INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

EFFECTIVE TEACHING BEHAVIORS AND ATTITUDES AS PERCEIVED BY FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

by

Teresa Reber

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

GRADUATE INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM IN
SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND TEACHING

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2001

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA ©
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Teresa Reber

entitled Effective Teaching Behaviors and Attitudes as Perceived by Foreign Language Teachers

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Renate A. Schulz	4/03/01
Renate A. Schulz	Date
Mary E. Wildner-Bassett	4/04/01
Mary E. Wildner-Bassett	Date
Carol A. Evans	4/04/01
Carol A. Evans	Date
	Date
	Date

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Renate A. Schulz	4/03/01
Dissertation Director Renate A. Schulz	Date

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgement of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Teresa Reber

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my dissertation committee for all they did to make it possible for me to finish this dissertation and for the countless hours they spent reading and offering suggestions to improve each chapter. I am especially grateful to Professor Renate Schulz for her support, encouragement, editorial suggestions, and mentoring throughout the entire dissertation process. I would also like to thank Professor Mary Wildner-Bassett for her encouragement, sincere kindness, and timely feedback. I am also grateful to Professor Carol Evans for the time and energy she spent in offering suggestions for the final versions.

I am grateful to Dr. Jenny Franklin for financing the data collection and helping me begin working with the data. I also would like to thank Dr. John Fulginiti of Pima Community College for his assistance in working with the data.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for their support and prayers while I was writing this dissertation and for believing I could finish it. I am so grateful that my husband, Ryan, stood by me during the last stages of writing the dissertation and supported me in every way possible. Without all of you, this dissertation could never have been completed. I will always remember all you did for me so that I could complete this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS—*Continued*

TABLE OF CONTENTS—*Continued*

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Schrier and Hammadou (1994) assert that in order to evaluate effective foreign language (FL) teaching, attributes of effective teaching should first be identified, should be agreed upon as being worth evaluating, should be identified on repeated occasions, and should be proved worthwhile in many settings. The more that is known about successful FL teaching and learning, the more likely FL teachers will be to create models for FL teacher preparation and evaluation that implement relevant behaviors and attitudes of effective FL teaching. The purpose of this study was to investigate teacher perceptions concerning the teaching behaviors and attitudes that contribute to effective FL teaching and learning. The data was collected by means of a questionnaire to which 457 post-secondary FL teachers of Spanish, French, and German who are members of ACTFL responded (the response rate was 45.7%). The 80-item questionnaire elicited responses to FL teaching behaviors and attitudes on a Likert-type scale from 1 (not important at all for effective FL teaching) to 5 (essential for effective FL teaching), based on teachers' perceptions regarding how important each attribute is for effective teaching. Based on current research on second language acquisition (SLA), on pedagogical theories underlying current teaching methodologies, and on teaching behaviors and attitudes found to be effective in the field of general education, various teaching behaviors and attitudes of effective FL teachers were identified for inclusion on the questionnaire. The results indicate that there is emerging professional consensus regarding a number of teacher behaviors and attitudes related to FL teaching. This study contributes to the knowledge of what acceptable classroom teaching behavior is. The more that is known about successful FL teaching and learning, the more likely FL teachers, administrators, and curriculum developers will be able to create models for FL teacher preparation and evaluation that reflect effective behaviors and attitudes for FL teaching.

Chapter 1
Introduction

The Search for Effective Foreign Language Teaching

In the last forty years, many researchers and professionals responsible for teacher evaluation have sought to establish criteria for assessing effective teaching (Borich, 1986; Brighton, 1965; Brosh, 1996; Costa, 1989; Doyle, 1977; Eble, 1988; McKeachie, 1977; Ornstain, 1991). While there is little agreement regarding which teaching behaviors constitute effective teaching, researchers agree at least on some dimensions that describe effective teaching, in general, regardless of subject matter. These dimensions of teaching include: enthusiasm/expressiveness, clarity of explanation, and rapport/interaction (Murray, 1991). Researchers also agree that teaching is multidimensional, and that even though these dimensions may vary according to setting and discipline, they are still consistent to some degree across disciplines (Doyle, 1975; Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Murray, 1991; Rosenshine & Furst, 1971; Travers, 1981).

Very little research has been conducted regarding discipline-specific teaching behaviors and attitudes of teachers (Franklin & Theall, 1995; Murray & Renaud, 1995; Schulz, 2000). Because every teaching and learning situation is context-specific and because disciplines differ, some teaching behaviors and attitudes are considered more effective in one discipline than in another (Murray & Renaud, 1995). For example, lecturing may be effective in a history course but not in a beginning foreign language (FL) course. Yet, in most cases, the history teacher and FL teacher might be evaluated using the same criteria (Sternberg & Horvath, 1995). Thus, while some teaching behaviors are considered to be effective regardless of discipline, there are also teaching behaviors and attitudes that are considered to be discipline-specific. The research literature suggests

that there is no one single accepted definition of effective FL teaching. FL teaching is a very complex, multidimensional process that means different things to different people. For the purpose of this study, the definition of effective FL teaching is teaching that provides learners with the grammatical (syntactical, morphological), lexical, phonological, pragmatic, and sociocultural knowledge and practice they need to communicate successfully in the TL. To this end, this study will first identify teaching behaviors and attitudes that are specific to FL teaching. It will then identify which teaching behaviors and teacher attitudes are perceived by post-secondary FL teachers to be particularly effective in FL teaching.

Recent Trends in Foreign Language Teaching

A shift in FL teaching from traditional grammar-based approaches to more communicative and interactive approaches has brought new developments in the ways FLs are taught. Recent trends in FL teaching, including communicative language teaching (Lee & VanPatten, 1995), computer-assisted language learning (Bush & Terry, 1997; Dunkel, 1991; Lafford & Lafford, 1997; Pennington, 1996), the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (1996), authentic assessment (Hancock, 1994; Liskin-Gasparro, 1996; Moore, 1994; Stansfield, 1994; Wiggins, 1989; Wiggins, 1993; Wiggins, 1994), culture teaching (Galloway, 1985; Kramsch, 1993a; Kramsch, 1993b; Lange, 1999), content-based instruction (Bragger & Rice, 1998; Genessee, 1998; Leaver & Stryker, 1989), languages for specific purposes, courses for heritage learners (Merino, Trueba, & Samaniego, 1993; Reber & Geeslin, 1998; Valdés, 1995), and focus on form in classroom SLA (Doughty & Williams, 1998a) reflect this shift from traditional grammar-based approaches to more interactive approaches to FL teaching.

With new approaches to FL teaching that put less emphasis on the role of

grammar in the FL classroom than previous approaches comes a recent discussion of the role of grammar in the communicative classroom. This discussion may be due partially to changes in second language acquisition (SLA) and teaching theories. For example, according to the Grammar-Translation Method of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, grammatical analysis and rule learning were the object of FL study (see Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Richards & Rodgers, 1986); whereas the Audiolingual Method, strongly influenced by B. F. Skinner's behaviorist view of learning, favored habit formation to explicit learning (Lado, 1964; Skinner, 1957). While the cognitive approach to FL learning stresses the importance of internal mental activity, Krashen's Monitor Model recognizes the importance of subconscious acquisition and makes the point that conscious learning does not lead to SLA. Other theories in and approaches to FL teaching such as Community Language Learning (Curran, 1976; Curran, 1982), the Silent Way (Gattegno, 1972), Suggestopedia (Lozanov, 1978), Total Physical Response (Asher, 1986), the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983), the notions of "communicative competence" (Savignon, 1983) and "proficiency" (Buck, Byrnes, & Thompson, 1989), and processing instruction (VanPatten, 1992) have continued to either emphasize or de-emphasize the role of grammar instruction in the FL classroom. More recently, the research on "focus on form" in the FL classroom (Doughty & Williams, 1998a) seeks to redefine FL teaching in the context of focusing on a specific grammatical feature while simultaneously attending to the meaning of the structure.

Improving Foreign Language Teaching

A presidential report entitled *Strength through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability* (1979) stressed that the lack of FL competence among the nation's youth negatively influenced the nation's economic competitiveness. A number of

recommendations were made to improve the quality of FL teaching so that FL teachers could teach FLs more effectively (see Schrier & Hammadou, 1994). One of these recommendations included improving the professional development of FL teachers in the language or languages they teach as well as their cultural knowledge of the target group(s). Schrier and Hammadou (1994) state that the FL profession reacted to the criticism of the President's Commission in several ways: (1) it reassessed its procedures for evaluating student FL achievement; (2) it published a set of guidelines for assessing language learners' proficiency (ACTFL, 1986); (3) it proposed defining FL teacher preparation (ACTFL, 1988) and ongoing FL teacher education (Hancock, 1981; Jarvis, 1983; Lange, 1993); and (4) it emphasized that teachers should have a high command of the subject matter for the language(s) they teach (AATF, 1989; AATSP, 1990; Schulz et al., 1993).

FL teachers generally agree that FL teaching exhibits aspects of teaching that are specific to FLs and that are not relevant to the teaching of any other discipline. Researchers (Bernhardt & Hammadou, 1987; Brosh, 1996; Jarvis & Taylor, 1990; Moskowitz, 1978; Spolsky, 1989) note, for instance, that FL learning is influenced by social, psychological, and political constraints that are beyond the control of the teacher, although such constraints can also be found in the teaching of other disciplines. Brosh (1996) points out that FL teaching differs from teaching other subjects "in terms of the process, where the means of instruction is also the subject of instruction" (p. 125). FL learners must know how to communicate in the TL so that they can understand what the teacher says and can participate in class sessions. If learners cannot communicate in the TL, they cannot continue to learn the TL or anything else that is taught in class, such as, culture, history, grammar, pronunciation, or literature. Further, when teaching languages such as Spanish, French, and German, teachers must also be aware that there are several

"standard" varieties of the language that could be taught and must somehow choose which one(s) they will teach (Fromkin & Rodman, 1983; Hidalgo, 1987; Reber & Geeslin, 1998).

The shift in FL teaching approaches from grammar-based to communicative to recent focus-on-form/communicative approaches calls for updated models for evaluating FL teaching. Schrier and Hammadou (1994) assert that in order to evaluate effective FL teaching, attributes of effective teaching should first be identified, should be agreed upon by FL teachers as being worth evaluating, should be identified on repeated occasions, and should be proved worthwhile in many settings. The FL teaching profession has sought over the past ten years to create guidelines that describe a qualified FL teacher (Schrier & Hammadou, 1994). In 1988 the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) presented *Provisional Guidelines for Foreign Language Teacher Education* (1988) which defined teacher education in these four categories: (1) personal development (general education courses); (2) pedagogy (professional education courses); (3) specialist development (major area of study); and (4) clinical or field experiences (student teaching). Specific to FL teaching are the standards introduced by the American Association of Teachers of French (AATF, 1989), the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP, 1990), and the American Association of Teachers of German (AATG) (Schulz et al., 1993). The goal of these standards is to improve teacher competence in terms of commitment to student learning, knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy, responsibility for managing and assessing student learning, reflection and flexibility, and commitment to life-long learning (Schulz et al., 1993). ACTFL's (1988) *Provisional Program Guidelines for FL Teacher Education* suggest a well-planned and broad sequence of studies to allow candidates to develop those skills that are necessary for experiencing success, satisfaction, and individual growth as FL

teachers and, by extension, in life. Although these guidelines propose the need for new models for preparing FL teachers as well as what the models should contain, they do not suggest specific criteria for effective FL teaching. As these standards are implemented and assessed on a regular basis, it is anticipated that the effectiveness of FL teaching will dramatically increase. In a sense, the guidelines presented by ACTFL and AATSP suggest that at the time these documents appeared, there was some agreement on what constitutes effective FL teaching because most of the same teaching behaviors and attitudes appear in each document.

In 1994, Schrier and Hammadou issued a call for the development of instruments to help assess the quality of all FL teachers. Those outside the profession generally agree that teaching is at the core of education and that the single most important action that can be taken to improve education is to improve teaching (Baratz-Snowden, 1993).

Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching

According to Ellis (1997), there are two main issues that relate SLA research and FL pedagogy: (1) identifying what SLA has discovered that is significant to FL teachers, and (2) deciding how the information SLA research has discovered and made available can be maximally used in FL pedagogy. Yet, as stated by Ellis (1997), the challenge remains that

> [t]here has, in fact, been very little consideration of how SLA can be utilized in language pedagogy. In general, researchers have been busy with finding out how L2 learners acquire a second language, while teachers have been busy trying to help them do it. Researchers have been wary of making proposals based on their research. Teachers have not had the time (or perhaps the inclination) to find out what researchers have discovered. There are, of course, exceptions, notably

> Krashen and Terrell (1983), who have attempted to combine the understandings of the researcher and language teacher. But there has been no comprehensive discussion of how this might best be achieved (p. 3).

Along these lines, Lightbown and Spada (1993) note that it is difficult to draw definite conclusions from the theoretical research that has been done to describe SLA both in natural and formal settings to date, and that much more research needs to be conducted before specific conclusions can be drawn. Until definitive research findings become available, however, it is still useful for teachers to hypothesize about the results of empirical research studies that explain how learners learn FLs best so that teachers can meet the needs of their own students. This study seeks first to identify aspects of SLA theories that are relevant to FL teaching, and then to investigate to what extent post-secondary FL teachers in the US consider these aspects to be important in FL teaching.

Call for Research

A critical fundamental assumption in teacher evaluation is that effective teaching behaviors are: (1) identifiable, (2) stable, and (3) reasonably consistent in their effects on students across contexts (Andrews & Barnes, 1990, p. 572). Thus teacher evaluation can be considered valid if it follows the properly delineated steps to (1) seek to identify effective teaching behaviors, and (2) come to a consensus in the profession to describe which of the identified teaching behaviors current FL teachers consider to be worth evaluating (see Schrier & Hammadou, 1994). With these assumptions in mind, the first step in identifying good teaching behaviors in FL teaching is to look at theoretical models of SLA and the research that has been conducted to test these models in the classrooms. The results of empirical research studies should point us in the direction of identifying teaching behaviors that have contributed to successful learning. If FL teachers are able to

provide learners with activities and assignments that allow them to use the FL in ways similar to the ways learners successfully learned FLs in research studies, the behaviors used by successful teachers in providing these experiences for learners would be identified as effective teaching behaviors. One obvious second step in establishing criteria for FL teacher evaluation would be to collect and collate individual opinions to find out which of these teaching behaviors are perceived by teachers to be effective in successful FL learning.

This study seeks to identify effective teaching behaviors in post-secondary FL instruction and to collect opinions regarding these behaviors from post-secondary FL teachers. This study focuses on post-secondary FL teachers for three reasons. First, much of the research in SLA and FL teacher preparation has been conducted with adult L2 learners in English as a Second Language (ESL) or in adult FL classrooms. Second, the researcher's own interest and experience is in the area of post-secondary FL teaching and teacher development. Third, funding for research, printing and mailing the questionnaires, and for analyzing the response data was available for the study of post-secondary teachers.

Professional consensus will be investigated by means of a questionnaire. Teachers will be asked to rate observable teaching behaviors or attitudes of FL teachers as to their effectiveness in teaching as well as to react to theoretical statements that explain SLA in general or in a classroom context.

The Importance of this Study

Bernhardt and Hammadou (1987) analyzed ten years of research in FL teacher education and by so doing hoped to answer the question: "What should they [FL teachers] do?" (p. 290). This study seeks to shed further light on this question.

If there are certain teaching behaviors and attitudes that are specific to effective FL teaching, it would seem logical that at least some of these should be grounded in SLA research and not only in teacher effectiveness research. As mentioned previously, in order to evaluate effective FL teaching, attributes of effective FL teaching must first be identified, must then be agreed upon as being worth evaluating by current FL teachers, must be identified on repeated occasions, and must be proved worthwhile in many settings (Schrier & Hammadou, 1994). This study will undertake the first two steps necessary in evaluating effective FL teaching by (1) identifying effective classroom teaching behaviors and attitudes that have been found to facilitate successful FL learning in SLA research, and (2) finding out which of these teaching behaviors and attitudes are perceived by post-secondary FL teachers to contribute to student learning.

Teacher effectiveness research is extremely complex. Many factors of teaching cannot be empirically researched due to the vast variety found in teaching as well as the many teaching contexts. We depend on a professional consensus to know what constitutes good teaching. This study contributes to the knowledge of what acceptable classroom teaching behavior is. The more that is known about successful FL teaching and learning, the more likely FL teachers will be to create models for FL teacher preparation and evaluation that reflect relevant behaviors and attitudes of FL teaching.

The Research Questions

Given the researcher's specific interest in investigating behaviors and attitudes of effective FL teachers, the following major research questions were formulated:

(1) What are the salient issues in the research literature in SLA and FL learning that can be modified or directly applied to effective FL teaching perspectives in the classroom context?

(2) To what extent do post-secondary FL teachers agree on behaviors or attitudes that are believed to contribute to effective FL teaching and learning?

Chapter 2
Review of Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature pertinent to this study. The following nine categories of research will be examined: (1) teacher effectiveness research in general education, (2) models of teacher evaluation in general education, (3) defining effective FL teaching, (4) pedagogical implications of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, (5) characteristics and behaviors of effective FL teachers, (6) models of FL teacher evaluation, (7) research on classroom FL teaching, (8) theories of and approaches to FL teaching and their implications for the role of the teacher, and (9) L2 learning research and its implications for teaching.

Teacher Effectiveness Research in General Education

An entire field of research known as teacher effectiveness research has focused on investigating certain teacher behaviors and attitudes and their effects on student satisfaction and learning. Criteria for defining effective teaching have changed significantly over the last century. Prior to 1900, students were held accountable for their own learning, and teachers were to have mainly a managerial role in the teaching-learning process (Travers, 1981). Travers (1981) points out that more recently, the view of the role of teacher as manager has changed so that the teacher is responsible for student learning. If students do not learn, then the teacher has not provided conditions conducive

for learning. Given a new role definition for the teacher, an entire domain of new criteria for evaluating teacher effectiveness must be considered. With this in mind, most researchers agree that several core teaching behaviors must be evident if teaching is to be considered effective (Doyle, 1975; Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Murray, 1991; Rosenshine & Furst, 1971). Because a similar field of research does not exist in FL teaching, it is necessary to examine the research that has been done in non-discipline specific teacher effectiveness research. This section reviews two of the most comprehensive surveys of teacher effectiveness research.

Murray (1991) provides a review of empirical studies dealing with teacher effectiveness research at the college- and university-levels. He gives preference to those studies investigating specific "low-inference" teaching behaviors rather than global "high-inference" characteristics. Low-inference behaviors are described as concrete, denotable actions of the instructor that can be recorded with little or no inference on the part of an observer. Examples include: "signals the transition from one topic to the next," "addresses individual students by name," and "gestures with arms and hands." In contrast, high-inference teacher characteristics can be assessed only through observer inference or judgment. Examples include: "clarity," "student-centeredness," and "task orientation." The advantages of low-inference behaviors are that these are easy to operationalize and record for purposes of observational research and are relatively easy to manipulate for purposes of experimental research. Also, it is easier to provide an instructor with diagnostic feedback for improvement of teaching if the focus is on specific, concrete

behaviors rather than on vague ones. The disadvantages of examining low-inference behaviors in evaluating teacher effectiveness are that these behaviors do not easily allow the observer to provide evaluation for the following: instructional goals of a course, the subject matter of a course, the quality of student-student interaction or small group work, or the content of activities and assignments.

Murray reviews two types of research methods: *observational* and *experimental*. In observational approaches, teaching behaviors are observed in their natural settings, and the investigator makes no attempt to control or manipulate variables. Correlations are then drawn between teaching behaviors and outcome measures such as achievement test scores, attitudes toward learning, or ratings of instruction. A benefit of this type of approach is that research findings are based on real teachers in real classrooms, and thus the results can often be generalized or applied to other teachers and teaching contexts. A drawback of this approach is that variables are not controlled, and therefore, results cannot be interpreted in terms of cause and effect. In experimental research, variables are controlled and manipulated. In a true experimental design, the researcher systematically manipulates one or more teaching behaviors while holding all other factors constant. True experimental research also depends on large random samples. Since controlled teaching behaviors are the only factors that theoretically vary across experimental conditions, any differences in pre- and post-student outcome measures are assumed to be caused by the teaching behavior in question. The advantage of this type of research is that relations among variables are easier to interpret in cause-effect terms.

Practically all educational research studies follow a quasi-experimental design (Thomas, 1998). True experimental designs involve randomly assigning subjects to various treatment or control groups. In educational settings, random assignment is usually impossible due to the fact that researchers must typically use an entire class as an intact group or are allowed to use only those students with parents' consent. Thomas (1998) mentions that "in all other respects they [educational experiments] are indeed experiments, their designs can be deemed at least *quasi-experimental*" (p. 111).

The following are conclusions drawn by Murray regarding the observational studies he reviewed: (1) assessment of low-inference behaviors has been found to show high levels of interrater reliability which indicates that these behaviors can be measured objectively and accurately; (2) classroom teaching behaviors have been shown to make a significant difference in student attitudes, learning of course content, and motivation for further learning; (3) three dimensions of teaching behavior have consistently emerged as strong predictors of instructional outcomes: enthusiasm/expressiveness, clarity of explanation, and rapport/interaction; (4) the impact of classroom teaching behaviors on student development can be interpreted in terms of cognitive theories of information-processing and learning; (5) teaching behaviors have typically shown an uneven profile of correlations with different instructional outcomes; (6) teacher classroom behaviors vary in different settings, and it has not yet been determined if teaching behaviors that are effective in lecture settings are also effective in other settings, such as in FL teaching; (7) within lecture methods, findings suggest that certain teaching behaviors contribute

similarly to overall teaching effectiveness regardless of academic discipline.

Murray drew the following conclusions from the results of the experimental studies he reviewed: (1) in the enthusiasm and clarity domains, classroom teaching behaviors seem to be causal antecedents (rather than mere correlates) of various instructional outcome measures; (2) low-inference teaching behaviors (such as, "signals the transition from one topic to the next," "addresses individual students by name," and "gestures with arms and hands") have been shown to influence student instructional ratings and objective measures of student learning; (3) teaching behaviors accounted for a sizable proportion of outcome measure variance in most experiments; (4) the specific teaching behaviors used to define teacher enthusiasm and teacher clarity manipulations in experimental studies were similar to behaviors loading on corresponding "enthusiasm" and "clarity" factors in observational studies; (5) evidence suggests that enthusiastic or expressive classroom teaching behaviors may affect student motivational processes that extend far beyond the classroom.

Rosenshine and Furst (1971) found in a thorough review of teacher effectiveness research that effective and ineffective teachers could be distinguished on the basis of ten variables: (1) clarity of presentation; (2) enthusiasm; (3) variety of activities during the lesson; (4) task-oriented and business-like behaviors in the classroom; (5) the amount of content covered by class; (6) teacher's acknowledgement and encouragement of students' ideas during discussion; (7) criticism of students (negatively related to achievement); (8) use of structuring comments at the start of and during lesson; (9) use of various types of

questions; (10) probing of students' responses by the teacher.

King (1981) reports a positive relationship between teacher personality and teacher effectiveness. Medley (1979) found in an analysis of 289 empirical studies that effective and ineffective teachers differed on a large number of actual classroom behaviors in three basic areas—maintenance of the learning environment, use of student time, and method of instruction.

It is evident that observable behaviors of effective teachers in general are also behaviors exhibited by effective FL teachers. This study, however, goes beyond the scope of general teaching behaviors and seeks to identify specific aspects that can be observed in effective FL teaching, i.e., behaviors that are not necessarily found in effective teaching in other disciplines.

Models of Teacher Evaluation in General Education

Assessment or evaluation can be defined as the "accurate, objective description of performance" (Schrier & Hammadou, 1994, p. 213). In regard to teacher education, evaluation is defined as measuring the quality of teaching or placing value on what is being measured. One main obstacle, however, in evaluating teaching at any level is that good teaching is difficult to define and identify. Teacher effectiveness researchers have asserted that effective teaching behaviors must be: (1) identifiable, (2) stable, and (3) reasonably consistent in their effects on students across contexts (Andrews & Barnes, 1990, p. 572).

Traditionally, teacher evaluation was carried out by means of paper-and-pencil tests and/or classroom observations. The paper-and-pencil tests were designed to assess teachers' knowledge of general, specialized subject, and/or pedagogical content. These tests, however, rarely predict future teaching performance and are unable to show if teachers are able to actually use their knowledge in real teaching settings (Schrier & Hammadou, 1994). Over the past few decades, the focus of teacher evaluation has fluctuated between teachers' knowledge of the subject they teach and their knowledge of learners and classrooms (Shulman, 1986). With the emergence of teacher effectiveness research, models for evaluating effective teaching are needed to provide formative as well as summative feedback for teachers. Several models of teacher evaluation exist both in teacher education in general and in FL contexts. For the purpose of this study, it is necessary to review models of teacher evaluation to see which teaching behaviors have shown to improve student learning and are worth evaluating. This section will review models and techniques of teacher evaluation in general education.

Over the past two or three decades, research in teacher evaluation has received increased attention. Millman (1981a) notes the following reasons teaching is evaluated: to improve teacher performance, to meet state and institutional directives, to promote research on teaching, and to assist students in selecting instructors of courses they wish to take (p. 13). Teacher evaluation can be *formative* (ongoing evaluation that provides a teacher with feedback so that teaching can be improved), *summative* (evaluation used in making decisions with respect to hiring, firing, promoting, etc.) or both formative and

summative.

One suggestion for evaluating teaching is made by Haefele (1981) who suggests teacher appraisal interviews as an effective component of teacher evaluation. An evaluator advises a teacher regarding improving teaching, assists in establishing goals, motivates good teaching, recognizes effective teaching, assesses teaching, and decides how the evaluator or supervisor can assist in improving teaching performance.

Another way teaching is evaluated is by means of student ratings of teaching (Aleamoni, 1981; Marsh & Dunkin, 1992; Murray & Renaud, 1995). Student ratings of instruction are considered to be a valid measurement of teaching quality for three main reasons: (1) Students are the main source of information about the accomplishment of education goals, the domains of rapport, degrees of communication, and problems between students and the teacher; (2) students (rather than an observer) are able to evaluate the teacher, textbooks, homework, course content, method of instruction, level of student interest, and student attitude toward the course; (3) students can communicate anonymously with the teacher (based on Aleamoni, 1981). On the other hand, some teachers question the actual validity of students' evaluations. Can students really judge the teachers and their teaching, given their lack of pedagogical training and possible desire to retaliate because of a bad grade? Aleamoni (1981) cites several studies that look at reliability in student ratings and found that if instruments are used that reflect the institutional teaching goals, if the instrument is validated, and if the results are correctly interpreted and used, student ratings of instruction can be an integral part of teacher

evaluation.

It is also of interest to this study that even though student ratings of instruction have been shown to be stable across items, raters, and time, they differ depending on academic discipline. Feldman (1978) and Cashin (1990) found that student ratings are highest for arts and humanities teachers and lowest for mathematics, science, and engineering teachers. The reasons for the differences in ratings have not yet been determined (Franklin & Theall, 1992; Murray & Renaud, 1995). Franklin and Theall (1992) conjectured that humanities teachers tend to stress "thought" goals more than "fact" goals and tend to use discussion and independent projects rather than lecturing. That student ratings of instruction vary according to discipline leads to the assumption that there are teaching behaviors specific to various disciplines and that all teacher behaviors found in teacher effectiveness research may not apply to every discipline.

Student achievement has also been proposed as a measure of effective teaching (Millman, 1981b). In considering student achievement, it is important to keep in mind that some factors can influence student achievement in addition to the teacher's performance. These factors include the way achievement is measured as well as individual student differences.

A number of reviews evaluate effective teaching behaviors in general post-secondary education. Doyle (1975) discusses the following five topics that are of particular importance for new teachers: (1) the purpose of the evaluation, (2) the focus of the evaluation (i.e., the activities or qualities to be evaluated), (3) the sources of

evaluative information, (4) the ways the information can be gathered, and (5) the technical properties or quality of the data gathering instrument.

Doyle notes that two broad kinds of evaluative questions are found in most teacher evaluation instruments. The first asks for student reaction to instructor characteristics or behaviors, to the various characteristics of the course materials, and to the social and physical environments. (Examples: How would you rate the instructor's general teaching ability? Were the exams fair?) The second kind of question focuses on student outcomes, including the amount of progress made toward general or specific educational goals: (Examples: How much would you say you learned from the instructor? Did this course help you develop your creative potential? To what extent did the assignments help you to think critically? How was this course beneficial to you?) In addition to rating instructor behaviors and student performance, student demographic information (which is usually used to explain student responses to specific items), what teachers actually do in the classroom, the course design (exams, course readings, texts, etc.), and student self-reports of course satisfaction can assist in an evaluation of a teacher and can explain specific parts of an evaluation (see also Borich & Madden 1977).

Sheal (1989) and Evertson and Holley (1981) discuss the importance of training classroom observers and of selecting an appropriate and valid observation form. Sheal describes a series of three workshops designed to train classroom observers geared for administrators and senior teachers responsible for English language teaching. Sheal notes that much of the teacher observation that goes on is unsystematic and subjective.

Observers are not always trained in observation or the use of systematic observation forms, and as a result, observers tend to use themselves as a standard, and their observations are often impressionistic rather than data supported. The purposes of observation forms are to increase observer objectivity and to increase consistency among observers. Several types of observation forms are available: frequency tabulation (used to describe objectively teacher/student behaviors in the classroom); structured description (a descriptive narrative of what goes on in the classroom); a checklist (recording the presence or absence of certain types of behavior as well as an attempt to provide comprehensive, systematic, and objective evaluation); and rating scales. Rating scales focus on evaluation rather than on describing behavior and are very subjective in nature. They are the most open to bias and create the most disagreement between observer and teacher; yet they are easy to use and are the most popular (see Sheal, 1989; Evertson & Holley, 1981). (See Borich & Madden, 1977 for a compilation of observation instruments.)

Onibokun (1984) proposes the Effective Teacher Evaluation (ETE) Model which is based on teacher effectiveness research and which emphasizes the ability for teacher evaluation to bring about desirable changes in student teachers at the secondary level. The ETE contains four dimensions: (1) cognitive-based, i.e., teacher's knowledge; (2) performance-based, i.e., teaching behavior (personality, enthusiasm); (3) competence-based, i.e., teacher's ability to teach by assessing pupil behavior, including formative evaluation of pupil understanding; and (4) affective-based, i.e., teacher/class or

teacher/student interaction.

ETE's evaluation forms contain ten major criteria for evaluation. Evaluators are to assign a value for each category on a scale from 0 to 5 and to provide comments. The criteria include: (1) The statement of objectives in the lesson plan should be clear, specific, expressed in behavioral terms, relevant, measurable, and achievable. The content of the lesson plan should be accurate, sequential, adequate, suitable, and logical. (2) The introduction to the lesson should be motivating and stimulating, should arouse curiosity and interest, and should assist the students in being alert and responsive. (3) Teachers should make effective and appropriate use of chalkboard, maps, models, charts, and other audio visual aids. Diagrams used should be clear and accurate, and chalkboard illustrations should be clear, legible, and uniform. (4) Questions posed by the teacher should be thought-provoking, frequent, relevantly distributed during class time, and answerable, and responses to student questions should be appropriate. (5) Voice projection, diction, correct usage of English, avoidance of distractive mannerisms, fluency, and use of non-verbal cues should be important in effective classroom communication. (6) Personal qualities a teacher should exhibit include: being patient, imaginative, courteous, even-tempered, enthusiastic, original, and resourceful. Teachers' dress should be neat and modest. (7) Professional qualities teachers should exhibit include: good knowledge of the subject matter, the attempt to relate content to the experience of the students, awareness of ability levels, individual differences among students, and orderly maintenance of interest. The method used, distribution of time,

graduated and sequential development of activities should be suitable. (8) The conclusion of the lesson should include recapitulation through children's participation, making sure that objectives were achieved, and emphasizing the important points of the lesson. (9) Assignment and assessment should be relevant to the objectives of the lesson within the children's ability range, evidence of checking assignments is also necessary. (10) In terms of class management, teachers should be alert to incipient problems, class routines should be handled properly, maintenance and control of class should be preserved, even under difficult conditions, and the student's attention and class participation should be encouraged.

Onibokun's ETE Model does not differentiate between high- or low-inference factors which could potentially make reliability an issue. Measuring high-inference teaching behaviors can rarely be objective, and high interrater reliability among evaluators is difficult to achieve. The ETE Model should be used in conjunction with pre-observation and post-observation conferences with the evaluator and teacher.

An alternative approach to more traditional ways of evaluating teaching, portfolio assessment, which emphasizes both process and product of teaching, might provide a more comprehensive set of evidence to assist in evaluating a teacher's effectiveness. Ryan and Kuhs (1993) relate an experiment of using portfolios as a means of assessing preservice teachers at the University of South Carolina. The actual development, presentation, defense, and scoring of a portfolio were to reflect the teacher's beliefs about what a teacher must know, be able to do, and care about to be an effective teacher.

From this review of models of teacher evaluation in education in general, it is evident that teacher evaluation can provide administrators with information about teachers that can assist them in making decisions that deal with hiring, promoting, or retaining teachers. Such evaluation is most frequently carried out using a form for observation and evaluation of some sort.

Defining Effective Foreign Language Teaching

This section will first provide a definition of FL teaching used in this study. It will then present current definitions that have been provided by researchers and teachers and will discuss pedagogical implications of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*. Finally, it will present and discuss characteristics and behaviors of effective FL teachers, first those suggested by researchers and professional organizations, and second, those suggested as the result of empirical studies. Before effective FL teaching can be defined, however, the distinction between L2 and FL teaching and learning needs to be clarified. As Ellis (1994) notes, in the case of SLA, the actual TL usually plays a social and institutional role in the community. On the other hand, FL learning generally takes place in settings where the TL plays no major role in the community and is basically learned exclusively in classroom contexts. Along the lines of Ellis' explanation, and for the purpose of this study, FL teaching and learning will be used to describe classroom SLA regardless of whether the TL is indeed a second language or third or fourth, etc.

