at least tested successfully or otherwise, in the second/foreign language teaching and learning classroom. Its principle aim is to inform and invite the reader to respond, either in terms of opinion or materialised in research itself which answers a need expressed in the paper. Unlike our other surveys, however, this section firstly has a much narrower remit in terms of the geographical context covered (each author will doubtless want to cover only those areas with which he or she is most familiar in terms of classroom practice) as well as a delimited area of the subject (e.g., ‘Revision’ rather than ‘L2 writing’). It will also present a necessarily more personal/subjective – although evidence-based – view of what is going on. There is, in theory, some overlap between the two sub-strands mentioned above. For example, a conclusion of a *Research into practice* piece might well end up suggesting what research needs to be done in order to feed into teaching needs, perhaps. Nevertheless, the aim is to produce two different angles and the research in practice paper is one that should be firmly grounded in evidence as to what has or has not got through to the teaching end together with speculation as to why it has or has not succeeded.

Both papers are envisaged to be approximately 5000 words in length.

## Replication research studies

A section of the journal is reserved for academic studies which use a replication approach: we invite submissions of previously unpublished articles based on LITERAL, APPROXIMATE OR CONSTRUCTIVE REPLICATION OF A PREVIOUS STUDY OR STUDIES of an aspect of L2 education. In keeping with the survey characteristics of *Language Teaching*, we also encourage submissions of meta-analyses which attempt to combine or synthesise a series of comparable research replications. Papers can be based on a broad range of topics, including:

- language teaching
- teacher training
- curriculum design and materials development
- language learning
- language testing
- teacher education
- neurolinguistics
- bilingualism/bilingual education
- sociolinguistics
- psycholinguistics
- pragmatics

LITERAL (OR EXACT) REPLICATION is the exact duplication of a previous methodologically sound study whereby the procedures and conditions are repeated to confirm the original findings. APPROXIMATE (OR SYSTEMATIC) REPLICATION involves the duplication of the methods of the original study as closely as possible but altering some variable (e.g. with a different subject group, age group, sex, etc.). CONSTRUCTIVE (OR CONCEPTUAL) REPLICATION means beginning with a similar problem statement as the original study but creating a new means or design to verify the original findings. Exact duplication of the original procedures is deliberately avoided. Thus, for example, different, but related, measures such as observation versus self-report, or using both quantitative and qualitative measures will help add to the body of knowledge obtained in the original report by validating the outcomes using two different techniques. Successful constructive replications provide stronger support for the original theory or hypothesis since evidence is provided that the outcomes are not limited to one particular methodology used. Authors should make it clear in their texts which kind of replication has been used, why and how.

Replication study articles SHOULD NOT NORMALLY EXCEED 8000 WORDS WITH REFERENCES. Please indicate the number of words at the end of the paper.

*Language Teaching's* commitment to publishing replication studies reflects the editor's belief that such research should play a more significant role in the field than it has up to now. The potential for reproducing studies in order to validate results is a requirement of scientific inquiry and should become more prominent in establishing and confirming the outcomes of L2 learning and teaching studies. We encourage replication studies because we believe that such work is both useful and necessary. Firstly, replications can improve the way in which we interpret empirical research because they provide a 'second opinion' on the procedures and results presented in the original work. Secondly, replications encourage researchers to introduce further variables or contexts alongside those used originally. Thus, evidence is provided about whether different approaches produce different results. If they do, judgments must be made about why this has happened and a further contribution to our knowledge is achieved. When results are consistent across two or more non-trivial studies, the basis for observed relationship(s) is stronger than the evidence of each individual study, since results that have been replicated are considered more likely to be generalisable.

