DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 838 FL 017 662

AUTHOR Peretz, Arna S.
TITLE Language and EFL Teacher Preparation in Non-English-Speaking Environments.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 33p.; Best copy available.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Change Strategies; Educational Objectives; *English (Second Language); *Language Proficiency; *Language Teachers; Learning Strategies; Linguistic Theory; Second Language Learning; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS *Nonnative Speakers

ABSTRACT

Linguistic and paralinguistic problems faced by non-native-English speakers training to be teachers of English as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL) in non-English-speaking environments are discussed. Relevant theories of second language learning and acquisition are reviewed, and the affective factors and sociccultural variables that appear to be related to adult foreign-language learning are examined. Drawing on this literature, the strategies and characteristics of "good" language learners are identified, and implications for the preparation of ESL teachers in non-English-speaking environments are outlined. It is proposed that the language proficiency standards for this group be lowered to a more realistic level, and that the focus in their language training be on knowledge, skills, and attitudes of value to nonspecialized language learners and on proficiency to attain classroom purposes. A 40-item bibliography is included. (MSE)

# LANGUAGE AND EFL TEACHER PREPARATION IN NON-ENGLISH-SPEAKING ENVIRONMENTS

Arna S. Feretz
Ben Gurion University of the Negev

ABSTRACT

It is clear that teacher preparation consists of many variables. In this paper I will briefly discuss linguistic and paralinguistic difficulties faced by non-English-speaking EFL trainees whose teacher preparation occurs in non-English-speaking environments. Selected theories of second language learning and acquisition will be reviewed and those affective factors and socio-cultural variables which appear to relate to adult foreign-language learners will be noted. I will briefly identify the strategies and characteristics of "good" language learners and conclude by discussing some implications for the preparation of EFL teachers in non-English-speaking environments.

## INTRODUCTION

It has been said that non-English-speaking EFL teacher trainees in non-English-speaking environments must learn to do something very much harder than native-speaking trainees (Britten 1988, Edge 1988, Medgyes 1986). They need to establish communication in a foreign language (English) with students who probably share their own mother tongue. They must be able to function socially as users of English. They must also learn how to focus the learners' attention on specific features of English form and function, how to model the language, motivate and organize its

practice and its use, and explain its workings. In other words, they must become teachers of the language. Non-English-speaking EFL teacher trainees also need to be able to talk about the language itself to analyse it, to understand how it works, and to make judgments about acceptability in doubtful cases; that is, they need to be able to function as analysts of the language. Furthermore, they must master a set of professional skills which will have to be performed in the foreign language (English). They have to outgrow not only ideas about teaching and learning foreign languages - ideas which were acquired as pupils in schools only a few years earlier - but also perhaps previous ideas about the nature of language and what it means to know a language.

Although teacher preparation consists of many variables, this paper focuses on the linguistic and paralinguistic difficulties faced by non-English-speaking teachers of EFL and reviews selected research in second language acquisition theory in relation to the adult learner of second and foreign languages. The paper concludes with a discussion of some implications for the teacher preparation of non-English-speaking EFL trainees in non-English-speaking environments.

## LINGUISTIC AND PARALINGUISTIC DIFFICULTIES

The difficulty faced by prospective EFL teachers who are non-native speakers of English and whose preparation will be

conducted in a non-English-speaking environment is the acquisition of those linguistic and paralinguistic features of English which will enable them to teach English at specified levels, for different purposes, and to different age groups. This difficulty relates to communicative competence and the variables of which it is comprised. Such variables, of written and spoken language, include the acquisition of registers and styles, communicative acts, and nonverbal dimensions of language (Brown 1980; Strevens 1977).

Styles or registers of language differ according to context--subject matter, audience, mode of discourse (written or spoken), and formality (Brown 1980; Strevens 1977). The acquisition of registers is difficult for second language learners as it involves both linguistic- and culture-learning. The latter includes what Brown (1980) has termed "cross-cultural variation" (p. 193), which is a major obstacle as it is comprised of cognitive and affective understanding of appropriate or inappropriate levels of formality.

A second factor concerns communication which has been defined as "a combination of acts...used systematically to accomplish particular purposes" (Brown 1980:193). For example, while a learner might acquire correct word order, syntax, and lexical items, he/she might not understand how to achieve a desired or intended function. In other words, the second language learner might not select the words, structure, intonation, and nonverbal

signals that will enable him/her to realize his/her intent.

Rules of conversation constitute another aspect of communicative competence. Rules of conversation include verbal and nonverbal conventions of attention getting, topic nomination, topic development, and topic termination (Brown 1980).