Definitions of Effective Foreign Language Teaching

It is important to note at the beginning of this discussion on effective FL teaching that the professional literature suggests little empirical evidence to help formulate a single definition of effective teaching in general (Aleamoni, 1981; Combs, 1989; Delamere, 1986; Doyle, 1977; Griffith, 1973; King, 1981; Medley, Coker, & Soar, 1984; Nerenz & Knop, 1982; Perry & Rog, 1992; Travers, 1981), and even less research exists on attempting to define effective teaching in the FL field (Nerenz & Knop, 1982; Brosh, 1996). Several aspects of FL teaching are distinctly different from teaching in other disciplines. Brosh (1996) notes that FL teaching differs from the teaching of most other disciplines in that the "means of instruction is also the subject of instruction" (p. 125).

For the purpose of this study, a definition of effective FL teaching was introduced in Chapter One. Effective FL teaching provides learners with the grammatical (syntactical, morphological), lexical, phonological, pragmatic, and sociocultural knowledge they need to communicate successfully in the TL. Recent documents (AATF, 1989; AATSP, 1990; Met, 1994; NADSFL, 1991; NBPTS, 1991; Phillips, 1998; Shulman, 1988; Smith & Rawley, 1998; Schulz et al., 1993) expand this definition and describe effective FL teaching in greater detail. This section looks at a number of definitions of effective FL teaching as they relate to this study.

Several FL teachers and SLA researchers have sought to define effective FL teaching. Met (1994) defines FL teaching as follows: "Effective foreign language instruction is holistic, performance-oriented, and based on constructivist views of

learning. It requires collaborative learning and practice, connects to other areas of the curriculum, and is enhanced through explicit instruction in metacognitive and cognitive learning strategies" (p. 87). In addition to defining what FL teaching is, it is also important to note that the FL teacher has several roles: decision-maker, creator of assessments, assessor, knower, doer, know-how-to person, etc. In this light Phillips (1998) explains that

> exemplary [FL] teachers have always performed multiple tasks...they have always pushed the boundaries of current practice to experiment and investigate new ways of teaching because they are keen observers of their students' learning. They have taken pride in improving and maintaining their language skills and their knowledge of target cultures. They have attended professional meetings and kept up with professional literature. Beyond this, they have been willing to admit to what they do not know by allowing students to pursue research and projects of personal interest; as teachers they have recognized that they do not have to be the source of all knowledge but only have to know how to point that way (Phillips, 1998, p. 10).

Phillips (1998) also points out that the present time requires much more from FL teachers than has been the case in previous years. In the past, teachers frequently associated their teaching with a method or an approach that was fairly prescriptive for them and their students.

Penner (1992) considers effective FL teaching to be the result of classroom

communication and says that the key to effective FL teaching is "the ability of the teacher to adequately communicate to the student and the student's ability and opportunity to respond and demonstrate some competence in reproducing what he has learned by formulating in his own words the facts and concepts that now illuminate his mind" (p. 16). While this is a great definition of effective teaching, it does not mention anything that sets a FL teacher apart from a teacher of any other discipline.

Further, even though a teacher may be very well qualified to teach, effective classroom learning is not guaranteed. Since thought, speech, and manners are a reflection of a teacher's personality, teaching styles vary with the personality of each teacher. What is actually heard and taken in by the learner may not depend so much on content or skill but on the personality of the teacher or the nature of the personal relationship between the teacher and learner (Eble, 1988; Harris, 1981).

The Pedagogical Implications of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*

The FL teaching profession now has the *Standards for FL Learning* (1996) which do not prescribe any one specific method of teaching. The five standards—Communication, Culture, Connections Comparisons, Communities—presented in the *Standards for FL Learning* (1996) recommend guidelines for FL learning in the US (Lafayette & Draper, 1996).

The current move toward national standards for FL learning focuses on learner

outcomes rather than on how these outcomes should be reached. The *Standards* recognize that there are different teaching and learning styles, all of which have their strengths and weaknesses. In the end what matters is whether the learner can communicate in the TL, compare cultures, use the TL in interdisciplinary settings, etc. The challenge then for post-secondary FL teachers in working with the *Standards* is to develop progress indicators for post-secondary FL instruction. The current progress indicators give examples of what students should be able to do with the FL at different levels (K-12 only) but do not hint at how accurate their production or expression should be. As far as behaviors of FL teachers are concerned, the *Standards* mix student outcomes with teaching processes. Further, the *Standards* seem to be based on communicative teaching approaches which see little need for traditional grammar instruction.

With the arrival of the *Standards*, the focus of FL teaching should shift to student performance, and the varying levels of instruction and goal areas suggest a few possible approaches to teaching FLs. As the FL teacher focuses on teaching individual learners, course levels, and ages of learners, he or she will have to carefully select how to go about teaching the FL (Phillips, 1998). Phillips (1998) also explains that successful FL teachers will have knowledge about linguistic and pedagogical theory and will also possess an abundance of wisdom gained from experience. A good FL teacher knows what activities keep his or her students in the TL, how to handle unexpected questions, when to move from an activity that seems to be dragging to a new one, and how to connect the two so

that they make sense to the students. She notes that in FL teaching, "the knowing is often in the doing" (Phillips, 1998, p. 17; see also Phillips, 1999; Shulman, 1988; Smith & Rawley, 1998).

Characteristics and Behaviors of Effective Foreign Language Teachers

Among the characteristics Byrnes (1994) considers to be effective in FL teaching, the following three are relevant to this study: (1) a student-centered learning environment; (2) learners should be cognitively engaged and involved in problem solving and critical analysis activities; (3) FL instruction should accommodate different learning styles and strategies and should utilize different pedagogical approaches.

Professional organizations have also sought in recent years to define effective FL teaching and to suggest guidelines for effective FL teaching. In 1988, ACTFL presented Provisional Program Guidelines for FL Teacher Education. These guidelines suggest a well-planned and broad sequence of studies to allow candidates to develop the processes and skills necessary to experiencing success, satisfaction, and individual growth as FL teachers and in life (see p. 72). Although these guidelines propose the need for new models for preparing FL teachers as well as what the models should contain, they do not suggest specific criteria for effective FL teaching.

The National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Languages (NADSFL, 1991) has also identified effective FL teaching behaviors that provide a basis for common understanding and communication among evaluators, observers, and

teachers in FL classrooms. The six categories include: (1) activities (use of TL by teacher and students during activities, appropriate grouping techniques during activities, activities that are appropriate for course objectives, activities that focus on the target culture); (2) error correction and assessment; (3) taking learning styles into account; (4) enabling students to be successful and develop positive attitudes; (5) variety of instructional materials used; and (6) continued professional development. Although all six categories are relevant to this study, only the first two of the six characteristics suggested by NADSFL to describe effective FL teaching are geared toward FL teaching specifically, while the others refer to general instructional characteristics that are also applicable to FL teaching.

In 1989, the AATF presented a "syllabus of competence" that attempts to define the level of language proficiency teachers should possess as well as knowledge of linguistics, culture, literature, and methodology. The three main principles upon which this syllabus is based are: (1) teacher development is a continuum; (2) accreditation of teacher education should go beyond program descriptions, and program evaluations should take into account what is needed for teacher development; or (3) the FL should be used to the greatest extent possible in the teacher education program and in in-service experiences.

The AATSP (1990) also presented program guidelines for the education and training of teachers of Spanish and Portuguese that are based almost entirely on the *ACTFL Provisional Program Guidelines*. In accordance with the ACTFL guidelines,

AATSP's guidelines provide suggestions for improving program development and pre-service models of teacher preparation rather than proposing criteria for effective teaching.

In 1991, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) described its expectations for accomplished teaching by stating what experienced teachers should know and be able to do. Their expectations are outlined in the following five propositions:

(1) Teachers are committed to students and their learning. In order to demonstrate proposition one, teachers will recognize individual differences in their students and adjust their practice accordingly. They will also have an understanding of how students develop and learn and know that their mission as teachers extends beyond developing the cognitive capacity of their students.

(2) Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students. According to this proposition, teachers appreciate how knowledge in their subjects is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines. Further, teachers command specialized knowledge, know how to convey a subject to students, and generate multiple paths of knowledge.

(3) Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning. When teachers manage and monitor student learning, they call on multiple methods to meet their goals, orchestrate learning in group settings, place a premium on student engagement, regularly assess student progress, and are mindful of their principal objectives.

(4) Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience. In order to engage in reflective teaching, teachers continually make difficult choices that test their judgment and seek the advice of others and draw on education research and scholarship to improve their teaching.

(5) Teachers are members of learning communities by collaborating with other professionals, working collaboratively with parents, and taking advantage of community resources.

Although the NBPTS does not yet offer a complete set of specific guidelines for FL teaching as a separate discipline, it is currently developing standards for FL teachers which should be complete and ready to implement as soon as 2001 (NBPTS, 2000).

In 1993, the AATG Task Force on Professional Standards presented their *Professional Standards for Teachers of German* (Schulz et al, 1993), which are primarily based on the general standards set for accomplished, experienced teachers by the NBPTS. For individual FL teachers to achieve exemplary teaching, three areas of consideration are discussed: (1) German language and culture learning and instruction must be coordinated with and reach into core curricula for all learners; (2) German language and culture learning and instruction must take place within a well-articulated, long-term sequence of instruction that covers all levels of education; and (3) German language and culture instruction must reach out to populations that may not have been traditionally served by German programs previously. In order to reach these goals, the new role of the teacher requires a solid knowledge and skills base that develops, increases, and displays

itself in a variety of ways. The standards also include the evaluation of German teachers' linguistic abilities, cross-cultural competence, professional abilities, sensitivity to diverse student populations, and commitment to life-long professional development. Each standard is explained in terms of specific professional development activities for attaining each standard, performance indicators, and evidence of attaining each standard.

Murphy (1990) describes desirable competencies for graduate teaching assistants who teach FLs. He defines these competencies in terms of *sociolinguistic abilities* (meeting demands for survival, using information in textbooks, explaining terms commonly used in culturally related texts, and using appropriate language in common social settings), *knowledge* (interpreting most common authentic texts, knowing main historical periods of TL countries, and knowing main geographical features and customs), and *attitudes* (being aware of stereotypes about the target culture(s) and explaining their origins and inadequacies, and pointing out attitudes reflected in language and gestures).

Delamere (1986) based her review of the literature on teaching behaviors that she divided into three categories—similar to those of Murphy: *knowledge*, *skills*, and *attitudes*. To be regarded as effective, an instructor should have *knowledge* of the SLA process, learning theory, the psychology of education, the psychology of language, sociolinguistics, effective learning strategies, communication strategies used by learners, and the affective variables influencing FL learning (empathy, attitude, and personality). The *skills* an instructor needs are: assessment and diagnostic skills, teaching techniques, flexibility, and adaptability in use of materials development, as well as skills in current

SLA pedagogical research. *Attitudes* should include interpersonal skills, intercultural awareness and skills, empathy with students, self-assurance, ability to focus instruction on the learner and to take account of individual learning styles, and concern for students' self-esteem and identification (Delamere, 1986).

Without suggesting categories or specific, identifiable teaching behaviors, Nerenz and Knop (1982) suggest that effective teaching takes place when the teacher provides students with opportunities to learn the curriculum content while structuring instruction so that students are actively involved with that content.

Although several general teacher behaviors also apply to FL contexts, there are several teacher behaviors that apply only to FL contexts that are not found in existing models of FL teacher evaluation. The purpose of this study is to gather information from SLA research that provides possible insights into what contributes to successful FL learning. These aspects found to enhance the SLA process are included in the questionnaire. By basing FL teacher behaviors on research that indicates possible factors that could facilitate successful FL learning, teachers can rate these aspects as to their effectiveness in FL teaching.

Empirical Studies on Effective Foreign Language Teaching

A recent empirical study by Brosh (1996) identifies characteristics of the effective FL teacher as perceived by FL teachers and students in the Israeli educational system. Two hundred FL teachers (of English, French, Arabic, and Hebrew) and 406 ninth grade

high school students from ten schools participated. Data were collected using questionnaires and interviews. The questionnaire contained a list of 20 characteristics of effective FL teachers. These characteristics were drawn from the research literature as well as from a pilot questionnaire asking students and teachers to rate the three teaching characteristics they consider to be most important from the list and then to rank the characteristics in order of importance. Interviews of 10-15 minutes in length were conducted with a few respondents to better understand questionnaire responses.

Each characteristic was graded on a scale of 0 to 3. The results yielded a large degree of symmetry between teachers and students as to their perceived characteristics of effective FL teaching. Both teachers and students found *command of subject matter* (i.e., the teacher's mastery of the four basic skills—speaking, listening, reading, and writing) to be the most important characteristic. Both groups agreed that the second most important characteristic was the ability of the teacher to *transmit knowledge* in a way that is easy to understand and remember, and to motivate students to do their best. But for the third priority, students differed significantly from teachers by emphasizing the importance of *treating students fairly and equitably* and the teacher's availability after class time; while the teachers' agreed third priority was to provide students with experiences of success. Factors that were considered *least* important by teachers and students include: knowledge of and attitude toward the culture, conducting lessons in the TL, knowledge of curriculum, classroom research orientation, readiness for inservice training, sense of humor, and teacher's sex and appearance. It is interesting that these factors were

considered to be of least importance because in the professional literature in FL teaching, the teacher's knowledge of and attitude toward the culture and conducting lessons in the TL are considered to be among the most important characteristics of effective FL teaching. The main problem with Brosh's study is that it does not apply exclusively to FL teaching but also indicates native language instruction (Hebrew).

Another study (Politzer and Weiss, 1971) closely observed the classroom behaviors of a group of FL teachers to identify those teachers who were successful in terms of student achievement and to compare their behaviors and characteristics with those teachers who were identified as less successful. The classroom behaviors of 17 teachers of first-year high school French were recorded on videotape in four 15-minute segments over a period of five months. By means of specially constructed criterion tests, student and teacher questionnaires, MLA-ETS Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers, and systematic observation and rating of classroom procedures, data were gathered that yielded 40 variables. Class means on the criterion tests were adjusted for student aptitude as measured by the Carroll-Sapon MLAT (Modern Language Aptitude Test) which was administered at the beginning of the study. Instead of overall effectiveness of each teacher, the effectiveness of a specific behavior or behavioral skill (e.g., achieving closure, using questions, ability to explain) was evaluated with reference to a specific short teaching task.

Politzer and Weiss tested two hypotheses. The first hypothesis predicted a significantly higher level of achievement in the five classes whose teachers ranked

highest in the proportion of free to controlled drill activities than in the five classes whose teachers ranked lowest on this variable. This hypothesis was not sustained. The second hypothesis predicted that teachers who vary classroom procedures from controlled to free drills would be more successful than those who stayed with the same type of drill for prolonged periods of time. This hypothesis was sustained. An analysis of the intercorrelation matrix of the 40 variables used in the study showed that a series of interrelated teacher behaviors and characteristics correlated significantly with student achievement. Among these characteristics were the use of free response drills, the use of visual aids, frequency of switching drill types, residence in France (the TL culture), and high performance in aural comprehension. As a result, these authors conclude that residence in the foreign country and a certain inclination for innovation and flexibility represent desirable characteristics of the FL teacher.

Models of Foreign Language Teacher Evaluation

Many of the criteria and procedures used to evaluate teaching are applicable across disciplines, and models of FL teacher evaluation are usually based on models of evaluation used in teacher education in general and in student teacher training (Jarvis, 1968; Wragg, 1970; Moskowitz, 1976; Gebhard, Gaitan, & Oprandy, 1990). This section will look at various models of evaluation that have been proposed specifically for FL teaching.

Beretta (1992) points out that while numerous books are published yearly in the

field of general education on teacher evaluation, very few publications discuss the evaluation of FL teaching. In the last decade, researchers have become interested in answering specific questions regarding classroom teaching and learning in the attempt to explain how students learn FLs best in classroom settings. Evaluation models are generally based on characteristics of effective FL teachers rather than on characteristics of a specific teaching method. The remainder of this section will look at three approaches to FL teacher evaluation.

Perhaps the most common approach to evaluating FL teaching is classroom observation. Supervisors, coordinators, department chairs, or peers are often called upon to observe other FL teachers. Several observation forms are available, some are theoretically grounded and others are not. Not all observation forms, however, are designed for the observer to make any type of judgment as to whether or not the teaching behaviors included on the form describe effective characteristics FL teaching. Williams (1989) provides a different look at classroom observations and writes that they often can cause problems for teachers and trainers. Observations tend to rely on a trainer's subjective judgment, rather than on developing the teacher's ability to assess his or her own practices. Williams describes a scheme of developmental classroom visits currently in use in an in-service teacher-training program for primary teachers in Singapore. A set of questionnaires with focus questions for the teachers to answer before and after the lesson is used, and the procedure for using the questionnaires are described. The purpose of the questions is to develop the teacher's own critical thinking ability. Questions are

provided for three classroom visits. The trainer's role is positive and helpful, and the visits were considered to be successful by teachers and trainers. The following queries were to be considered prior to the first visit:

(1) Have you chosen an activity that is interesting and will generate meaningful language use?

(2) What classroom arrangement will you use? What materials do you need?

(3) Is your organization smooth? Are the instructions clear? Do the students know the 'rules' of your class?

(4) At what point in your lesson will the students use language for a real purpose?

(5) Write down a question you will ask to encourage a *thoughtful* answer rather than a *correct* answer (p. 87).

The following were to be considered during and after the lesson:

(1) Write down something a student said in the lesson where language was used to communicate a need by the student.

(2) Write down any evidence that your activity was successful/unsuccessful, was smoothly/badly organized, was interesting/boring.

(3) Who was/was not involved?

(4) Which question provided a thoughtful answer by a student?

(5) What would you have done better/like to improve/change in the future? (p. 87).

By making use of such questions, both the trainer and teacher can be made aware of what

goes on in the classroom in terms of what is expected from the teacher. These questions can also assist the teacher in self-evaluation when the teachers understand the characteristics of effective teaching that are considered to be effective in their school (see also Carroll, 1981).

Valdés (1991) describes a model of formative evaluation for beginning FL teachers at the university level that will assist them in the process of improving their teaching from the very first classes they teach. Valdés notes that feedback from video-recorded teaching segments and student ratings are more effective when a skilled, experienced teacher assists the new teacher in analyzing the teaching segment and student ratings. In the context of FL teacher evaluation, Valdés suggests that a combination of videotaped teaching samples and student evaluations can provide improved FL teaching over time. New teachers should be required to keep a record of all student evaluations of their teaching and a videotape recording of at least one class per academic term. Further, rather than having assessment be a threat to teachers, Valdés asserts that it should be an asset.

Valdés proposes a five-point plan with regard to teaching in the reward system: (1) All teaching should be measured by student ratings of instruction. These ratings should be evaluated by a committee on teaching and should become part of an educator's dossier. (2) Every new member of the faculty should have a videotape made of one class per academic term, and this should also be assessed by a committee. (3) Every new faculty member should be assisted in making a pilot videotape to be included in a dossier

as an aid in future job searches. (4) The entire faculty should take part in informal sessions of discussing teaching methods, and all new faculty should be offered assistance in improving their teaching. (5) Course outlines and reading lists should be required of all faculty members, should be available well before a term begins, and should be evaluated for accuracy, clarity, and completeness. One disadvantage of this approach to FL teacher evaluation, however, is that it does not include teaching standards that are based on current research in SLA and teaching.

Pennington and Young (1989) assess the applicability and drawbacks of six procedures of FL teacher evaluation. The first procedure is *teacher interviews*. Teacher interviews consist of standardized questions asked by a supervisor. Interviews can be used as a valid part of pre-employment evaluation or to review performance and as a basis to evaluate performance goals. Pennington and Young also list *competency tests* as a procedure for FL teacher evaluation. Competency tests consist of a standardized test battery that is used for summative purposes as part of teacher certification. It is necessary to note that these tests have low predictive ability for effective teaching. Next, *student ratings of instruction* can be used for formative evaluation purposes if they are completed during the semester and for summative purposes if they are completed as part of the final evaluation process. There is broad agreement among experts that student ratings of instruction, when properly developed and administered, are valid and reliable assessment procedures. Another type of teacher assessment the authors discuss is *classroom observations by a supervisor.* Observations can be used for formative or summative

purposes, and they usually consist of a pre-observation meeting in which criteria and procedures for evaluation are discussed. The observation is followed by a feedback session with the supervisor. The drawback of classroom observations is that they are very time-consuming because multiple observations by trained observers are needed. Like classroom observations, *peer review* can also be both formative and summative in nature. Peer review also usually includes pre- and post-observation meetings and has high face validity but low reliability if used summatively, since bias on the part of the reviewer can never yield totally objective results (French-Lazovik, 1981). The final procedure of evaluation discussed by Pennington and Young is *self-evaluation*, which can be performed through self-reports, or using self-rating forms. It is generally used for formative evaluation only. The authors conclude that there is a need for the following in teacher evaluation: new instruments and procedures for evaluating teaching; research on the effects and effectiveness of the new instruments and procedures; a variety of methods and sources to be used to evaluate teaching in various contexts; active involvement by teachers in the evaluation process; focus on evaluation incorporated into professional development; and training of evaluators.

As can be seen from the reviews of current models of FL teacher evaluation, FL teacher evaluation can take on a number of forms and can come from several different perspectives. Once a consensus is reached on what constitutes effective FL teaching, models of teacher evaluation that reflect the consensus can be created.

Research on Classroom Foreign Language Teaching

Two basic approaches have been used in research on classroom FL teaching: interaction analysis and observation (Allwright, 1988; Chaudron, 1988; Day, 1990; Gebhard, Gaitan, & Oprandy, 1990; Jarvis, 1968; Long, 1980; Moskowitz, 1976; Wragg, 1970). Several methods are available within each approach for the collection and analysis of data. Behavioral observation systems, discourse analysis, ethnography, and diary studies are the most common methods of describing classroom behavior of teachers and students (Long, 1980; Chaudron, 1988). Over 200 instruments have been developed for describing classroom behaviors as well as classroom settings (Allwright, 1988; Borich & Madden, 1977; Chaudron, 1988; Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Flanders, 1970; Bellack, Kliebard, Hyman, & Smith, 1966; Wright & Nuthall, 1970). Well over twenty schemes are intended to investigate behaviors in FL teaching (Chaudron, 1988; Long, 1980; Delamere, 1986). The observation instruments usually consist of lists of behaviors (which are primarily verbal behaviors) which highly trained observers watch for and record. Tallies or numbers that denote specific behavioral categories are used to note how often behaviors occur during an interval of time during a lesson either in "real-time" or during a recording of a lesson. These schemes differ in various ways, some of which include the focus of the scheme, the ease of use for real-time coding, the unit to be coded and analyzed, the types of recording procedures used, the types of items they contain, the number of categories they include, whether or not they use multiple coding, and their intended purpose. This section will review the following four major observation schemes

in FL teaching: Moskowitz's FLINT scheme (1971); Fanselow's FOCUS (1977); Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, and Todesco's 1978 scheme; and Allen, Fröhlich, and Spada's COLT system (1984).

One of the early, most well-known instruments is the Foreign Language Interaction Analysis System (FLINT) which was adapted and somewhat extended by Moskowitz (1971, 1976, 1978) from Flanders' (1970) widely-used observation scheme. This scheme gives FL teachers objective feedback from an audiolingual perspective about interaction in their classrooms, especially in terms of the learning environment created by the teacher. The original scheme contained ten general categories in its first stage—seven for teacher behaviors (i.e., deals with feelings, uses ideas of students, asks questions, directs pattern drills), two for student responses (specific response and open-ended or student initiated response), and one for silence or confusion. The updated scheme contains the following 34 categories where the first 19 categories deal with teacher talk, the next ten deal with student talk, and the last five deal with special conventions:

Table 2.1. The Foreign Language Interaction Analysis System by Moskowitz.
(Based on Moskowitz, 1976)

Teacher talk	Student talk	Special conventions
• deals with student feelings	• responds to teacher with specific answers	• use of English by teacher or student(s)
• praises or encourages	• choral response	• nonverbal gestures or facial expressions that communicate a message

• jokes	• reads orally	• silence/students doing tasks
• uses ideas of students	• student initiated talk	• teacher writes on board
• repeats student response verbatim	• off task	• teacher smiles (may or may not be speaking)
• asks questions	• silence	
• asks cultural questions	• silence during A-V tasks	
• personalizes	• confusion, work-oriented	
• gives information	• confusion, non-work-oriented	
• corrects without rejection	• laughter	
• discusses culture/civilization		
• models examples		
• explains procedures		
• personalizes about self		
• carries out routine tasks		
• gives directions		
• directs pattern drills		
• criticizes student behavior		
• criticizes student response		

This system was designed for real-time coding at three-second intervals and takes place during an entire class meeting. At each interval, the observer places a tally in a grid of columns and rows which both represent the same categories. This tally stands for the paired sequence of behaviors that has just been observed in the three-second interval,

where the first behavior category determines the row, and the second determines the column of the tally. Then the second behavior is paired with the next one in a new row and column tally. The strengths of the FLINT system are that it can objectively recognize, categorize, and analyze verbal classroom behavior, and it provides a relatively accurate and factual description of what goes on in a classroom (Moskowitz, 1971; Chaudron, 1988; Gebhard, Gaitan, & Oprandy, 1990). The weaknesses of this scheme are that it cannot accommodate elements of interaction found in partner or group work (Gebhard, Gaitan, & Oprandy, 1990); it does not allow analysis of the interactive form of discourse past the linking of pairs (Chaudron, 1988); it can be difficult to choose to which category certain events are to be assigned, as some may fall into more than one category; it does not take instructional goals, context, and content into account, nor can it judge quality of the subject matter. Further, no evaluation of the teaching during the observation is implicit—only the individual who knows the specific goals of the lesson can make meaningful value judgments as to the desirability level of certain behaviors (i.e., a "good" lesson for teaching subject-verb agreement would not necessarily be a "good" lesson for analyzing poetry). This scheme is cumbersome to score due to the large number of possible categories to which each teaching behavior could be assigned. Also, there can be a lack of reliability as well as observer bias, and it can be difficult for an observer to make split-second judgment calls when assigning categories. Bailey (1975) observed that in determining reliability in Flanders' interaction analysis system, on which Moskowitz's FLINT is based, event-by-event agreement between observers is actually

overestimated and hidden, as it is based on the number of collected tallies for each of the categories, rather than on the agreement for each event. Finally, the scheme has not been validated.

Fanselow (1977) developed an observation system called *Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings* (FOCUS). This scheme is designed to describe the teaching act and to be useful for research purposes in finding relationships between interaction and consequent outcomes. Fanselow's alternative to Flanders' scheme was an attempt to "bridge the gap between teacher trainers and researchers by providing something of practical value to everybody, in any field" (Allwright, 1988, p. 152). The instrument is designed so the evaluator can easily classify communications people send and receive in teaching situations. It also illustrates the use of different analytical dimensions for multiple coding and contains five components of communication which are representative of classroom activity: the source, the medium, the use, the content, and the pedagogical purpose of the activity. The unit of analysis is the "move" in pedagogical discourse where the categories of the pedagogical purposes (structuring, soliciting, responding, reacting) distinguish classroom interactions. The major strengths of FOCUS are that the instrument can be used for observation either live or from a recording; teachers can identify the source and target of each act of communication (see Gebhard, Gaitan, & Oprandy, 1990), and the intent of communication and what means are used to communicate in the FL teaching context; teachers can investigate their teaching in just one category or several; and purposes and amounts of student interaction can be

investigated (Gebhard, Gaitan, & Oprandy, 1990). The weaknesses of FOCUS are that much practice is needed to effectively use this complex scheme. Non-trained observers may find it difficult to make judgments because it can be arduous to choose to which category certain events are to be assigned. Like FLINT, it is only descriptive, not prescriptive in nature (Long, 1980), and it does not take instructional goals, context, and content into account.

Like Fanselow's scheme, the scheme by Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, and Todesco (1978) consists of five main categories (pedagogical discourse, activity, mode, subject matter, and clues), but unlike Fanselow's scheme, it explains each category in much more detail. Also like Fanselow's, the unit of analysis is the "move" in pedagogical discourse, although this scheme has different subcategories than Fanselow's. Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, and Todesco were interested in the type of feedback teachers provide for student errors as well as when teachers do not respond to learner errors at all. The weaknesses of this scheme are that the manner in which classroom events are to be coded is vague, and it is difficult to choose to which category certain events are to be assigned. The authors claim that coders reached high level of agreement after some practice and training, but actual statistical results were never provided. Like FLINT and FOCUS, the scheme by Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, and Todesco is only descriptive and does not account for instructional goals, context, and content.

In 1984, Allen, Fröhlich, and Spada produced the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) instrument for the purpose of evaluating communicative FL

teaching. This observation instrument is divided into two parts: Part A deals with lesson activities and is made for real-time coding, and Part B deals with verbal interaction in the classroom and is made for analysis following a lesson based on audio recordings. The purpose of this scheme is to "pay closer attention to what teachers actually do in the classroom" (p. 232), in contrast to what linguists and psychologists believe they should do. The COLT scheme looks at four general issues: the nature of FL proficiency, the influence of social context on bilingual development, the effects of instructional variables on language development, and the influence of individual learner characteristics. The authors report the results of a pilot study conducted with the scheme in thirteen courses (French language, French immersion, and ESL) and claim that the scheme has high validity in distinguishing differences among the three programs and the classes contained within the programs (Fröhlich, Spada, & Allen, 1985). No statistical analyses are applied to their scores that consist of observed frequencies counted from each form. Also, the researchers found that primarily form-based instruction contributed to the development of higher grammatical abilities than primarily meaning-based instruction, and that primarily meaning-based instruction did not contribute to the development of higher levels of communicative ability. A few years later, Spada (1990) reports results from observation studies that used COLT and found that form-based instruction led to higher grammatical ability, and meaning-based instruction led to higher levels of communicative abilities. The major strength of COLT is that it is capable of revealing significant differences in communicative orientation among L2 classes at various levels of instruction and learning,

and the major weakness is that it does not address error correction.

A comparison of four of the major observation instruments of interaction analysis shows the degree to which different features of classroom interaction have been considered as the topics of research and as categories for classifying classroom behavior. This comparison also shows that none of the systems can evaluate the content, context, and goals of a FL course, nor can they evaluate unobservable events or teacher characteristics (i.e., teachers' ability to motivate students to learn). Of all the systems, COLT is the closest to actually getting at observable teaching behaviors. In addition, none of the four schemes is overtly prescriptive in nature. By simply including certain behaviors, the researcher suggests which teaching behaviors and attitudes the researchers consider to be effective in FL teaching and learning, even though none states which behaviors they consider to contribute to effective FL teaching.

Theories of and Approaches to Foreign Language Teaching and Their Implications for the Role of the Teacher

A discussion of the major methods of FL teaching will provide insights into which teaching behaviors were considered effective in the past. Before reviewing the methods, however, three key terms *approach*, *method*, and *technique* must be defined and differentiated. According to Anthony (1963),

> [t]he arrangement [of the terms: approach, method, and technique] is hierarchical. The organizational key is that techniques carry out a method which is consistent

> with an approach...An approach is a set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning. An approach is axiomatic. It describes the nature of the subject matter to be taught...Method is an overall plan for the orderly presentation of language material, no part which contradicts, and all of which is based upon, the selected approach. An approach is axiomatic, a method is procedural. Within one approach, there can be many methods...A technique is implementational—that which actually takes place in a classroom. It is a particular...stratagem...used to accomplish an immediate objective. Techniques must be consistent with a method, and therefore in harmony with an approach as well (pp. 63-67).

These definitions of approach, method, and technique assist in differentiating what each terms means in light of the ensuing discussion.

Diller (1978) stated that methods of teaching FLs in the US did not have a linear development where those who created new methods sought to actually remedy what was wrong with previous methods. In discussing methods of FL teaching that have been implemented during the past century, their main assumptions of how a language is learned, their main goals, and the role of the FL teacher in each will be briefly discussed. The following methods of FL teaching and learning will be reviewed: the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method, Total Physical Response, the Natural Approach and communicative language teaching, as well as a cognitive approach to FL teaching and learning, the Cognitive-Code Method. Three

humanistic approaches, that were not as widely practiced as other methods, will also be reviewed: the Silent Way, Suggestopedia, and Community Language Learning.

The Grammar-Translation Method

The Grammar-Translation Method and the Direct Method are the two methods of FL teaching that were most widely used up until about the 1960s. These two methods resulted from very different theories of FL learning. The Grammar-Translation Method was the main method of FL teaching from about the 1840s to 1940s, and Richards and Rodgers (1986) note that revised versions of it are still used today. The Grammar-Translation Method is based on the belief that FL learning is primarily an intellectual process of analyzing and translating texts and memorizing vocabulary lists and explicit grammar rules. It emphasizes explanations of grammatical points because it is based on the view that FL learning is the acquisition of conscious rule knowledge. The goal of FL study under this method is that learners learn a FL in order to read its literature or to benefit from the mental discipline and intellectual development that FL study has to offer (see Stern, 1983). With these goals in mind, reading and writing are the main focus while little, if any, time is spent on speaking or listening. Vocabulary is selected based on the reading texts used in each course, and translation exercises assist learners in reviewing and learning vocabulary and grammatical structures (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Accuracy is essential, and the student's L1 is the language of instruction. Effective Grammar-Translation teachers know the grammar of a language, are the authority in the

classroom, and direct all learning activities. Students follow what the teacher tells them to do, so that they can learn what the teacher knows. Teachers do not necessarily have to be proficient in the TL.