Among the principal factors reviewers consider when recommending a paper for

publication are the following:

- The original replicated study is a significant contribution to the field, and so needful of replication, in terms of its content and/or its impact on the field, and has been published in a refereed-journal within the field.
- The study replicates a previous study or studies in a sound and thorough manner which helps throw more light on the validity, reliability, and/or credibility of previous results and helps the field to generalise from them. In this way, the paper can be said to make a significant contribution to the field.
- The paper is presented in a way which makes it accessible to the broad readership of the journal and not only to specialists in the area covered.
- The paper has clear implications for people working in a wide variety of different L2 learning and teaching contexts.
- The Introduction/Problem Statement section provides a satisfactory overview of the current situation in the field with respect to the object of study and explains the need for, and objectives of, the replication undertaken.
- The Methods and Analysis sections describe exactly what modifications were made with respect to the original study (or studies) and how they were carried out.
- The Methods and Analysis sections include enough detail to permit further replication.
- Results and Discussion/Conclusion sections comment sufficiently on key comparisons with the original study and/or previous replications. Suggestions are made for further research based on the findings.
- To facilitate the interpretation of the data and the future compilation of meta-analyses, reports on research using quantitative and/or statistical methods include an adequate and appropriate measure of effect size and alpha levels illustrating the main relationships highlighted in the research.

Authors are asked to confirm the following before we process the paper further:

1. That the manuscript submitted is not published or in press, or currently being reviewed or considered for publication elsewhere.
2. If this study is part of a larger study or if you have used the same data in whole or in part in other papers, both already published or under review. If this is the case, please state where the paper is published/under review and describe clearly and in as much detail as you think necessary where the similarities and differences are and how the current submission to *Language Teaching* makes a different and distinct contribution to the field.

## Research in progress reports

Contributions are written to interest and inform the international readership of *Language Teaching* and typically focus on ongoing or recently-completed research projects, or relevant activities of research groups. Reports may include accounts of a single project/event or a collection of projects/events at a single institution or within a single organisation. They may include descriptions of research underway in various university departments by both students and faculty. Reports on symposia or round table discussion may also be submitted to this section.

The usual length of a research report is up to 2500 words, including references, although sometimes, of course, a research project or the activities of a research group can be described effectively in some 800-1000 words. Naturally, research reports are not refereed but there usually are editorial queries and comments to be consulted with authors before the final version of a report is produced.

## Submission procedure

The Editor should be consulted in the early stages of planning a submission in order to agree a suitable timeline. The initial draft manuscript must be reader-friendly but need not yet conform to the house-style of *Language Teaching* (see below, 'House style check list'). Only papers accepted for publication should strictly follow the formatting requirements stated below. All manuscripts should be sent in electronic form to the Editor:

**editorlanguageteaching@gmail.com**

The peer review process is intended to judge the paper's suitability for both an informed and less 'expert' audience, and to feed in constructively to an enhanced final version. To assist in the process, the Editor appoints at least three reviewers with particular interest and proven experience in the field in question. Authors are welcome to put forward names of potential reviewers familiar with the field under review, if they wish. The names of the reviewers are printed annually in the volume in which the papers which they have reviewed have been published. In addition to positive assessment by reviewers and the Editor, acceptance of an article is conditional on its not previously having been published or being considered for publication elsewhere.

## Copyright

Authors are required to assign copyright to Cambridge University Press (on certain conditions). Upon publication all authors receive a PDF file with the printed version of their paper.

## Proofs

Authors will be asked by e-mail to download the proofs of their articles in the form of a PDF file. They will be responsible for proofreading their text and sending proof corrections as instructed within three working days of the receipt of the e-mail notification.

