

UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA. UNIVERSITY OF GRANADA

JORNADAS INTERNACIONALES DE LINGÜISTICA APLICADA

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Robert J. Di Pietro. IN MEMORIAM.

ACTAS / PROCEEDINGS

VOLUMEN / VOLUME 1

UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA
INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS DE LA EDUCACION

CONSEJO EDITORIAL

Pedro Alvarez Suárez
Ana Callejas Cotrina
José Luis Delgado López
Magdalena Leyva Martínez
Isidro E. Sáez Pérez

DIRECCION EDITORIAL

Luz de Ulierte Vázquez

La presente publicación forma parte de una de las series que edita el I.C.E. de la Universidad de Granada. Con estas publicaciones se pretende transmitir al profesorado, las experiencias, conocimientos específicos u opiniones que los autores vierten en ellas. En esta transmisión se respetan íntegramente los contenidos que los autores incluyen en sus originales. Por tanto, no puede interpretarse que las opiniones recogidas en estos documentos son asumidas por el I.C.E. como institución.

JORNADAS INTERNACIONALES DE LINGÜISTICA APLICADA.
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS.
Robert J. Di Pietro. IN MEMORIAM.
Actas / Proceedings.
Volumen / Volume 1

Edición de: Jorge Fernández-Barrientos Martín.

Con la colaboración de: Felipe Bueno Maqueda, Margarita Carretero González, Antonio Castillo Guzmán, Antonio Garcés Rodríguez, Mercedes García Guerrero, José Manuel Martín Morillas, Blas Moreno Hurtado, Emilio Ortega Arjonilla, Faustino Rodríguez Morón, Aurora Rodríguez Morón, M^a Carmen Ruiz Román, Adelina Sánchez Espinosa, Fernando Trujillo Saez y Celia Wallhead.

I.S.B.N.: 84-86848-55-5.

Depósito Legal: GR-293/93.

UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA. UNIVERSITY OF GRANADA

JORNADAS INTERNACIONALES DE LINGÜISTICA APLICADA
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Robert J. Di Pietro. IN MEMORIAM.

Organiza / Organized by: DEPARTAMENTO DE FILOLOGIA INGLESA.

Coordina / Coordinated by: Jorge Fernández-Barrientos Martín.

Con la colaboración de / With the collaboration of:

Consejería de Educación y Ciencia, Vicerrectorado de Investigación, Vicerrectorado de Extensión Universitaria, Consejo Social, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Escuela Universitaria de Traductores e Intérpretes, Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación, Centro de Lenguas Modernas, Departamentos de Filología Española, Filología Francesa y Lingüística General, Grupo de Investigación de Lingüística Aplicada, Asociación Española de Lingüística Aplicada, Excmo. Ayuntamiento de Granada, Patronato Federico García Lorca de la Diputación de Granada (Casa Museo García Lorca, Fuentevaqueros), Consejo Británico, Editoriales Alhambra Longman, Oxford University Press, y Santillana, La General, IDEAL, Cadena COPE (Radio Popular), Cadena SER (Radio Granada), Hipercor, Aguas de Lanjarón, Librería Fleming.

Exposición de libros de / Book Exhibition of:
Alhambra Longman, Cambridge University Press, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Oxford University Press, Penguin Books y Santillana.

Granada, 11 - 15 de Enero de 1993
Granada, January 11 - 15, 1993

PRESIDENTE DE HONOR / HONORARY PRESIDENT:

Excmo. Sr. D. Lorenzo Morillas Cueva.
Rector Magnífico de la Universidad de Granada.

COMITE ORGANIZADOR / ORGANIZING COMMITTEE:

Presidente / President:

Jorge Fernández-Barrientos Martín.
Departamento de Filología Inglesa.

Vice-presidente / Vice-president:

José Manuel Martín Morillas.
Departamento de Filología Inglesa.

Secretaría General / General Secretariat:

Celia Wallhead y Adelina Sánchez Espinosa.
Departamento de Filología Inglesa.

Programa / Programme:

Emilio Ortega Arjonilla.
G.I. de Lingüística Aplicada.

Información e inscripción / Information and registration:

Gracia Arredondo Fernández.
Departamento de Filología Inglesa.

Colaboradores de organización:

Felipe T. Bueno, Margarita Carretero, Witiza Castillo.
Antonio J. Castillo, Jorge Fdez-Barrientos, Olga Fdez-
Barrientos, Antonio Garcés, Mercedes García, Blas Moreno,
Elisabeth Ortega, Ana M. Relaño, Faustino Rodríguez,
Ma. Aurora Rodríguez, Jesús Rodríguez, Ma. Carmen Ruiz,
Fernando Trujillo.