Still another variable is related to personality functions. Empathy, self-esteem, dominance, and other personality attributes affect conversation since language and personality are intricately entwined.

The final factor is the nonverbal dimension of communicative competence, which involves knowledge of all the varying nonverbal semantics of the second or foreign culture, as well as an ability to both send and receive nonverbal signals unambiguously (Brown 1980). Nonverbal communication includes kinesics or body language, eye contact, physical proximity, kinesthetics or touching, artifacts or clothing and jewelry, and the olfactory modality.

Communicative competence, however, refers not only to the mastery of a surface linguistic code; it also includes the development of an awareness of and sensitivity to the values and traditions of the target language culture (Tucker and Lambert 1973). It can thus be said that language is a social institution without which there would be no meaningful interpersonal communication.

## SELECTED THEORIES OF SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING AND ACQUISITION

Before discussing affective variables and sociocultural factors that affect second language learning and acquisition, I will briefly review Bialystok's model of second language learning and Krashen's research on second language acquisition and learning.

Bialystok's (1978) model of second language learning was developed in an attempt to explain why language learning proceeds at different rates for different individuals. The model is organized on three levels: input (language exposure), knowledge (storage - linguistic and other knowledge), and output (responses - comprehension and production).

Input refers to the language and situation to which the learner is exposed. Knowledge is divided into two types: linguistic and other knowledge. Linguistic knowledge is both explicit (the conscious facts the learner possesses about the language and his/her ability to articulate those facts) and implicit (the information the speaker has that he/she uses automatically, spontaneously, and intuitively in language tasks). The distinction between the two types of language is one of function, not content. Since language fluency depends on implicit knowledge, the aim of language learning is to increase the learner's implicit information and knowledge. Other knowledge refers to all other information the learner brings to the language task.

Output refers to the product - to language comprehension or to language production. There are two types of output or responses: immediate and spontaneous, and deliberate and occurring after a delay. The former is associated with speaking which demands fluency, while the latter may be associated with reading and writing which permit review and monitoring as there are few time constraints (Bialystok 1978).

Language learning, according to Bialystok (1978), involves processes and strategies. The input processes relate input to knowledge while the output processes relate knowledge to output. In the input process, the type of language or situation to which the learner is exposed directly affects the knowledge source. In traditional classrooms, where the focus is on formal rules and form, explicit linguistic knowledge is emphasized. Exposure in communicative settings or in immersion programs increases the learner's implicit knowledge of the language while emphasis on subject matter in the target language increases the other knowledge.

The output process describes how language is used for communication, i.e. for comprehension and production. Since communication is generally spontaneous and free from monitoring, it is associated with implicit linguistic knowledge. Monitoring, which involves the use of explicit linguistic knowledge, occurs only under particular situations (Bialystok 1978).

Bialystok (1978) noted that individual learner characteristics, such as attitude, personality, motivation, and language learning aptitude, "determine the efficiency with which the model will operate for particular individuals without changing the nature of that operation in terms of the possible strategies or processes" (p. 80). In other words, the processes and strategies involved in second language learning are the same for all learners. Differences in learning rate and achievement are accounted for by differences in individual characteristics.

Hypotheses about second language acquisition were summarized by Krashen (1981a):

1. Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis - According to this hypothesis, adults both acquire and learn a language. Language acquisition requires participation in natural communication settings without conscious attention to form. It is a subconscious process which appears to develop similarly in all learners of a given language. Language acquisition requires meaningful and communicative use of the language. Language learning, on the other hand, is a conscious process. It occurs in a formal language learning situation or in a self-study program and is accompanied by feedback, error correction, and rule isolation in artificial settings. Language learning is conscious knowledge about the language (grammar), or formal knowledge, or explicit knowledge (Krashen 1976, 1978, 1981a).

2. Monitor Hypothesis - Krashen (1977a, 1977b, 1978) attempted by means of the Monitor Model, to explain the different ways adults learn and perform in a second language. He proposed that adult second language learners develop and employ two systems or processes - one acquired and one learned. The acquired system is similar to Bialystok's (1978) implicit linguistic knowledge and functional practice, while the learned system, which acts as a Monitor, can be compared to Bialystok's (1978) strategies of formal practice and monitoring.