## House style check list

- Please arrange for satisfactory proof-reading of your draft manuscript if your first language is not English. Manuscripts are sent back to the author(s) where serious language deficiencies remain in the text.
- Manuscripts should be DOUBLE-SPACED throughout (including the references), font TIMES 12 POINT.
- Each page should be numbered, with the page number displayed in the TOP RIGHT corner TIMES 12 POINT throughout the manuscript.
- The right margin should be ragged.
- Title page:** should include the title, author's name, affiliation and email address (see example below).
- Title page:** an abstract of 100–200 words and author's biographical note of up to 100 words. Both will appear in the printed article. The note should include the author's current academic position and **full postal address**, and describe his/her research interests and publications (see examples below).
- The first paragraph beginning each new section should be flush with the left margin; subsequent paragraphs should be indented.
- Do not** use an extra blank line to separate paragraphs and **do not** use automatic paragraph marking.
- Sections:** both sections and subsections should be numbered, normally up to three levels in articles (e.g., 1, 1.1, 1.1.1).
- Sections:** All section and subsection titles should be in sentence-style capitalisation.
- Sections:** Section-heading line should be in bold and any **subsection**-heading lines should be in normal font type (i.e. no bold and no italics).
- Sections:** Section and sub-section numbering to be set manually. **Do not** use automatic section numbering.
- Emphasis:** Words or phrases receiving particular emphasis, including technical terms at first mention, should be in SMALL CAPITALS. This function can be found in WORD in the “fonts” section, under “small caps”.
- Linguistic examples and other text in languages other than English:** Examples from English and other languages should be set in italics and, in the latter case, followed by an English gloss or translation (see examples below).
- Linguistic examples and other text in languages other than English:** Longer quotations from non-English sources should normally be given in the text in English translation; the original wording may appear in the accompanying footnote.

- URLs:** Ensure URLs are supplied in accurate spelling and that they lead to active websites or web pages. (All the links should be checked at proofs and any amendments should be included in the list of proof corrections).
- Footnotes and endnotes:** Footnotes should be avoided as much as possible. If present, they should be formatted as ENDNOTES though they will appear as footnotes in the printed text. Automatic endnote numbering/formatting is permitted.
- Acknowledgements and appendixes:** Conventional ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS should be expressed in a paragraph just **before** References, in a short section headed 'Acknowledgements'. If present, appendixes should be located **between** the main text and the acknowledgements.
- In-text references:** References made IN THE BODY OF THE TEXT should give the name of the author and year of publication, and – where relevant – the page number(s). See examples below.
- In-text references (quotations):** Direct citations should appear in SINGLE ROUNDED quotation marks. Double quotation marks are used ONLY for quotes within quotes. Longer quotations can be set apart from the paragraph. See examples below.
- In-text references (multiple works):** Where more than one work is cited in a list, they are listed **CHRONOLOGICALLY**, and alphabetically only if more than one work is listed for the same year. See examples below.
- In-text references:** **NO COMMA** between the author's name and the year. Note that **DIFFERENT WORKS ARE SEPARATED BY “;”**, e.g., Dickinson 1995; Ushioda 1996b; Benson & Voller 1997; Ehrman & Dörnyei 1998
- In-text references (joint authors):** **There is an ampersand (&)** in place of the word 'and' in joint-authors' citations.
- In-text references (multiple authors):** Works by three co-authors or co-editors are referred to IN FULL at first mention (e.g. 'as is argued in Zuengler, Ford & Fassnacht (1998)') and in short subsequently throughout (e.g. 'Zuengler et al. (1998) also note'). Works by more than three authors are referred to in short even at first mention (e.g. 'Schegloff et al. (2002)'). The abbreviation 'et al.' is NOT in italics.
- In-text references (page numbers):** the page number(s) follow(s) a colon and a space, page number spans are marked with a **LONG dash (–)**, NOT an ordinary dash (-). See examples below. **LONG dash (–) is also used for page spans in the reference list.** Use Alt+0150 on the numeric keypad.
- Reference list:** Check that all the in-text works appear in the reference list AND vice-versa.
- Reference list:** All references cited in the text should be listed in alphabetic

order at the end of the article, with a hanging indent, and should follow the model examples given further below.