PREFACIO

La idea para la organización de las primeras Jornadas Internacionales de Lingüística Aplicada en la Universidad de Granada, surgió en 1991 durante mi estancia como profesor invitado en la Universidad de Delaware, en los Estados Unidos. En principio se pensó en un encuentro a nivel de grupo de trabajo de profesores de lingüística y de enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras. Aprobada la propuesta de celebración por el Consejo del Departamento de Filología Inglesa de la Universidad de Granada, se constituyó el Comité Organizador de dichas Jornadas.

Habiendo fallecido a finales de 1991 el Profesor Robert J. Di Pietro, director del Departamento de Lingüística de la Universidad de Delaware, se pensó dedicar las Jornadas In Memoriam de Di Pietro y se decidió como fechas más apropiadas del 11 al 15 de Enero de 1993.

La celebración del encuentro científico se difundió por todas las universidades del mundo y se solicitó la participación de todos aquellos profesores que quisieran presentar sus investigaciones y experiencias en el mismo. La respuesta fue, para nuestra sorpresa, sorprendente; se recibieron más de doscientas propuestas de participación y más de mil profesores y estudiantes de universidades de todo el mundo deseaban asistir al mismo.

Ante el interés despertado por el encuentro, organizamos un denso programa de conferencias, mesas redondas y ponencias al más alto nivel. Se invitó a quince profesores de reconocido prestigio universal, especialistas en distintas ramas científicas de la Lingüística Aplicada, para impartir conferencias plenarias y participar en las nueve mesas redondas seleccionadas. Asimismo se hizo una selección de ponencias rechazando aquellas que no se enmarcaban en ninguna de las distintas áreas científicas reconocidas por AILA o cuyo resumen no nos garantizaba el grado de calidad determinado por el Comité Organizador.

Por otra parte, se invitó a estar presentes y exponer sus últimas publicaciones a aquellas entidades editoriales más representativas en el campo de la Lingüística Aplicada, y la respuesta fue también significativa.

Un encuentro científico tan intenso de cinco días de duración debía complementarse con actividades de tipo socio-cultural, así se organizó un programa también denso de recepciones, conciertos, visitas, etc. Para poder acometer este ambicioso proyecto, se solicitó la colaboración de organismos nacionales, autonómicos y locales, así como de entidades privadas y medios de difusión.

En nombre de los componentes del Comité Organizador expreso mi más profunda gratitud a todos los que han colaborado de una u otra forma, haciendo posible que la celebración de las primeras Jornadas Internacionales de Lingüística Aplicada de la Universidad de Granada no sólo hayan sido una realidad, sino que hayan constituido uno de los mayores encuentros de este campo acontecidos en España hasta la fecha.

Jorge Fernández-Barrientos Martín
Presidente de las Jornadas

THE "PROCESS-PRODUCT SPIRAL": A REPORT ON THE USE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN THE EFE CLASSROOM.

Bryan Robinson.
University of Granada (Spain).

1 Strategic Interaction "Learning a new language should be as meaningful as any other social activity." (Di Pietro, 1987:vii)

Published in 1987, this contribution to language teaching methodology made by Robert J. Di Pietro, coincided with the work of many others in the field (Wilberg 1987, Grundy 1989) in its emphasis on the significance of the learner's personal contribution to their own language learning, and on what is now well-known as learner-generated learning. Strategic Interaction establishes a clear frame for language trainers to employ in order to free themselves and their learners from many of the bonds imposed on them by other "methods". The work which is described in this paper originated in the years 1985-87, and has been refined by a number of trainers working in Britain and Europe in subsequent years. Essentially it involves extensions of the scenario format proposed by Di Pietro, and draws on the practices of *psychodramaturgie*, an approach to language learning developed by Bernard Dufeu (1988; 1992), of the University of Mainz; on the terminological base consolidated by Peter Wilberg (1987); and on the approach to context coordinates in Discourse Analysis described by Brown and Yule (1983). The form this paper will take is that firstly, we will look briefly at the Strategic Interaction approach; secondly, we will describe the three sources of influence previously mentioned; and thirdly, we will outline exactly what we mean by the "process-product spiral". We will continue by looking at an activity which demonstrates the results of these extensions to Di Pietro's framework; and finally, we will draw a few conclusions.