Three types of Monitor users were identified and described by Kounin and Krashen (1978) and Krashen (1981b). Over-users constantly refer to the conscious grammar when using the second language. Over-use is also the result of a lack of acquisition, as in those foreign language classrooms where the empohasis is on conscious grammar. Over-users exhibit a hesitant, over-careful manner of speaking, and are often difficult to understand. The second type of Monitor user has been called the under-user. Under-users do not seem to use or be aware of grammar at all; they appear to speak by "feel", using a subconsciously acquired system. They seem to be immune to error correction and do not perform well on grammar tests. They may, however, "control impressive amounts of the target language without the benefit of conscious rules" (Kounin and Krashen 1978:207) and "often use quite complex constructions" (Krashen 1981b:4). The best performer is the optimal Monitor user who is concerned with form

and knows the rules but uses the Monitor when it is appropriate, i.e. when there is time.

3. Input Hypothesis - In his Input Hypothesis, Krashen (1980, 1981b) theorized that competence in a second language can be acquired without production. Acqusition seems to occur best when language learners are able to, and do, focus on the message and not on the form. Structure is acquired as a result of understanding. It was suggested that the language acquisition process is enhanced when the learner is presented, through reading or hearing, with language, including structure, that is understandable and at the same time just beyond his/her current level of competence. Optimal input, which gets progressively more complex, must be understood, be at the appropriate level, and be natural and interesting (Krashen 1980, 1981b).

Studies and informal accounts have indicated that delaying speech in second language learning, when active listening is provided, may be beneficial to the second language learner. Input methods which require the second language learner to listen actively while the teacher speaks, thus providing a silent period, encourage second language acquisition. When the second language learner is forced to communicate, i.e. to produce, before he/she has acquired enough of the second or target language, the learner originates the utterance in the native language and translates it into the target language by using the Monitor (Stevick 1980). In such cases, the surface structure of the native language

interferes with or influences second-language production. Such interference or influence is "most prevalent in acquisition-poor environments, such as foreign-language situations" (Krashen 1978:13).

## AFFECTIVE AND SOCIOCULTURAL FACTORS

In discussing affective and sociocultural factors, Gardner and Lambert (1972), Krashen (1977a, 1977b, 1978, 1981a, 1981b), and Schumann (1975, 1978) have shown that such affective variables as attitude and motivation affect second language acquisition and learning. Schumann (1975) noted that learner attitude toward the speakers of the target language, the target culture, and the instructor, can either enhance or inhibit second language acquisition. Attitudinal factors include both personality factors and motivation. Krashen (1981b) has written that "the 'right' attitudinal factors produce two effects: they encourage useful input for language acquisition and they allow the inquirer to be 'open' to this input so it can be utilized for acquisition" (p. 5).

Regarding one's affective filter, Brown (1980) has noted that some personality characteristics, such as self-confidence and lack of anxiety, predict success. Affective variables seem to relate more directly to acquisition than to learning. Students with more self-confidence and motivation, and weak or low

affective filters, will interact more and obtain more input for acquisition.

Effective second language acquisition thus depends on comprehensible or optimal input which is presented under conditions that encourage a low or weak affective filter. Optimal input is input that is comprehensible, interesting, relevant, and not grammatically sequenced, and is presented so as to weaken or lower the learner's affective filter. Approaches which encourage student participation, focus on meaning, enhance feelings of security and acceptance, avoid excessive error correction, and provide relevant and interesting input lower the affective filter.

Motivation also affects second language learning and acquisition. It has been divided into two categories: integrative motivation, i.e. the desire to learn the language for purposes of communication, and instrumental motivation, i.e. the desire to learn the language for such utilitarian purposes as getting a job or passing a course (Gardner and Lambert 1972). Gardner (1968) has written that successful second language acquisition depends upon integrative motivation, which has been further defined as the willingness or desire to be like members of the second language community. Other studies, however, appear to disagree with this conclusion. Kohn (1980) pointed out that most learning done for pragmatic reasons; although a positive attitude and learning correlates with good learning, there is no

necessary connection between wanting to integrate with the target-language community and success in that language. While integrative motivation appears to be more powerful in maintaining the long-term effort that is needed to achieve fluency and proficiency in a second language, in cases where there is an urgent need to learn a second language instrumental motivation is effective (Gardner and Lambert 1972; Sajavaara 1978). In fact, research has shown that learners of a second language outside the second language setting, i.e. learners of a foreign language, exhibit instrumental motivation (Alptekin 1981).

O'Doherty (1973) noted that "the choice of the second or third language which a social group may make will be determined by a variety of social criteria which will vary with the particular group concerned. Some of the social criteria moreover will affect the individual motivation involved in second language learning" (p. 251). The most obvious social motivation today is economic. Knowledge of and competence in English as a second or foreign language is essential not only for higher education, but also on the the lower levels of the educational scale, in the realms of technology and commerce. Internationally, communication is conducted in English - not only between native and non-native speakers, but increasingly so between non-native speakers.