The Direct Method

Both the Grammar-Translation and the Direct Methods have been used to teach FLs for centuries. In contrast with the Grammar-Translation Method, however, the Direct Method uses the TL as medium of instruction, and emphasis is placed on developing speaking and listening skills rather than strictly on reading and writing. The Direct Method seeks to encourage learners to make a *direct* associations between meanings of FL words and their L1 equivalents. For proponents of the Direct Method, the purpose of learning FLs is not exclusively to be able to read literature in the TL but also to communicate using the TL. Grammar is to be taught inductively. Larsen-Freeman (1986) points out that an explicit grammar rule may never be provided or explained and that culture is also an important aspect of FL learning. Effective Direct Method teachers motivate students to think and communicate in the TL. Classroom activities are primarily teacher-centered and generally focus on students' active involvement using the TL. Such activities might include singing, using commands to teach grammar and vocabulary, using pictures to teach vocabulary, and small group discussions.

The Audiolingual Method

The Audiolingual Method is based on behaviorist theories of learning that stress habit formation through mimicry, memorization, and repeated practice drills. It was developed in the US during World War II (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). The predominant theory of SLA in the 1950s and 1960s was rooted in behaviorist psychology. Behaviorists believed that FL learning was simply a matter of imitation and habit formation (repetitive manipulation of forms). This belief stems from the notion that in L1 acquisition infants imitate the sounds and patterns they hear around them and receive positive reinforcement when they do. Young children are encouraged by their surroundings and continue to imitate and practice sounds and patterns until they form "habits" of accurate FL use. Behaviorists also believe that the quality and quantity of the FL that learners hear, and the consistency of the reinforcement given by those around them, contribute to successful SLA.

The underlying belief of the Audiolingual Method is that FL learners draw on the habits they formed in learning their L1 and transfer these habits to learning the FL. Errors that FL learners make are the result of transfer from the L1 to the L2. In the attempt to minimize errors in FL learning, behaviorists employed the *Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis* (CAH) and compared structures in the FL with those in the L1. The CAH theorizes that FL learners will easily learn structures that are similar in the L1 and FL, but will have difficulty learning structures that are different from structures in the L1. Researchers, however, found that not all errors predicted by the CAH were made by FL

learners, and that learners also made errors that were not predicted by the CAH.

The theory of language underlying the Audiolingual Method comes from the view suggested by American linguists in the 1950s known as *structural linguistics* (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Language was considered to be a system of structurally related components (phonemes, morphemes, words, structures, and sentence types) for the encoding of meaning. The L1 and TL have different linguistic systems that should be kept separate so that the learners' L1 interferes as little as possible with learners' efforts to learn the TL.

The Audiolingual Method differs from the Grammar-Translation and Direct Methods in the belief that the different linguistic systems of the L1 and TL should be kept separate so that a student's L1 does not interfere with the learning of the TL. Correct TL production is essential to successful FL learning, so it is the teacher's role to model the TL in a native or native-like manner. According to the Audiolingual Method, the teacher can be regarded as the conductor of an orchestra who directs and controls the FL output of his or her students (see Larsen-Freeman, 1986). If learners produce incorrect TL structures, bad habits can be formed, and the TL can never successfully be learned, hence errors must be corrected. Larsen-Freeman (1986) notes that the primary challenge in teaching according to the Audiolingual Method is to require learners to overcome habits of their L1. A comparison between the L1 and TL will tell the teacher those areas in which the students should encounter difficulty. As with the Direct Method, the purpose of FL learning is to use the FL to communicate. Effective audiolingual teachers are able to

explain the TL grammar in the TL, direct stimulus-response drills, correct student errors, and assist students in overcoming habits they have formed in their L1.

Total Physical Response

The Total Physical Response Method (TPR) is based on theories of L1 learning and on the premise that kinetic, multi-sensory involvement while learning the TL facilitates L1 acquisition. Based on research studies (Asher, Kusudo, & de la Torre, 1974; Katona, 1940; Winitz, 1981), Asher (1977; 1986) claims that when FL learners listen to commands in the TL and carry them out, they can effectively learn a FL. Asher (1986) describes TPR as follows: "In a sense, language is orchestrated to a choreography of the human body." When students are physically moving in response to various commands, they will learn and remember what they learn in the TL better and retain it longer and will be relaxed as they do so. A sample lesson using TPR would consist of the FL teacher encouraging the students to respond to the given commands, such as: "Stand up. Sit down. Open the book. Read the book. Close the book. Open the book to page 100. Take a piece of paper. Take a pen or pencil. Write your name on the paper." The teacher's role in the beginning is to direct all student language learning behavior and to provide correct models of the TL in the imperative form. As students begin speaking, they may take over the class and give commands to the teacher and other class members. Effective TPR teachers are "director[s] of a stage play in which the students are actors"

(Asher, 1977, p. 43). They also decide what to teach, and who models and presents the new material.

The Natural Approach and Communicative Language Teaching

In reaction to the behaviorist view of FL learning, the nativists, headed by Chomsky (1959), believed that children are biologically programmed for language learning, that language develops in a child in a similar way that other biological functions (such as walking) develop, and that the societal environment only triggers a child's L1 acquisition through comprehensible input. Further, Chomsky argues that children learn far more about the complex structures of their L1 than they would ever be expected to learn based solely on the input they receive from those around them. The input they hear is sometimes based on incorrect information about their L1 (such as wrong words, slips of the tongue, false starts, etc.) and, more often than not, does not contain all of the structures they need to hear to fully develop their L1 (Mitchell & Myles, 1998). Chomsky also believes that children's minds are not blank slates to be filled as a result of imitating and practicing language structures, but that they possess the innate ability, known as the *Language Acquisition Device* (LAD), the "black box," or, more recently, *Universal Grammar* (UG) to learn on their own the structures of their L1 (Chomsky, 1981; Cook, 1988; White, 1989). UG contains the principles[1] and parameters[2] that are

---

[1]"Principles" are abstract rules that permit or prohibit certain structures from occurring in a language.

common to all languages, and children discover intuitively through their input what parts of the UG apply to their own L1.

Krashen and Terrell (1983) based their Natural Approach to FL learning on nativist theories of language learning and on Krashen's *Monitor Model* of SLA (Krashen, 1981; Krashen, 1982; Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Krashen, 1985). The *Monitor Model* has provided theoretical underpinnings not only for the Natural Approach but also for other approaches of communicative language teaching. Krashen's five central hypotheses will first be discussed as they relate to FL teaching: (1) the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis; (2) the Monitor Hypothesis; (3) the Natural Order Hypothesis; (4) the Input Hypothesis; and (5) the Affective Filter Hypothesis. Following the discussion of the *Monitor Model*, the Natural Approach and communicative language teaching will be discussed.

According to Krashen's first hypothesis, the *Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis*, learners go about gaining competence in a FL in two ways: they can "acquire" the language, or they can "learn" it. Krashen claims that FL learners acquire structures of the FL when they are involved in meaningful interaction in the FL, in a manner similar to the way children acquire their L1. (*Meaningful interaction* means successful exchange of information without regard to grammatical accuracy.) Learning, on the other hand, takes place in the classroom setting when FL learners are engaged in conscious study and attention to correct form through explanation, analysis, and/or error correction. For Krashen, acquiring a FL is more important than learning it, because only language that

---

ß[2]"Parameters" are systematic ways in which languages vary, usually expressed as a choice between two options; such as the pro-drop parameter—either sentences in a language

has been acquired is available to the learner in natural language use situations. Also, learning cannot turn into acquisition because speakers of FLs who have consciously learned rules are not able to correctly employ the rules in real-life, potentially face-threatening situations in which they are to converse in the FL, because they cannot attend to both meaning and form at the same time. One drawback of this hypothesis is that it cannot be proven whether language that has been acquired or learned is being used at any give time.

Krashen's second hypothesis of FL learning, the *Monitor Hypothesis*, states that the structures of the FL that have been acquired are responsible for fluency and unconscious, automatic judgments regarding accuracy of utterances. The structures of the FL that have been learned, on the other hand, can only serve as an "editor" or "monitor" for consciously correcting utterances in the FL that have been made, provided that there is sufficient time, rule knowledge, and focus on accuracy. A weakness of this hypothesis is that it is very difficult to demonstrate when the "monitor" is being used and to know exactly which features of the TL have been acquired and which have been learned in any given utterance.

According to Krashen's third hypothesis, the *Natural Order Hypothesis*, FL learners acquire the rules of a FL in a predictable progression and some rules are acquired early while others are acquired later on in the learning process. FL learners will acquire these rules in the *natural order* regardless of the order in which the rules are taught, and regardless of whether the FL is learned in a formal classroom setting or in a natural

---

must have a subject or a sentence may not require a subject.

environment. Krashen's evidence for this hypothesis comes primarily from research done in morpheme acquisition studies which have found that FL learners may indeed pass through similar stages in their development of the FL grammatical system (Brown, 1973; de Villiers & de Villiers, 1973; Dulay & Burt, 1973; Dulay & Burt, 1974; Dulay & Burt, 1975; Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982; Slobin, 1970; Slobin, 1973). Slobin (1970; 1973) and Brown (1973) established similarities in the language learning behaviors of young children, regardless of their native language. With the study of young children learning English as their L1, the order of acquisition in which several structures emerge in speech was found. Evidence exists of a positive relationship between morpheme acquisition orders in both instructed and natural SLA (Krashen, 1977; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Pica, 1984), and developmental stages do not appear to be modifiable consistently by instruction (Pica, 1983; Pienemann, 1984; Pienemann, 1989).

Krashen's fourth hypothesis, the *Input Hypothesis*, explains that FL learners acquire FLs only through *comprehensible input*, or by understanding the written or spoken message they receive in the FL. If the input learners receive contains structures or forms that are just beyond the learners' level of competence in the FL—a level called $i + 1$ by Krashen—the learners will comprehend the input and should acquire the new structures or forms. The weaknesses of this hypothesis are that Krashen's $i + 1$ has neither been clearly defined nor empirically documented, and Krashen (1985) himself has acknowledged that comprehensible input is necessary but not sufficient for successful SLA (McLaughlin, 1987; White, 1989; White, 1991).

Krashen's *Input Hypothesis* has important implications for FL teaching and is related to Long's Interaction Hypothesis. According to interaction theory, adults usually modify their speech when speaking with young children. When adults speak with young children in English, they generally slow their rate of speech, elevate the pitch of their voice, exaggerate their intonation, and use shorter and simpler sentences (Lightbown & Spada, 1993). Supporters of the interactionist view, such as Long (1985), Long and Robinson (1998), Schmidt (1993), and Sharwood Smith (1993) are more concerned with how input is made comprehensible than that it is comprehensible. Long's Interaction Hypothesis states that

> [m]odification of the interactional structure of conversation...is a better candidate for a necessary (not sufficient) condition for acquisition [than non-modification of the interactional structure]. The role it plays in negotiation for meaning helps to make input comprehensible while still containing unknown linguistic elements (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, p. 144).

Further, Long's Interaction Hypothesis maintains that SLA is a process described by neither a purely linguistic nativist nor a purely environmentalist theory (Long, 1996). This hypothesis states that interaction between learners and, preferably but not only, more proficient speakers is critical in SLA and between learners and particular types of written texts (Long, 1997). In his research on interaction in SLA, Long (1981; 1983; 1985) found that there is little linguistic difference between the speech produced by NS-NS and NS-NNS pairs in terms of grammatical complexity, yet significant differences between the

two sets of interactions in terms of language functions and managing conversations are seen. For example, the NS-NNS pairs were more likely to use communication strategies such as *repetitions*, *comprehension checks*, and *clarification requests* (for more examples, see Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1987).

If comprehensible input is all that is needed for successful SLA, the issue of when and how FL learners convert that input into intake (language that they actually acquire) should be considered. Yet when and how learners convert input into intake remains insufficiently explained in SLA research (Long & Robinson, 1998; Schmidt, 1993; Sharwood Smith, 1993). Some researchers claim that learners must consciously attend to certain features in input that is both communicative and comprehensible to be able to process the input and eventually implement these features into their own linguistic systems of the TL as these systems develop (Long & Robinson, 1998; Rutherford & Sharwood Smith, 1985; Schmidt, 1990; Schmidt, 1993; Sharwood Smith, 1993). Krashen (1977; 1982; 1985), on the other hand, maintains that acquisition is a subconscious process and that FL learners look for meaning first before noticing any grammatical forms in the input. Doughty and Williams (1998a) in their recent edited volume on focus on form in classroom SLA—along with DeKeyser (1998), Williams and Evans (1998), Harley (1998), Lightbown (1998), Long and Robinson (1998), Swain (1998), Doughty and Varela (1998), White (1998)—firmly advocate that learners must consciously attend to features of input that are to become part of their linguistic systems.

VanPatten (1985) suggests, however, that it is highly unlikely that FL learners in

the early stages of SLA simultaneously process meaning and form due to the cognitive effort that is involved in doing so. VanPatten conducted a study that investigated whether or not learners can consciously attend to both form and meaning when processing input. Subjects were 202 university students of Spanish (first semester, fourth semester, and third-year conversation courses). The results of this study offer support that conscious attention to form in the input competes with conscious attention to meaning, and in addition, it is only when input is easily understood that learners are able to attend to form as part of the intake processing.

Finally, the *Affective Filter Hypothesis* states that some type of affective barrier exists that prevents learners from acquiring or learning input that is in their surroundings due to their increased state of self-consciousness, anxiety, tension, boredom, etc. If the learner is stressed or anxious about learning, the filter is "up," and if the learner is motivated and relaxed while learning the FL, the filter is "down." The affective filter is described to have four functions:

> (1) It determines which language models the learner will select.
>
> (2) It determines which part of the language will be attended to first.
>
> (3) It determines when the language acquisition efforts should cease.
>
> (4) It determines how fast a learner can acquire a language (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982, p. 46).

Weaknesses of this hypothesis are that Krashen does not explain how the affective filter is developed, how it determines "which part of the language" is attended to first, or how

any part of language reaches the filter.

Some researchers (McLaughlin, 1987; Swain, 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1995) disagree with some, if not all, of Krashen's claims. It is, however, interesting to note that Krashen (1999), despite much criticism, still holds strong to his claim that traditional grammar instruction does not lead to successful FL acquisition (see also Krashen, 1992; Krashen, 1993).

The Natural Approach is based on Krashen's *Monitor Model* of SLA and its main objective that FL learners learn to communicate competently in the TL so that their speech is comprehensible to a NS. Terrell suggested that "the level of competence needed for minimal communication acceptable to native speakers is much lower than that supposed by most teachers...if we are to raise our expectations of oral competence in communication we must lower our expectations for structural accuracy" (Terrell, 1977, p. 326). Classroom activities should encourage communication, minimize the time spent on error correction, and allow for responses in either the L1 or TL. Teachers should concentrate more on ensuring that their students receive large amounts of "comprehensible input," or input in the TL that is slightly above students' current level of competency in the TL, than on practicing features of the TL. The teacher's role is to provide comprehensible input, make the classroom environment friendly, and select and direct a variety of activities that meet students' needs and interests (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

Communicative language teaching is considered to be the leading approach since

the mid-1970s. It developed from the writings of applied linguists such as Wilkins, Widdowson, Brumfit, Candlin, and Savignon (see Omaggio, 1993 and Richards & Rodgers, 1986) and does not claim a particular theory of FL learning as its basis, although Krashen's *Monitor Model* provides theoretical underpinnings for this approach. Omaggio (1993) and Richards and Rodgers (1986) point out that three main theoretical premises are implied in this approach—the principle of communication (activities that include communication promote FL learning), the principle of task (activities that require learners to complete real-life tasks promote FL learning), and the principle of meaningfulness (learners must be engaged in meaningful and authentic FL use in order for learning to take place). Meaning and contextualization of vocabulary and grammar are of primary importance in communicative language teaching. Learners are encouraged to communicate using the TL from the beginning of instruction, and the L1 is only to be used judiciously. Fluency and comprehensible language use are the main goal. The teacher's role in communicative language teaching is to facilitate the communication process between all learners in the classroom, to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group, to organize resources, and to act as a resource (Breen & Candlin, 1980).

Much of the support for communicative FL teaching comes from discourse interaction theory (Baker, 1992; Bowers & Flinders, 1990; Gutierrez, 1994; Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995; Nystrand, 1997; Wells, 1996). The basic claim of discourse interaction theory is that negotiations for meaning lead to subsequent modifications of a

FL learner's interlanguage and are essential to language development. Research on discourse interaction in the FL classroom provides support that connects learners' interactional involvement to their communicative development (Hall, 1999). Ellis (1994) provides a thorough overview of research focused on discourse interaction theory. He examines the following four common principles investigated in discourse interaction theory: (1) input frequency, (2) comprehensible input, (3) learner output, and (4) collaborative discourse.

Learner output studies have shown that SLA occurs when learners are "pushed" into producing the TL. Without an incentive to produce spoken or written expressions in the TL, FL learning will likely stagnate, and as a result, learners will not achieve greater levels of FL proficiency (Swain, 1985; Harley, Allen, Cummins, & Swain, 1990).

Collaborative discourse studies have focused on several variables concerning both NS-NNS and NNS-NNS interactions. Pica, Holliday, Lewis, Berducci, and Newman (1991) attempted to explain the role of gender in NS-NNS interaction, and Zuengler (1993) provided evidence for the role of content knowledge in NS-NNS conversations. Although these two studies have made contributions to our understanding of discourse interaction, limitations in both studies do not allow the results to be generalized. Pica et al. (1991) note that their study was conducted under "the basic assumption that languages are learned through interactions, but it is this very assumption that itself must first be tested" (p. 370). And Zuengler (1993) questions whether the same results would be achieved in spontaneous speech rather than in research-imposed communication

activities. Ellis' (1994) conclusion on discourse interaction theory is perhaps the most insightful: "In all likelihood, input combines with other factors such as the learner's L1, the learner's communicative need to express certain meanings and the learner's internal processing mechanisms" (p. 288).

Another aspect of communicative language teaching is research that has been conducted in the area of functional and pragmatic perspectives about L2 learning. The main findings explain that learners acquire aspects of the L2 as they are needed to express communicative needs in the L2 (see Givon, 1979; Klein, 1986; MacWhinney, 1987; MacWhinney, Bates, & Klingell, 1984; Perdue, 1991; Perdue & Klein, 1992). Further, the formal aspects of the L2 are acquired and employed as the need arises for L2 learners to express meaning by means of more complex forms. A general assumption of functional approaches according to Tomlin (1990) is that "the acquisition of a language arises from general circumstances of use and communicative interaction" (p. 161). According to functionalists, L1 acquisition consists of learning certain fundamental functions of the L1 and the procedures for carrying them out as the need arises. Based on this premise, in SLA learners are already familiar with these functions from their L1 and apply them to the input they receive in the TL (Klein, 1991). Klein (1991) explains this as follows:

> It is these functions...[that] drive the learner to break down parts of the input and to organize them into small subsystems, which is reorganized whenever a new piece from the flood of input is added, until eventually the target system is

reached (p. 220).

Research studies using functional and pragmatic perspectives about SLA generally take the form of case studies of either individuals or groups in natural settings (usually in the work place) in the early stages of SLA. The studies yield much data to assist in explaining how and how fast L2s are learned. Research studies have only dealt with the early stages of SLA. This strand of SLA research has not yet attempted to explain later and more complex stages of syntactic development (see Sato, 1990).

The effective communicative language teaching teacher designs classroom activities that focus on communication in the TL, reserving traditional grammar explanations and practice outside the classroom whenever possible. The teacher should plan lessons that are focused on modifying and improving learners' grammar rather than focusing on one rule at a time. The teacher should also provide learners with large amounts of vocabulary. Finally, it is imperative that the teacher provides a comfortable and relaxed classroom environment that is conducive to FL learning.

The Cognitive-Code Method

The main goal of teaching according to the Cognitive-Code Method is for FL learners to acquire similar abilities in the FL similar to those of NSs (Chastain, 1976). In the attempt to attain this goal, students should strive for control of grammar rules so that they are able to create in the TL on their own when encountering a situation for which they are not linguistically prepared. In other words, competence must precede

performance. Grammar rules should be explicitly explained and discussed—generally in the L1. Further, all activities in the FL classroom should be meaningful to the students, and students should always understand what they are being asked to do. Possible disadvantages of this approach are that teachers might tend to spend too much time on traditional grammar explanations, too much time speaking the L1, and culture learning is not directly incorporated into the curriculum.

The theoretical underpinnings for the Cognitive-Code Method come from cognitive research in L2 learning. In the 1970s, SLA researchers were primarily concerned with describing the linguistic systems of L2 learners. Later, SLA researchers sought to describe how L2 learners learn and process various features of the L2. For cognitive psychologists, SLA is the development of knowledge systems that will ultimately become automatically available for the comprehension and production of written and spoken language (McLaughlin, 1987). Pienemann's *learnability-teachability hypothesis* and communication strategies in L2 learning are two relevant aspects of cognitive research in SLA.

Pienemann's *learnability-teachability hypothesis* suggests that in learning an L2, learners follow a fixed path in their acquisition of certain grammar structures. He based this hypothesis on the research done by the ZISA project (*Zweitspracherwerb Italienischer, Spanischer und Portugiesischer Arbeiter*; see Meisel, Clahsen, & Pienemann, 1981; Pienemann, 1981), which found that migrant workers learning German acquired stages of German word order in a predictable fashion.

Pienemann's explanation of these developmental stages is in terms of processing complexity. FL learners first adopt a canonical order that reflects the way in which they perceive events (Actor-Action-Acted upon). When learners realize that German does not consistently follow this canonical order, they are constrained by processing limitations in the hypotheses they can make. Pienemann argues in his teachability hypothesis that FL instruction can only be effective if learners pass through the preceding stages on the developmental path. When a learner show signs of having reached a developmental stage, however, teaching can then speed up the acquisition process.

Communication strategies are used by non-fluent language learners while interacting in the L2 so that they can exchange information without complete mastery of the language. A communication strategy can be regarded as a means of overcoming a problem in communication or as "potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal" (Faerch & Kasper, 1983, p. 143). Communication strategies can be: (1) mutual attempts to solve L2 communication problems by participants (Tarone, 1980); (2) individual solutions to psychological problems of L2 processing (Faerch & Kasper, 1984); and (3) ways of filling vocabulary gaps in the L1 or L2 (Kellerman, Ammerlaan, Bongaerts, & Poulisse, 1990; Poulisse, 1990).

The research on cognitive approaches and communication strategies sheds light on the process of SLA. If learners are taught communication strategies, they might become more successful FL learners than if they are not taught to use them. It is still

unclear, however, whether cognitive approaches can explain what learners' mental grammar contains or what impact learners' theories about the TL system have (Mitchell & Myles, 1998).

The effective FL teacher who teaches according to the Cognitive-Code approach assists learners in developing the same types of abilities NSs have by helping them attain a minimal control over the rules of the TL so they can produce their own language in previously unencountered situations appropriately. Also, in teaching the language, the teacher must move from the student's present knowledge base to what they still need to learn. The teacher should introduce situations that encourage students to work creatively with the TL. The teacher should also teach grammar overtly and discuss it with learners. Finally, the teacher should make all material meaningful and comprehensible to learners and should organize new material so learners can relate it to their existing cognitive structure (Chastain, 1976).

The previous widely practiced approaches to FL teaching have been discussed: the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method, Total Physical Response, the Natural Approach, communicative language teaching, and the Cognitive-Code Method. Three humanistic approaches, that were not as widely practiced as these methods, will be reviewed in the next sections: the Silent Way, Suggestopedia, and Community Language Learning.

The Silent Way

Developed by Gattegno (1972), the Silent Way is based on the belief that the learner rather than the teacher should produce as much language as possible. Learning is facilitated if the student discovers rather than imitates something in the TL. Further, if students work with physical objects that mediate the space between the teacher and student, learners can learn the TL in a manner similar to the way they learned their L1 (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). The Silent Way is probably best known for its use of wooden, colored cuisenaire rods that are used to teach primary structures of the TL. According to the Silent Way, FL learners should be able to use the FL to express their thoughts and feelings, and to be able to do this, they need to rely on themselves rather than on the teacher. The teacher's role is like that of a technician or engineer (Larsen-Freeman, 1986), and the teacher should only provide students with what is absolutely necessary for them to learn. The teacher should strive to build on what learners already know. The silent role of the teacher is likely the most difficult aspect of the Silent Way. Teachers rarely correct errors. Richards and Rodgers (1986) write that "the Silent Way teacher, like the complete dramatist, writes the script, chooses the props, sets the mood, models the action, designates the players, and is critic for the performance" (p. 107). Effective Silent Way teachers design and sequence instruction, are proficient in the TL, and "focus student attention on the structures of the language" (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 63).

Suggestopedia

Lozanov (1978) applied the study of suggestion in psychology to FL pedagogy by proposing that FL learners overcome any psychological barriers they might have (i.e., potential fear to learn the TL) to make better use of their mental capacity. For Lozanov, FL learning must take place in a relaxed environment. Comfortable seats, baroque music, bright decorations, special lighting, and dramatic teaching techniques all contribute to the relaxed atmosphere that is conducive to uninhibited FL learning (Omaggio, 1993). The first principle of Suggestopedia, *infantilization*, is that learners must return to a childlike state so that they can return to types of learning they possessed as children. The second principle, *pseudopassivity*, involves the relaxed atmosphere that encourages intensified mental activity and concentration (Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Omaggio Hadley, 1993; Richards & Rodgers, 1986). The teacher's role is that of an authority figure to which students surrender themselves. In classroom instruction, the TL is the exclusive means of communication. The teacher first reviews material using stories, games, and role play activities (rather than pattern drills). Then new material is presented in the context of long dialogues that are representative of situations in which the TL might typically occur. These dialogues are introduced in two "concert stages," an active concert and a passive concert. During the active concert learners listen to music, employ methods of controlled breathing, and follow the text of the dialogue while the teacher reads it aloud. During the passive concert, the teacher reads the dialogue again to music, but this time the students listen with their eyes closed. These two concerts should assist learners in immersing themselves in the TL at a seemingly unconscious level (Omaggio Hadley, 1993).

Following the two concert stages, an eight-hour "activation" period follows in which learners work with the new material learned from the dialogue. If grammar explanations are needed, they are provided in the L1. Lozanov (1978) lists seven behaviors that teachers must have to teach according to this method. The teacher must:

(1) Show absolute confidence in the method.

(2) Display fastidious conduct in manners and dress.

(3) Organize properly and strictly observe the initial stages of the teaching process—this includes choice and play of music, as well as punctuality.

(4) Maintain a solemn attitude towards the session.

(5) Give tests and respond tactfully to poor papers (if any).

(6) Stress global rather than analytical attitudes towards material.

(7) Maintain a modest enthusiasm (Lozanov, 1978, pp. 275-276).

Bancroft (1972) notes that Suggestopedia teachers should be trained in acting, singing, and psychotherapeutic techniques. Effective Suggestopedia teachers are authority figures who employ dramatic techniques of presenting materials, create a relaxed atmosphere in the classroom, and are able to explain grammatical rules.

Community Language Learning

Curran (1976) applied techniques of psychological counseling to FL learning based on the belief that FL learners need to be understood and assisted in achieving their

own individual goals while learning the TL. The teacher is regarded as a passive counselor who provides the language necessary for students to communicate their needs and thoughts. The students sit in a small circle to reduce anxiety and foster open communication and discussion. The learning process typically proceeds as follows: a student says something in the L1, a teacher comes up behind the student and calmly whispers the translation in the student's ear. The student repeats the translation, and this utterance is recorded on an audiotape so that it can be transcribed and analyzed later. Effective Community Language Learning teachers must establish a close relationship with each student so that they can be trusted as their counselor in language learning. They must also have a native-like command of the TL and understand how to provide corrective feedback in a non-threatening manner when students are ready for it.

It can be seen by this review of methods of FL teaching that the roles of teachers and students in the FL classroom have shifted from the teacher as an authority figure to the teacher as a counselor and friend and finally to a facilitator and provider of input. Today, no one method exists that prescribes exactly how a FL teacher should teach or how effective FL teaching should be evaluated (Alderson, 1992; Musumeci, 1997), even though communicative language teaching is currently the predominant approach to FL teaching. It is important to note that most teaching methods are not sufficiently supported by empirical research. The next section will discuss various research studies that suggest ways FL learners go about learning FLs. This review will extrapolate behaviors effective

FL teachers should exhibit in assisting learners in the SLA process based on partial explanations of SLA.

Second Language Learning Research and Its Implications for Teaching

Much research has been conducted on L2 learning. Of particular interest are studies that have attempted to explain how L2s are acquired in a classroom setting. The following categories of SLA theory and research will be discussed: (1) the role of learners' personal factors in SLA, (2) the effects of group work in SLA, (3) the re-emergence of formal grammar instruction, and (4) types of feedback in classroom SLA.

During the 1960s SLA research started as its own field. A number of studies had been conducted before the 1960s that investigated the effects teaching had on learning in general (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974), but not much was known about how learners actually went about learning FLs. Scherer and Wertheimer (1964) and Smith (1970) wanted to find out whether the Audiolingual Method or the Cognitive Code Method was more effective for FL learning. The results of their experimental studies were inconclusive, and hence, neither of the methods was proven to be superior. In the late 1960s, researchers sought to explain how learners acquired FLs through empirical and case studies. Duskova (1969) studied students' errors in their production of the TL, and Ravem (1968) looked at FL learning in natural settings. These two studies found that FL learners gained knowledge about the FL in a predictable manner, similar to the manner in which children acquire their L1. Since the 1960s, SLA research has grown exponentially.

We need to understand FL learning better than we currently do for three basic reasons: (1) teachers and researchers will be able to gain a more general understanding about the nature of language, FL learning, intercultural communication, and how the mind processes FLs; (2) teachers and researchers will be able to better account for successes and failures in FL learning and thus learn how to assist students in learning FLs; and (3) FL learners will know better how to go about learning FLs. Some of the theories that have been developed to explain SLA have been derived from L1 acquisition theories. For example, some SLA theories (e.g., the notion of the Language Acquisition Device and the Universal Grammar Theory) emphasize FL learners' innate abilities while others (e.g., Schumann's Acculturation Model; Schumann, 1978) emphasize the importance of the environment in which the FL is being learned. Generally, however, FL classroom learning for a child or an adult differs from their learning of their L1 based on individual learner differences, maturational differences, and cognitive differences, including learning styles. Factors that affect learning a FL include—among others—the age of the learner; the fact that the FL learner has already mastered one language; the fact that the learner is likely cognitively mature (can solve problems, use his or her memory, and think critically) (see also Skehan, 1998); the fact that the learner has gained a broad knowledge of the world; the learner might be more anxious about making mistakes in the FL than when learning the L1; and the learner often does not have much exposure to NSs of the TL.

Since the 1970s, the field of SLA research has yielded several studies that assist in

explaining how FLs are learned in different settings. The following section will briefly look at the main theoretical bases underlying questions researchers pose today in the attempt to explain how FLs are learned. The first part of this section will describe various personal factors of learners that are believed to contribute to or obstruct successful SLA.

The Role of Personal Factors in SLA

Certain personality characteristics (e.g., extroversion, introversion, willingness to make mistakes, etc.) and individual factors (e.g., age, gender, motivation, aptitude, attitudes, etc.) contribute to or hinder successful FL learning. The role of personal factors in FL learning is relevant in this study because it provides, in part, a basis of teachers' beliefs in how FLs are learned. Evidence exists that level of intelligence (see Mitchell & Myles, 1998; Ellis, 1994), aptitude for learning FLs (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Ellis, 1994; Gardner & McIntyre, 1992; Skehan, 1998), motivation (Ellis, 1994; Gardner, 1985), and attitudes toward learning the TL (Ellis, 1994; Gardner, 1985; Gardner & McIntyre, 1992) are directly linked to successful FL learning. Certain personality characteristics (e.g., inhibition, self-esteem, talkativeness, responsiveness, empathy, dominance) have also been studied to investigate whether they contribute to successful FL learning (Brumfit & Johnson, 1979; Ellis, 1994; Mitchell & Myles, 1998), but the available research does not indicate clearly defined relationships between certain

personality characteristics or individual factors and increased FL learning (Ellis, 1994; Mitchell & Myles, 1998).

The Effects of Group Work in SLA

The role of group work in classroom FL learning has received much attention and has been found to facilitate SLA from a pedagogical perspective (Long & Porter, 1985). A few of the most important pedagogical reasons that support group work are that it: (1) provides FL learners with significantly more time to practice the TL (Fanselow, 1977); (2) allows FL learners to improve the quality of their speech in the TL (Long, 1975; Fanselow, 1977; Long, Adams, McLean, & Castaños, 1976); (3) provides a context for natural conversation (Long, Adams, McLean, & Castaños, 1976); (4) assists in creating a positive, affective environment (White & Lightbown, 1983); (5) and can increase student motivation (Littlejohn, 1982; Littlejohn, 1983). It is important to note that little research has been conducted to date on NNS-NNS interactions in classroom contexts. NS-NNS activities do not directly apply to classroom learning situations because group work is usually understood to involve two NNSs. Because group work is advocated as an integral part of classroom SLA, the relevant research that has been conducted on group work will be discussed.

Long and Porter (1985) reviewed several research studies that supported their claim that not only is group work in the FL classroom beneficial from a pedagogical perspective, but also from a psycholinguistic perspective, based on Long's Interaction

Hypothesis. When one FL learner has information another learner needs, he or she is much more likely to make sure the other person understands what is being said so that they can complete the task (Long, 1980; Long, 1981; Long, 1983; Pica & Doughty, 1985a). Further, some teachers and researchers may argue that FL learners cannot provide each other with correct input in the FL, but Porter (1983) pointed out that they can provide each other with authentic communicative practice even though they cannot receive more advanced grammatical and sociolinguistic input. She also found that learners produced more speech with other learners than with NSs, and that learners produced more speech with more advanced learners than with learners at their same level.

Another important study dealing with group work in SLA is by Long, Adams, McLean, and Castaños (1976) in intermediate level adult ESL classes in Mexico. The researchers compared the quantity and quality of the speech produced in two teacher-fronted discussions with the speech produced in two partner discussions in which each group performed the same task (see also Pica & Doughty, 1985a). The results show that the amount and variety of speech produced by students is significantly greater in the dyads than in the teacher-fronted discussion.