- Reference list: Author's surname** should be given before the initial(s) in the initial part of the entry only and all subsequent names should be given with the initial(s) before the surname; any adjacent initials should be separated by a space.
- Reference list (Date format):** Names should be followed by date of publication in parentheses and then by a full stop.
- Reference list (Editors):** To indicate the EDITOR(S), use separate parentheses before the date, e.g. Smith, A. M. (1989).; Smith, F. N., R. D. Burton & J. T. O'Reilly (eds.) (1993).; Turner, S. H. (ed.) (2004). Please note the use of '&' in place of 'and'.
- Reference list (Titles):** Book titles, chapter titles and article titles should be in sentence-case throughout i.e. capitals only for the initial letters of the title and proper names. Titles should be followed BY A FULL-STOP. See examples below.
- Reference list (Titles):** Book titles AND periodical titles should be in italics, and periodical titles should be in title-case; e.g. *Reading in a Foreign Language; Language, Culture and Curriculum*. Please note that the full-stop immediately after a book title should NOT be in italic.
- Reference list (Editions):** If a second (or third, etc.) edition of a book is referenced, this should be indicated in parentheses following the title, before the full stop; e.g. *Language learning outside the classroom: A curious experience* (2nd edn). NOTE NO STOP AFTER edn)
- Reference list (Place of publication):** Place of publication should be followed by a colon and the name of the publisher, followed by a full stop. The publisher's name should be given IN FULL; e.g. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Oxford: Oxford University Press; Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Reference list (Chapter/paper in an edited book):** Where a CHAPTER/ARTICLE IN AN EDITED BOOK is cited, the author(s), date and title of the chapter should be followed by the full details of the book in which it appears, together with the article page numbers. However, IF MORE THAN ONE CHAPTER OF A GIVEN BOOK IS CITED, the book's editor(s) and the article page numbers are given in the chapter/article entry briefly, and the book itself is fully referenced elsewhere in the bibliography; e.g. In Smith et al. (eds.), 123–156. Note that page spans are presented with LONG hyphens (use the INSERT SYMBOL function in MS Word).

- Reference list (Article in a periodical):** Where an ARTICLE IN A PERIODICAL is cited, the name of the periodical should be followed by the volume number and part-number, a comma and the page numbers; e.g. *The Modern Language Journal* 16.3, 234–256. Note there is **NO COMMA** after the periodical name.
- Reference list (Titles in other languages):** Titles of books and articles in languages other than English should generally not be translated. Rather, the following note should be inserted at the beginning of the References:
 

‘Given space limitations, titles are given in the original language(s) only. Readers interested in their English translations should contact the author at [email address]’.

This applies particularly to survey articles. Where non-English titles appear in the References sporadically, an English translation should be set in square brackets and immediately follow the title (cf. see Zifoun et al. example below). Non-English journal titles are not to be translated.
- Tables and figures:** Each table and each figure should be numbered in separate respective sequences, and each table and each figure should have a caption. Tables and figures should be formatted consistently for style (appearance). Tables should include **HORIZONTAL LINES ONLY**, unless vertical lines are strictly essential for the transparency of a given table.
- Tables and figures:** Each figure should be supplied in a separate DOC file AND a corresponding PDF file, **WITHOUT** any captions or other annotations; the identity of the figure will be clear from the file’s name, e.g. Jones-Fig1doc, Jones-Fig1.pdf, Jones-Fig2.doc, Jones-Fig2.pdf, etc. Please use only black, white and grey in figure and table files (**NO colour**). Figures should be of high quality, with resolution at least 400 dpi.

To avoid potential problems associated with file transfers, authors should submit all the electronic material in PDF files **IN ADDITION TO** the files in the usual editing format (MS Word or similar). PDF files are requested especially for figure files and any material which includes IPA or other special symbols.

## Example title pages

### STATE OF THE ART PAPER

#### **Recent developments in language assessment and the case of four large-scale tests of ESOL ability**

**Stephen Stoyhoff**

Minnesota State University, Mankato, USA

stephen.stf@mnsu.edu

This should be followed by an abstract of 100–200 words and author's biographical note of up to 100 words. Both will appear in the printed article. The note should include the author's current academic position and **full postal address**, and describe his/her research interests and publications.