Turning to language learning environments, Burt and Dulay (1981) identified four optimal language learning environments. Natural

language environments are necessary for optimal language acquisition. In such environments, the focus is on content rather than on language itself. Exposure to the language is natural, as in ordinary conversation, reading for information or pleasure, and viewing television or movies. In foreign language situations, content becomes the focus when academic subjects are learned in the foreign language, the language being used as a vehicle to focus on the subject matter content.

A second feature of the environment is that communicative interactions must match the learner's level of language development. Such interactions have been identified as one-way, partial two-way, and full two-way communications (Burt and Dulay 1981). In one-way communication, the learner listens, but does not communicate back. In partial two-way communication, the learner responds in the first language or nonverbally. Only in full two-way communication does the learner receive and send verbal messages in the second language. "Matching the type of communicative interaction with the learners' level of language development appears to maximize the students' likelihood for success" (Burt anbd Dulay 1981:183).

Target language input must be comprehensible to the learner. This means that in the early stages empnasis should be on the here and now and on the concrete. Finally, language learners attend to, and acquire, the language and dialect spoken by people with whom they identify, who are the sources of the language they

hear. Research indicates that "language learners attend selectively to different target language speakers. They learn from some but not from others" (Burt and Dulay 1981:186). Learners exhibit three kinds of preference: peers over teachers, peers over parents, and one's own ethnic group over non-members.

Environmental input is a part of the language acquisition process. It "provides the raw language material which the learner filters, organizes and monitors according to principles applicable to most human beings. These principles are responsible for similarities in errors, acquisition orders and transitional rules that have been observed in the performance of second language learners the world over" (Burt and Dulay 1981:189).

## STRATEGIES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF "GOOD" LANGUAGE LEARNERS

It has been suggested that identification of the strategies employed by good, i.e. successful, language learners would enable teachers to help problem learners improve their approach to language learning (Rubin 1975; Stern 1975). Such strategies were defined by Bialystok (1978) as "optional methods for exploiting available information to increase the proficiency of second language learning" (p. 76). They are similar to those described by Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975) which refer to the conscious techniques or devices which the language learner uses. Because

pertinent knowledge is actively brought to the learning situation, these strategies improve performance.

Four language learning strategies were identified by Bialystok (1978): formal practicing, functional practicing, monitoring, and inferencing. Formal practice focuses on the language code and the learner's knowledge of that code; it is concerned with form. Formal practice is employed by the learner who studies from a grammar book or who asks others for information about rules, morphemes, and pronunciation in addition to formal study in order to increase competence in the target language. Explicit knowledge used in language drills and exercises with the aim of transferring it to implicit knowledge is also defined as formal practice (Bialystok 1978).

Functional practice refers to the use of language for communication; it focuses on meaning. Functional practice occurs in a variety of settings, both inside and outside the classroom, and in a variety of activities, such as movies, parties, shopping, role-playing, and reading for pleasure, where meaning is of prime importance (Bialystok 1978).

Monitoring and inferencing are viewed as complementary strategies. Monitoring involves production and is considered a formal strategy, while inferencing is related to comprehension and thus to functional language. Monitoring requires time as it is a process which demands conscious intervention by the learner.

Monitoring uses formal knowledge in order to improve those responses which are deliberate and occur after a delay, i.e. after some thought (Bialystok 1978; Kounin and Krashen 1978; Krashen 1977a, 1977b, 1978, 1981a, 1981b).

In inferencing, the learner uses information - inter-lingual, intra-lingual, or extra-lingual - in order to hypothesize about an unknown form or meaning. Inferencing makes use of the learner's other knowledge and of implicit knowledge in order to comprehend meaning or form. The new information is then identified as explicit knowledge. Although inferencing is primarily a comprhension strategy, it can also be used with monitoring for production tasks (Bialystok 1978).

Characteristics of good language learners were identified by Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975). Good language learners participate actively in the language learning process. They are good guessers; that is, they are willing to guess and are not afraid to make mistakes. They have a strong desire to communicate and are willing to practice. In addition to their concern with meaning, good language learners monitor their own speech; i.e., they attend to how well their communication is received, and they analyze, categorize, and synthesize forms, clues, and information in communication settings. In short, good language learners know that language acquisition is a cooperative enterprise involving social interaction (Corder 1977).