Gass and Varonis (1994) investigated the relationship among input, interaction, and FL production as it relates to pair and group work in classroom SLA. Based on data from NS-NNS interactions in a task focused on giving directions, the authors explain that only interaction has an effect on resulting task performance. Gass and Varonis (1989) show that based on NNS-NNS interactions, a correctly modeled linguistic form by a NNS

often resulted in changes by the other NNS in the dyad, even though the changes may not have occurred until later in the conversational interaction.

Varonis and Gass (1983; 1985) investigated NS-NS, NS-NNS, and NNS-NNS conversational interactions. Their results show that negotiation of meaning is most prevalent among NNS-NNS pairs. This negotiation serves the function of providing FL learners with a greater amount of comprehensible input which can lead to increased SLA and of allowing FL learners to experiment with the TL, a type of practice they cannot get otherwise. Varonis and Gass believe that NNS-NNS interactions allow FL learners a non-threatening environment in which they can practice their developing FL skills. It also provides them with the opportunity to receive input which they themselves have made comprehensible through negotiation of meaning.

According to some SLA theorists, a necessary condition for successful SLA is a lowered affective filter on the part of the FL learner (being in a state of relaxation and being free from anxieties in the learning environment) (Hall, 1999; Krashen, 1982; Terrell, Tschirner, Nikolai, & Genzmer, 1996; Tschirner, 1996). And, as stated already, another necessary condition for successful SLA is the opportunity for negotiated interaction (where learners negotiate meaning in relevant and appropriate conversational exchanges) (Long, 1981). Schinke-Llano and Vicars (1993) set out to find a relationship between the degree of interaction provided by certain classroom activities and the learner's level of comfort during these activities. The study was designed to determine learners' levels of comfort with language activity types allowing varying degrees of

interaction. Subjects were 110 first-year FL students enrolled in seven French, Spanish, and Italian courses at a private four-year undergraduate institution and at a public two-year community college. Students were given the following four activity types, randomly ordered, at one-week intervals during the middle of the semester: (1) teacher-fronted activity with group response for three to five minutes (examples of this would be practicing verb conjugations in meaningful sentences or having the class chorally provide lines to a dialogue in which the professor plays one character); (2) teacher-fronted activity with individual response for three to five minutes (examples could be having a student respond to questions which use recently studied vocabulary or having student answer personalized questions based on variations of a dialogue); (3) small group problem-solving activity for about ten minutes (examples could include having a group of students plan a party and decide on the necessary purchases or having a group develop a series of personal questions to be used in dyadic work); (4) dyadic activity with two-way information-gap activity for eight to ten minutes (two examples could be having students role-play ordering a meal in a restaurant or having students ask each other questions that they developed in activity type 3). The activities increase in the amount of negotiation required.

Following the presentation of each activity, students completed a brief Likert-type questionnaire, asking them to rank on a scale from 1 (very little) to 5 (very much) how much they enjoyed the activity, how relaxed they felt during it, how easy it was to pay attention, how much they would like to do another similar activity in FL class, how much

they felt they learned as a result of the activity, and how much they enjoyed studying a FL. Mean scores were tabulated for each activity type by language. These scores were rank ordered and a coefficient of concordance was calculated. The results were not statistically significant. However, three of the four groups listed one of the two student-centered activities as the most comfortable, and three of the four groups listed the teacher-fronted activities as their least comfortable.

Oxford (1997) outlines and discusses the similarities and differences among *cooperative learning, collaborative learning*, and *interaction* in FL learning and notes that it is crucial for FL teachers to understand the purposes of each, so that they can appropriately and effectively apply them in FL teaching. She points out that *cooperative learning* is highly structured and focuses on learner interdependence, that each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning, and that learners are motivated to assist in increasing the learning of others in their group. *Collaborative learning* consists of the construction of knowledge within a social context that encourages the acculturation of individuals in a learning community. In a community of FL learners, linguistic and cultural concepts are best formed as a result of "reflective inquiry with other people (teachers, peers, native speakers, etc.)" (p. 448) who assist each learner in negotiating his or her own degree of potential under the best conditions. Teachers assist learners by providing scaffolding that can be slowly taken away as the FL learner becomes able to communicate proficiently. And finally, Oxford describes *interaction* as personal communication that is facilitated by an understanding of these four elements: (1) certain

types of FL tasks that encourage interaction (games, role plays, etc.), (2) the willingness to communicate, (3) style differences among individuals, and (4) group dynamics. Oxford concludes that several questions regarding the implementation of any or all three of these classroom interaction techniques still need to be empirically researched.

In summary, the following seven conclusions can be made regarding group work in FL instruction: (1) learners receive more individual practice in NNS-NNS dyads than in NS-NNS (Porter, 1983); in NNS-NNS dyads, learners receive more individual practice when the other NNS is more advanced than they are (Porter, 1983); and learners receive more individual practice in two-way than one-way tasks (Pica & Doughty, 1985a; Doughty & Pica, 1986); (2) a greater range of language functions (i.e., rhetorical, pedagogic, interpersonal) is used by individual learners in group work than in teacher-fronted activities (Long, Adams, McLean, & Castaños, 1976); (3) learners perform at the same grammatical level in group work where the teacher is not present as they do when the teacher is present (Pica & Doughty, 1985b), and the level of accuracy is the same whether the learner speaks with a NS or NNS (Porter, 1983); (4) learners are more likely to correct themselves or others in group work than in teacher-fronted discussions (Pica & Doughty, 1985b); (5) learners are much more likely to negotiate meaning in group work than in teacher-fronted activities (Doughty & Pica, 1986), and conversations in NNS-NNS dyads include more negotiation when learners are not at the same level of proficiency or are from a different L1 background (Porter, 1983; Varonis & Gass, 1983); (6) two-ways tasks (which require information exchange from both speakers) produce

more negotiation than one-way tasks (Long, 1980; Long, 1981); and (7) small group activities provide a more comfortable and relaxed environment for FL learning than teacher-fronted activities (Schinke-Llano & Vicars, 1993).

The Re-Emergence of Formal Grammar Instruction

According to Lightbown and Spada (1993), two main pieces of evidence need to be immediately taken into consideration by FL teachers: (1) FL learners continue to have difficulty with basic structures of the FL in programs that do not offer focus-on-form instruction, and (2) FL learners who are provided with opportunities to engage in conversational interactions in the TL might have increased fluency and ability to manage conversations in the TL. Research studies dealing with formal grammar instruction have addressed four main questions: (1) Should the FL teacher teach grammar in the FL classroom? (2) Does teaching grammar to FL students work? (3) What features of the TL grammar should teachers teach? (4) How should grammar be taught to FL learners? In fact, Williams & Evans (1998) found that without any attention to form, learners demonstrated little progress in the use of the target structure. Learners in the treatment groups, though treatments differed, improved in accuracy on two types of form (participial adverb and passive) while the control group did not. And, Lightbown and Spada (1990) found that learners in the FL classroom who received the most focus on form instruction were the most accurate in using the progressive *-ing* and in using the possessive determiners *his* and *her*.

Communicative language teaching is based on the belief that language learners of all ages learn languages best by experiencing language as a medium of communication rather than as the object of study (Doughty & Williams, 1998a) and that by so doing, learners' accuracy will eventually improve. Doughty and Williams (1998a) agree that "focus on form entails a prerequisite engagement in meaning before linguistic structures can be expected to be effective" (p. 3). However, they make the point that focus on form in the classroom is FL instruction that centers on one grammatical form—even though other forms are present—at a time, while attempting to also attend to meaning. Previous discussions of communicative language teaching support nativist views (i.e., denying a role for formal study of grammar), and focus on form instruction questions nativist views. Recently, the study and teaching of grammar is experiencing a renewed interest (see, e.g., Bygate, Tonkyn, & Williams, 1994). Particularly, the concepts of grammar awareness (Schmidt, 1990) and input enhancement (Sharwood Smith, 1993) have been extensively discussed and are slowly entering mainstream teaching materials and teacher education programs. As Tschirner (1998) states, however, "There is a real danger...in assuming that modern theories of grammar and grammar teaching are simply providing new justification for traditional notions of grammar and grammar teaching, which may have been shunned in theory but in practice may be just as widespread today as they were twenty years ago" (p. 113).

In further describing focus on form instruction, Long and Robinson (1998) note that "focus on form is learner-initiated, and it results in noticing" (p. 40). Some studies

(Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Lyster & Ranta, 1997) based on classroom data support the view that focus-on-form instruction in combination with corrective feedback in a communicative setting is more effective than focus-on-form instruction on its own or communicative language teaching on its own. Beginning in 1981, Sharwood Smith started investigating whether *consciousness-raising* or *input enhancement* activities would assist FL learners in more successfully learning the TL[3] (Ellis, 1991; Rutherford & Sharwood Smith, 1985; Sharwood Smith, 1981). Ellis (1991) and Schmidt (1990; 1993) also conducted studies to find out if making students *aware* of new TL items, rules, or regularities (e.g., by highlighting them in the input) would enhance their acquisition of those features by drawing attention to them. Schmidt (1993) defines *noticing* and understanding as follows:

> [Noticing is] registering the simple occurrence of some event, whereas *understanding* implies recognition of a general principle, rule, or pattern. For example, a second language learner might simply notice that a native speaker used a particular form of address on a particular occasion, or at a deeper level the learner might understand the significance of such a form, realizing that the form used was appropriate because of status differences between speaker and hearer. Noticing is crucially related to the question of what linguistic material is stored in memory (Schmidt, 1993, p. 26).

In accordance with Schmidt's notion of *noticing*, Long (1991) defined *focus on form*

---

[3]Sharwood Smith (1981, 1993) now favors the term *input enhancement* over *consciousness-raising*. The term *input enhancement* is used to describe activities that direct

instruction as FL instruction that seeks to draw learners' attention to form in the context of meaningful communication.

White's (1998) study looks at the relationship between input in which a linguistic feature has been enhanced (and thus would require the learners' focused attention) and the acquisition of that feature by learners who have been known to have difficulty acquiring that feature. The feature she focused on was third person singular possessive determiners for ESL learners who were NSs of French. She found that all three treatment groups improved in their ability to use *his* and *her* in oral communicative tasks. The findings do suggest that possessive determiners were equally salient in all three treatments. One group received a typographically enhanced input flood as well as extensive reading and listening. The second group received a typographically enhanced input flood only. The third group received a typographically unenhanced input flood. In her treatment group receiving the most explicit (though still very implicit) input enhancement, the possessive determiners were enhanced in that they were in bold type, italicized, or underlined. White notes later that using arrows or color coding could perhaps have better clarified the relationship between the possessive determiner and its referent, or that a brief rule explanation at some point to help learners structure the enhanced input may have been more beneficial (see also VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993; VanPatten & Sanz, 1995).

It has been suggested that highlighting a feature in the input would be distracting to FL learners. Doughty and Varela (1998) sought to investigate whether learners' attention can be turned to formal features of the TL without distracting them from the

---

the learners' attention to the target items.

original communicative content, and if it can, how it should be done. The researchers conjectured that based on research in L1 acquisition, recasts would be the ideal focus on form procedure to be implemented in their study (see Demetras, Post, & Snow, 1986; Bohannon & Stanowicz, 1988), provided that recasting as it occurs in parental feedback with children in L1 acquisition could be employed in a classroom setting (Doughty, 1994). The results showed that learners in the treatment group in a content-based ESL science class improved in accuracy as well as the total number of attempts to use the target structure in classroom speech.

Several studies have examined the effect of focus on form instruction in FL instruction. Researchers (DeKeyser, 1998; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Doughty & Williams, 1998a; Doughty & Williams, 1998b; Harley, 1998; Lightbown, 1998; Long & Robinson, 1998; Swain, 1998; White, 1998; Williams & Evans, 1998) have recently found that focus on form activities can lead to more effective classroom SLA.

Instructed SLA can have an effect on question formation in the L2. White (1991) found that the treatment group that received instruction on question formation formed questions correctly while those in the control group formed questions with subject-verb inversion incorrectly. In a follow-up test five weeks later, the learners who received the instruction were still forming questions correctly. And Spada and Lightbown (1993) found similar results after two weeks of instruction and corrective feedback (like in the White study) and maintained their gain scores five weeks following the instruction and posttest. The questions that remain unanswered in recent research, however, deal with

when and how focus on form activities should be implemented.

Corrective Feed back in Classroom SLA/Types of Feedback

Most of the research that has been done on corrective feedback in SLA has been conducted in ESL and FL classroom settings. Some studies propose that frequent and explicit error correction contributes to increased accuracy in learners' production of the TL. (For comprehensive reviews of studies on feedback, see Chaudron, 1988 and DeKeyser, 1993.) Recent studies on implicit negative feedback in child and adult SLA have begun to produce early findings similar to those found in child L1 acquisition. In child L1 acquisition, children often receive correct reformulations of learners' speech (or *recasts*) from which learners are more apt to notice correct reformulations than from models only (Oliver, 1995; Long, 1997). It has also been found that adults benefit more from recasts than children. Lyster and Ranta (1997) found in an investigation of types of negative feedback provided in the classroom that recasts were the most common type used by FL teachers. The authors note that one problem with recasts as the main form of negative feedback is that learners do not necessarily have to pay attention to it. Further, more interactive types of feedback might encourage learners to pay attention to negative feedback and modify the hypotheses they have formulated about particular TL structures. Lightbown and Spada (1990) found that individual teachers' non-verbal reactions to certain types of errors (e.g., by raising eyebrows or making a face) were related to greater accuracy on those types of errors.

According to Carroll and Swain (1993), *explicit* forms of negative feedback include any feedback that clearly declares that a learner's output is not part of the TL; and *implicit* forms would include recasts (because learners conclude that their utterance was incorrect), requests for clarification (because learners conclude that some form of their utterance can be attributed to the hearer's comprehension difficulty), confirmation checks, and failures to understand. The authors set out to determine the extent to which explicit types of feedback are helpful in learning grammatical generalizations. One hundred adult ESL learners (with Spanish as their primary language) enrolled in various low-intermediate ESL classes in the Toronto area participated in this study. Subjects were placed in five groups according to the type of feedback they received. Subjects in Group 1 were told they were wrong whenever they made a mistake and were given a semantic or phonological explanation for the error (explicit hypothesis rejection). Those in Group 2 were merely told they were wrong (explicit utterance rejection). Subjects in Group 3 received a reformulated correct response whenever they made a mistake. Subjects in Group 4 were asked if they were sure their response was correct when it was not (implicit/indirect metalinguistic feedback—no model). Group 5 was the control group and received no error correction. The null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference across the groups. If the subjects could learn the dative alternation as a result of negative feedback, then there would be a meaningful difference between the results of groups 1-4 and the comparison Group 5. Findings indicated that the treatment groups outperformed the control group. Carroll and Swain conclude that not only the

explicit forms but also implicit forms of feedback led to learning. However, Group 1 (explicit hypothesis rejection) outperformed all other groups. This study lends empirical support to the claim that indirect and direct forms of feedback can help adult FL learners make hypotheses about abstract linguistic generalizations, and that interruptions in conversational discourse (that are regarded as feedback during the flow of discourse) can be noticeable to learners.

Negotiation activities, such as information gap activities, can also provide negative feedback, including corrective feedback in learners' speech, while keeping the learners' attention on the intended meaning of the activity. This type of feedback draws learners' attention to mismatches between what they have said and what they hear as feedback causing them to focus on form (Long & Robinson, 1998). Further, Long (1996) proposes

> that environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner's developing L2 processing capacity, and these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during *negotiation for meaning*. Negative feedback obtained in negotiation work or elsewhere may be facilitative of L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology and language-specific syntax, and essential for learning certain specifiable L1-L2 contrasts" (p. 414).

Carroll and Swain (1993) advocate that the study of the role of negative feedback in SLA has significant pedagogical and theoretical implications. Pedagogically, it is

important to know the effects of negative feedback to decide whether, when, and/or how corrective feedback should be employed in FL classrooms. The authors review the research on feedback and learning theory and conclude the following: (1) feedback does not necessarily play a role in the acquisition of FL phonology and major features of syntax but can assist learners in making hypotheses about abstract linguistic generalizations noticeable to learners; (2) learners' errors in the FL classroom often go unnoticed or uncorrected; and (3) negative feedback may or may not improve grammatical competence.

As the studies cited have shown, generally speaking, corrective feedback can help FL learners produce more correct utterances in the TL (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Long, 1995; Long, 1996; Long & Robinson, 1998; Oliver, 1995). The question still remains, however, as to what types of feedback work best and who benefits from each type of feedback, which structures are most amenable to correction, and when (i.e., at what point of instruction) feedback is most effective.

Conclusions

This review of the literature has examined several areas of research that have possible applications to effective FL teaching. Some of these are based on SLA theories and research, while others are based on research in FL classroom teaching. Teacher effectiveness research in general education has been discussed because most researchers agree that several core teaching behaviors are relevant across disciplines and must be

evident if teaching is to be considered effective. Models of teacher evaluation in general and in FL education in particular play a role because these models focus on what researchers consider to be valid approaches to evaluating teaching. Methods of FL teaching are included because a review of these methods provides insights into those teaching behaviors that were considered effective in the past. Research on classroom FL teaching has been discussed to look at which teaching behaviors have been considered to be worth evaluating over the past 30 years. L2 learning research has been reviewed because several studies have been conducted that seek to explain how L2s are acquired, and some of these findings can be applied to classroom FL teaching.

Effective FL teaching has been a topic of discussion ever since FLs entered the school curriculum (Schulz, 1988). Professional organizations have issued standards for effective FL teaching and for FL learning in the attempt to improve the quality of FL teaching in the US. Some of the characteristics that are advocated for effective FL teaching are based solely on research that has been done in non-discipline specific domains. Some teaching behaviors that are specific to FL teaching are not always sufficiently described or evaluated. This study seeks first to identify effective teaching behaviors that are specific to FL teaching based on SLA theories and research. It also attempts to examine the extent to which post-secondary teachers in the US agree on which of these behaviors are essential in effective FL teaching. Because teacher effectiveness research is extremely complex and because some factors of teaching cannot be empirically researched due to the differences found among individual teachers as well

as in various teaching contexts. We depend on the professional consensus to know what constitutes good teaching. This study contributes to the knowledge of the consensus about what acceptable classroom teaching behavior is.

Based on the review of the literature, the research questions of this study are:

(1) What are the salient issues in the research literature in SLA and FL learning that can be modified or directly applied to effective FL teaching perspectives in the classroom context?

(2) To what extent do post-secondary FL teachers agree on behaviors or attitudes that are believed to contribute to effective FL teaching and learning?

Taking these research questions as a point of departure, salient items in the research literature in SLA and teaching that apply to teaching and that are related to effective FL teaching will be identified in Chapter Three. Chapter Three will also present the research design and instrumentation for this study and a discussion of the rationale behind the data collection method used.

Chapter 3
Methodology and Research Design

Introduction

Chapter Two provided a review of the literature in nine relevant areas: (1) teacher effectiveness research in general education, (2) models of teacher evaluation in general education, (3) definitions of effective FL teaching, (4) pedagogical implications of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, (5) characteristics and behaviors of effective FL teachers, (6) models of FL teacher evaluation, (7) research on classroom FL teaching, (8) theories of and approaches to FL teaching and their implications for the role of the teacher, and (9) L2 learning research and its implications for teaching. The review of the literature also discussed the strengths and weaknesses of selected studies as well as the conclusions drawn from the research. This chapter will outline the research design and method used for data collection and will discuss the development of the data collection instrument.

The Research Questions

Given the researcher's specific interest in investigating behaviors and attitudes believed to be effective for FL teaching, the following major research questions were formulated:

(1) What are the salient issues in the research literature in SLA and FL learning that can be modified or directly applied to effective FL teaching perspectives in the

classroom context?

(2) To what extent do post-secondary FL teachers agree on behaviors or attitudes that are believed to contribute to effective FL teaching and learning?

Development of Questionnaire

This section will discuss questionnaire research in general and what should be taken into consideration when constructing a questionnaire. It will also provide brief rationales for the items selected for inclusion on the questionnaire.

For the purpose of this study, questionnaire research was considered an appropriate form of data collection to find out teachers' beliefs about effective FL teaching because it is the most practical way to reach a large number of teachers in a relatively timely manner. Further, questionnaire research lends itself to the study of individuals' perceptions and beliefs about themselves and their current situation (Goddard & Villanova, 1996; Rea & Parker, 1997). It:

(1) requires considerably less time than other methods of data collection (e.g., interviews or observations) and can be completed at the respondents' convenience;

(2) is less expensive than other methods of data collection;

(3) can vary in length; and

(4) can be administered by mail.

Further, respondents have no time constraints when completing the questionnaire and are more likely to provide candid answers because most questionnaires are anonymous

(Goddard & Villanova, 1996; Rea & Parker, 1997).

Questionnaire research is not without disadvantages, however. The following are the

main limitations of questionnaire research:

(1) Questionnaires are difficult to construct.

(2) Nonresponse rates can be very high (Vaux, 1996; Wright, 1979; Heberlein & Baumgartner, 1978; Hippler & Schwarz, 1987), and mailed questionnaire studies almost never reach a 100 percent response rate (Rea & Parker, 1997).

(3) Because items on questionnaires are preset, respondents may not be able to express their true opinions (Goddard & Villanova, 1996) or ask questions of clarification (Rea & Parker, 1997) when completing the questionnaire.

It is, of course, important to keep in mind that questionnaire research does not yield conclusions about cause-and-effect relationships and that it usually cannot provide a picture of complex and interacting social, cultural, linguistic, and cognitive factors relating to the topic being researched (Johnson, 1992).

Questionnaire research was considered an appropriate form of data collection for this study which has as its purpose to explore teachers' beliefs about effective FL teaching and learning. The questionnaire was developed by the researcher and contains 80 items that cover the following categories relevant to SLA and FL teaching: (1) learning objectives related to the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, (2) corrective feedback, (3) theories and teacher behaviors related to communicative

approaches, (4) focus on form in classroom SLA, (5) individual learner differences in FL learning, (6) strategies for foreign language learning, (7) theories about SLA, (8) teacher qualifications, and (9) assessment in foreign language teaching. The questionnaire is divided into two parts. Part One contains items regarding observable behaviors of effective FL teachers. As each questionnaire item is discussed in this study, it is designated with either "B" (for behavior) or "T" (for theory) as well as the number of the item as it appears on the questionnaire. Part Two of the questionnaire contains theoretical statements about SLA and FL teaching and learning. The next section will list the items and provide references to pertinent discussions supporting the item, which can be found in Chapter Two.

Category One: Learning Objectives Related to the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*

The five *Standards for FL Learning* (1996)—Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities—outline what FL students should be striving for while learning a FL. Based on these Standards, effective FL teachers design their curricula and lesson plans so that how and what they teach assist students in achieving these goals. Given the recent enthusiasm for implementing the *Standards* into the FL curriculum, eight items have been included on the questionnaire. The questionnaire items based on the Standards are listed in this section according to the Standard they represent.

Communication

B3: The effective foreign language teacher uses *information gap* activities (where students have to find out unknown information from a classmate or another source) (Doughty & Pica, 1986; Schinke-Llano and Vicars, 1993; Tschirner, 1996; Walz, 1986).

B17: The effective foreign language teacher simplifies his or her target language output so students can understand what is being said (Long, 1985; Long & Robinson, 1998).

B21: The effective foreign language teacher exposes students to different dialects of the target language (Standards for foreign language learning, 1996; Glisan, 1996).

B27: The effective foreign language teacher uses the target language as the predominant means of classroom communication (Byrnes, 1994; Brosh, 1996; Delamere, 1986; Diller, 1978; Handschin, 1923; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992; Schulz et al., 1993; Terrell, Tschirner, Nikolai, & Genzmer, 1996; Viëtor,1886; Walmsley, 1984).

B31: The effective foreign language teacher devotes class time to giving examples of cultural differences between target and student's native language use (Diller, 1978; Standards for foreign language learning, 1996). (This item is also related to the Standard *Comparisons*.)

B32: The effective foreign language teacher teaches idiomatic expressions and language routines to help learners successfully engage in conversations in the TL (Hatch, 1978; Cook, 1996).

B44: The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for students to

use the target language both within and beyond the school setting (Standards for foreign language learning, 1996).

T15: Foreign language learners should interact with native speakers of the target language as often as possible (Gass & Varonis, 1989; Zuengler, 1993).

Cultures

B21: The effective foreign language teacher exposes students to different dialects of the target language (Standards for foreign language learning, 1996; Glisan, 1996).

B31: The effective foreign language teacher devotes class time to giving examples of cultural differences between target and student's native language use (Diller, 1978; Standards for foreign language learning, 1996). (This item is also related to the Standard *Comparisons*.)

B42: The effective foreign language teacher selects materials that present distinctive viewpoints that are available only through the foreign language and its cultures (Standards for foreign language learning, 1996).

B47: The effective foreign language teacher frequently uses authentic materials and realia (e.g., maps, pictures, artifacts, items of clothing, foods) to illustrate features of the target language and culture (Handschin, 1923; Rogers & Medley, 1988; Schulz et al, 1993; Terrell, Tschirner, Nikolai, & Genzmer, 1996; Terry, 1998).

T32: Teaching about the target culture is not as important as teaching grammar and vocabulary (Lange, 1999; Standards for foreign language learning, 1996; Oxford, 1997). (This item is also related to the category Focus on Form.)

Connections

B41: The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for students to reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign language (Diller, 1978; Standards for foreign language learning, 1996).

Comparisons

B31: The effective foreign language teacher devotes class time to giving examples of cultural differences between target and student's native language use (Diller, 1978; Standards for foreign language learning, 1996). (This item is also related to the Standard *Cultures*.)

B43: The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for students to demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the target language and their own (Diller, 1978; Standards for foreign language learning, 1996).

Communities

B44: The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for students to use the target language both within and beyond the school setting (Standards for foreign language learning, 1996).

Category Two: Corrective Feedback

Various types of feedback in FL classrooms are possible, and studies have shown that, for the most part, corrective feedback can help FL learners produce more correct utterances in the TL (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Lyster & Ranta,

1997). However, the question still remains as to what types of feedback work best, what type of student benefits from each type of feedback, which structures are most amenable to correction, and when (i.e., at what point of instruction) feedback is most effective. Given the professional consensus that corrective feedback in some form or another is a significant part of classroom SLA, the following seven items have been included on the questionnaire:

B23: The effective foreign language teacher uses *recasts* (correct reformulations of students' speech) as a preferred method of feedback (Long, 1997; Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Oliver, 1995; Ortega & Long, 1997).

B24: The effective foreign language teacher corrects errors as soon as possible after they occur (Carroll & Swain, 1993; see reviews of this research in Chaudron, 1988, pp. 175-178, & DeKeyser, 1993).

B25: The effective foreign language teacher uses indirect cues or hints to signal errors to the learner (such as, asking them if they are sure their response is correct or using facial expressions or body language) (Carroll & Swain, 1993; DeKeyser, 1993).

B35: The effective foreign language teacher explains *why* learner responses are inaccurate when students make errors (Doughty & Williams, 1998b; Carroll, Roberge, & Swain, 1992; Tomasello & Herron, 1988; Tomasello & Herron, 1989).

T3: Foreign language learners should be corrected when they make grammatical mistakes (Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

T8: It is essential to correct most errors (Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

T11: Most of the mistakes learners make are due to differences between the target language and their native language (see Cook, 1996; Doughty & Williams, 1998b).

Category Three: Theories and Teacher Behaviors Related to Communicative Approaches

There are a number of theories and teacher behaviors related to communicative approaches of FL teaching. The items in this category will be presented in five subcategories: (1) items regarding general theories and teaching behaviors related to communicative approaches, (2) Krashen's Monitor Model, (3) small group work, (4) negotiation of meaning in SLA, and (5) interaction with NSs.

General Theories and Teaching Behaviors Related to Communicative Approaches

The following items relate to theories and teaching behaviors in the communicative classroom:

B27: The effective foreign language teacher uses the target language as the predominant means of classroom communication (Byrnes, 1994; Brosh, 1996; Delamere, 1986; Diller, 1978; Handschin, 1923; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992; Schulz et al, 1993; Terrell, Tschirner, Nikolai, & Genzmer, 1996; Viëtor,1886; Walmsley, 1984).

B28: The effective foreign language teacher provides learners with concrete tasks to complete while reading or listening to texts in the target language (Adams, 1983; Cook, 1996; Lund, 1990; Terrell, Tschirner, Nikolai, & Genzmer, 1996; Underwood, 1989).

T25: Learners must understand every word of an oral message to understand what is being said in the target language (Bacon, 1992; Cook, 1996).

T26: Making the first occurrence of a new word memorable is more important than practicing it several times (Bahrick, 1984; Bahrick & Phelps, 1987; Cohen, 1990).

T27: The teacher's insistence on rapid speaking by learners improves target language production (Cook, 1996).

B26: The effective foreign language teacher has students act out commands or engage in other physical activity given by the teacher to practice listening comprehension in the target language (Asher, 1986; Tschirner, 1996).

B33: The effective foreign language teacher encourages learners to begin speaking in the target language only when they feel that they are ready to (see Schulz, 1988).

B34: The effective foreign language teacher encourages foreign language learners to speak in the target language beginning the first day of class (Terrell, Tschirner, Nikolai, & Genzmer, 1996).

Krashen's Monitor Model

Among the more familiar theories related to communicative approaches is Krashen's Monitor Model (1985). Krashen's theories of SLA and FL teaching have had an impact on the Natural Approach to FL teaching as well as on communicative teaching in general. The questionnaire items listed in this section are associated with the Monitor Model.

B2: The effective foreign language teacher teaches new complex language

structures only after less complex structures have been introduced and practiced (Baddeley, 1986; de Sauzé, 1929; Bailey, Madden, & Krashen, 1974; Valdman, 1975).

T22: Foreign language learners do not always learn grammatical structures by means of formal instruction (Krashen, 1992; Krashen, 1993; Krashen, 1999).

T9: Written and spoken language comprehensible to the learner but slightly above the difficulty level of his or her productive ability is all that is necessary for foreign language acquisition (Krashen, 1985).

T17: Foreign language learners can learn to use a foreign language proficiently by mere exposure to it (i.e., reading in or listening to the language) (Krashen, 1977).

T21: Foreign language learners acquire foreign language structures in a predictable order, whether the language is learned in a classroom or not (Cook, 1996; Ellis, 1986; Felix, 1981; Krashen, 1985).

T24: Aspects of the target language that are formally learned enable learners to edit their target language speech for grammatical correctness (Krashen, 1985).

T7: Grammatical structures that are formally taught are more difficult to use in natural communication than grammatical structures that are learned in natural communication outside the classroom (Krashen, 1985; Krashen, 1992; Krashen, 1993).

T10: One of the most important things a foreign language teacher can do is reduce learner anxiety (Krashen, 1982; Schinke-Llano & Vicars, 1993; Terrell, Tschirner, Nikolai, & Genzmer, 1996).

Small Group Work in Classroom SLA

Small group work in classroom FL learning has received much attention and has been found to facilitate SLA from a pedagogical perspective (Long & Porter, 1985). The following items related to small group work in the FL classroom have been included on the questionnaire:

B4: The effective foreign language teacher uses small groups to help learners experience a greater degree of involvement (Long, 1996; Pica, 1991; Pica & Doughty, 1985a; Varonis & Gass, 1985; Schulz, 1988).

B5: The effective foreign language teacher gives learners a time limit to complete small group activities (Ballman, 1998).

B8: The effective foreign language teacher uses student-student role play situations from the beginning of elementary language instruction (Terrell, Tschirner, Nikolai, & Genzmer, 1996; Long, 1996; Pica, 1991; Pica & Doughty, 1985a; Varonis & Gass, 1985).

T6: Using small group instruction is likely to reduce learner anxiety (Curran, 1976; Long, 1996; Pica, 1991; Pica & Doughty, 1985a; Varonis & Gass, 1985).

T12: Using small group instruction is likely to enhance student self-correction (Gass & Varonis, 1994).

T19: Using small group instruction is likely to cause students to learn inaccurate forms of the target language from each other (Lightbown & Spada, 1990; White, 1991;

Wong Fillmore, 1992).

Negotiation of Meaning

Negotiation of meaning is believed to play an important role in SLA (Long, 1985; Long & Robinson, 1998; Varonis & Gass, 1985). As learners attempt to communicate in the TL, they may not always be understood. Negotiating meaning with other speakers of the TL allows learners to restate an utterance and ask questions of clarification so that input can be comprehensible although it still may contain unknown linguistic elements. The following three items have been included on the questionnaire regarding negotiation of meaning:

B3: The effective foreign language teacher uses *information gap* activities (where students have to find out unknown information from a classmate or another source) (Doughty & Pica, 1986; Schinke-Llano and Vicars, 1993; Tschirner, 1996; Walz, 1986).

B17: The effective foreign language teacher simplifies his or her target language output so students can understand what is being said (Long, 1985; Long & Robinson, 1998).

T23: Activities that focus on the exchange of meaning between two speakers are more important than activities that focus on the manipulation of grammatical forms (Ballman, 1998; Long, 1996; Pica, 1991; Pica & Doughty, 1985a; Varonis & Gass, 1985). (This item also relates to the category Focus on Form.)

Interaction with Native Speakers

T14: Too much interaction with native speakers can hinder beginning foreign language learners because native speakers generally take control of conversations (Hatch, 1992; Gass & Varonis, 1989; Zuengler, 1993).

T15: Foreign language learners should interact with native speakers of the target language as often as possible (Gass & Varonis, 1989; Zuengler, 1993).

Category Four: Focus on Form in Classroom SLA

Recent research has found that activities and assignments that draw learners' attention to specific grammatical features of the TL can increase learner accuracy (Doughty & Williams, 1998a; Doughty & Williams, 1998b; Ellis, 1991; Long, 1981; Long & Robinson, 1998; Rutherford & Sharwood Smith, 1985; Schmidt & Frota, 1986; Schmidt, 1990; Schmidt, 1993; Sharwood Smith, 1991; Sharwood Smith, 1993; Tschirner, 1998; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991). The following items refer to focus on form in classroom SLA:

B1: The effective foreign language teacher creates lesson plans that emphasize particular grammar aspects of the target language (Cook, 1996; DeKeyser, 1998; Ellis, 1997; Lightbown, 1998; Lightbown & Pienemann, 1993; Long & Robinson, 1998; Schmidt, 1993; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991).