2 Strategic Interaction: an overview.

Di Pietro's work is based on the concept of the scenario, on the learners' rehearsal and performance of this, and on their subsequent debriefing. The scenario contains four basic elements: strategic interplay, roles, personal agendas, and shared context. It is not the same as a roleplay, in that here learners play themselves "within the framework of the role" - hence the personal agendas - rather than playing a part assigned to them. Furthermore the situation is not developed for the learner, but by the learner in collaboration with the others in the group: strategic interplay in a shared context. In a roleplay, language is targeted in advance, whereas in a scenario the language is that used by the learners to carry out the performance. This freedom of action on the part of the learners creates the greater element of uncertainty and dramatic tension which distinguishes scenarios from roleplays.

Similarly, the scenario is not a simulation. A simulation involves far more elaborate, and sophisticated resources and prompts. Moreover, simulations often develop over several episodes, which a scenario could, but would not normally do.

One final important point about the scenario is the role which Di Pietro assigns to grammar in the debriefing phase. As we have already mentioned, one of the four defining characteristics of the scenario is the lack of a targeted language input. This means that grammar, as the study of the formal rules of the language, cannot come into play until the learners have reached the debriefing stage, and therefore is looked upon exclusively as one part of their output. This, of course, is very much in keeping with

the overall tendencies of the communicative approach to language learning, but can - as Guy Cook has reminded us - lead to "top-down misunderstanding" (1993). The role of grammar is one we will return to later when we look at the techniques proposed in this study for the processing of learner-generated texts.

3 Three sources of influence

The methodology of the scenario involves three separate phases, and the extensions to Di Pietro's framework which we have made involve firstly the rehearsal and performance phases together, and secondly the debriefing phase. Let's now consider each of these in turn and discuss the sources of our methodological variations and their relationship with Di Pietro's formula.

3.1 The rehearsal and performance phases

As we have said before, the work we have carried out has introduced elements

from *psychodramaturgie*, which is a method developed for the teaching of French as a foreign language. Dufeu's application of psychodrama to foreign language learning to a certain extent conflicts with one of the principles on which Di Pietro has based Strategic Interaction. This very divergence is of great importance in Dufeu's work in that it makes a greater impact on the learner, and makes learning more effective. Di Pietro talks (1987:70) of the therapeutic effect of group work - something with which Dufeu would wholeheartedly agree - and he goes on to refer to foreign language learning as being a "shield", in Curran's terms (1976) for some learners. While Dufeu's work does not deny this, he bases scenarios on learner's real-life experiences, whether elicited directly or through the use of symbol. His aim is contrary to Di Pietro's, in that he does not seek to "defuse ... potentially stressful" real-life experiences by means of the scenarios (1987:68), but rather to draw directly on these, in the safe and secure context of the group, in order to give the learning experience greater effect.

3.2 The debriefing phase

Complementing this extension of the rehearsal and performance phases, is the work of Wilberg (1987). He describes a multiplicity of manners in which learner-generated materials can be reformulated and reformatted - terms which we define in detail below - and provides a wealth of techniques which make this phase the richest possible. It is through applying these techniques that we move learners forward along what we have called the process-product spiral.

So, before proceeding to describe the activities and debriefing techniques we have used, let's now define three processes derived from Wilberg which we use in this phase: auditing, reformulation, and reformatting.

3.2.1 Auditing

"Analyzing and making the student aware of language forms" (Wilberg 1987:13) is the definition we have adopted for the debriefing work dealing with the transcript produced by learners. This process may involve many kinds of language awareness activities which are separate from the essential analysis of the "product" text itself. And these would not necessarily feed directly back into the "process-product spiral". Auditing does not, however, mean simply correcting in the traditional sense which is fundamentally a negative exercise. It is, rather, a positive process.

3.2.2 Reformulation

The term reformulation has been variously defined as a non-traditional correction technique which "attempts to imitate the way in which real-life correction happens" (Bartram & Walton 1991:52), and as "a variety of

procedures in which the teacher provides a format for student input and then provides the language that the student lacked in expressing him- or herself" (Wilberg 1987:27). For the purposes of our study in which the emphasis is on learner-generated materials, we would wish to expand on this last definition to include the possibility of either learner, learners or trainer providing the format, and also for either of them to provide the language lacking. In addition, we would follow Bartram and Walton when they draw on Krashen's suggestion that the trainer should try to expose the student to language just above the student's current level of English: that is, a level which is just within their range on the upward curve of the language learning spiral. And of course, we must include here reference to the trainer's knowledge of the application of Grice's cooperative principles (1975), and the subtleties of language which indicate the specific co-ordinates of context in each case.