I have already noted that although the processes and strategies involved in second language learning are the same for all learners (Bialystok 1978), differences in learning rate and achievement can be explained by differences in individual characteristics such as attitude, personality, motivation, aptitude, age, and learning style. Other factors that need to be considered in relation to the variation between learners are the task - rote memorization may be required rather than oral drill; the learning stage - different stages demand different strategies; the context - learning and practice are restricted to the classroom; cultural differences in cognitive learning styles - listening until one can speak perfectly, successful approximation to native speech, and rote learning are examples of different learning styles typical of certain societies (Rubin 1975).

## A CRITIQUE: SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION RESEARCH AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

One may very well ask how much of the research in second language acquisition, i.e. the research described in the preceding sections of this paper, is directly transferable to the foreign language context - the non-English-speaking environment.

There is general agreement among scholars in the fields of second language acquisition research and foreign language teaching that much of this research is not directly transferable to foreign

language contexts. This is because most of the research conducted has been in the area of ESL with college students in the United States (Gingras 1978). In a second-language context, such as ESL in the United States or Great Britain, the target language is spoken outside the classroom; the student lives in an acquisition-rich environment and most of his/her exposure to the target language occurs outside the classroom. The foreign-language context, on the other hand, is an acquisition-poor environment (Krashen 1977a, 1977b, 1978; Neufeld and Webb 1979). The student in an acquisition-poor environment has limited contact with native speakers and little opportunity to acquire the target language in natural communication settings. Most of the student's contact with the foreign language occurs in the classroom, often with teachers who are themselves non-native speakers of the foreign language. Nevertheless, some of the second language acquisition research findings, and particularly those of Krashen and Schumann, appear to be helpful for foreign language contexts (Gingras 1978).

The relevance of second language acquisition theory to language teaching was noted by Stevick (1980): "the distinction between adult "learning" and "acquisition" of language is potentially the most fruitful concept for language teachers that has come out of the linguistic sciences during my professional lifetime" (p. 270). In his discussion of the Monitor Model and foreign language communication, Sajavaara (1978) stated that Krashen's

Monitor Model "can be considered a breakthrough in the development of the theory of language acquisition mainly because this is the first time that many individually well-known phenomena can be explained by means of an explicitly formulated model. ... it's the first consistent formulation of the overall system" (p. 55).

The main goal of communication is to get the message through in an efficient manner; language is thus viewed as a functionally governed phenomenon. The distinction between acquisition and learning is a valid one (Gingras 1978). It relates to the distinction between informal and formal learning. Neither is restricted to the first or second language nor to verbal behavior alone. In fact, it can be said that all human communication involves both acquisition and learning (Sajavaara 1978). Moreover, there is great variation in acceptable language behaviors in actual situations within a communicative framework. This creates problems in foreign language teaching and learning as input is not merely grammatical but also social and affective. Foreign language learners need to "be exposed to the language spoken colloquially at a normal or near-normal rate from the very beginning...and to a variety of regional/social/attitudinal/affective varieties" (Sajavaara 1978:55) if they are to become communicatively competent.

The importance of affective factors in language learning was emphasized by Krashen (1977a, 1977b, 1978, 1981a, 1981b) and

Schumann (1975, 1978). Although Schumann's (1978) Acculturation Model applies to second language acquisition in natural settings, a number of factors in foreign language learning seem to correspond to the social variables noted by Schumann (Sajavaara 1978). Among these variables is motivation, which has been termed the most important variable in foreign language learning (Sajavaara 1978). It has been suggested that instrumental motivation is often more important than integrative motivation in EFL (Gardner and Lambert 1972; Sajavaara 1978). However, the importance of English as a medium of international communication makes it difficult to make a definitive statement, as a willingness to communicate in English with foreigners in general is considered an element in integrative motivation. Political and geographical factors such as dominance, nondominance, subordination, and size affect interlanguage communication. Assimilation, acculturation, and congruence in relation to the distance of the target language and its culture from the learner's language and culture, as well as attitude, affect integrative motivation. Instrumental motivation by itself, however, may not lead to real language competency, especially where passing a specific examination is the main goal (Sajavaara 1978).

Language shock is also an important variable (Sajavarra 1978); it may take a long time before the foreign language learner gets over the feeling of sounding strange in tne foreign language.

Culture shock, on the other hand, does not seem to be important (Sajavaara 1978). Indeed, not all foreign language learning contexts are culturally loaded. In fact, while certain personality characteristics are considered essential for good foreign language learning, lowering the socio-affective filter is seen as less important in foreign language learning as it relates directly to language acquisition (Sajavaara 1978). Aptitude factors appear to compensate for socio-affective factors, i.e. for the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language group (acculturation), in foreign language learning situations. Aptitude factors which relate to general academic success also relate to conscious language learning. Socio-affective variables, such as attitude and assimilation, which affect school performance in general also affect language learning (Sajavaara 1978).

## IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF EFL WHO ARE NON-NATIVE-SPEAKERS

What does all this mean for the preparation of teachers of EFL who are non-native-speakers of English and whose training takes place in non-English-speaking environments? Regarding language preparation, it is recognized that weakness in the EFL teacher's command of English - both spoken and written - is a serious problem in many countries (Lee 1974; Strevens 1977). It is also recognized that teachers of EFL must possess an adequate command of English for classroom purposes. This has been defined as

"error-free in the classroom" (Strevens 1977:71). Although this is a minimum, it is a realistic objective in terms of what can be achieved during or prior to preservice teacher education. Lee (1974) suggested that teacher preparation for those with an inadequate command of English should include "getting down to the detail of what they have to teach" (p. 37), i.e. dealing with detail, rather than in generalizations. Prior to training, it is necessary to examine the trainees' command of English, including those facets they need to teach, or some of the teacher preparation will be beyond them and therefore ineffective (Lee 1974).

In other words, we need to lower our sights in regard to foreign language teacher preparation for those who are non-native speakers of the foreign language (Valdman 1978) because the level of communicative ability attainable in ordinary foreign language contexts is relatively low. While immersion in the country where the foreign language is spoken is highly desirable, it is obviously not often feasible. Valdman (1978) suggested that teacher trainees should study a basic course organized to provide them with a body of knowledge, skills, and attitudes of value to nonspecialized students; such a basic course would result in the study of not only the foreign language but also the culture.

An adequate command of English can be further delineated by identifying classroom purposes. As Strevens (1977) noted, "it is rare for a trainee not to have a fairly close idea of the

educational level at which he is preparing to teach, and of other basic features of the job he expects to take up" (p. 70). The type and degree of English-language-acquisition required of the prospective teacher of EFL would thus vary depending on the ages of the students, the type of school, curricular emphasis, student proficiency, level, etc. (Strevens 1977).

If second language learning is viewed as a process, it can be said that "its further improvement requires an ever-deepening knowledge oif its three equipollent elements: the mind of the learner, the nature of language, and the skill of the teacher" (Strevens 1977:11). This implies a need for human growth and development, learning theory, linguistics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and pedagogy as components of a teacher preparation program. As Lee (1974) stated, while teacher preparation should be centered on classroom practice, on the tasks the teacher needs to perform, and on the pupils themselves, theory should not be excluded. In fact, one might go further and say that "an understanding of the nature of language and how it works should form a basic part of the training of <u>all</u> teachers whatever type of teaching they may eventually be concerned with" (Scarbrough 1976:105). Theory and practice are thus viewed as being closely interwoven so that the exclusion of theory results in a lowering of teacher effectiveness. The implication of this is that one needs recurrent inservice programs as theories and practices are not static.

Although the teacher of EFL who is a non-native speaker is at a disadvantage in many respects, he/she is at a distinct advantage in regard to his/her knowledge of the language of the students. If the teacher is well-prepared, he/she knows the level of competence and performance of the pupils in their native language. Such a teacher will not introduce structures, idioms, and other materials which are beyond the grasp of the pupils. Furthermore, knowledge of the students' interests and culture will aid the teacher in selecting appropriate materials and activities which are not overloaded with items that do not fit their situations (Williams 1975).

Advanced knowledge of a target language, with few exceptions, requires residence in the target language country or exposure to the realities of language use by contact with native speakers of the target language (Stern 1981). As noted earlier, although this can be effected through student exchanges and immersion programs, this is not often feasible. What, then, can be done in foreign language settings? Humanistic techniques, individualized instruction, the genuine interest and concern of the teacher, and meaningful activities such as role-playing and drama, all offer opportunities for language acquisition to occur as well as opportunities for the learner to develop coping techniques which will be utilized when in the target language environment (Stern 1981).

It is clear that English has become a language of wider communication; i.e., it is being used by non-native speakers to communicate with other non-native speakers. Teachers of EFL must therefore know something about other peoples and cultures, and not only about native speakers of English and their cultures. This point was noted by Marquardt (1969) who stated that non-native students study English in order to prepare themselves for cross-cultural communication.