---

### L2 OR COUNTRY-SPECIFIC PAPER

#### **Review of recent research (2002-2009) on applied linguistics and language teaching with specific reference to L2 German**

**Johannes Eckerth**

Kings College, University of London

johannes.eckerth@kcl.ac.uk

OR

#### **Research in applied linguistics and language teaching and learning in Singapore (2000-2007)**

Rani Rubdy

National Institute of Education, Singapore

ranibdy@nie.edu.sg

T. Ruanni F. Tupas

National University of Singapore

eltr@nus.edu.sg

This should be followed by an abstract of 100–200 words (**IN THE L2 CONCERNED AS WELL AS IN ENGLISH**) and author's biographical note of up to 100 words. Both will appear in the printed article. The note should include the author's current academic position and **full postal address**, and describe his/her research interests and publications

---

#### **PH.D./ED.D. REVIEW PAPER**

##### **Review of doctoral research in second language acquisition in Wales (2003-2008)**

**Tess Fitzpatrick**, Swansea University, UK

t.fitzpatri@swansea.ac.uk

This should be followed by an abstract of 100–200 words and author's biographical note of up to 100 words. Both will appear in the printed article. The note should include the author's current academic position and **full postal address**, and describe his/her research interests and publications.

---

#### **RESEARCH TIMELINE PAPER**

##### **Research timeline**

##### **Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition**

**James P. Lantolf & Tracy G. Beckett**

The Pennsylvania State University, USA

jpo7@psu.edu, tbb130@psu.edu

This should be followed by the author's biographical note of up to 100 words. The note should include the author's current academic position and **full postal address**, and describe his/her research interests and publications.

---

**THINKING ALLOWED PAPER****Vygotskian theory and second language learning: a research agenda****James P. Lantolf**

The Pennsylvania State University, USA

jpo7@psu.edu

This should be followed by the author's biographical note of up to 100 words. The note should include the author's current academic position and **full postal address**, and describe his/her research interests and publications.

**OR****Research into practice: L2 revision practices in Spain****Anthony Bruton**

Universidad de Sevilla

abton@us.es

This should be followed by the author's biographical note of up to 100 words. The note should include the author's current academic position and **full postal address**, and describe his/her research interests and publications.

---

**PLENARY SPEECH****Many lessons from a school: What classroom discourse analysis reveals**

Jane Zuengler

University of Wisconsin-Madison

zuengrj@wisc.edu

Revised version of a plenary address given at the 2009 SLA Student Symposium, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, April 19, 2009

This should be followed by an abstract of 100–200 words and author's biographical note of up to 100 words. Both will appear in the printed article. The note should include the author's current academic position and **full postal address**, and describe his/her research interests and publications.

---

## **REPLICATION STUDIES**

### **Negotiated interaction in the L2 classroom: An approximate replication of Foster (1998)**

Johannes Eckerth

Department of Education & Professional Studies

King's College London

johannes.eckerth@kcl.ac.uk

This should be followed by an abstract of 100–200 words and author's biographical note of up to 100 words. Both will appear in the printed article. The note should include the author's current academic position and **full postal address**, and describe his/her research interests and publications.

---

## **RESEARCH IN PROGRESS PAPER**

Use this example

### **SYMPOSIUM OR COLLOQUIUM REPORT**

#### **Symposium: Accentuating the positive: Directions in pronunciation research**

Presented at the Association canadienne de linguistique appliquée/ Canadian Association of

Applied Linguistics conference, Ottawa, May 27, 2009

OR, IN A RESEARCH REPORT

**English Language and Literature Academic Group at the National Institute of Education,  
Singapore**

AT THE END OF THE ARTICLE please place the author(s) name(s) as follows:

Benny P. H. Lee

benny.lee@nie.edu.sg

---

## Linguistic examples and other text in languages other than English

students find it easy to use *this* and *that* appropriately

compare Fr. *nuit* ‘night’, which corresponds to Sp. *noche* and It. *notte*, then Sp. *leche* ‘milk’ and It. *latte* correspond to Fr. *lait*

Finally, accomplishment terms are ‘telic’ in that they have an endpoint and they also have inherent duration (e.g. *faire un dessin* ‘draw a picture’).