B15: The effective foreign language teacher uses activities and assignments that

draw learners' attention to specific grammatical features (Doughty & Williams, 1998a; Doughty & Williams, 1998b; Ellis, 1991; Long, 1981; Long & Robinson, 1998; Rutherford & Sharwood Smith, 1985; Schmidt & Frota, 1986; Schmidt, 1991; Schmidt, 1993; Sharwood Smith, 1991; Sharwood Smith, 1993; Tschirner, 1998; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991).

B16: The effective foreign language teacher uses activities where learners need to understand a certain grammatical feature to understand the meaning of spoken or written text (Galloway, 1998; Lightbown, 1998; Long, 1991; Tschirner, 1998).

B18: The effective foreign language teacher thoroughly explains new grammar rules before asking students to practice the relevant structure (Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

B19: The effective foreign language teacher teaches grammar inductively (i.e., gives examples before grammatical rules) (Diller, 1978; Handschin, 1923; Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Schulz, 1988).

B30: The effective foreign language teacher presents grammar rules one at a time and has students practice examples of each rule before going on to another (Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

B45: The effective foreign language teacher teaches grammar deductively (i.e., gives grammatical rules before examples) (Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Robinson, 1996).

B22: The effective foreign language teacher requires students to practice unfamiliar grammatical forms or patterns in substitution or transformation exercises

(Chastain, 1976).

T32: Teaching about the target culture is not as important as teaching grammar and vocabulary (Lange, 1999; Standards for foreign language learning, 1996; Oxford, 1997). (This item is also related to the Standard *Cultures*.)

T23: Activities that focus on the exchange of meaning between two speakers are more important than activities that focus on the manipulation of grammatical forms (Ballman, 1998; Long, 1996; Pica, 1991; Pica & Doughty, 1985a; Varonis & Gass, 1985). (This item also relates to the category Negotiation of Meaning.)

Category Five: Individual Learner Differences in Foreign Language Learning

Given that individual differences among learners (age, intelligence, motivation, etc.) can affect SLA, the following items explore the role of individual learner differences in SLA:

B9: The effective foreign language teacher encourages students to express and discuss their needs and preferences for language learning (Cook, 1996; Oxford, 1990).

B10: The effective foreign language teacher adjusts learning activities to meet the needs of foreign language students with a variety of interests (Barr-Harrison & Horwitz, 1994; Cook, 1996; Diller, 1978; Oxford, 1997).

B12: The effective foreign language teacher permits learners to select their own topics for discussion (Byrnes, 1994; Cook, 1996; Rulon & McCreary, 1986; see also Diller, 1978; Schulz, 1988).

B14: The effective foreign language teacher varies learning activities of foreign language instruction depending on learners' ages (Cook, 1996).

T1: Adult learners will rarely, if ever, achieve native-like proficiency in a foreign language (Chomsky, 1959).

T13: Foreign language learners should be put into groups of fast and slow learners (Cook, 1996).

T18: The higher a person's IQ, the more likely he or she is to learn a foreign language well (Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

Category Six: Strategies for Foreign Language Learning

The professional literature suggests various strategies FL learners can apply to facilitate communication in the TL. The following items have been included on the questionnaire:

B13: The effective foreign language teacher teaches foreign language students to use various learning strategies (i.e., self-evaluation, repetition, imagery, etc.) (Bialystok, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1993; Oxford, 1990; Oxford & Crookall, 1989).

B20: The effective foreign language teacher teaches appropriate hesitation or other discourse strategies to help learners gain time in conversational exchanges (Hatch, 1978; Cook, 1996).

B29: The effective foreign language teacher teaches foreign language students to

use strategies to improve their vocabulary learning (e.g., memory devices or creating a mental image of the word) (Bahrick & Phelps, 1987; Cohen, 1990; Cook, 1996).

B32: The effective foreign language teacher teaches idiomatic expressions and language routines to help learners successfully engage in conversations in the TL (Hatch, 1978; Cook, 1996).

Category Seven: Theories about Second Language Acquisition

T2: Adults learn a foreign language in a manner similar to the way they learned their first language (Duskova, 1969; Ellis, 1986; Krashen, 1985; Ravem, 1968).

T4: Learning a foreign language "on the street" is generally more effective than learning it in the classroom (Lightbown & Spada, 1993).

T5: A foreign language is learned predominantly by imitating correct models of the language (Chomsky, 1981).

T16: Each person possesses certain subconscious knowledge about language that allows him or her to learn a foreign language to some degree (Chomsky, 1981; Cook, 1988; Cook, 1996; Doughty & Williams, 1998b; Ellis, 1994; Ellis, 1997; Mitchell & Myles, 1998; White, 1989).

T20: The learner who identifies with members of the target culture groups learns the target language more accurately than the learner who learns the language for personal gain (i.e., monetary) (Cook, 1996; Ellis, 1994; Gardner, 1985; Lambert, 1969; Schumann, 1978).

Category Eight: Teacher Qualifications

Individual teacher qualifications—including TL competence and familiarity with linguistics, SLA theories, and the use of technology—contribute to the way FLs are taught and learned. The following items are included in the questionnaire regarding teacher qualifications:

B40: The effective foreign language teacher uses the target language competently (Schulz, 1988; Schulz et al, 1993).

T28: Native or near-native language proficiency of the teacher is more important than his or her teaching skills (Krashen, 1977; Krashen & Terrell, 1983).

B11: The effective foreign language teacher shows personal involvement in or enthusiasm for the target language and culture (Cook, 1996; Schulz et al, 1993).

B39: The effective foreign language teacher understands the fundamentals of linguistic analysis (phonology, morphology, syntax) as they apply to the target language (AATF, 1989; Byrnes, 1994; Cook, 1996; Doughty & Williams, 1998b; Lightbown & Spada, 1993; Schulz et al, 1993).

B46: The effective FL teacher integrates computer-aided instruction (e.g., computer-based exercises, e-mail, the Internet, CD-ROM, etc.) into foreign language teaching (Bush & Terry, 1997; Dunkel, 1991; Lafford & Lafford, 1997; Pennington, 1996).

T33: Familiarity with theories of second language acquisition helps foreign

language teachers teach better (Byrnes, 1994; Cook, 1996; Doughty & Williams, 1998b; Lightbown & Spada, 1993; Schulz et al, 1993).

Category Nine: Assessment in Foreign Language Teaching

The FL teaching profession has given much attention to assessing learners' language abilities. The following items explore teachers' attitudes and beliefs regarding assessment:

B6: The effective foreign language teacher bases at least some part of students' grades on their actual use of the target language (Ballman, 1998; Byrnes, 1994; Schulz et al, 1993).

B7: The effective foreign language teacher bases at least some part of students' grades on completion of assigned group tasks (Ballman, 1998).

B36: The effective foreign language teacher allows students to write summaries or answer questions on reading or listening passages using English rather than the target language (Bernhardt, 1991; Davis, 1994; Lee, 1986).

B37: The effective foreign language teacher grades spoken language production predominantly for grammatical accuracy (Hammerly, 1991; Valette, 1991; Valette, 1992; Valette, 1993; Valette, 1994).

B38: The effective foreign language teacher grades written language assignments predominantly for grammatical accuracy (Hammerly, 1991 ; Valette, 1991; Valette, 1992; Valette, 1993; Valette, 1994; see also Schulz, 1988).

T29: Tests should imitate real-life language situations whenever possible (Valette, 1994).

T30: Testing students on what has been taught in class is more important than testing their overall language development.

T31: Portfolio assessment (a collection of student's work, such as oral and written reports, creative projects, writings, etc.) can be used to validly and reliably measure student achievement in the foreign language (Liskin-Gasparro, 1996; Moore, 1994; Stansfield, 1994).

It should be noted that the 80 items on the questionnaire appeared in a random order, not according to category. Further, some items were stated negatively (i.e., the professional literature would suggest the opposite behavior or theoretical stance). Also, all responses were confidential, and respondents were assured in the introduction to the questionnaire that their responses would be kept confidential. Each questionnaire was assigned a number so that the researcher could identify which teachers had responded and which should be reminded to complete and return the questionnaire if they had not done so before the deadline.

Pilot Testing of Questionnaire

The pilot version of the questionnaire was given or mailed to 62 FL teachers in Arizona, Utah, California, Indiana, New Mexico, Colorado, and Pennsylvania. Forty of

these were completed and returned to the researcher. A copy of the pilot questionnaire that was mailed to potential respondents is located in Appendix A. A table presenting the results from this pilot version is included in Appendix B.

Respondents offered suggestions to change the wording of some items for clarity. Eight items were dropped from the pilot questionnaire in the attempt to make the final version shorter. Items that were dropped seemed to overlap with other items. Respondents to the pilot version suggested varying the order in which the items appeared on the questionnaire. Although two respondents suggested that the items should appear according to category, the researcher decided that the items should appear randomly to look for consistencies and inconsistencies in respondents' patterns of response. A few respondents suggested removing the "uncertain" rating from the response ratings so that respondents would be forced to either agree or disagree with each item. The researcher decided that the "uncertain" response alternative should be included so that respondents would not feel pressured into agreeing or disagreeing with each item. The category "uncertain" is also useful to explore areas in need of more investigation or teacher development in the profession. Several of the items were rewritten according to respondents' suggestions for the final version of the questionnaire.

Distribution of Questionnaire

The questionnaire containing 80 items describing behaviors and attitudes of effective FL teachers was sent by U.S. mail to 1,000 post-secondary FL teachers in

October 1999. The mailing list for this study included 1,000 post-secondary teachers: 950 members of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and 50 post-secondary FL instructors at the University of Arizona. Respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire, rating each item according to its perceived importance to effective FL teaching, then to return it by November 12, 1999. In mid-November 1999, the researcher contacted via e-mail and telephone most of those who had not yet returned a completed questionnaire. Of the 1,000 questionnaires that were mailed or distributed, 457 completed questionnaires were returned, resulting in a response rate of 45.7%. It should be noted that a response rate of 45.7% is greater than the suggested minimum return rate of 30-35% for questionnaire research (Rea & Parker, 1997).

Profile of Respondents

This section will provide demographic information about the respondents who returned the questionnaire and will draw generalizations about the population of respondents. The large majority of the respondents who participated in this study are members of ACTFL. Members of ACTFL were selected to complete the questionnaire because the purpose of this study was to focus on responses from those post-secondary teachers with interest in FL pedagogy rather than in literary scholarship. ACTFL is the only national organization dedicated to the improvement and expansion of the teaching and learning of all languages at all levels of instruction. Its focus is on expanding FL knowledge and cultural understanding throughout the US. Also, there is a sizeable

number of post-secondary FL teachers who are members of ACTFL, and the mailing list of members was easily obtainable. Membership in ACTFL was not determined of the fifty FL instructors at the University of Arizona. It should be noted that the sample of respondents is not a true sample of post-secondary FL teachers in the US because membership in ACTFL reflects mainly pedagogical (rather than literary/cultural) interests. Not all FL teachers in the US are members of ACTFL.

All respondents teach or have taught at some time Spanish, French, or German at the post-secondary level. The researcher selected teachers of Spanish, French, and German because much of the classroom-based research on FL learning has been conducted in classrooms where Spanish, French, or German is being taught. From the ACTFL mailing list, 950 names of teachers of Spanish, French, and German were randomly selected, and questionnaires were mailed to these individuals. The following nine tables represent the demographic information collected from the respondents, including: (1) gender, (2) age, (3) FL taught, (4) the type of institution where respondents teach, (5) level of FL they teach, (6) the number of years respondents have been teaching, (7) the highest degree obtained, (8) the number of pedagogy-related inservice activities attended, and (9) the pedagogy-related courses completed. It appears that there is a good representation of various groups of respondents for all of the demographic variables.

Table 3.1. Gender of respondents.

Gender of respondents	Total N	Percent
Female	157	34.4
Male	96	21.0
Missing	204	44.6
Total	457	100.0

It should be noted that 44.6% of the respondents did not identify their gender. More female teachers completed the questionnaire than male teachers, which can possibly be explained by the fact that there are more female than male members of ACTFL. In a 1996 survey regarding PhDs granted in 1993-1994, of 704 total PhDs granted in FLs, 42.3% were men, and 57.7% were female (ADFL, 1996). Of the 402 graduates of programs in Spanish, French, or German, 149 male graduates and 253 female graduates had reported employment status at post-secondary institutions at the time of the survey.

In Fall 1992, a survey of full-time and part-time instructional faculty in post-secondary institutions indicated that of all full-time FL faculty members, 48.2% were male, and 51.7% were female (National Center for Education Statistics, 1996). Of all part-time FL faculty members, 36.2% were male, and 63.9% were female.

Table 3.2. Age of respondents.

Age range	Total N	Percent
under 30	34	7.4
30-39	61	13.3
40-49	60	13.1
50-59	91	19.9
60 and over	27	5.9
Missing	184	59.7
Total	457	100.0

Based on the available information regarding respondents' ages, 33.8% of the respondents are under the age of fifty. Of the respondents, 59.7% did not provide information regarding their age.

Table 3.3. FLs respondents who currently teach or have taught.

FL taught	Total N	Percent
French	85	18.6
German	59	12.9
Spanish	148	32.4
Missing	181	39.6
Total	473	103.8

Of the information provided, about one-third of the respondents teach Spanish while about 19% teach French, and 13% teach German. Some respondents teach or have

taught more than one language. These responses also reflect enrollment patterns in post-secondary institutions.

Table 3.4. Instructional level at which respondents currently teach or have taught.

Level taught	Total N	Percent
Elementary school	41	8.9
Middle school	52	11.4
High school	106	23.2
Community college	52	11.4
University undergraduate	301	65.9
University graduate	112	24.5
Missing	111	24.3
Total	775	169.6

All respondents were teaching at a post-secondary institution at the time they completed the questionnaire. Some may have been teaching at more than one institution at the time, and several had previously taught at the K-12 level. Based on the results above, 43.5% of respondents had taught or currently teach at the K-12 level.

Table 3.5. FL courses respondents teach or have taught.

Level of FL taught	Total N	Percent
Beginning	391	85.6
Intermediate	377	82.4
Advanced	307	67.2
Literature	201	44.0
Linguistics	122	26.7
Teaching methods	177	38.7
Missing	29	6.4
Total	1,604	351.0

Most of the respondents have taught beginning or intermediate FL courses, while 67.2% have taught advanced courses. Of all respondents, 44.0% teach or have taught literature courses. This should be noted because at smaller colleges, teachers are often required to teach both language and literature. It is possible that a larger portion of the responses came from teachers at smaller colleges than from large research universities. Also, more than one-third of all respondents teach or have taught a teaching methods course and have expertise in teaching methodology. The latter finding can be explained by the fact that ACTFL's organizational purpose focuses on improving and expanding the teaching and learning of FLs at all levels of instruction as well as on expanding FL knowledge and cultural understanding.

Table 3.6. The number of years respondents have been teaching a FL.

Number of years taught	Total N	Percent
less than one year	8	1.8
1-2 years	16	3.5
3-4 years	19	4.2
5-7 years	37	8.1
8-9 years	18	3.9
10-15 years	80	17.5
16-19 years	33	7.2
20 or more years	220	48.1
Missing	26	5.7
Total	457	100.0

Of all respondents, 72.8% have been teaching for ten or more years. This leads us to believe that the sample of post-secondary teachers who completed the questionnaire are experienced teachers. It should also be noted that almost half of the respondents have been teaching for twenty years or longer. Those who have been teaching for fewer years are likely graduate teaching assistants (TAs) who are enrolled in MA or PhD programs and teach part-time.

Table 3.7. The highest degree obtained by respondents.

Highest degree	Total N	Percent
High school diploma	2	0.4
BA or BS	25	5.5
MA or MS	123	26.9
PhD	266	58.2
Missing	41	9.0
Total	457	100.0

Because the respondents chosen were selected based on the criterion that they teach a FL at the post-secondary level, it might be expected that the majority of all respondents would have PhDs, and reportedly, 58.2% have PhDs. Those with MA degrees likely teach at community colleges or in lecturer, TA, or instructor positions at universities.

Table 3.8. The estimated number of pedagogy-related inservice development activities attended in the last 10 years.

Number of inservice activities	Total N	Percent
none	14	3.1
1-3	34	7.4
4-7	60	13.1
8-11	73	16.0
12-15	42	9.2
16-19	27	5.9
20-22	20	4.4
23+	142	31.1
Missing	45	9.9
Total	457	100.0

Just fewer than one-third of the respondents have attended 23 or more pedagogy-related inservice development activities (conferences, workshops, lectures, etc.) in the past ten years. Perhaps this item could have been worded in a manner to include all who responded to the questionnaire and not just those teaching for ten or more years. Since approximately 23% of the respondents had been teaching less than ten years, this item may not reflect how actively they participate in pedagogy-related inservice development activities. The majority (almost 75%) of the respondents have attended about ten inservice activities over the past ten years. This heavy interest in teacher development suggests that the group of respondents is fairly well informed about current trends in FL

teaching and reflects particular interests of ACTFL membership.

Table 3.9. The pedagogical training courses respondents have completed.

Pedagogy courses	Total N	Percent
FL teaching methods course	339	74.2
Pedagogy course	244	53.4
Testing course	161	35.2
Curriculum development course	153	33.5
Other	95	20.8
Missing	67	14.7
Total	1,059	231.8

Of all respondents, 74.2% have completed a course in FL teaching methods, and 53.4% have completed a course in FL pedagogy other than the teaching methods course. This finding is not surprising, due to the fact that 43.6% of all respondents have taught at the K-12 level and are, presumably, certified teachers. Only about one-third have completed a course in testing and/or in curriculum development.

Methods of Data Analysis

The methods of data analysis used in this study will be briefly addressed in this section, then discussed in detail in Chapter Four. Research Question One was answered by the review of the literature in Chapter Two:

(1) What are the salient issues in the research literature in SLA and FL learning that can be modified or directly applied to effective FL teaching perspectives in the classroom context?

The questionnaire was constructed to find answers to Research Question Two:

(2) To what extent do post-secondary FL teachers agree on behaviors or attitudes that are believed to contribute to effective FL teaching and learning?

The questionnaire used in this study to elicit responses by teachers to items related to SLA and FL teaching was constructed to be computer-scanned to determine frequencies of responses. For each individual questionnaire item, the responses are reported in Appendix C according to percentages of agreement, disagreement, and marked uncertainty as well as to ranked means.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided an outline of the research design and methodology for the present study. The research questions were presented, and advantages and disadvantages of questionnaire research were discussed. Then the data collection instrument used in this study was described, and the profile of respondents was described based on demographic information provided. Chapter Four will present the results and analyses of the data obtained from the questionnaire study.

Chapter 4
Data Analysis and Results

The present study sought to investigate behaviors and attitudes believed to be conducive to effective FL teaching as perceived by post-secondary FL teachers in the US. Chapter Three outlined the research questions and presented the design of and procedures used in the study. Research Question One (What are the salient issues in the research literature in SLA and FL learning that can be modified or directly applied to effective FL teaching perspectives in the classroom context?) was addressed by the review of the literature in Chapter Two. The results and analysis of the data relevant to Research Question Two (To what extent do post-secondary FL teachers agree on behaviors or attitudes that are believed to contribute to effective FL teaching and learning?) are presented in this chapter.

Research Question Two

Research Question Two poses the following question:

(2) To what extent do post-secondary FL teachers agree on behaviors or attitudes that are believed to contribute to effective FL teaching and learning?

To find answers to this question, descriptive statistics were applied to the data, using SPSS Base 10.1 for Windows (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2000). First, the total count of responses for each of the nine individual demographic items was scored and is presented in Chapter Three to provide background information on the

respondents. Second, the total count of responses to each of the 80 questionnaire items as well as the percentages of the total responses for each item were counted and calculated. Results of all 80 items on the questionnaire are presented in Appendix C. In this chapter, results of this study will be summarized according to the nine categories which constituted the items on the questionnaire.

Summary of the Pertinent Results according to Category

For each of the nine categories, items that yielded high agreement (mean responses of 4.0 and above on a five-point scale), majority agreement (51% agreement and higher), high disagreement (mean responses of 2.5 and lower on a five-point scale), majority disagreement (51% disagreement and higher), uncertainty of at least 10%, and controversial items (items that did not yield majority agreement or disagreement) will be reviewed and discussed in light of current research and recent trends in FL teaching. The total results are presented in tabular form in Appendix C.

Category One: Learning Objectives Related to the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*

Responses to the items dealing with the recently published *Standards for FL Learning* (1996) indicate strong support among the teachers who responded to the questionnaire. For instance, five of the eight items included on the questionnaire that are based on the *Standards* yielded high agreement (i.e., an agreement rating of 4.0 or higher on a 5-point scale) among respondents:

(1) The effective FL teacher frequently uses authentic materials to illustrate features of the TL and culture (item B47) (mean response: 4.64; agree: 97%; disagree: 0.4%; uncertain: 1.8%).

(2) The effective FL teacher devotes class time to giving examples of cultural differences between target and student's native language use (item B31) (mean response: 4.1; agree: 85%; disagree: 7.3%; uncertain: 7.7%).

(3) The effective FL teacher selects materials that present distinctive viewpoints that are available only through the FL and its cultures (item B42) (mean response: 4.08; agree: 80%; disagree: 3.6%; uncertain: 16.4%).

(4) The effective FL teacher provides opportunities for students to reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the FL (item B41) (mean response: 4.26; agree: 89%; disagree: 2.9%; uncertain: 8.1%).

(5) The effective FL teacher provides opportunities for students to use the TL both within and beyond the school setting (item B44) (mean response: 4.39; agree: 92%; disagree: 1.4%; uncertain: 6.6%).

Two additional items related to the *Standards* that did not achieve high mean response rates but that yielded majority agreement (51% or higher) for a total agreement among respondents for eight of nine items related to the *Standards:*

(1) Teacher exposes students to different dialects of the TL (item B21) (agree: 63%; disagree: 16.2%; uncertain: 18.2%).

(2) Teacher provides opportunities for students to demonstrate their own

understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the TL and their own (item B43) (agree: 80%; disagree: 7%; uncertain: 11.2%).

Based on the agreement rates to these questionnaire items related to the *Standards*, it seems that the FL teaching profession at large has accepted the *Standard.*

Only one item pertaining to the *Standards* yielded low agreement: Teaching about the target culture is more important than teaching grammar and vocabulary (item T32) (agree: 7%; disagree: 83%; uncertain: 8.3%). Finally, only three of eight items yielded uncertainty of 10% or higher:

(1) Teacher exposes students to different dialects of the TL (item B21) (agree: 63%; disagree: 16.2%; uncertain: 18.2%).

(2) Teacher selects materials that present distinctive viewpoints that are available only through the FL and its cultures (item B42) (agree: 80%; disagree: 3.6%; uncertain: 16.4%).

(3) Teacher provides opportunities for students to demonstrate their own understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the TL and their own (item B43) (agree: 80%; disagree: 7%; uncertain: 11.2%).

Category Two: Error Correction

All seven items on the questionnaire dealing with error correction indicated the highest level of uncertainty among respondents. Of these seven items, none achieved a high rate of agreement among respondents, and only one item achieved low agreement: It

is essential to correct most errors (item T08) (mean response rate: 2.42; agree: 19%; disagree: 63%; uncertain: 16%). Two items did, however, achieve majority agreement (51% or higher) among respondents:

(1) The teacher uses *recasts* as a preferred method of corrective feedback (item B23) (agree: 78.8%; disagree: 8.8%; uncertain: 12.9%).

(2) The effective FL teacher uses indirect cues or hints to signal errors to the learner (item B25) (agree: 70.5%; disagree: 14.3%; uncertain: 14.9%).

Finally, four of the seven items regarding error correction did not achieve majority agreement or disagreement:

(1) FL learners should be corrected when they make grammatical mistakes (item T03) (34% agreed, 36% disagreed, and 28% were uncertain).

(2) Most of the mistakes FL learners make are due to differences between the TL and their L1 (item T11) (32% agreed, 42% disagreed, and 22% were uncertain).

(3) The effective FL teacher corrects errors as soon as possible after they occur (item B24) (40% agreed, 38% disagreed, and 21% were uncertain).

(4) The effective FL teacher explains *why* learner responses are inaccurate when students make errors (item B35) (48% agreed, 26% disagreed, and 24% were uncertain).

Teachers' lack of agreement and disagreement with these items may reflect the experience teachers have had with error correction in their own classrooms regarding when and how error correction should be employed. These results may also reflect the

conflicting theoretical positions taken by SLA scholars regarding corrective feedback (Chaudron, 1988; DeKeyser, 1993) as well as the inconsistent results reported in empirical studies as to whether or not explicit and/or error correction is beneficial to learners (Carroll & Swain, 1993). It is evident from the four items that yielded neither majority agreement nor disagreement that the role, place, and type of error correction as well as the source of learner errors remain controversial topics.

Category Three: Theories and Teacher Behaviors Related to Communicative Approaches

The items pertaining to theories and teacher behaviors related to communicative approaches to FL teaching and learning indicated overall agreement among respondents. These results possibly reflect respondents' familiarity with theories and teacher behaviors related to communicative approaches. For instance, seventeen of the 27 items yielded majority agreement (51% or higher). Category Three consists of the following five subcategories pertaining to theories and teaching behaviors related to communicative approaches to FL teaching: (1) general communicative theories and communicative behaviors, (2) Krashen's Monitor Model, (3) small group work, (4) negotiation of meaning, and (5) interaction with NSs.

General Theories and Teaching Behaviors Related to Communicative Approaches

Communicative approaches to FL teaching and learning have been the

predominant approaches for the past thirty years (Omaggio, 1993; Richards & Rodgers, 1996). Because 48.1% of all respondents have been teaching for twenty years or longer, it would be expected that respondents would be familiar with communicative practices. The items dealing with communicative approaches indicated agreement, disagreement, and uncertainty among respondents. For instance, four of the eight items yielded high agreement (with mean response rates of 4.0 or above) among respondents:

(1) The effective FL teacher has students act out commands or engage in other physical activity given by the teacher to practice listening comprehension in the TL (item B26) (mean response: 4.08; agree: 82.6%; disagree: 4.3%; uncertain: 13.1%).

(2) The effective FL teacher uses the TL as the predominant means of classroom communication (item B27) (mean response: 4.56; agree: 94%; disagree: 2.5%; uncertain: 3.5%).

(3) The effective FL teacher provides learners with concrete tasks to complete while reading or listening to texts in the TL (item B28) (mean response: 4.4; agree: 94%; disagree: 2.1%; uncertain: 3.9%).

(4) The effective FL teacher encourages FL learners to speak in the TL beginning the first day of class (item B34) (mean response: 4.28; agree: 86%; disagree: 6.1%; uncertain: 7.9%).

Three of eight items yielded majority disagreement (51% or higher) among respondents:

(1) The effective FL teacher encourages learners to begin speaking in the TL only

when they feel they are ready to (item B33) (agree: 23%; disagree: 57%; uncertain: 19.3%).

(2) Learners must understand every word of an oral message to understand what is being said in the TL (item T25) (agree: 2%; disagree: 96%; uncertain: 1.5%).

(3) The teachers' insistence on rapid speaking by learners improved TL production (item T27) (agree: 7%; disagree: 72%; uncertain: 19.7%).

In addition, three of the eight items yielded uncertainty of 10% or higher:

(1) The effective FL teacher encourages learners to begin speaking in the TL only when they feel they are ready to (item B33) (agree: 23%; disagree: 57%; uncertain: 19.3%).

(2) Making the first occurrence of a word meaningful is more important than practicing it several times (item T26) (agree: 33%; disagree: 34%; uncertain: 30.6%).

(3) The teachers' insistence on rapid speaking by learners improved TL production (item T27) (agree: 7%; disagree: 72%; uncertain: 19.7%).

Only one item related to theories and behaviors of communicative approaches to FL learning did not yield majority agreement or disagreement: Making the first occurrence of a word memorable is more important than practicing it several times (item T26) (33% agreed, 34% disagreed, and 31% were uncertain).

Overall, respondents showed agreement on the majority of the items dealing with

theories and behaviors of communicative approaches to FL teaching and learning. These results reflect that communicative language teaching has been the leading approach to FL teaching since the mid-1970s (see Omaggio, 1993; Richards & Rodgers, 1996). As previously mentioned, since 48% of the respondents have been teaching for at least twenty years, it can be expected that they would be well acquainted with characteristics of communicative language teaching.

For the most part, teacher responses are in accordance with the professional literature regarding communicative approaches. Only one item is not: Making the first occurrence of a word memorable is more important than practicing it several times (item T26) (33% agreed, 34% disagreed, and 31% were uncertain). The professional literature suggests that if FL teachers make the first occurrence of a new vocabulary item memorable in some way to students, the students will be more likely to remember the word later than if students are required to simply practice it several times (Bahrick, 1984; Bahrick & Phelps, 1987; Cohen, 1990).

Krashen's Monitor Model

Krashen's *Monitor Model*, which sought to explain how FLs are learned (Krashen, 1985), was met with much criticism (McLaughlin, 1987; Rivers, 1994; Swain, 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1995). This model has contributed much, however, to the Natural Approach to FL teaching as well as to communicative approaches in general. The items dealing with Krashen's *Monitor Model* indicated majority agreement (51% or higher) for

four of the eight items, possibly reflecting respondents' own teaching experience, the intuitive appeal of the items, or respondents' familiarity with theories and teacher behaviors of communicative approaches in general. The following four items yielded majority agreement:

(1) FL learners do not always learn grammatical structures by means of formal instruction (item T22) (agree: 91%; disagree: 1.8%; uncertain: 6.1%).

(2) The effective FL teacher teaches new complex language structures only after less complex structures have been introduced and practiced (item B02) (agree: 72.7%; disagree: 17%; uncertain: 10.1%).

(3) One of the most important things a FL teacher can do is reduce learner anxiety (item T10) (agree: 80%; disagree: 7%; uncertain: 11.8%).

(4) Aspects of the TL that are formally learned enable learners to edit their TL speech for grammatical correctness (item T24) (agree: 70%; disagree: 8%; uncertain 20.6%).

Two items pertaining to Krashen's *Monitor Model* yielded high disagreement (with mean responses of 2.5 or lower on a five-point scale):

1) Written and spoken language comprehensible to the learner but slightly above his or her productive ability is all that is necessary for FL acquisition (item T09) (mean response: 2.31; agree: 14%; disagree: 69%; uncertain: 15.3%).

2) FL learners can learn to use a FL proficiently by mere exposure to it (item T17) (mean response: 2.35; agree: 17%; disagree: 65%; uncertain: 15.8%).

Four of the eight items yielded uncertainty of 10% or higher:

(1) Written and spoken language comprehensible to the learner but slightly above his or her productive ability is all that is necessary for FL acquisition (item T09) (agree: 14%; disagree: 69%; uncertain: 15.3%).

(2) One of the most important things a FL teacher can do is reduce learner anxiety (item T10)) (agree: 80%; disagree: 7%; uncertain: 11.8%).

(3) FL learners acquire FL structures in a predictable order, whether the language is learned in a classroom or not (item T21) (agree: 39%; disagree: 28%; uncertain: 30.9%).

(4) The effective FL teacher teaches new complex language structures only after less complex structures have been introduced and practiced (item B02) (agree: 72.7%; disagree: 17%; uncertain: 10.1%).

Finally, two items related to Krashen's *Monitor Model* did not achieve majority agreement or disagreement:

(1) FL learners acquire FL structures in a predictable order, whether the language is learned in a classroom or not (item T21) (39% agreed, 28% disagreed, and 31% were uncertain).

(2) Grammatical structures that are formally taught are more difficult to use in natural communication than grammatical structures that are learned in natural communication outside the classroom (item T07) (37% agreed, 33% disagreed, and 28% were uncertain).

Because neither majority agreement nor disagreement was achieved among respondents for these two items, these items can be regarded as controversial topics in SLA and FL teaching. The notion that grammatical structures that are taught formally are more difficult for learners to use in communication than structures learned in natural communication outside the classroom (Krashen, 1985; Krashen, 1992; Krashen, 1993) must still be researched before teachers can know whether formal grammar instruction can lead to automatic use of those formally taught grammar structures (Doughty & Williams, 1998a).

Small Group Work in Classroom SLA

Item responses related to small group work in classroom SLA indicated high agreement among respondents, which possibly reflects the research literature (Long & Porter, 1985; Long, 1996; Pica, 1991; Pica & Doughty, 1985a; Varonis & Gass, 1985) that suggests that interaction in groups can assist in facilitating SLA. Respondents possibly also agreed with these items based on their own teaching experience or the intuitive appeal of the items. Four of six items pertaining to small group work yielded high agreement (with mean responses of 4.0 or higher on a five-point scale):

(1) The effective FL teacher uses small groups to help learners experience a greater degree of involvement (item B04) (mean response: 4.61; agree: 96.4%; disagree: 2%; uncertain: 1.8%).

(2) The effective FL teacher gives learners a time limit to complete small group

activities (item B05) (mean response: 4.41; agree: 92.6%; disagree: 1%; uncertain: 5.9%).

(3) The effective FL teacher uses student-student role play situations from the beginning of elementary language instruction (item B08) (mean response: 4.28; agree: 85.4%; disagree: 5%; uncertain: 9.4%).

(4) Using small group activities is likely to reduce learner anxiety (item T06) (mean response: 4.12; agree: 84%; disagree: 3%; uncertain: 12.3%).