It can be argued that culture and language are intertwined, except for specialized instrumental acquisition in certain foreign language situations (Brown 1980). Language acquisition thus involves culture acquisition. Customs, cultural patterns, and ways and views of life are expressed in language. Prospective teachers should understand that the linguistic code is only one of the possible message systems used in human communication. It is culture - ways of perceiving and behaving - that causes a person to interact with members of other cultures in a specific manner. For example, different expectations can be noted regarding pacing and pausing, including differences in regional and cultural backgrounds and male/female differences, and loudness (e.g. lower tones are indicative of whispering or withholding, of being shy or withdrawn, while louder tones connote anger or assertiveness). What are appropriate listening behaviors? Are men expected to remain silent while women are expected to interrupt with "mms" and "ahas"? Less enthusiasm may

confer that one is not interested while more enthusiasm may be taken to mean that one is "hurrying the speaker along". There are also differences in conversational style (e.g. questioning, story-telling, how and when the speaker gets to the main point). In some cultures, such as America, directness is equated with honesty and indirectness with dishonesty. As Tannen (1986) noted, it is not so much what we say but how we say it - cross-cultural communication presents conflicting demands: don t assume that I am different yet don't assume that we are the same.

It thus seems clear that teacher education programs must consider English as an international or world language (Smith 1981). This in turn implies a need for a multicultural component in EFL teracher preparation programs. Indeed, it is no longer sufficient for the EFL teacher who is a non-native speaker to be presented with a course on American or British culture.

Furthermore, socio-cultural factors affect the ability of the foreign language learner to communicate effectively with speakers of the foreign language. Inherent cultural differences are often manifested in communication difficulties - difficulties which cannot be resolved by purely verbal learning. It is therefore necessary that nonlinguistic knowledge and skills be acquired if communication is to be effective.

While it is frequently these socio-cultural aspects of the foreign language, rather than the purely linguistic ones, which

motivate the foreign language learner, they are, unfortunately, often totally neglected or poorly transmitted in teacher preparation programs (Tucker and Lambert 1973). There are seldom courses, seminars, or workshops which foster the development of cross-cultural understanding of the pedagogic tasks of the teacher. The staff of teacher preparation programs is also often uninformed as to "the inner fabric and operation of the students' cultures" (Alptekin 1981:281).

SUMMARY

In this paper I have tried to note some of the variables and difficulties of EFL teacher preparation for non-English-speaking trainees in non-English-speaking environments. I would like to conclude by looking toward the future, and raising, what may appear to some, a number of controversial points.

We have seen that second language acquisition research is of value to the foreign language teacher. Study of the process of second language acquisition, i.e. how learners acquire and learn a second language, and of the variables affecting the language acquisition process, will enhance the foreign language teacher's understanding of his/her teaching and will aid him/her in improving that teaching (Hatch 1981).

English instruction has become increasingly widespread. In fact, the people who teach English are often non-native speakers who have themselves learned the language from other non-native

speakers. This situation will not change in the future (Allen 1981). The term "communicative competence" needs to be defined more broadly, since English has become a language of wider communication. English is used for more than interaction between native and non-native speakers; in fact, it is learned for other purposes in many countries. In many EFL situations, communication primarily involves understanding lectures and textbooks. In such contexts, focus is not on the skills needed for one-to-one interaction with native or non-native speakers. The traditional view that a little language learning is worse than none is changing (Allen 1981), and the notion that a working knowledge of a language is better than no knowledge is more widely accepted.

While the focus of this paper has not been on the goals, content or shape of the actual teacher preparation program, I would like to conclude by saying that the changing emphases vis-a-vis language learning will directly influence the goals, content, and shape of language teaching programs and teacher preparation programs for foreign language teaching. Goals will be more realistic and more modest; the aim will be to teach learners enough to enable them to enter into situations where the language is used. In short, what is in the language classroom and in teacher preparation programs will depend "as is always true in communications - on the who, where, whom and why" (Allen 1981:156).

## REFERENCES


Allen, V.F. (1981) Learning for communication: practical considerations. In J.E. Alatis, H.B. Altman, & P.M. Alatis (Eds.), The second language classroom: directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press.

Alptekin, C. (1981) Sociopsychological and pedagogic considerations in L2 acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 15, 275-284.

Bialystok, E. (1978) A theoretical model of second language learning. Language Learning, 28, 69-83.

Britten, D. (1988) Three stages in teacher training. ELT Journal, 42, 3-8.

Brown, H.D. (1980) Principles of language learning and teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Burt, M. & Dulay, H. (1981) Optimal language learning environments. In J.E. Alatis, H.B. Altman, & P.M. Alatis (Eds.), The second language classroom: directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press.