## In text-references examples

A number of recent reviews and discussions (e.g. Dickinson 1995; Ushioda 1996b; Benson & Voller 1997; Ehrman & Dörnyei 1998) provide evidence that L2 motivation and learner autonomy go hand in hand, that is, ‘enhanced motivation is conditional on learners taking responsibility for their own learning ... and perceiving that their learning successes and failures are to be attributed to their own efforts and strategies rather than to factors outside their control’ (Dickinson 1995: 173–176).

The most influential pioneering article in this vein is usually considered to be Crookes & Schmidt (1991), and a good summary of the various positions is provided by the ‘*The Modern Language Journal* debate’ (Dörnyei 1994a, b; Gardner & Tremblay 1994a, b; Oxford 1994; Oxford & Shearin 1994).

## Reference list examples

### AN ARTICLE IN A PERIODICAL

Dörnyei, Z. (1997a). Motivational factors in second language attainment: A review of research in Hungary. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 44.3, 261–275.

Dörnyei, Z. (1997b). Psychological processes in cooperative language learning: Group dynamics and motivation. *The Modern Language Journal* 81.4, 482–493.

Dörnyei, Z. & A. Malderez (1997). Group dynamics and foreign language teaching. *System* 25.1, 65–81.

Schegloff, E. A., I. Koshik, S. Jacoby & D. Olsher (2002). Conversation Analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22, 3–31.

#### **A CHAPTER/ARTICLE IN AN EDITED BOOK**

- Covington, M. V. & B. W. Roberts (1994). Self-worth and college achievement: Motivational and personality correlates. In P. R. Pintrich, D. R. Brown & C. E. Weinstein (eds.), *Student motivation, cognition, and learning* (3rd edn). New York: Continuum, 157–187.
- Deci, E. L. (1992). The relation of interest to the motivation of behavior: A self-determination theory perspective. In K. A. Renninger, S. Hidi & A. Krapp (eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development* (vol. 2). Austin, TX: Labyrinth Publications, 43–70.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1996). Moving language learning motivation to a larger platform for theory and practice. In Oxford (ed.), 89–101.
- Ford, C. & S. Thompson (1996). Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Ochs et al. (eds.), 134–184.
- Goodwin, C. (1996). Transparent vision. In Ochs et al. (eds.), 370–404.
- Thompson, A. (1981). *Classroom language and behavior*. In Oxford (ed.), 221–240.

#### **A BOOK**

- Ajzen, I. & M. Fishbein (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour* (2 vols.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Alatis, J. E., H. B. Altman & P. M. Alatis (eds.) (1981). *The second language classroom: Directions for the eighties*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arnold, J. (ed.) (in press). *Affect in language learning* (3rd edn). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, A., E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (eds.) (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

#### **OTHER**

- Cooke, M., M. L. G. Lecumberri, J. Maidment & A. Ericsson (no date). Web Transcription Tool. <http://www.Wtt.Org.Uk>
- Haznedar, B. (1997). Child second language acquisition of English: A longitudinal case study of a Turkish-speaking child. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Durham.
- HCMP (Humanities Computing and Methodology Programme) (2001). Hong Kong, Mainland China & Taiwan: Chinese character frequency – a transregional, diachronic survey. Chinese University of Hong Kong. <http://www.arts.cuhk.edu.hk/Lexis/chifreq/>.
- Oslo Corpus of Tagged Norwegian Texts (no date). <http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/norsk/bokmaal/english.html>.
- Zifonun, G., L. Hoffmann & B. Strecker (1997). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache* [A grammar of the German language]. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Reinders, H., H. Anderson, M. Hobbs & J. Jones-Parry (eds.) (2004). *Supporting independent learning in the 21st century*. Proceedings of the inaugural conference of the Independent Learning Association, Melbourne September 13–14 2003. Auckland: Independent Learning Association Oceania.
- Bilingualism as the key to educational success, *La Razón* (Newspaper),

25 June 2006, p. 127.

The in-text reference can be a truncated version of the title + year. It should be clear from the context or explicit wording that the thing cited is from a newspaper.

Last updated: 28/10/2011 gp