Only one item related to small group work yielded low agreement (with a mean response rate of 2.5 or lower): Using small group instruction is likely to cause students to learn incorrect forms of the TL from each other (item T19) (mean response: 2.37; agree: 13%; disagree: 66%; uncertain: 19.7%). Three items related to small group work achieved a high rate of uncertainty (10% or higher):

(1) Using small group activities is likely to reduce learner anxiety (item T06) (agree: 84%; disagree: 3%; uncertain: 12.3%).

(2) Using small group instruction is likely to enhance student self-correction (item T12) (agree: 44%; disagree: 23%; uncertain: 31.5%).

(3) Using small group instruction is likely to cause students to learn incorrect forms of the TL from each other (item T19) (agree: 13%; disagree: 66%; uncertain: 19.7%).

One item pertaining to group work did not yield majority agreement or disagreement: Using small group instruction is likely to enhance student self-correction

(item T12) (44% agreed, 23% disagreed, and 32% were uncertain). This item is somewhat controversial in that it did not achieve majority agreement or disagreement and also showed a high rate of uncertainty (23%). More respondents did agree with this item (44%) than disagreed (32%), but based on the responses, it is certain that this area of SLA is in need of more research.

It should also be noted that respondents' agreement to items pertaining to small group work is in accordance with the research literature that found positive effects of small group work in classroom SLA.

Negotiation of Meaning

Items on the questionnaire regarding negotiation of meaning indicated that the majority of teachers (51% or higher) who responded to the questionnaire agreed with all three items related to this topic. These results are in accordance with the professional research literature that suggests that negotiation of meaning has been found to be an essential part of SLA (Hall, 1999; Long, 1981; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Varonis & Gass, 1983; Varonis & Gass, 1985) and that information gap activities can be beneficial for FL learners because learners can provide negative feedback for other learners, including corrective feedback in learners' speech, while keeping the learners' attention focused on meaning. This type of feedback can also sometimes draws learners' attention to mismatches between what they have said and what they hear as feedback, causing them to also focus on grammatical form (Long & Robinson, 1998).

(1) The effective FL teacher uses *information gap* activities in FL instruction (item B03) (mean response: 4.25; agree: 86.9%; disagree: 5.4%; uncertain: 7.7%).

(2) Activities that focus on the exchange of meaning between two speakers are more important than activities that focus on the manipulation of grammatical forms (item T23) (mean response: 4.09; agree: 79%; disagree: 8%; uncertain: 11.6%).

(3) The effective FL teacher simplifies his or her TL output so students can understand what is being said (item B17) (agree: 76%; disagree: 13.9%; uncertain: 10.1%).

As previously mentioned, none of the items related to negotiation of meaning yielded disagreement, but two of the three yielded uncertainty of 10% or higher:

(1) The effective FL teacher simplifies his or her TL output so students can understand what is being said (item B17) (agree: 76%; disagree: 13.9%; uncertain: 10.1%).

(2) Activities that focus on the exchange of meaning between two speakers are more important than activities that focus on the manipulation of grammatical forms (item T23) (agree: 79%; disagree: 8%; uncertain: 11.6%).

Interaction with Native Speakers

In general, teachers who responded to the questionnaire agreed that interaction

with NSs is beneficial for FL learners (item T15) (agree: 92%; disagree: 3%; uncertain: 4.6%). This result reflects current research on interaction in SLA that suggests if learners are able to interact frequently with NSs, they will have more practice understanding NSs and making themselves understood than learners who do not, thus promoting FL learning (Long, 1985; Long & Robinson, 1998; Schmidt, 1993; Sharwood Smith, 1993). Also in support of this result, most teachers agreed that too much interaction with NSs will not hinder beginning FL learners because NSs generally take control of conversations, although this item also achieved a high rate of uncertainty (item T14) (agree: 62%; disagree: 14%; uncertain: 22.5%).

Category Four: Focus on Form in Classroom SLA

Respondents agreed with half of the items that deal with focus on form. These results possibly reflect the research literature that suggests that FL learners can benefit from focusing on grammatical form or may reflect the teachers' own experience with the teaching of formal grammar in a FL classroom. Only one behavioral item (out of eight related to focus on form) yielded a high mean response of 4.0 or higher on a five-point scale: The teacher uses activities and assignments that draw learners' attention to specific grammatical features (item B15) (mean response: 4.06; agree: 84.2%; disagree: 7.7%; uncertain: 8.1%). This response rate is in accordance with the research literature where SLA scholars (Doughty & Williams, 1998a; DeKeyser, 1998; Williams & Evans, 1998; Harley, 1998; Lightbown, 1998; Long & Robinson, 1998; Swain, 1998; Doughty &

Varela, 1998; White, 1998) agreed that learners must consciously attend to features of input if these features are to become part of their linguistic systems.

The following three items pertaining to focus on form also yielded majority agreement (51% or higher) among respondents:

(1) The teacher creates lesson plans that emphasize grammatical aspects of the TL (item B01) (agree: 66.4%; disagree: 24.7%; uncertain: 8.5%).

(2) The teacher uses activities where learners need to understand a certain grammatical feature to understand the meaning of spoken or written text (item B16) (agree: 63%; disagree: 21%; uncertain: 16.2%).

(3) The teacher teaches grammar inductively (i.e., gives examples before grammatical rules) (item B19) (agree: 72.2%; disagree: 9%; uncertain: 18.4%).

Only two items yielded majority disagreement (51% or higher):

(1) The teacher thoroughly explains new grammar rules before asking students to practice the relevant structure (item B18) (agree: 32.1%; disagree: 52.5%; uncertain: 15.1%).

(2) The teacher teaches grammar deductively (i.e., gives grammatical rule before examples (item B45) (agree: 26%; disagree: 52%; uncertain: 21%).

The majority of the items (7 out of 10 total) related to focus on form yielded high uncertainty (10% or higher) among respondents:

(1) Activities that focus on the exchange of meaning between two speakers are

more important than activities that focus on the manipulation of grammatical forms (item T23) (agree: 79%; disagree: 8%; uncertain: 11.6%).

(2) The teacher teaches grammar deductively (rules before examples) (item B45) (agree: 26%; disagree: 52%; uncertain: 21%).

(3) The teacher presents grammar rules one at a time and has students practice examples of each rule before going on to another (item B30) (agree: 46%; disagree: 33%; uncertain: 19.5%).

(4) The teacher requires students to practice unfamiliar grammatical forms or patterns in substitution or transformation exercises (item B22) (agree: 31.6%; disagree: 49.1%; uncertain: 19%).

(5) The teacher teaches grammar inductively (examples before rules) (item B19) (agree: 72.2%; disagree: 9%; uncertain: 18.4%).

(6) The teacher uses activities where learners need to understand a certain grammatical feature to understand the meaning of spoken or written text (item B16) (agree: 63%; disagree: 21%; uncertain: 16.2%).

(7) The teacher thoroughly explains new grammar rules before asking students to practice the relevant structure (item B18) (agree: 32.1%; disagree: 52.5%; uncertain: 15.1%).

Finally, two items out of ten related to focus on form also did not yield majority agreement or disagreement:

(1) The effective FL teacher requires students to practice unfamiliar grammatical

forms or patterns in substitution or transformation exercises (item B22) (32% agreed, 49% disagreed, and 19% were uncertain).

(2) The effective FL teacher presents grammar rules one at a time and has students practice examples of each rule before going on to another (item B30) (46% agreed, 33% disagreed, and 20% were uncertain).

These results that represent neither majority agreement nor disagreement as well as high rates of uncertainty among respondents for items pertaining to formal grammar instruction in FL teaching indicate that formal grammar teaching remains a controversial topic in FL teaching.

Category Five: Individual Learner Differences in Foreign Language Learning

Responses dealing with individual learner differences in FL learning indicate agreement among the teachers who responded to the questionnaire. Even though research does not exhibit clearly defined relationships between certain personality characteristics or individual factors and increased FL learning (Ellis, 1994; Mitchell & Myles, 1998), FL teachers agree that the types of classroom FL learning activities teachers use should be selected based on the age group and interests of the learners. Four questionnaire items pertaining to individual learning differences yielded majority agreement (51% or higher) among respondents:

(1) The teacher adjusts learning activities to meet the needs of FL students with a variety of interests (item B10) (agree: 94.7%; disagree: .07%; uncertain:

4.6%).

(2) The teacher varies learning activities of FL instruction depending on learners' ages (item B14) (agree: 90.2%; disagree: 2.6%; uncertain: 7.2%).

(3) The teacher encourages students to express and discuss their needs and preferences for language learning (item B09) (agree: 83.3%; disagree: 4.4%; uncertain: 12.3%).

(4) The teacher permits learners to select their own topics of discussion (item B12) (agree: 67.7%; disagree: 9.5%; uncertain: 23%).

Respondents disagreed with two statements regarding individual learner differences:

(1) The higher a person's IQ, the more likely he or she is to learn a FL well (item T18) (agree: 12%; disagree: 57%; uncertain: 29.5%).

(2) FL learners should be put into groups of fast and slow learners (item T13) (agree: 20%; disagree: 57%; uncertain: 21.7%).

Respondents were uncertain about five of the seven total items related to individual learner differences:

(1) The teacher permits learners to select their own topics for discussion (item B12) (agree: 67.7%; disagree: 9.5%; uncertain: 23%).

(2) The teacher encourages students to express and discuss their needs and preferences for language learning (item B09) (agree: 83.3%; disagree: 4.4%; uncertain: 12.3%).

(3) The higher a person's IQ, the more likely he or she is to learn a FL well (item T18) (agree: 12%; disagree: 57%; uncertain: 29.5%).

(4) FL learners should be put into groups of fast and slow learners (item T13) (agree: 20%; disagree: 57%; uncertain: 21.7%).

(5) Adult learners will rarely, if ever, achieve native-like proficiency (item T01) (37% agreed; 50% disagreed; 11.6% were uncertain).

The rate of uncertainty among respondents to these items possibly reflects the research in SLA that does not clearly define relationships between certain personality characteristics or individual factors and increased FL learning (Ellis, 1994; Mitchell & Myles, 1998), yet FL teachers still agree, and know from experience, that the types of classroom FL learning activities teachers use should be selected based on the age group of the learners.

Finally, one item pertaining to individual learner differences did not yield majority agreement or disagreement: Adult learners will rarely, if ever, achieve native-like proficiency in a FL (item T01) (37% agreed; 50% disagreed; 11.6% were uncertain). The lack of majority agreement or disagreement among respondents for this controversial item indicates that this area of SLA is still in need of research.

Category Six: Strategies for Foreign Language Learning

For items dealing with strategies for FL learning, teachers showed strong agreement for all four items that pertain to this topic:

(1) The teacher teaches FL students to use various learning strategies (item B13)

(agree: 91.3%; disagree: 1%; uncertain: 7.7%).

(2) The teacher teaches idiomatic expressions and language routines to help learners successfully engage in conversations in the TL (item B32) (agree: 93%; disagree: 3.1%; uncertain: 3.9%).

(3) The teacher teaches FL students to use strategies to improve their vocabulary learning (item B29) (agree: 85%; disagree: 2.5%; uncertain: 12.5%).

(4) The teacher teaches appropriate hesitation or other discourse strategies to help learners gain time in conversational exchanges (item B20) (agree: 74.6%; disagree: 4%; uncertain: 20.8%).

Respondents' agreement with these items is in accordance with the professional research literature that proposes that the use of language learning strategies may encourage successful FL learning (Bahrick & Phelps, 1987; Bialystok, 1990; Cohen, 1990; Hatch, 1987; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1993; Oxford, 1990).

No items related to strategies for FL learning yielded low rates of agreement, no items yielded neither majority agreement nor disagreement, and two yielded a high rate of uncertainty:

(1) The teacher teaches appropriate hesitation or other discourse strategies to help learners gain time in conversational exchanges (item B20) (agree: 74.6%; disagree: 4%; uncertain: 20.8%).

(2) The teacher teaches FL students to use strategies to improve their vocabulary

learning (item B29) (agree: 85%; disagree: 2.5%; uncertain: 12.5%).

Category Seven: Theories about Second Language Acquisition

Responses to items dealing with theories about SLA yielded high uncertainty among respondents. This uncertainty possibly reflects the varied theoretical stances of SLA scholars related to some theories about SLA as well as the lack of intuitive appeal for these items and respondents' own teaching experience. Respondents were uncertain regarding four of the five items:

(1) The learner who identifies with members of the target culture group learns the TL more accurately than the learner who learns the language for personal gain (i.e., monetary) (item T20) (agree: 30%; disagree: 33%; uncertain: 34.4%).

(2) Each person possesses certain subconscious knowledge about language that allows him or her to learn a FL to some degree (item T16) (agree: 69%; disagree: 5%; uncertain: 23.6%).

(3) Learning a FL "on the street" is generally more effective than learning it in the classroom (item T04) (agree: 19%; disagree: 57%; uncertain: 23%).

(4) A FL is learned predominantly by imitating correct models of the language (item T05) (agree: 41%; disagree: 41%; uncertain: 19%).

These theories about SLA are still in need of research.

The majority of all respondents (51% or higher) agreed that each person possesses certain subconscious knowledge about language that allows him or her to learn a FL to

some degree (item T16) (agree: 69%; disagree: 5%; uncertain: 23.6%), and disagreed that adults learn a FL in a manner similar to the way they learned their first language (item T02) (agree: 13%; disagree: 76%; uncertain: 10%) and that learning a FL "on the street" is generally more effective than learning it in the classroom (item T04)) (agree: 19%; disagree: 57%; uncertain: 23%).

Two items related to theories about SLA also did not achieve majority agreement or disagreement:

(1) A FL is learned predominantly by imitating correct models of the TL (item T05) (41% agreed, 41% disagreed, and 18.4% were uncertain).

(2) The learner who identifies with members of the target culture groups learn the TL more accurately than the learner who learns the language for professional gain (T20) (30% agreed, 33% disagreed, and 34.4% were uncertain).

It is suggested that the theoretical statements presented in these questionnaire items remain controversial among post-secondary FL teachers because no majority consensus was obtained.

Category Eight: Teacher Qualifications

For items dealing with teacher qualifications, respondents agreed with the majority of the following items (five out of six):

(1) The effective FL teacher shows personal involvement in or enthusiasm for the TL and culture (item B11) (agree: 99.4%; disagree: .6%; uncertain: 0%).

(2) The effective FL teacher uses the TL competently (item B40) (agree: 97%; disagree: .9%; uncertain: 1%).

(3) The effective FL teacher integrates computer-aided instruction into FL teaching (item B46) (agree: 83%; disagree: 5%; uncertain: 12%).

(4) The effective FL teacher understands the fundamentals of linguistic analysis as they apply to the TL (item B39) (agree: 80%; disagree: 10.2%; uncertain: 9.8%).

(5) Familiarity with theories of SLA helps FL teachers teach better (item T33) (agree: 87.5%; disagree: 4%; uncertain: 8.5%).

Respondents disagreed with only one item: Native or near-native language proficiency of the teacher is more important than his or her teaching skills (item T28) (agree: 3%; disagree: 86.3%; uncertain: 10.7%).

Teachers agreed with five out of six of the items related to qualifications of FL teachers, and there were very low rates of uncertainty for four of these five items (lower than 10%). These results were to be expected because 74.2% of the respondents completed a course in FL teaching methods, and 38.7% teach or have taught a course in teaching methods. SLA and FL learning theories and how they relate to FL teaching and learning are generally introduced in methods courses, so it would be expected that respondents would have an understanding that knowledge of SLA theories can improve FL teaching. Also, 48.1% of all respondents have been teaching for twenty years or longer, and as experienced teachers, they would know which teacher qualifications are

important for effective FL teachers.

Category Nine: Assessment in Foreign Language Teaching

The questionnaire items dealing with assessment indicated relatively high levels of agreement but also some uncertainty among respondents. These results possibly reflect the attention authentic assessment is receiving in the FL teaching profession as well as the attention communicative approaches to FL teaching receive that have dominated the profession over the past thirty years. According to communicative approaches of FL teaching and learning, FL teaching and testing should aim to create real-life situations in which students might potentially use the TL. Regarding assessment, teachers agreed with four items:

(1) Tests should imitate real-life situations whenever possible (item T29) (agree: 84%; disagree: 6%; uncertain: 8.8%).

(2) At least some part of students' grades should be based on their actual use of the TL (item B06) (agree: 97.8%; disagree: 0.4%; uncertain: 1.8%).

(3) At least some part of students' grades should be based on completion of assigned tasks (item B07) (agree: 78.7%; disagree: 7.7%; uncertain: 13.6%)

(4) Portfolio assessment can be used to validly and reliably measure student achievement in the TL (T31) (agree: 70%; disagree: 10%; uncertain: 16.2%).

Regarding assessment, teachers disagreed that written and spoken language assignments should be graded predominantly for grammatical accuracy (item B37—

agree: 9%; disagree: 82.5%; uncertain: 8.5%, and B38—agree: 27%; disagree: 63.6%; uncertain: 9.4%).

Teachers were uncertain about four items pertaining to assessment:

(1) Students should be allowed to write summaries or answer questions on reading or listening passages in English rather than the TL (item B36) (agree: 44%; disagree: 33%; uncertain: 21.2%).

(2) At least some part of students' grades should be based on completion of assigned tasks (item B07) (agree: 78.7%; disagree: 7.7%; uncertain: 13.6%).

(3) Testing students on what has been taught in class is more important than testing their overall language development (item T30) (agree: 17%; disagree: 53%; uncertain: 28%).

(4) Portfolio assessment can be used to validly and reliably measure student achievement in the TL (item T31) (agree: 70%; disagree: 10%; uncertain: 18.2%).

Finally, one item related to assessment achieved neither majority agreement nor disagreement: The effective FL teacher allows students to write summaries or answer questions on reading or listening passages using English rather than the TL (item B36) (44% agreed, 33% disagreed, and 21.2% were uncertain).

Most of the items pertaining to assessment achieved majority agreement among respondents, although four also achieved high rates of uncertainty among respondents. As previously mentioned, assessment in FL teaching and learning has received much

attention in recent years. Although the professional literature is replete with suggestions for assessing learners' FL skills, to date, effective types of assessment have been suggested but not empirically studied. The area of assessment in FL teaching and learning remains a subject in need of more research and teacher development.

Conclusion

In summary, respondents agreed with the majority of the items pertaining to the *Standards*, to theories and teaching behaviors related to communicative teaching approaches, to small group work, and to strategies for FL learning. These results indicate that the respondents have most likely had teaching experience related to these categories of FL teaching. Further, given the sample of respondents, it is also highly probably that some respondents may be familiar with the professional literature, including research and pedagogical suggestions, and this could be another reason respondents agreed with some items on the questionnaire.

It should be noted that only one of eight items related to teaching grammar and only two of eight items related to assessment in FL teaching achieved high agreement. Also, although studies have looked at types of corrective feedback and when and how to implement it into teaching, none of the items pertaining to corrective feedback achieved high mean responses.

Overall, more than half (26 out of 47, 55.3%) of the behavioral items on the questionnaire yielded mean response rates of 4.0 and higher, while only six of the 33

theoretical items (18.2%) yielded mean responses of 4.0 and higher. The items on the questionnaire were based on theories and research in SLA and FL teaching and on pedagogical suggestions that have been made to FL teachers. Given the type of respondents selected for this study (i.e., respondents were predominantly members of ACTFL, an organization which is dedicated to the improvement and expansion of the teaching and learning of all languages at all levels of instruction), respondents were assumed to be experienced teachers, familiar with the behaviors advocated in the questionnaire. Most of the classroom practices described in the behavioral items have at one time or another been considered effective in FL teaching.

More than 50% of the items (47 items out of 80 total items, or 59%), yielded uncertainty of 10% or higher among respondents. Items yielding high rates of uncertainty (10% or higher) are possible areas in SLA and FL teaching that are still in need of more research as well as teacher development. It should be noted that the "uncertain" response rating on the questionnaire is somewhat problematic in that it is not clear why respondents were uncertain about particular items. Most of the respondents are members of ACTFL, and as such are likely familiar with professional literature that includes empirical studies and pedagogical suggestions. The researcher suggests that there are four possible reasons why respondents might not be sure about how to rate specific items. First, the wording of the items could have been unclear, and respondents were unsure what a specific item or items meant. Second, respondents might not be familiar with a particular theory or practice and would therefore be uncertain whether or not it would

lend itself to effective FL teaching. Third, respondents might mark "uncertain" if they agree with the item to some degree but have not actually verified the behavior or theory in their own teaching experience. Fourth, respondents might agree with an item in some settings but disagree in other settings and for this reason would indicate that they are uncertain.

It is of interest to the FL teaching profession that fourteen of the 80 items (18%) on the questionnaire did not obtain majority agreement or disagreement among respondents. It should be noted that each of these items also yielded high uncertainty (11.6% and higher) among respondents. The response patterns for items that did not yield majority agreement or disagreement are of interest to the profession because the lack of agreement for these items indicates remaining controversies among post-secondary FL teachers for items pertaining to error correction, vocabulary teaching and learning, Krashen's *Monitor Model*, small group work, focus on grammatical form in classroom SLA, individual learner differences, theories about SLA, and assessment.

This chapter has presented and discussed the results and analysis of the data relevant to Research Question Two: To what extent do post-secondary FL teachers agree on behaviors or attitudes that are believed to contribute to effective FL teaching and learning? Chapter Five will discuss the results of this study within the theoretical framework presented in Chapter Two. It will also address the limitations of this study, discuss its implications for teaching and teacher training, and suggest future research possibilities.

Chapter 5
Conclusion: Summary and Discussion

Objectives of the Study

This study sought first to identify behaviors and attitudes that have been advocated in the professional literature for effective FL teaching. Secondly, this study sought to explore which of these teaching behaviors and attitudes are perceived by post-secondary FL teachers to contribute to student learning. The following two research questions guided this study:

(1) What are the salient issues in the research literature in SLA and FL learning that can be modified or directly applied to effective FL teaching perspectives in the classroom context?

(2) To what extent do post-secondary FL teachers agree on behaviors or attitudes that are believed to contribute to effective FL teaching and learning?

This chapter will first discuss items that indicate emerging professional consensus among post-secondary FL teachers as well as those results that were confusing, or reassuring to the researcher, or which may appear controversial to the field at large. It will then address this study's implications for future research and the limitations of the study. Finally, it will discuss the implications this study has for FL teacher development and evaluation.

Significant Results of the Study

The results of this questionnaire study indicate that there is emerging professional

consensus in the FL teaching profession for more than half (56%) of the teaching behaviors and attitudes related to FL teaching that appeared on the questionnaire (with response rates of 4.0 and higher or 2.5 and lower). Generally speaking, there was strong agreement for all five of the *Standards for FL Learning* (1996). These *Standards* were published about three years before teachers completed the questionnaire, and the questionnaire results indicate that respondents have accepted the *Standards*. Teachers also agreed with the majority of the results for items related to qualifications of FL teachers. Respondents also agreed most of the questionnaire items pertaining to the following six categories: general theories and behaviors related to communicative theories of FL teaching, to small group work, to negotiation of meaning, strategies in FL learning, and assessment.

The most confusing results emerged in the following three categories: (1) error correction, (2) focus on grammatical form, and (3) individual differences of FL learners. For all of the items related to error correction, at least 10% of all respondents were uncertain whether any of them contributed to effective FL teaching. Respondents were also uncertain for seven of the ten items related to focus on grammatical form, and for five of the seven items related to individual differences of FL learners. Because these three categories--error correction, focus on grammatical form, and individual differences of FL learners—are current topics in FL teaching and are important in an effective FL classroom, the results of this study indicate that these areas of FL teaching remain controversial; in the FL teaching profession.

The most reassuring results of this study are that the 457 post-secondary FL

teachers of Spanish, French, and German who responded to the questionnaire are for the most part familiar with most of the pedagogical behaviors and attitudes represented on the questionnaire. They are also informed members of the FL teaching profession who are most likely interested in improving the teaching of FLs in the US.

Finally, the most controversial results of this study are found in the results of six items (7.5% of all items) that yielded very close rates of agreement and disagreement. The fact that these items did not reach majority agreement or disagreement and that their rates of agreement and disagreement are so close implies that the categories of SLA and teaching that are represented by these items remain in need of further research.

For instance, two items (out of seven total related to the same topic) regarding error correction achieved very close rates of agreement and disagreement: (1) FL learners should be corrected when they make grammatical mistakes (item T03) (34% agreed, 36% disagreed, and 28% were uncertain), and (2) the effective FL teacher corrects errors as soon as possible after they occur (item B24) (40% agreed, 38% disagreed, and 21% were uncertain).

Two items pertaining to teacher behaviors or theories related to communicative approaches to FL teaching and learning also achieved very close rates of agreement and disagreement: (1) making the first occurrence of a word memorable is more important than practicing it several times (item T26) (33% agreed, 34% disagreed, and 31% were uncertain), and (2) grammatical structures that are formally taught are more difficult to use in natural communication than grammatical structures that are learned in natural communication outside the classroom (item T07) (37% agreed, 33% disagreed, and 28%

were uncertain).

Finally, two items related to theories about SLA also did not achieve majority agreement or disagreement: (1) a FL is learned predominantly by imitating correct models of the TL (item T05) (41% agreed, 41% disagreed, and 18.4% were uncertain), and (2) the learner who identifies with members of the target culture groups learn the TL more accurately than the learner who learns the language for professional gain (T20) (30% agreed, 33% disagreed, and 34.4% were uncertain).

Limitations of Study

The limitations of this study will be discussed first in terms of the method of data collection used and secondly in terms of sampling. First, as with most questionnaire research, the response rate was relatively low. Of the 1,000 questionnaires that were mailed or distributed, 457 completed questionnaires were returned, resulting in a return rate of 45.7%. It is important to note, however, that a return rate of 30-35% in questionnaire research in which the questionnaires are distributed by mail is generally considered adequate for valid results (Rea & Parker, 1997).

There are two important limitations of questionnaire research in general. First, questionnaires are difficult to construct. It is possible with this questionnaire that the wording of some items was unclear so that respondents either simply did not respond to an item they did not understand or marked it "uncertain." Secondly, respondents were not able to express their feelings or opinions about individual questionnaire items. One respondent reportedly marked "uncertain" on a number of items, not because this

respondent did not have an opinion, but because this person was unwilling to make categorical judgments out of context. Very often the response was: "Yes, that can be an effective strategy if used correctly," but this teacher was not willing to make it something that is absolutely necessary for effective FL teaching.

The second limitation of questionnaire research concerns the issue of using strictly quantitative research in a study regarding behaviors and attitudes of effective FL teachers. If the questionnaire had been more open-ended, respondents would have been able to express their feelings and opinions about items on the questionnaire. They could have expressed that the wording or concept was unclear or explained why and when they agreed or disagreed with a certain behavior or attitude. Further, questionnaire research cannot provide a description or explanation of complex and interacting social, cultural, linguistic, and cognitive factors relating to behaviors and attitudes of effective FL teachers.

Also, just because post-secondary FL teachers agree that specific teaching behaviors are essential for effective FL teaching, it does not necessarily mean that these behaviors are actually conducive to SLA or that they are practiced by respondents. The researcher is aware that this is a potential limitation of this study. However, since many behaviors cannot be definitively researched because of the variety of teaching contexts, consensus in agreement of professionals is crucial in establishing models of effective teaching. This study contributes to the knowledge of what effective classroom FL teaching behavior is, and presents emerging consensus in the FL teaching profession in the following areas of FL teaching: the *Standards for FL Learning*, theories related to

communicative approaches to FL teaching, small group work, negotiation of meaning, strategies for FL learning, and teacher qualifications.

Another limitation of this study is that the results of the pilot questionnaire were not subjected to any statistical analyses. The pilot questionnaire was used exclusively to ensure comprehensibility of questionnaire items so that the researcher could reword items on the pilot questionnaire that were unclear to respondents. It was not possible to set up the pilot questionnaire, so that the data could be scanned for analysis. If the pilot results would have been subjected to data analysis, some items may have been deleted based on extremely high agreement or a frequent response rate of "uncertain," possibly due to lack of comprehension on the part of the respondents. The questionnaire should have been shortened so that it would have taken respondents less time to complete. Some non-respondents commented that the 80-item questionnaire was too long and complex to complete in a short period of time, so they chose not to complete it. Some respondents also commented that the questionnaire was much too long.

This present study is intended to serve as a large-scale pilot study to explore teacher beliefs and attitudes. In the future, items that yielded a high rate (10% or higher) of uncertainty among respondents should be examined for clarity. Items that yielded especially high or especially low mean scores could be eliminated to make the questionnaire shorter.

Another limitation of the study was the population selected for sampling since it may not be representative of the faculty teaching FLs in US post-secondary institutions. Also, post-secondary FL teachers may not necessarily be the best source of data for rating

teacher behaviors and attitudes because FL teachers at the post-secondary level often have not received training in teaching FLs specifically or teaching in general. The respondents' membership in ACTFL implies, however, at least an interest—if not training or special expertise—in pedagogical aspects of FL teaching. Further, a considerable number of respondents (43.5%) indicated experience in teaching FLs at levels other than post-secondary. Also, the group of respondents included graduate teaching assistants. Generally, at the post-secondary level, more FL teachers specialize in literature rather than in SLA or FL pedagogy. Members of ACTFL, however, tend to be interested in FL pedagogy more than in literature. In fact, 38.7% of all respondents teach or have taught a course in methods of teaching FLs.

One respondent noted that the basic premise of the questionnaire seemed to suggest that there is only one kind of teacher, one kind of student, and one way to teach FLs. The researcher's intent was to explore what post-secondary FL teachers consider to be effective teaching behaviors and attitudes, not to describe the perfect FL teacher and learner.

Suggestions for Future Research

A similar study that would be valuable to the profession would be one comparing and matching teacher and student belief systems. For example, a student who prefers to hear explanations of new grammar structures before practicing forms would probably have difficulty in a classroom where the teacher is convinced that such explanations inhibit FL learning. These differences could be observed for other topics used in the questionnaire: corrective feedback, small group work, etc.

Further studies on teacher beliefs should permit respondents to express their opinions about the content of individual items. Another way to incorporate qualitative data would be to include a follow-up interview with some of the respondents. It would also be interesting to find out the extent to which teacher beliefs are reflected in their actual teaching practice.

Finally, when observable behaviors of effective FL teaching have been agreed upon, they must be identified as being stable and reasonably consistent in their effects on students across contexts. Once this has been undertaken, an observation scheme for evaluating effective FL teaching can be created and validated.

Implications for Foreign Language Teacher Development and Evaluation

The results of this study exploring teacher beliefs regarding effective FL teaching are of interest to several groups: (1) FL teachers, (2) administrators who work with FL teachers, (3) teacher candidates who are preparing to teach, (4) those who train teacher candidates, (5) those responsible for the ongoing development of FL teachers, and (6) those responsible for FL teacher evaluation. Many individual items indicate emerging consensus on effective teacher behaviors and theories for FL education. Of the items on the questionnaire, 59% yielded majority agreement (51% or higher) among respondents, even though the mean response ratings did not all obtain a rating of 4.0 or higher. It is proposed here that for those items where 70% or more of the respondents agreed, the results are meaningful in terms of emerging professional consensus. The results of the questionnaire are of interest to the FL teaching profession, because they provide a

glimpse of emerging consensus on those behaviors and beliefs which are perceived to be effective in FL teaching. This section will discuss the implications of this study for FL teacher development and FL teacher evaluation.

Foreign Language Teacher Development

The results of this study are of importance to FL teacher preparation and inservice development. All teachers can benefit from an awareness of emerging professional consensus regarding specific teaching behaviors that are believed to contribute to effective FL teaching and learning. By being made aware of these behaviors before they begin teaching, new teachers will be much better prepared for the FL teaching profession and will be able to critically reflect on their own beliefs and teaching behaviors.

It would also be useful if the questionnaire items that yielded high agreement among respondents could be discussed in ongoing teacher development to make teachers aware of behaviors that experienced FL teachers (questionnaire respondents) believe to be effective in FL teaching. Teachers could also be asked to react to certain items and reflect on what they to be effective teaching behaviors (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). This process could be useful especially if teachers' beliefs differ from the majority agreement or disagreement of respondents to this study. It would also be useful to let teachers respond to a similar questionnaire and then compare their own responses to those of the study.

Foreign Language Teacher Evaluation

Numerous researchers and professionals responsible for teacher evaluation have sought to establish criteria for assessing effective teaching (Borich, 1986; Brighton, 1965; Brosh, 1996; Costa, 1989; Doyle, 1977; Eble, 1988; McKeachie, 1987; Ornstain, 1991; White, 1989). The shift in FL teaching approaches from grammar-based to communicative to recent focus-on-form/communicative approaches calls for updated models to be used for evaluating FL teaching. This study has identified eighty observable behaviors or theoretical statements that describe effective FL teaching based on research on SLA and FL teaching and on teacher beliefs about FL teaching and learning. It is necessary to note that one of the main problems in teacher evaluation is how evaluators define effective teaching (Gebhard, 1990). To assist in working with this problem, teacher evaluators can use the behaviors that yielded high agreement among FL teachers as teaching behaviors worthy of evaluating. Teacher evaluation is more effective when teachers and teacher evaluators agree on which behaviors should be evaluated.

An alternative measure of evaluation would be to have teachers compare aspects of their own teaching with the behaviors on the questionnaire that yielded high agreement so that they can determine if their teaching is in accordance with experienced colleagues who responded to the questionnaire.

Conclusion

While many effective teacher behaviors are not discipline specific, there are certain behaviors and attitudes that are specific to effective FL teaching. This study has found that a number of these are grounded in SLA research as well as in teacher

effectiveness research. As mentioned previously, in order to evaluate effective FL teaching, attributes of effective FL teaching must first be identified, must then be agreed upon as being worth evaluating by current FL teachers, must be identified on repeated occasions, and must be proved worthwhile in many settings (Schrier & Hammadou, 1994). This study sought to undertake the first two steps necessary in evaluating effective FL teaching by (1) identifying effective classroom teaching behaviors and attitudes that have been found to facilitate FL learning according to SLA theories and results of empirical research, and (2) finding out which of these teaching behaviors and attitudes are perceived by post-secondary FL teachers to contribute to student learning.