Corder, P. (1977) Language teaching and learning: a social encounter. In H.D. Brown, C. A. Yorio, & R.H. Crymes (Eds.), On TESOL '77. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Edge, J. (1988) Applying linguistics in English language teacher training for speakers of other languages. ELT Journal, 42, 9-13.

Gardner, R.C. (1968) Attitudes and motivation: their role in second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 2, 141-150.

Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. (1972) Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Gingras, R.C. (Ed.) (1978) Second-language acquisition and foreign language teaching. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hatch, E.M. (1981) TESOL and second language acquisition. In J.C. Fisher, M.A. Clarke, & J. Schachter (Eds.), On TESOL '80. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Kohn, J.J. (1980) What ESL teachers need to know about sociolinguistics. In K. Croft, Readings on English as a second language (2nd ed). Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.

Kounin, T.E. & Krashen, S.D. (1978) Approaching native speaker proficiency from two different directions. In C.H. Blatchford & J. Schachter (Eds.), On TESOL '78. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Krashen, S.D. (1976) Formal and informal environments in language acquisition and language learning. TESOL Quarterly, 10, 157-168.

Krashen, S.D. (1977a) Some issues relating to the monitor model. In H.D. Brown, C.A. Yorio, & R.H.Crymes (Eds.), On TESOL '77. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Krashen, S.D. (1977b) The monitor model for adult second language performance. In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Finocchiaro (Eds.), Viewpoints on English as a second language. New York: Regents Publishing Co., Inc.

Krashen, S.D. (1978) The monitor model for second-language acquisition. In R.C. Gingras (Ed.), Second-language acquisition and foreign language teaching. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Krashen, S.D. (1980) The input hypothesis. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), Current issues in bilingual education: proceedings of the Georgetown Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Krashen, S.D. (1981a) Effective second language acquisition: insights from research. In J.E. Alatis, H.B. Altman, & P.M. Alatis (Eds.), The second language classroom: directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S.D. (1981b) Second language acquisition and second language learning. New York: Pergamon Press.

Lee, W.R. (1974) On getting down to grass roots in EFL teacher training. ELT Journal, 29, 35-42.

Medgyes, P. (1986) Queries from a communicative teacher. ELT Journal, 40, 107-12.

Marquardt, W.F. (1969) Preparing English teachers abroad. TESOL Quarterly, 3, 31-35.

Neufeld, J.K. & Webb, M.R. (1979) ESL teacher training: tne need for a complete curriculum. In C.A. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.), On TESOL '79. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

O'Doherty, E.F. (1973) Social factors and second language policies. In J.W. Oller, Jr. & J.C. Richards (Eds.), Focus on the learner: pragmatic perspectives for the language teacher. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Rubin, J. (1975) What the "good language learner" can teach us. TESOL Quarterly, 9, 41-51.

Sajavaara, K. (1978) The monitor model and monitoring in foreign language speech communication. In R.C. Gingras (Ed.), Second-language acquisition and foreign language teaching. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Scarbrough, D.R. (1976) Practical theory in the training of teachers of EFL. ELT Journal, 30, 103-109.

Schumann, J.H. (1975) Affective factors and the problem of age in second language acquisition. Language Learning, 25, 209-235.

Schumann, J.H. (1978) The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R.C. Gingras (Ed.), Second-language acquisition and foreign language teaching. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Smith, L. (1981) TESOL and training non-native English speakers: are M.A. teacher-education programs getting the job done? Part II. In J.C. Fisher, M.A. Clarke, & J. Schachter (Eds.), On TESOL '80. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Stern, H.H. (1975) What can we learn from the good language learner? Canadian Modern Language Review, 31, 304-318.

Stern, H.H. (1981) Communicative language teaching and learning: toward a synthesis. In J.E. Alatis, H.B. Altman, & P. M. Alatis (Eds.), The second language classroom: directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stevick, E.W. (1980) Teaching languages: a way and ways. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Strevens, P. (1977) New orientations in the teaching of English. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1986) Paper presented at 20th Annual TESOL Convention, Anaheim, California.

Tucker, G.R. & Lambert, W.E. (1973) Sociocultural aspects of language study. In J.W. Oller, Jr. & J.C. Richards (Eds.), Focus on the learner: pragmatic perspectives for the language teacher. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Valdman, A. (1978) Implications of current research on second-language acquisition for teaching foreign languages in the United States. In R.C. Gingras (Ed.), Second-language acquisition and foreign language teaching. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Williams, W.E. (1975) The training of teachers of English as a foreign language (a balance between knowledge and skill). ELT Journal, 29, 107-115.