For the nine categories of SLA and FL teaching represented in this study, there was strong majority agreement, and hence emerging professional consensus, on more than 50% of the items related to the *Standards for FL Learning*, theories related to communicative approaches to FL teaching, small group work, negotiation of meaning, strategies for FL learning, and teacher qualifications. There is still major uncertainty in the profession as to the place and role of error correction in FL teaching and learning, how and when focus on grammatical form should be implemented into FL teaching and learning, and the effects of learning differences among individual learners. From the results of this study, it is evident that those categories which elicited uncertain responses are still in need of research as well as professional development. Overall, this study contributes to the knowledge of what constitutes acceptable classroom teaching behavior. The more that is known about successful FL teaching and learning, the more likely FL teachers, administrators, and curriculum developers will be able to create models for FL

teacher preparation and evaluation that reflect effective behaviors and attitudes for FL teaching.

APPENDIX A

THE FINAL VERSION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING SURVEY

I would like to invite you to participate in a pilot version of a questionnaire study regarding effective teaching behaviors of foreign language teachers. This study seeks to identify effective classroom teaching behaviors and attitudes as perceived by you as a foreign language teacher. Your participation in this study is voluntary. Your responses to the questionnaire will remain anonymous. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid business reply envelope no later than Friday, November 12th. If you have questions concerning the questionnaire or research study, please contact me at (520) 621-7385 or by e-mail (treber@u.arizona.edu). If you would like to receive a summary of the data results, please provide your name and address on the last page. I greatly appreciate your assistance with this study.

Teresa Reber

Part I. Instructions: For each of the following statements describing effective foreign language teaching in a classroom setting, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. If you find any items to be redundant, too obvious, or unclear in anyway, please make comments in the right column.

The effective foreign language teacher.....

	SD Strongly Disagree	D Disagree	U Uncertain	A Agree	SA Strongly Agree
1. creates lesson plans that emphasize particular grammatical aspects of the target language.	○	○	○	○	○
2. teaches new complex language structures only after less complex structures have been introduced and practiced.	○	○	○	○	○
3. uses information gap activities (where students have to find out unknown information from a classmate or another source).	○	○	○	○	○
4. uses small groups to help learners experience a greater degree of involvement.	○	○	○	○	○
5. gives learners a time limit to complete small group activities.	○	○	○	○	○
6. bases at least some part of students' grades on their actual use of the target language.	○	○	○	○	○
7. bases at least some part of students' grades on completion of assigned group tasks.	○	○	○	○	○
8. uses student-student role play situations from the beginning of elementary language instruction.	○	○	○	○	○
9. encourages students to express and discuss their needs and preferences for language learning.	○	○	○	○	○
10. adjusts learning activities to meet the needs of foreign language students with a variety of interests.	○	○	○	○	○
11. shows personal involvement in or enthusiasm for the target language and culture.	○	○	○	○	○
12. permits learners to select their own topics for discussion.	○	○	○	○	○
13. teaches foreign language students to use various learning strategies (i.e., self-evaluation, repetition, imagery, etc.).	○	○	○	○	○
14. varies learning activities of foreign language instruction depending on learners' ages.	○	○	○	○	○
15. uses activities and assignments that draw learners' attention to specific grammatical features.	○	○	○	○	○
16. uses activities where learners need to understand a certain grammatical feature to understand the meaning of spoken or written text.	○	○	○	○	○
17. simplifies his or her target language output so students can understand what is being said.	○	○	○	○	○
18. thoroughly explains new grammar rules before asking students to practice the relevant structure.	○	○	○	○	○
19. teaches grammar inductively (i.e., gives examples before grammatical rules).	○	○	○	○	○
20. teaches appropriate hesitation or other discourse strategies to help learners gain time in conversational exchanes.	○	○	○	○	○
21. exposes students to different dialects of the target language.	○	○	○	○	○
22. requires students to practice unfamiliar grammatical forms or patterns in substitution or transformation exercises.	○	○	○	○	○
23. uses *recasts* (correct reformulations of students' speech) as a preferred method of corrective feedback.	○	○	○	○	○

more on back

The effective foreign language teacher.....

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Uncertain
Agree
Strongly Agree

	SD	D	U	A	SA
24. corrects errors as soon as possible after they occur.	○	○	○	○	○
25. uses indirect cues or hints to signal errors to the learner (such as, asking them if they are sure their response is correct or using facial expressions or body language).	○	○	○	○	○
26. has students act out commands or engage in other physical activity given by the teacher to practice listening comprehension in the target language.	○	○	○	○	○
27. uses the target language as the predominant means of classroom communication.	○	○	○	○	○
28. provides learners with concrete tasks to complete while reading or listening to texts in the target language.	○	○	○	○	○
29. teaches foreign language students to use strategies to improve their vocabulary learning (e. g., memory devices or creating a mental image of the word).	○	○	○	○	○
30. presents grammar rules one at a time and has students practice examples of each rule before going on to another.	○	○	○	○	○
31. devotes class time to giving examples of cultural differences between target and student's native language use.	○	○	○	○	○
32. teaches idiomatic expressions and language routines to help learners successfully engage in conversations in thetarget language.	○	○	○	○	○
33. encourages learners to begin speaking in the target language only when they feel that they are ready to.	○	○	○	○	○
34. encourages foreign language learners to speak in the target language beginning the first day of class.	○	○	○	○	○
35. explains *why* learner responses are inaccurate when students make errors.	○	○	○	○	○
36. allows students to write summaries or answer questions on reading or listening passages using English rather than the target language.	○	○	○	○	○
37. grades spoken language production predominantly for grammatical accuracy.	○	○	○	○	○
38. grades written language assignments predominantly for grammatical accuracy.	○	○	○	○	○
39. understands the fundamentals of linguistic analysis (phonology, morphology, syntax) as they apply to the target language.	○	○	○	○	○
40. uses the target language competently.	○	○	○	○	○
41. provides opportunities for students to reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign language.	○	○	○	○	○
42. selects materials that present distinctive viewpoints that are available only through the foreign language and its cultures.	○	○	○	○	○
43. provides opportunities for students to demonstrate nderstanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the target language and their own.	○	○	○	○	○
44. provides opportunities for students to use the target language both within and beyond the school setting.	○	○	○	○	○
45. teaches grammar deductively (i.e., gives grammatical rule before examples).	○	○	○	○	○
46. integrates computer-aided instruction (e.g., computer-based exercises, e-mail, the Internet, CD-ROM, etc.) into foreign language teaching.	○	○	○	○	○
47. frequently uses authentic materials and realia (e.g., maps, pictures, artifacts, items of clothing, foods) to illustrate features of the target language and culture.	○	○	○	○	○

Part II. Instructions: For each of the following statements regarding foreign language teaching and learning in a classroom setting, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each. If you find any items to be redundant, too obvious, or unclear in any way, please make comments in the right column.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Uncertain
Agree
Strongly Agree

	SD	D	U	A	SA
1. Adult learners will rarely, if ever, achieve native-like proficiency in a foreign language.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Adults learn a foreign language in a manner similar to the way they learned their first language.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Foreign language learners should be corrected when they make grammatical mistakes.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Learning a foreign language "on the street" is generally more effective than learning it in the classroom.	○	○	○	○	○
5. A foreign language is learned predominantly by imitating correct models of the language.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Using small group instruction is likely to reduce learner anxiety.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Grammatical structures that are formally taught are more difficult to use in natural communication than grammatical structures that are learned in natural communication outside the classroom.	○	○	○	○	○
8. It is essential to correct most errors.	○	○	○	○	○
9. Written and spoken language comprehensible to the learner but slightly above the difficulty level of his or her productive ability is all that is necessary for foreign language acquisition.	○	○	○	○	○
10. One of the most important things a foreign language teacher can do is reduce learner anxiety.	○	○	○	○	○
11. Most of the mistakes learners make are due to differences between the target language and their native language.	○	○	○	○	○
12. Using small group instruction is likely to enhance student self-correction.	○	○	○	○	○
13. Foreign language learners should be put into groups of fast and slow learners.	○	○	○	○	○
14. Too much interaction with native speakers can hinder beginning foreign language learners because native speakers generally take control of conversations.	○	○	○	○	○
15. Foreign language learners should interact with native speakers of the target language as often as possible.	○	○	○	○	○
16. Each person possesses certain subconscious knowledge about language that allows him or her to learn a foreign language to some degree.	○	○	○	○	○
17. Foreign language learners can learn to use a foreign language proficiently by mere exposure to it (i.e., reading in or listening to the language).	○	○	○	○	○
18. The higher a person's IQ, the more likely he or she is to learn a foreign language well.	○	○	○	○	○
19. Using small group instruction is likely to cause students to learn inaccurate forms of the target language from each other.	○	○	○	○	○
20. The learner who identifies with members of the target culture group learns the target language more accurately than the learner who learns the language for personal gain (i.e., monetary).	○	○	○	○	○
21. Foreign language learners acquire foreign language structures in a predictable order, whether the language is learned in a classroom or not.	○	○	○	○	○
22. Foreign language learners do not always learn grammatical structures by means of formal instruction.	○	○	○	○	○
23. Activities that focus on the exchange of meaning between two speakers are more important than activities that focus on the manipulation of grammatical forms.	○	○	○	○	○
24. Aspects of the target language that are formally learned enable learners to edit their target language speech for grammatical correctness.	○	○	○	○	○
25. Leaners must understand every word of an oral message to understand what is being said in the target language.	○	○	○	○	○
26. Making the first occurrence of a new word memorable is more important than practicing it several times.	○	○	○	○	○

more on back

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Uncertain
Agree
Strongly Agree

	SD	D	U	A	SA
27. The teacher's insistence on rapid speaking by learners improves target language production.	○	○	○	○	○
28. Native or near-native language proficiency of the teacher is more important than his or her teaching skills.	○	○	○	○	○
29. Tests should imitate real-life language use situations whenever possible.	○	○	○	○	○
30. Testing students on what has been taught in class is more important than testing their overall language development.	○	○	○	○	○
31. Portfolio assessment (a collection of student's work, such as, oral and written reports, creative projects, writings, etc.) can be used to validly and reliably measure student achievement in the foreign language.	○	○	○	○	○
32. Teaching about the target culture is not as important as teaching grammar and vocabulary.	○	○	○	○	○
33. Familiarity with theories of second language acquisition helps foreign language teachers teach better.	○	○	○	○	○

Demographic Information

1. My sex is
   - ○ female
   - ○ male

2. My age is
   - ○ under 30 years
   - ○ 30-39
   - ○ 40-49
   - ○ 50-59
   - ○ 60 and over

3. Language(s) taught
   - ○ French
   - ○ German
   - ○ Spanish
   - ○ other_____

4. Teaching experience
   - ○ elementary school
   - ○ junior high/middle school
   - ○ high school
   - ○ community college
   - ○ university-undergraduate courses
   - ○ university-graduate courses

5. Level(s) of language taught
   - ○ beginning language courses
   - ○ intermediate languge courses
   - ○ advanced language courses
   - ○ literature courses
   - ○ linguistics courses
   - ○ methods course
   - ○ other_____

6. Years of teaching experience
   - ○ less than 1 year
   - ○ 1-2 years
   - ○ 3-4 years
   - ○ 5-7 years
   - ○ 8-9 years
   - ○ 10-15 years
   - ○ 16-19 years
   - ○ 20 or more years

7. Highest degree
   - ○ high school diploma
   - ○ B.A. or B.S.
   - ○ M.A. or M.S.
   - ○ Ph.D.
   - ○ other_____

8. The number of pedagogy-related inservice development activities (conferences, workshops, lectures, etc) in the last 10 years
   - ○ none
   - ○ 1-3
   - ○ 4-7
   - ○ 8-11
   - ○ 12-15
   - ○ 16-19
   - ○ 19-22
   - ○ 23+

9. Pedagogical training
   - ○ methods course
   - ○ pedagogy course
   - ○ testing course
   - ○ curriculum development course
   - ○ other_____

Please complete this portion of the questionnaire if you would like to receive a summary of the results.

Name_____

Affiliation_____

Address_____

E-mail_____

APPENDIX B

RESULTS OF THE PILOT VERSION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

RESULTS OF PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following table presents the results of a pilot questionnaire on effective foreign language teaching. 62 questionnaires were mailed or distributed to foreign language teachers in Arizona, California, Texas, and Pennsylvania. 39 completed questionnaires were returned. Thank you so much for your participation in the pilot phase of this study. The results of the final phase of data collection for this study complete with statistical analyses will be posted to this web site no later than December 2000.

PILOT QUESTONNAIRE

Dear Foreign Language Teacher:

I would like to invite you to participate in a pilot version of a questionnaire study regarding effective teaching behaviors of foreign language teachers. This study seeks to identify effective classroom teaching behaviors and attitudes as perceived by you as a foreign language teacher. Your participation in this study is voluntary. Your responses to the questionnaire will remain anonymous. Please return the questionnaire to my box in ML 571 by Friday, August 27th. If you have questions concerning the questionnaire or research study, please contact me at (520) 621-7385 or by e-mail (treber@u.arizona.edu). If you would like to receive a summary of the data results, please provide your name and address on the last page. I greatly appreciate your assistance with this study.

Sincerely,

Teresa Reber

Part I. Instructions: For each of the following statements, please indicate how important you consider the teacher behavior described for effective foreign language teaching in a classroom setting. If you find any items to be redundant, too obvious, or unclear in any way, please make comments in the right column.

The effective foreign language teacher...	Did not respond	Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important	Essential
1. creates lesson plans that emphasize particular grammatical aspects of the target language.	2	0	11	18	5	3
2. teaches new complex language structures only after less complex structures have been introduced and practiced.	0	2	14	11	4	8
3. uses information gap activities (where students have to find out unknown information from a classmate or another source).	0	0	2	12	19	6
4. uses small groups to help learners experience a greater degree of involvement and to engage them in group discussions independent of the teacher.	0	0	2	2	17	18
5. gives learners a time limit to complete small group activities.	0	0	3	12	12	12
6. bases at least some part of students' grades on their actual use of the target language.	0	1	2	0	11	25
7. bases at least some part of students' grades on their cooperation with classmates.	0	4	12	9	10	4
8. bases at least some part of students' grades on completion of assigned group tasks.	1	0	12	10	10	6

9. uses role play situations from the beginning of instruction.	2	1	8	7	12	9
10. encourages students to express and discuss their needs and preferences for language learning.	0	1	4	6	17	11
11. adjusts learning activities to meet the needs of foreign language students with a variety of interests.	0	1	0	9	8	21
12. shows personal involvement in or enthusiasm for the target language and culture.	0	0	0	2	5	32
13. permits learners to selects their own topics for discussion.	0	2	7	9	13	8
14. trains foreign language students to use various learning strategies (i.e., self-evaluation, repetition, imagery, etc.).	0	1	0	10	13	15
15. varies learning activities of foreign language instruction depending on learners' ages.	4	1	1	4	11	18
16. uses activities and assignments that draw learners' attention to specific grammatical features.	1	0	7	14	13	4
17. uses activities where learners need to understand a certain grammatical feature to understand the meaning of spoken or written text.	2	5	8	12	5	7
18. simplifies his or her target language output so students can understand what is being said.	2	1	9	8	12	7
19. thoroughly explains new grammar rules before asking students to practice them.	2	11	16	5	2	3
20. teaches grammar inductively (i.e., gives examples before grammatical rules).	2	0	6	19	8	4
21. teaches appropriate hesitation or other discourse strategies to help learners gain time in conversational exchanges.	1	6	4	13	11	4

22. exposes students to different dialects of the target language.	1	1	16	7	12	2
23. requires students to practice unfamiliar grammatical forms or patterns in substitution or transformation exercises.	4	11	11	9	3	1
24. uses recasts (correct reformulations of students' speech) as a preferred method of corrective feedback.	0	1	9	13	12	4
25. interrupts students to correct errors immediately after they occur.	3	23	9	4	0	0
26. uses indirect cues or hints to signal errors to the learner (such as, asking them if they are sure their response is correct or using facial expressions or body language).	1	5	9	14	8	2
27. has students act out commands or engage in other physical activity given by the teacher to practice listening comprehension in the target language.	0	1	10	15	8	5
28. uses the target language as the exclusive means of classroom communication.	0	3	8	4	15	9
29. provides learners with concrete tasks to complete while reading or listening to texts in the target language.	0	1	1	6	18	3
30. teaches foreign language students to use strategies to improve their vocabulary learning (e. g., memory devices or creating a mental image of the word).	0	0	2	12	14	11
31. presents grammar rules one at a time and has students practice examples of each rule before going on to another.	2	10	13	6	4	4

32. devotes class time to giving examples of cultural differences between target and native language use.	1	2	6	12	11	7
33. teaches idiomatic expressions and language routines to help learners successfully engage in conversations in the target language.	0	0	4	10	10	15
34. encourages learners to begin speaking in the target language only when they feel that they are ready to.	2	12	10	8	5	2
35. encourages foreign language learners to speak in the target language beginning the first day of class.	1	7	5	2	10	14
36. explains why learner responses are inaccurate when students make errors.	1	3	12	16	4	3
37. allows students to write summaries or answer questions on reading or listening passages using English rather than the target language.	0	8	10	12	5	4
38. tests grammatical accuracy in spoken language production.	3	9	9	11	6	1
39. tests grammatical accuracy in written language production.	2	1	9	11	10	6
40. understands the fundamentals of linguistic analysis (phonology, morphology, syntax) as they apply to the target language.	0	8	10	5	6	10
41. uses the target language competently.	0	3	1	2	4	29
42. ensures that students understand and interpret written and spoken language on a variety of topics.	4	0	0	7	13	15

43. guides students to present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.	3	0	3	8	16	9
44. ensures that students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices and products and underlying beliefs and values of the target culture.	1	0	5	13	7	13
45. provides opportunities for students to reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign language.	1	3	10	8	10	7
46. assists students in recognizing the distinctive viewpoints that are available only through the foreign language and its cultures.	3	0	7	6	13	10
47. provides opportunities for students to demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the target language and their own.	0	0	7	11	10	11
48. provides opportunities for students to use the target language both within and beyond the school setting.	0	0	4	2	16	17
49. provides opportunities for students to show evidence of becoming lifelong learners by using the foreign language for personal enjoyment and enrichment.	3	0	0	9	8	19
50. teaches grammar deductively (i.e., gives grammatical rule before examples).	3	5	13	11	5	2

51. integrates computer-aided instruction (e.g., computer-based exercises, e-mail, the Internet, CD-ROM, etc.) into foreign language teaching.	1	3	8	7	16	5
52. frequently uses authentic materials and realia (e.g., maps, pictures, artifacts, items of clothing, foods) to illustrate features of the target language and culture.	0	0	0	4	7	28
53. uses audio-visual materials (audio cassette tapes, video tapes, etc.) to enhance listening comprehension skills.	0	0	0	5	8	26

Part II. Instructions: For each of the following statements regarding foreign language teaching and learning in a classroom setting, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement by checking the appropriate box on the scale. If you find any items to be redundant, too obvious, or unclear in any way, please make comments in the right column.

	Did not respond	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Adult learners will rarely, if ever, achieve native-like proficiency in a foreign language.	2	4	10	5	13	5
2. Adults learn a foreign language in a manner similar to the way they learned their first language.	0	10	18	4	5	2
3. Foreign language learners should be corrected when they make grammatical mistakes.	5	2	8	3	21	0

4. Learning a foreign language "on the street" is generally more effective than learning it in the classroom.	1	4	16	10	7	1
5. A foreign language is learned mainly by repeated practice of correct forms.	2	8	11	5	11	2
6. A foreign language is learned predominantly by imitating correct models of the language.	2	4	8	7	16	2
7. Most of the mistakes learners make are due to differences between the target language and their native language.	0	3	16	6	11	3
8. Aspects of the target language that are taught are more difficult to use in natural communication than aspects of the target language that are learned in natural communication.	5	0	11	11	11	1
9. Aspects of the target language that are formally learned enable learners to edit their target language speech for grammatical correctness.	1	2	2	5	27	3
10. Language comprehensible to the learner but slightly above the difficulty level of his or her productive ability is all that is necessary for foreign language acquisition.	2	7	14	7	7	2
11. One of the most important things a foreign language teacher can do is reduce learner anxiety.	0	0	2	2	21	14
12. Using small group instruction is likely to reduce learner anxiety.	0	0	4	11	16	8
13. Using small group instruction is likely to enhance student self-correction when students hear correct forms of the target language from each other.	0	3	6	16	10	4

14. Using small group instruction is likely to cause students to learn inaccurate forms of the target language from each other.	2	3	16	11	7	0
15. Too much interaction with native speakers can hinder beginning foreign language learners because native speakers generally take control of conversations.	0	12	19	5	3	0
16. Foreign language learners should interact with native speakers of the target language as often as possible.	1	0	1	2	20	15
17. Each person possesses certain subconscious knowledge about language that allows him or her to learn a foreign language to some degree.	0	1	1	7	27	3
18. Foreign language learners can learn to use a foreign language proficiently by mere exposure to it (i.e., reading in or listening to the language).	0	4	14	10	10	1
19. The higher a person's IQ, the more likely he or she is to learn a foreign language well.	1	8	10	11	7	2
20. Foreign language learners should be grouped into groups of fast and slow learners to accelerate language learning.	3	7	16	10	3	0
21. The learner who identifies with the target language group more accurately learns the target language than the learner who learns the language for personal gain (i.e., monetary).	4	3	13	7	10	2
22. Foreign language learners acquire foreign language structures in a predictable order, whether the language is learned in a classroom or not.	4	1	9	6	15	4
23. Foreign language learners do not always learn structures of the language by means of formal grammar instruction.	3	0	4	4	19	9

24. Activities that focus on the exchange of meaning between two speakers are more important than activities that focus on the manipulation of grammatical forms.	3	2	4	3	16	11
25. It is essential to correct as many errors as possible.	1	11	22	0	3	2
26. Learners must understand every word of an oral message to understand what is being said in the target language.	0	26	11	0	2	0
27. Making the first occurrence of a new word memorable is more important than practicing it several times.	3	1	11	12	10	2
28. Insistence on rapid speaking by the learner improves their target language performance.	3	11	16	6	3	0
29. Familiarity with theories of second language acquisition helps foreign language teachers teach better.	0	1	2	6	14	16
30. Native or near-native language proficiency of the teacher is more important than his or her teaching skills.	0	9	24	2	2	1
31. Tests should imitate real-life language use situations whenever possible.	1	0	1	1	21	15
32. Validity (authenticity of communicative language use) is more important than reliability (fairness or consistency) in measuring student language use.	7	6	10	8	6	2
33. Testing students on what has been taught in class is more important than testing their overall language development.	8	3	12	8	4	4
34. Portfolio assessment (a collection of student's work, such as, oral and written reports, creative projects, writings, etc.) can be used to validly and reliably measure student achievement in the FL.	3	2	1	7	21	5
35. Teaching about the target culture is not as important as teaching grammar and vocabulary.	0	14	19	1	4	1

APPENDIX C

Responses to Each Item on the Questionnaire according to Percentage of Agreement, Percentage of Disagreement, Percentage of Uncertainty, and Ranked Means of Responses

Appendix C. Responses to Each Item on the Questionnaire according to Percentage of Agreement, Percentage of Disagreement, Percentage of Uncertainty, and Ranked Means of Responses.

These two tables present the total results of the questionnaire used in this study in tabular form. The first column contains the questionnaire items, the second column contains the the response rate percentage (the percentage of respondents who completed the questionnaire item). The second column contains the mean score of all responses to the item, and the third column contains the standard deviation for the item. The fourth column contains the percentage of respondents who agreed with the item, the fifth contains the percentage of respondents who disagreed with the item, and the sixth column contains the percentage of respondents who were uncertain whether the item contributes to effective FL teaching.

Table One. Total Tabular Responses to Part One of the Questionnaire.

Questionnaire Item The effective FL teacher...	**Response Rate %**	**Mean on a scale of 1-5**	**Standard of Deviation**	**Agreement %**	**Disagree-ment %**	**Uncertainty %**
B11) shows personal involvement in or enthusiasm for the TL and culture.	98.5	4.89	.39	99.4	.6	0
B40) uses the TL competently.	98.0	4.76	.53	97.0	.9	1.0
B06) bases at least some part of students' grades on their actual use of the TL.	98.5	4.67	.55	97.8	.4	1.8
B47) frequently uses authentic materials and realia (e.g., maps, pictures, artifacts, items of clothing, foods) to illustrate features of the TL and culture.	98.5	4.64	.58	97.0	1.8	1.2
B04) uses small groups to help learners experience a greater degree of involvement.	98.2	4.61	.64	96.4	1.8	1.8
B27) uses the TL as the predominant means of classroom communication.	97.8	4.56	.67	94.0	3.5	2.5

B10) adjusts learning activities to meet the needs of FL students with a variety of interests.	98.7	4.45	.62	94.7	4.6	.07
B14) varies learning activities of FL instruction depending on learners' ages.	98.0	4.44	.76	90.2	7.2	2.6
B05) gives learners a time limit to complete small group activities.	97.8	4.41	.68	92.6	5.9	1.5
B28) provides learners with concrete tasks to complete while reading or listening to texts in the TL.	98.7	4.40	.69	94.0	3.9	2.1
B44) provides opportunities for students to use the TL both within and beyond the school setting.	98.0	4.39	.63	92.0	6.6	1.4
B13) teaches FL students to use various learning strategies (i.e., self-evaluation, repetition, imagery, etc.).	98.5	4.38	.67	91.3	7.7	1.0
B32) teaches idiomatic expressions an language routines to help learners successfully engage in conversations in the TL.	97.4	4.34	.65	93.0	3.9	3.1
B34) encourages FL learners to speak in the TL beginning the first day of class.	97.8	4.28	.88	86.0	7.9	6.1
B08) uses student-student role play situations from the beginning of elementary language instruction.	98.9	4.28	.87	85.4	9.4	5.2
B41) provides opportunities for students to reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the FL.	98.0	4.26	.72	89.0	8.1	2.9

B03) uses information gap activities (where students have to find out unknown information from a classmate or another source).	97.2	4.25	.86	86.9	7.7	5.4
B29) teaches FL students to use strategies to improve their vocabulary learning (e.g., memory devices or creating a mental image of the word).	98.0	4.21	.74	85.0	12.5	2.5
B09) encourages students to express and discuss their needs and preferences for language learning.	98.2	4.15	.80	83.3	12.3	4.4
B31) devotes class time to giving examples of cultural differences between target and student's native language use.	97.8	4.10	.84	85.0	7.7	7.3
B46) integrates computer-aided instruction (e.g., computer-based exercises, e-mail, the Internet, CD-ROM, etc.) into FL teaching.	98.2	4.09	.80	83.0	12.0	5.0
B42) selects materials that present distinctive viewpoints that are available only through the FL and its cultures.	97.8	4.08	.76	80.0	16.4	3.6
B26) has students act out commands or engage in other physical activity given by the teacher to practice listening comprehension in the TL.	98.0	4.08	.77	82.6	13.1	4.3
B39) understands the fundamentals of linguistic analysis (phonology, syntax) as they apply to the TL.	97.2	4.06	.95	80.0	9.8	10.2
B15) uses activities and assignments that draw learners' attention to specific grammatical features.	98.2	4.06	.87	84.2	8.1	7.7

B07) bases at least some part of students' grades on completion of assigned tasks.	98.5	4.03	.89	78.7	13.6	7.7
B20) teaches appropriate hesitation or other discourse strategies to help learners gain time in conversational exchanges.	98.2	3.96	.81	74.6	4.1	20.8
B23) uses recasts (correct reformulations of students' speech) as a preferred method of corrective feedback.	98.5	3.96	.85	80.0	7.0	12.9
B43) provides opportunities for students to demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the TL and their own.	97.2	3.96	.85	80.0	7.0	11.2
B17) simplifies his or her TL output so students can understand what is being said.	97.4	3.87	1.01	76.0	13.9	10.1
B02) teaches new complex language structures only after less complex structures have been introduced and practiced.	97.8	3.85	1.08	72.7	17.0	10.1
B19) teaches grammar inductively (i.e., gives examples before grammatical rules).	98.2	3.83	.90	72.2	9.0	18.4
B12) permits learners to select their own topics for discussion.	97.6	3.73	.82	67.7	8.5	23.0
B25) uses indirect cues or hints to signal errors to the learner (such as, asking them if they are sure their response is correct or using facial expressions or body language).	97.8	3.71	.95	70.5	14.3	14.9

B21) exposes students to different dialects of the TL.	97.4	3.63	1.03	64.7	17.0	18.2
B16) uses activities where learners need to understand a certain grammatical feature to understand the meaning of spoken or written text.	97.2	3.57	1.09	63.0	21.0	16.2
B01) creates lesson plans that emphasize grammatical aspects of the TL.	95.6	3.56	1.18	66.4	24.7	8.5
B35) explains why learner responses are inaccurate when students make errors.	95.8	3.25	1.08	48.0	26.0	23.9
B30) presents grammar rules one at a time and has student practice examples of each rule before going on to another.	97.2	3.16	1.18	46.0	33.0	19.5
B36) allows students to write summaries or answer questions on reading or listening passages in English rather than the TL.	96.5	3.09	1.21	44.0	33.0	21.2
B24) corrects errors as soon as possible after they occur.	96.7	3.05	1.15	40.0	38.0	21.2
B18) thoroughly explains new grammar rules before asking students to practice the relevant structure.	97.6	2.74	1.29	32.1	52.5	15.1
B22) requires students to practice unfamiliar grammatical forms or patterns in substitution or transformation exercises.	98.5	2.68	1.20	31.6	49.1	19.0

B45) teaches grammar deductively (i.e., gives grammatical rule before examples).	96.5	2.59	1.14	26.0	52.0	20.6
B33) encourages learners to begin speaking in the TL only when they feel they are ready to.	98.2	2.54	1.12	23.0	57.0	19.3
B38) grades written language assignments predominantly for grammatical accuracy.	97.2	2.49	1.15	27.0	63.0	9.4
B37) grades spoken language production predominantly for grammatical accuracy.	97.8	1.98	.89	9.0	82.5	8.5

Table Two. Total Tabular Responses to Part One of the Questionnaire.

Questionnaire Item	**Response Rate %**	**Mean on a scale of 1-5**	**Standard of Deviation**	**Agreement %**	**Disagree-ment %**	**Uncertainty %**
T15) FL learners should interact with native speakers of the TL as often as possible.	97.2	4.30	.73	92.0	3.4	4.6
T33) Familiarity with theories of SLA helps FL teachers teach better.	97.8	4.22	.88	87.5	4.0	8.5
T22) FL learners do not always learn grammatical structures by means of formal instruction.	97.2	4.13	.59	91.0	2.9	6.1
T06? Using small group activities is likely to reduce learner anxiety.	96.1	4.12	.77	84.0	4.0	12.0
T29) Tests should imitate real-life language use situations whenever possible.	97.2	4.09	.84	84.0	7.2	8.8

T23) Activities that focus on the exchange of meaning between two speakers are more important than activities that focus on the manipulation of grammatical forms.	97.2	4.09	.95	80.0	8.4	11.6
T10) One of the most important things a FL teacher can do is reduce learner anxiety.	96.7	3.96	.84	80.0	7.0	11.8
T16) Each person possesses certain subconscious knowledge about language that allows him or her to learn a FL to some degree.	96.5	3.80	.86	69.0	5.0	23.6
T31) Portfolio assessment (a collection of student's work, such as, oral and written reports, creative projects, writings, etc.) can be used to validly and reliably measure student achievement in the FL.	96.9	3.71	.91	70.0	10.0	18.2
T24) Aspects of the TL that are formally learned enable learners to edit their TL speech for grammatical correctness.	97.2	3.70	.80	70.0	8.0	20.6
T12) Using small group instruction is likely to enhance student self-correction.	96.9	3.26	.99	44.0	23.0	31.5
T21) FL learners acquire FL structures in a predictable order, whether the language is learned in a classroom or not.	96.9	3.12	.99	39.0	28.0	30.9
T07) Grammatical structures that are formally taught are more difficult to use in natural communication than grammatical structures that are learned in natural communication outside the classroom.	95.8	3.06	1.05	37.0	33.0	28.0
T26) Making the first occurrence of a new word memorable is more important than practicing it several times.	95.6	3.00	1.09	33.0	34.0	30.6

T20) The learner who identifies with members of the target culture group learns the TL more accurately than the learner who learns the language for personal gain (i.e., monetary).	96.7	2.98	1.02	30.0	33.0	34.4
T05) A FL is learned predominantly by imitating correct models of the language.	95.0	2.94	1.14	41.0	41.0	19.0
T03) FL learners should be corrected when they make grammatical mistakes.	93.9	2.93	1.00	34.0	36.0	28.0
T11) Most of the mistakes learners make are due to differences between the TL and their native language.	96.7	2.89	1.05	32.0	42.0	21.9
T01) Adult learners will rarely, if ever, achieve native-like proficiency in a FL.	96.5	2.80	1.25	37.0	50.0	12.0
T30) Testing students on what has been taught in class is more important than testing their overall language development.	94.1	2.58	.94	17.0	53.0	28.0
T04) Learning a FL "on the street" is generally more effective than learning it in the classroom.	95.8	2.53	1.04	19.0	57.0	22.1
T13) FL learners should be put into groups of fast and slow learners.	96.3	2.52	1.05	20.0	57.0	21.7
T18) The higher a person's IQ, the more likely he or she is to learn a FL well.	96.6	2.42	.90	12.0	57.0	31.0
T08) It is essential to correct most errors.	95.4	2.42	1.05	19.0	65.0	16.0

T19) Using small group instruction is likely to cause students to learn inaccurate forms of the TL from each other.	97.6	2.37	.86	13.0	67.3	19.7
T14)Too much interaction with native speakers can hinder beginning FL learners because native speakers generally take control of conversations.	96.1	2.36	.98	14.0	63.5	22.5
T17) FL learners can learn to use a FL proficiently by mere exposure to it (i.e., reading in or listening to the language).	96.5	2.35	1.05	17.0	67.2	15.8
T09) Written and spoken language comprehensible to the learner but slightly above the difficulty level of his or her productive ability is all that is necessary for FL acquisition.	95.4	2.31	1.01	14.0	70.7	15.3
T27) The teacher's insistence on rapid speaking by learners improves TL production.	96.5	2.14	.84	7.0	73.3	19.7
T02) Adults learn a FL in a manner similar to the way they learned their first language.	97.2	2.12	1.00	13.0	77.2	9.8
T32) Teaching about the target culture is not as important as teaching grammar and vocabulary.	96.3	1.93	.84	7.0	83.0	8.3
T28) Native or near-native language proficiency of the teacher is more important than his or her teaching skills.	97.4	1.88	.77	3.0	86.3	10.7
T25) Learners must understand every word of an oral message to understand what is being said in the TL.	97.4	1.43	.68	2.0	96.5	1.5

References

Adams, S. J. (1983). Scripts and second language reading skills. In J. W. Oller, Jr. & P. A. Richard-Amato (Eds.), *Methods that work.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Alderson, J. C. (1992). Guidelines for the evaluation of language education. In J. C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 274-304). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aleamoni, L. M. (1981). Student ratings of instruction. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 110-145). London: Sage Publications.

Allen, P., Fröhlich, M. & Spada, N. (1984). The communicative orientation of language teaching: An observation scheme. In J. Handscombe, R. A. Orem, & B. P. Taylor, (Eds.) *On TESOL '83: The question of control.* Washington: TESOL.

Allwright, D. (1988). *Observation in the language classroom.* London: Longman.

American Association of Teachers of French. (October 1989). The teaching of French: A syllabus of competence. *AATF National Bulletin, 15* (Special issue).

American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. (1990). AATSP program guidelines for the education and training of teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. *Hispania, 73,* 785-794.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1986). *Proficiency guidelines.* New York: ACTFL.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1988). ACTFL provisional program guidelines for foreign language teacher education. *Foreign Language Annals, 21,* 71-82.

Andrews, T. E. & Barnes, S. (1990). Assessment of teaching. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators.* New York: Macmillan.

Anthony, E. M. (1963). Approach, method and technique. *English Language Teaching, 17,* 63-67.

Asher, J. (1977). *Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guide book.* Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.

Asher, J. (1986). *Learning another language through actions: The complete teachers guidebook.* Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.

Asher, J., Kusudo, J., & de la Torre, R. (1974). Learning a second language through commands: The second field test. *Modern Language Journal, 58*, 24-32.

Assocation of Departments of Foreign Languages (Spring 1996). The MLA's 1993-94 survey of PhD placement: The latest foreign language findings and trends through time. *ADFL Bulletin, 27*(3), 58-77.

Bacon, S. M. (1992). Authentic listening in Spanish: How learners adjust their strategies to the difficulty of the input. *Hispania, 75*, 398-412.

Baddeley, A. D. (1986). *Working memory.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bahrick, H. P. (1984). Semantic memory content in permastore: Fifty years of memory for Spanish learned in school. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General,* 113(1), 1-30.

Bahrick, H. P. & Phelps, E. (1987). Retention of Spanish vocabulary over eight years. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 13*(2), 344-349.

Bailey, L. (1975). An observational method in the foreign language classroom: A closer look at interaction analysis. *Foreign Language Annals, 8*, 335-344.

Bailey, N., Madden, C., & Krashen, S. (1974). Is there a 'natural sequence' in adult second language learning? *Language Learning, 24*, 235-243.

Baker, C. (1992). Description and analysis in classroom talk and interaction. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 27*(2), 9-14.

Bancroft, W. J. (1972). The psychology of suggestopedia or learning without stress. *The Educational Courier, February*, 16-19.

Ballman, T. (1998). From teacher-centered to learner-centered: Guidelines for sequencing and presenting the elements of a FL lesson. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming of age of the profession: Issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 97-111). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Baratz-Snowden, J. (1993). Assessment of teachers: A view from the national board for professional teaching standards. In A. D'Costa & W. Loadman (Eds.), *Assessing tomorrow's teachers: Theory into practice.* Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Barr-Harrison, P. & Horwitz, E. K. (1994). Affective considerations in developing tests. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), *Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 183-210). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Bellack, A. A., Kliebard, R. H., Hyman, R., & Smith, F. (1966). *The language of the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beretta, A. (1992). Evaluation of language education: An overview. In J. C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 5-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bernhardt, E. B. (1991). Proficient texts or proficient readers? *ADFL Bulletin, 21*, 25-28.

Bernhardt, E. & Hammadou, J. (1987). A decade of research in foreign language teacher education. *Modern Language Journal, 71*, 289-299.

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bohannon, J. & Stanowicz, L. (1988). The issue of negative evidence: Adult responses to children's language errors. *Developmental Psychology, 34*(5), 684-689.

Borich, G. D. (1986). Paradigms of teacher effectiveness research. *Education and Urban Society, 18*, 143-167.

Borich, G. D. & Madden, S. K. (1977). *Evaluating classroom instruction: A sourcebook of instruments*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bowers, C. A. & Flinders, D. (1990). *Responsive teaching: An ecological approach to classroom patterns of language, culture, and thought*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bragger, J. D. & Rice, D. B. (1998). Connections: The national standards and a new paradigm for content-oriented materials and instruction. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming of age of the profession: Issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 191-217). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Breen, M. & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 89-112.

Brighton, S. (1965). *Increasing your accuracy in teacher evaluation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*, 125-138.

Brown, R. (1973). *A first language: The early stages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brumfit, C. J. & Johnson, K. (1979). *The communicative approach to language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buck, K., Byrnes, H., & Thompson, I. (Eds.). (1989). *The ACTFL oral proficiency interview tester training manual.* Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.

Bush, M. & Terry, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Technology-enhanced language learning.* Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Bygate, M., Tonkin, A., & Williams, E. (Eds.). (1994). *Grammar and the language teacher*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Prentice Hall International.

Byrnes, H. (1994). Faculty assessment and evaluation. *ADFL Bulletin, 25,* 17-22.

Carroll, J. G. (1981). Faculty self-evaluation. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 180-200). London: Sage Publications.

Carroll, S., Roberge, Y., & Swain, M. (1992). The role of feedback in adult second language acquisition: Error correction and morphological generalizations. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 13*, 173-198.

Carroll, S. & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 357-386.

Cashin, W. E. (1990). Students do rate different academic fields differently. In M. Theall & J. Franklin (Eds.), *Student ratings of instruction: Issues for improving practice*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Chastain, K. (1976). *Developing second language skills: Theory to practice*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1959). Review of *Verbal behavior* by B. F. Skinner. *Language, 35*, 26-58.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Cohen, A. (1990). *Language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Combs, A. W. (1989). New assumptions for teacher education. *Foreign Language Annals, 22,* 129-133.

Cook, V. (1988). *Chomsky's universal grammar*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Cook, V. (1996). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.

Costa, A. L. (1989). Re-assessing assessment. *Educational Leadership, 46,* 2.

Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41*(4), 469-512.

Curran, C. A. (1976). *Counselling-learning in second languages*. Apple River, Illinois: Apple River Press.

Curran, C. (1982). A linguistic model for learning and living in the new age of the person. In R. W. Blair (Ed.), *Innovative approaches to language teaching* (pp. 136-146). Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Davis, J. J. (1994). Authentic assessment: Reading and writing. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), *Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 139-162). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Day, R. R. (1990). Teacher observation in second language teacher education. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 43-61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

de Sauzé, E. B. (1929). *The Cleveland plan for the teaching of modern languages with special reference to French*. Philadelphia: Winston.

De Villiers, P. A. & De Villiers, J. G. (1973). A cross-sectional study of the development of grammatical morphemes in child speech. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 1*, 299-310.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *Modern Language Journal, 77*, 501-514.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1998). Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom*

second language acquisition (pp. 42-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Delamere, T. (1986). On the supervision and evaluation of instruction. *System, 14,* 327-333.

Demetras, M., Post, K., & Snow, C. (1986). Feedback to first language learners: The role of repetitions and clarification requests. *Journal of Child Language, 13*(2), 275-292.

Diller, K. (1978). *The language teacher controversy.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Doughty, C. (Convener) (1994). Symposium: Focus on form - What is it? Second Language Research Forum, Montreal.

Doughty, C. & Pica, T. (1986). "Information gap" tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 305-325.

Doughty, C. & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (1998a). Introduction. *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (1998b). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 197-261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doyle, K. O., Jr. (1975). Student evaluation of instruction. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Company.

Doyle, W. (1977). Paradigms for research on teacher effectiveness. *Review of Research in Education, 5,* 163-198.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1973). Should we teach children syntax? *Language Learning, 24,* 245-258.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1974). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 24,* 37-53.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1975). Creative construction in second language learning and teaching. In M. Burt & H. Dulay (Eds.), *New directions in second language learning, teaching, and bilingual education* (pp. 21-32). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dunkel, P. (Ed.). (1991). *Computer-assisted language learning and testing: Research issues and practice*. New York: Newbury House.

Dunkin, M. J. & Biddle, B. J. (1974). *The study of teaching*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Duskova, L. (1969). On sources of errors in foreign language learning. *IRAL, 7*, 11-36.

Eble, K. E. (1988). *The craft of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ellis, R. (1986). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Ellis, R. (1991). Grammar teaching practice or consciousness-raising? In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and second language pedagogy* (pp. 232-241). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ellis, R. (1994). Input and interaction and second language acquisition. In *The study of second language acquisition* (pp. 269-291). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition research and language teaching*. New York: Oxford.

Evertson, C. M. & Holley, F. M. (1981). Classroom observation. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 90-109). London: Sage Publications.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). London: Longman.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1984). Two ways of defining communication strategies. *Language Learning, 34*, 45-63.

Fanselow, J. F. (1977). Beyond RASHOMON--Conceptualizing and describing the teaching act. *TESOL Quarterly, 11*, 17-39.

Feldman, K. A. (1978). Course characteristics and college students' ratings of their teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Research in Higher Education, 9*, 199-242.

Felix, S. W. (1981). The effect of formal instruction on language acquisition. *Language Learning, 31*, 87-112.

Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teacher behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Franklin, J. & Theall, M. (1992). Disciplinary differences: Instructional goals and activities, measures of student performance, and student ratings of instruction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. San Francisco, April 1992.

Franklin, J. & Theall, M. (1995). The relationship of disciplinary differences and that value of class preparation time to student ratings of teaching. In N. Hativa & M. Marincovich (Eds.), *Disciplinary differences in teaching and learning: Implications for practice* (41-48). San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

French-Lazovik, G. (1981). Peer review: Documentary evidence in the evaluation of teaching. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 73-89). London: Sage Publications.

Fröhlich, M., Spada, N., & Allen, P. (1985). Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 19,* 27-57.

Galloway, V. B. (1985). Communicating in a cultural context. Workshop given at the Northeast Conference Winter Workshop, Wakefield, MA.

Galloway, V. (1998). Constructing cultural realities: "Facts" and frameworks of association. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming of age of the profession: Issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 129-140). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. The University of Western Ontario: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. & McIntyre, P. D. (1992). A student's contributions to second language learning. Part I: Cognitive variables. *Language Teaching, 25*, 211-220.

Gass, S. M. & Varonis, E. M. (1989). Incorporated repairs in nonnative discourse. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 71-86). New York: Plenum Press.

Gass, S. M. & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 283-302.

Gattegno, C. (1972). *Teaching foreign languages in schools: The silent way.* New York: Educational Solutions.

Gebhard, J. G. (1990). Models of supervision: Choices. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 156-166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gebhard, J. G., Gaitan, S., & Oprandy, R. (1990). Beyond prescription: The student teacher as investigator. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 16-25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Genessee, F. (1998). Content-based instruction. In M. Met (Ed.), *Critical issues in early second language learning* (pp. 103-105). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley.

Givon, T. (1979). *On understanding grammar.* New York: Academic Press.

Glisan, E. (1996). A collaborative approach to professional development. In R. C. Lafayette (Ed.), *National standards: A catalyst for reform* (pp. 57-95). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Goddard, R. D. & Villanova, P. (1996). Designing surveys and questionnaires for research. In F. T. L. Leong & J. T. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology research handbook: A guide for graduate students and research assistants* (pp. 85-97). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Griffith, F. (1973). *A handbook for the observation of teaching and learning.* Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company.

Gutierrez, K. (1994). How talk, context, and script shape contexts for learning: A cross-case comparison of journal sharing. *Linguistics and Education, 5*, 335-365.

Gutierrez, K., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(3). 445-471.

Haefele, D. L. (1981). Teacher interviews. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 41-57). London: Sage Publications.

Hall, J. K. (1999). The communication standards. In J. K. Phillips & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language standards: Linking research, theories, and practices* (pp. 15-56). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Hammerly, H. (1991). *Toward balance in language teaching and learning.* Clevedon,

UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hancock, C. R. (1981). Modest proposals for teacher education in the 1980's. In J. Phillips (Ed.), *Action for the 80's: A political, professional, and public program in foreign language education*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Hancock, C. R. (1994). Glossary of selected terms. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), *Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 235-240). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Handschin, C. H. (1923). *Methods of teaching modern languages*. Yonkers, NY: World.

Harley, B. (1998). The role of focus-on-form tasks in promoting child L2 acquisition. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 156-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harley, B., Allen, P., Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (1990). *The development of second language proficiency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harris, W. (1981). Teacher command of subject matter. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 58-72). London: Sage Publications.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heberlein, T. A. & Baumgartner, R. (1978). Factors affecting response rates to mailed questionnaires: A quantitative analysis of the published literature. *American Psychological Review, 43*, 447-462.

Hippler, H. J. & Schwarz, N. (1987). Response effect in surveys. In H. J. Hippler, N. Schwarz, & S. Sudman (Eds.), *Social information processing and survey methodology* (pp. 102-122. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Jarvis, G. A. (1968). A behavioral observation system for classroom foreign language skill acquisition activities. *Modern Language Journal, 52,* 335-341.

Jarvis, G. A. (1983). Pedagogical knowledge for the second language teaching. In J. E. Alatis, H. H. Stern, & P. Stevens (Eds.), *Applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: Toward a rationale*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Johnson, D. M. (1992). *Approach to research in second language learning.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Katona, G. (1940). *Organizing and memorizing: Studies in the psychology of learning and teaching.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Kellerman, E., Ammerlaan, T., Bongaerts, T., & Poulisse, N. (1990). System and hierarchy in L2 compensatory strategies. In R. C. Scarcella, E. S. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicate competence in a second language.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Klein, W. (1986). *Second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klein, W. (1991). Seven trivia of language acquisition. In L. Eubank (Ed.), *Point counterpoint: Universal Grammar in the second language.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

King, J. A. (1981). Beyond classroom walls: Indirect measures of teacher competence. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 167-179). London: Sage Publications.

Kramsch, C. (1993a). *Context and culture in language teaching.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1993b). Foreign language study as border study: Report on a cross-cultural teacher training seminar. *Culture and content: Perspectives on the Acquisition of cultural competence in the foreign language classroom*, Monograph Series #4. Tempe, AZ: Southwest Conference on Language Teaching.

Krashen, S. (1977). The monitor model for adult second language performance. In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Finocchiaro (Eds.), *Viewpoints on English as a second language* (pp. 152-161). New York: Regents.

Krashen, S. (1981). The fundamental pedagogical principle in second language teaching. In B. Sigurd & J. Svartik (Eds.), *AILA 1981.* CWK Gleerup.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London: Longman.

Krashen, S. (1992). Under what conditions, if any, should formal grammar instruction take place? *TESOL Quarterly, 26*, 409-411.

Krashen, S. (1993). The effect of formal grammar study: Still peripheral. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 722-725.

Krashen, S. D. (1999). Seeking a role for grammar: A review of some recent studies. *Foreign Language Annals, 32*(2), 245-257.

Krashen, S. & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching*. New York: McGraw.

Lafayette, R. C. & Draper, J. B. (1996). Introduction. In R. C. Lafayette (Ed.), *National standards: A catalyst for reform* (pp. 1-8). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Lafford, P. A. & Lafford, B. A. (1997). Learning language and culture with internet technologies. In M. D. Bush & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Technology-enhanced language learning* (pp. 215-262). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Lambert, W. (1969). *Psychological aspects of motivation in language.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lange, D. L. (1993). Teacher development and certification in foreign languages: Where is the future? *Modern Language Journal, 67*(4), 374-381.

Lange, D. L. (1999). Planning for and using the new national culture standards. In J. K. Phillips & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language standards: Linking research, theories, and practices* (pp. 57-135). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and practices in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition theory and research*. London: Longman.

Leaver, B. L. & Stryker, S. B. (1989). Content-based instruction for foreign language classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals, 22,* 269-275.

Lee, J. F. (1986). Background knowledge and L2 reading. *Modern Language Journal, 70*, 350-354.

Lee, J. F. & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen.*

New York: McGraw Hill.

Lightbown, P. M. (1998). The importance of timing in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 177-196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, P. & Pienemann, M. (1993). Comments on Stephen Krashen's "Teaching issues: Formal grammar instruction." *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 717-722.

Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*(4), 429-448.

Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liskin-Gasparro, J. (1996). Assessment: From content standards to student performance. In R. C. Lafayette (Ed.), *National standards: A catalyst for reform* (pp. 169-196). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Littlejohn, A. P. (1982). Teacherless language learning in groups: An experiment. Manuscript, University of Lancaster.

Littlejohn, A. P. (1983). Increasing learner involvement in course management. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*(4), 595-608.

Long, M. H. (1975). Group work and communicative competence in the ESOL classroom. In M. Burt & H. Dulay (Eds.), *On TESOL '75* (pp. 211-233). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Long, M. H. (1980). Inside the "black box": Methodological issues in classroom research on language learning. *Language Learning, 30,* 1-42.

Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 379,* 259-278.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 126-141.

Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of research on second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic.

Long, M. H. (1997). Authenticity and learning potential in L2 classroom discourse. In G. M. Jacobs (Ed.), *Language classrooms of tomorrow: Issues and responses* (pp. 148-169). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Long, M. H. & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 207-227.

Long, M. H. & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. H., Ignaki, S. & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 357-371.

Long, M. H., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castaños, F. (1976). Doing things with words: Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In R. Crymes & J. Fanselow (Eds.), *On TESOL '76* (pp. 137-153). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Lozanov, G. (1978). *Suggestology and outlines of Suggestopedia.* New York: Gordon & Breach.

Lund, R. J. (1990). A taxonomy for teaching second language listening. *Foreign Language Annals, 23*, 65-80.

Lyster, R. & Ranta, E. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37-61.

MacWhinney, B. (1987). Applying the competition model to bilingualism. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 8,* 315-327.

MacWhinney, B., Bates, E. & Klingell, R. (1984). Cue validity and sentence interpretation in English, German and Italian. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 23*, 127-150.

Marsh, H. W. & Dunkin, M. J. (1992). Students' evaluations of university teaching: A multidimensional perspective. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, volume VIII* (pp. 143-233). New York: Agathon Press.

McKeachie, W. J. (1977). Can evaluating instruction improve teaching? In L. M. Aleamoni (Ed.), *Techniques for evaluating and improving instruction* (pp. 1-7). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second language learning.* London: Edward Arnold.

Medley, D. M. (1979). The effectiveness of teachers. In P. Peterson & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Research on teaching* (pp. 11-12). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Medley, D. M., Coker, H., & Soar, R. S. (1984). *Measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance: An empirical approach.* New York: Longman.

Meisel, J., Clahsen, J., & Pienemann, M. (1981). On determining developmental stages in natural second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 3*, 109-135.

Merino, B. J., Trueba, H. T., & Samaniego, F. A. (Eds.) (1993). *Language and culture in learning: Teaching Spanish to native speakers of Spanish.* London: Falmer.

Met, M. (1994). Are America's schools ready for world-class standards? *Educational Leadership, May*, 86-87.

Millman, J. (1981a). Introduction. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 12-13). London: Sage Publications.

Millman, J. (1981b). Student achievement as a measure of teacher competence. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 146-166). London: Sage Publications.

Mitchell, R. & Myles, F. (1998). *Second language learning theories.* London: Arnold.

Moore, Z. T. (1994). The portfolio and testing culture. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), *Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 163-182). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Moskowitz, G. (1971). Interaction analysis: A new modern language for supervisors. *Foreign Language Annals, 5,* 213.

Moskowitz, G. (1976). The classroom interaction of outstanding foreign language

teachers. *Foreign Language Annals, 9,* 135-143, 146-157.

Moskowitz, G. (1978). *Caring and sharing in the foreign language class.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Murphy, J. A. (1990). The graduate teaching assistant in an age of standards. In S. S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges in the 1990s for college foreign language programs* (pp. 129-150). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Murray, H. G. (1991). Effective teaching behaviors in the college classroom. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (vol. 6) (pp. 135-172). New York: Agathon Press.

Murray, H. G. & Renaud, R. D. (1995). Disciplinary differences in classroom teaching behaviors. In N. Hativa & M. Marincovich (Eds.), *Disciplinary differences in teaching and learning: Implications for practice* (31-40). San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Musumeci, D. (1997). *Breaking tradition: An exploration of the historical relationship between theory and practice in second language teaching.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.

National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Languages. (1991). Characteristics of effective foreign language instruction: Guidelines. *Proceedings of annual NADSFL meeting at the ACTFL conference.* Washington, D. C.: NADSFL.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1991). Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession. Detroit, MI: NBPTS.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (January 2000). *Foreign language standards (for teachers of students ages 3-18+) (Draft).* Southfield, MI: NBPTS.

National Center for Education Statistics. (September 1996). U. S. Department of Education. National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF).

Nerenz, A. G. & Knop, C. A. (1982). A time-based approach to the study of teacher effectiveness. *Modern Language Journal, 66,* 243-254.

Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue.* New York: Teachers College Press.

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Language learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1993). Learner characteristics in second-language acquisition. In A. Omaggio Hadley (Ed.), *Research in language learning: Principles, processes, and prospects* (pp. 96-123). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17*(4), 459-482.

Omaggio Hadley, A. (1993). *Teaching languages in context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Onibokun, O. M. (1984). Evaluating teaching practice: A review of major approaches and a suggested model. In O. M. Onibokon (Ed.), *The organisation, supervision and evaluation of teaching* (pp. 88-99). Ibadan: Evans Brothers.

Ornstain, A. C. (1991). Teacher effectiveness research: Theoretical considerations. In H. C. Waxman & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Effective teaching: Current research* (pp. 63-80). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Ortega, L. & Long, M. H. (1997). The effects of models and recasts on the acquisition of object topicalization and adverb placement in L2 Spanish. *Spanish Applied Linguistics, 1*(1).

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in the language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 443-456.

Oxford, R. L. & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: Methods, findings, and instructional issues. *Modern Language Journal, 73,* 404-419.

Penner, J. G. (1992). *Why many college teachers cannot lecture*. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Pennington, M. C. (1996). *The power of CALL*. Houston, TX: Athelstan.

Pennington, M. C. & Young, A. L. (1989). Approaches for faculty evaluation for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 23,*, 619-645.

Perdue, C. (1991). Cross-linguistic comparisons: Organizational principles in learner languages. In T. Huebner & C. Ferguson (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Perdue, C. & Klein, W. (1992). Why does the production of some learners not grammaticalize? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14*, 259-272.

Perry, C. M. & Rog, J. A. (1992). Preservice and inservice teachers' beliefs about effective teaching and the sources of those beliefs. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 49-59.

Phillips, J. K. (1998). Changing teacher/learner roles in standards-driven contexts. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming of age of the profession: Issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 3-14). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Phillips, J. K. (1999). Introduction. Standards for world languages--On a firm foundation. In J. K. Phillips & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language standards: Linking research, theories, and practices* (pp. 1-14). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Pica, T. (1983). Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different conditions of exposure. *Language Learning, 33*(4), 465-497.

Pica, T. (1984). Methods of morpheme quantification: Their effect on the interpretation of second language data. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6*(1), 69-78.

Pica, T. (1991). Classroom interaction, negotiation, and comprehension: Redefining relationships. *System, 19*, 437-452.

Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1985a). The role of group work in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*, 233-248.

Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1985b). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., Berducci, D., & Newman, J. (1991). Language learning through interaction: What role does gender play? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 343-376.

Pienemann, M. (1981). *Der Zweitsprachenerwerb ausländischer Arbeitskinder*. Bonn: Bouvier.

Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6*(2), 186-214.

Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? *Applied Linguistics, 10*(1), 52-79.

Politzer, R. L. & Weiss, L. (1971). *The successful language teacher*. Philadelphia: The Center for Curriculum Development.

Porter, P. A. (1983). Variations in the conversations of adult learners of English as a function of the proficiency level of the participants. Ph.D. dissertation. Stanford University.

Poulisse, N. (1990). *The use of compensatory strategies by Dutch learners of English.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruijter.

President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. (1979). *Strength through wisdom: A critique of U.S. capability*. Washington, DC: GPO; *Modern Language Journal, 64*(4), 9-57.

Ravem, R. (1968). Language acquisition in a second language environment. *IRAL, 6*, 165-185.

Rea, L. M. & Parker, R. A. (1997). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reber, T. & Geeslin, K. (1998). An investigation of student opinions and educational experiences in Spanish for Heritage Speakers courses at Arizona State University and the University of Arizona. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education, 3*(2), 33-50.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogers, C. V. & Medley, F. W., Jr. (1988). Language with a purpose: Using authentic materials in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 21*, 467-478.

Rosenshine, B. & Furst, N. (1971). Research on teacher performance criteria. In B. O. Smith (Ed.), *Research in teacher education* (pp. 37-72). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rulon, K. A. & McCreary, J. (1986). Negotiation of content: Teacher-fronted and small-group interaction. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 182-199). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Rutherford, W. & Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Consciousness-raising and universal

grammar. *Applied Linguistics, 6*(3), 274-282.

Ryan, J. M. & Kuhs, T. M. (1993). Assessment of preservice teachers and the use of portfolios. In A. D'Costa & W. Loadman (Eds.), *Assessing tomorrow's teachers, 1993*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Sato, C. (1990). *The syntax of conversation in interlanguage development*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and practice.* Reading, MA: Addison.

Scarcella, R. C. & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Scherer, A. & Wertheimer, M. (1964). *A psycholinguistic experiment in foreign language teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Schinke-Llano, L. & Vicars, R. (1993). The affective filter and negotiated interaction: Do our language activities provide for both? *Modern Language Journal, 77*, 325-329.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. W. & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schrier, L. L. & Hammadou, J. (1994). Assessment in foreign language teacher education. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), *Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 211-234). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Schumann, R. (1978). The acculturation model of second language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching*. Georgetown: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Schulz, R. A. (1988). Methods in teaching German in the United States: A historical

perspective. In D. P. Benseler, W. F. W. Lohnes, & V. Nollendorfs (Eds.), *Teaching German in America: Prolegomena to a history* (pp. 55-75). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Schulz, R. et al. (1993). AATG professional teaching standards: Recommendations of the AATG task force on professional standards. *Unterrichtspraxis, 26,* 80-96.

Schulz, R. A. (2000). Foreign language teacher development: *MLJ* perspectives—1916-1999. *Modern Language Journal, 84,* 496-523.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1981). Speaking on many minds: On the relevance of different types of language information for the L2 learner. *Second Language Research, 7*(2), 118-132.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*(2), 165-179.

Sheal, P. (1989). Classroom observation: Training the observers. *ELT Journal, 43,* 92-103.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15*(2), 4-14.

Shulman, L. (1988). The dangers of dichotomous thinking in education. In P. Grimmet & G. Erickson (Eds.), *Reflection in teacher education* (pp. 31-39). New York: Teachers College Press.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior.* New York: Appleton.

Slobin, D. (1970). Universals of grammatical development in children. In F. d'Arcais & W. Levelt (Eds.), *Advances in psycholinguistics.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing.

Slobin, D. (1973). Cognitive prerequisites for the development of grammar. In C. Ferguson & D. Slobin (Eds.), *Studies of child language development* (pp. 175-208). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Smith, A. N. & Rawley, L. (1998). Teachers taking the lead: Self-inquiry as professional development. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming of age of the profession: Issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 15-36). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Spada, N. (1990). Observing classroom behaviors and learning outcomes in different second language programs, In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 293-312). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing the 21st century. (1996). Yonkers, NY: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.

Stansfield, C. W. (1994). Developments in foreign language testing and instruction: A national perspective. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), *Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 43-67). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Base 10.1 for Windows. (2000). Chicago: SPSS.

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sternberg, R. J. & Horvath, J. A. (1995). A prototype view of expert teaching. *Educational Researcher, 24*(6), 9-17.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64-82). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*, 371-391.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning, 30*(2), 417-431.

Terrell, T. (1977). A natural approach to second-language acquisition and learning. *Modern Language Journal, 61*, 325-337.

Terrell, T., Tschirner, E., Nikolai, B., & Genzmer, H. (1996). *Kontakte: A communicative approach* (3rd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Terry, R. M. (1998). Authentic tasks and materials for testing in the foreign language

classroom. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming of age of the profession: Issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 277-290). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Thomas, R. M. (1998). *Conducting educational research: A comparative view*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Tomasello, M. & Herron, C. (1989). Feedback for language transfer errors: The garden path technique. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 385-395.

Tomasello, M. & Herron, C. (1988). Down the garden path: Inducing and correcting overgeneralization errors in the foreign language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 9*, 237-246.

Tomlin, B. (1990). Functionalism in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 155-177.

Travers, R. M. W. (1981). Criteria of good teaching. In J. Millmann (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 14-22). London: Sage Publications.

Tschirner, E. (1996). *Instructor's manual and transparency masters to accompany Kontakte*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Tschirner, E. (1998). From lexicon to grammar. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming of age of the profession: Issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 113-128). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Underwood, M. (1989). *Teaching listening*. Harlow: Longman.

Valdés, G. (1995). The teaching of minority languages as academic subjects: Pedagogical and theoretical challenges. *Modern Language Journal, 79*, 299-328.

Valdés, M. J. (1991). On the assessment of teaching. *ADFL Bulletin, 22*, 6-9.

Valdman, A. (1975). Error analysis and grading in the preparation of teaching materials. *Modern Language Journal, 59*, 422-426.

Valette, R. M. (1991). Proficiency and the prevention of fossilization--An editorial. *Modern Language Journal, 75*, 325-328.

Valette, R. M. (1992). Proficiency and accuracy: Enemies or allies? In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University round table on language and linguistics 1992*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Valette, R. M. (1993). The challenge of the future: Teaching students to speak fluently and accurately. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 50*(1), 173-178.

Valette, R. M. (1994). Teaching, testing, and assessment: Conceptualizing the relationship. In C. Hancock (Ed.), *Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 1-42). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

VanPatten, B. (1985). Communicative value and information processing in second language acquisition. In P. Larson, E. Judd, & D. Messerschmitt (Eds.), *On TESOL '84: A brave new world for TESOL* (pp. 89-100). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

VanPatten, B. (1992). Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching: Part 2. *ADFL Bulletin, 23*(3), 23-37.

VanPatten, B. & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*(2), 225-243.

VanPatten, B. & Sanz, C. (1995). From input to output: Processing instruction and communicative tasks. In F. Eckman, D. Highland, P. W. Lee, J. Mileham, & R. R. Weber (Eds.), *Second language acquisition theory and pedagogy* (pp. 169-185). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Varonis, E. M. & Gass, S. (1983). "Target language" input from non-native speakers. Paper presented at the 17th Annual TESOL Convention. Toronto, March 1983.

Varonis, E. M. & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation and meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 6*, 71-90.

Vaux, A. (1996). Conducting mail surveys. In F. T. L. Leong & J. T. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology research handbook: A guide for graduate students and research assistants* (pp. 127-138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Viëtor, W. (1886). *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren! Ein Beitrag zur Überbürdungsfrage*. Heilbronn.

Walmsley, J. B. (1984). Quousque Tandem: Wilhelm Viëtor's language instruction must do an about-face. *Modern Language Journal, 68*, 37-44.

Walz, J. (1986). The classroom dynamics of information gap activities. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(3), 481-494.

Wells, G. (1996). Using the tool-kit of discourse in the activity of learning and teaching. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 3*(2), 1-22.

White, J. (1998). Getting the learners' attention: A typographical input enhancement study. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 85-113). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, J. & Lightbown, P. M. (1983). Asking and answering in ESL classes. *Canadian Modern Language Journal, 11-23.*

White, L. (1989). The adjacency condition on case assignments: Do L2 learners observe the subset principle? In S. Gass & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 134-158). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research, 12*(3), 133-161.

White, L., Spada, N., Lightbown, P. M., & Ranta, L. (1991). Input enhancement and L2 question formation. *Applied Linguistics, 12*(4), 416-432.

Wiggins, G. (1989). A true test: Toward more authentic and equitable assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*(9), 703-713.

Wiggins, G. (1993). Assessment: Authenticity, context, and validity. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75*(3), 200-214.

Wiggins, G. (1994). Toward more authentic assessment of language performances. In C. Hancock, (Ed.), *Northeast conference reports. Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection* (pp. 69-85). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Williams, J. & Evans, J. (1998). What kind of focus and on which forms? In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 139-155). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, M. (1989). A developmental view of classroom observations. *ELT Journal, 43,* 85-91.

Winitz, H. (1981). *The comprehension approach to foreign language instruction.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1992). Learning a language from learners. In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 46-66). New York: D. C. Heath.

Wragg, E. C. (1970). Interaction analysis in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 54,* 116-120.

Wright, C. J. & Nuthall, G. A. (1970). Relationships between teacher behaviors and pupil achievement in three experimental elementary science lessons. *American Educational Research Journal, 7,* 477-491.

Wright, S. R. (1979). *Quantitative methods and statistics: A guide to social research.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Zuengler, J. (1993). Encouraging learners' conversational participation: The effect of content knowledge. *Language Learning, 43*, 403-432.