3.2.3 Reformatting

Essentially this process involves making changes in the context to either the channel, or the message-form, or indeed both. Reformatting means changing the channel from written to spoken: for example, by expressing the contents of a letter as a dialogue; or changing the message-form, by rewriting personal notes of a conversation, as a formal written report; or by extracting information from a text in order to complete a table or graph. This last exercise is used in many recent EFL textbooks where it is called an information transfer activity. In our study we have extended this too, in order to include changes in the roles of addressor or addressee; the introduction or removal of a specified audience; and alterations of setting, while maintaining throughout the same topic. The degree of subtlety of these changes has obviously depended on the level of sophistication of the learner's language and on the specific objectives of the course.

3.3 The contribution of Discourse Analysis

The range of variants which are described by Wilberg has been clarified and expanded in our work through a clearer understanding of the parameters of context, and of the variety of context co-ordinates at work in any given scenario.

3.3.1 Context co-ordinates

Brown and Yule (1983:35-49) describe a wide range of co-ordinates which have been proposed by Hymes (1964) and Lewis (1972) among others, for the purpose of delimiting the variants at work in the analysis of context of situation. They develop this topic by taking up Fillmore's question as to the effect of making the context "slightly different" (Fillmore 1977:119 in Brown and Yule 1983:45), to which they reply that "if you alter the condition specified by any of the co-ordinates, you alter the context". From this starting point, in our work, we have set out to elicit or suggest alterations to specific, individual co-ordinates which, at the debriefing stage, our learners then have to put into effect in the texts they have previously generated. Thus, they instigate their search for specific changes in these texts which would indicate the alterations that have taken place.

4 The process-product spiral: a definition.

In Strategic Interaction, Di Pietro contemplates that learners might re-enact a performance once they have carried out a full debriefing. He points out that when this occurs the second performance is much improved, and that learners do not read their revised texts verbatim, but actually put into practice the refined language they have analyzed (1987:137). The move from an emphasis on fluency - in the first performance - to accuracy - in the debriefing - and then back to fluency - in a second performance - is

seen by Di Pietro as a valuable extra option.

As a direct consequence of the insights gained from the discourse analysis work described above, we have found that the essence of success has in fact been in this very same repetition: hence the choice of the term "process-product spiral". The first phase emphasizes fluency through the process of creating a text. The second concentrates on accuracy in working on an analysis and refinement of that text. This improved product then becomes the next step upwards on the spiral as the process is repeated through a re-run of the scenario. And so on, and so on. From being an optional extra, we have made the spiral the key to upgrading learners' language awareness, and indeed general communicative awareness, on all levels. Finally, to return to the subject of "explicit grammatical knowledge" (Di Pietro 1987:98). This, clearly, is required of learners and trainers when dealing with output in as much as it will clarify "bottom-up misunderstandings". What is also important to note is that the opportunity for this work is available when dealing with the learner-generated product texts.

5 In the classroom

In this section we will describe in some detail an activity which has been successfully used in order to produce texts suitable for our purposes. Not only will we describe the procedural moves made by the trainer, but we will also detail the ways in which the product texts have been exploited during debriefing and/or later performances.

5.1 Turning the table

The use of something as simple as a table to create a scene is a technique drawn from Dufeu. In this activity it is the change in the setting co-ordinate, that is: where the table is located, which initiates the move from first stage product to second stage product. Consequently, the first reformulation processing is carried out in the very same activity. As described here, the activity has been used with groups of salesmen, marketing, and purchasing managers. It has also been adapted for working with teachers' groups. It easily lends itself to almost any situation, but the trainer needs to adapt his instructions to suit the learners he is working with.

The trainer suggests learners recall a "first encounter with a client" scenario. They re-create the scene around a table, perhaps the desk in the client's office. They run through the scenario with an observer recording details of the text, or with a video- or audio-recording being made. Immediately on completing the performance, the trainer asks them to re-enact it, but metaphorically turns the table around, and places them in a restaurant setting. The learners work through the same content, but in this new context - one which is perfectly normal for business people. The observer continues to make notes, and at the end of this second scene we have two products: the first stage version, and a second stage text with all of the learner-generated reformulations which have come about as a result of the change of setting. Trainer and learners can then move ahead to analyze both of these.

The changes of co-ordinates have been made within the activity itself by moving the setting from office to restaurant. So, the first step in analyzing these is to produce parallel texts which can be read simultaneously to highlight the changes of language use which learners have made both consciously and unconsciously. Typically in this scenario the guest is more pro-active in the second setting than in the first. Similarly, the guest's language tends to indicate a peer relationship when in the restaurant, whereas in the office there are sometimes indications that he is in an inferior. This appears through an increased use of tag

questions, and through the fact that he generally makes more interventions in this second context. For many learners the key next move is to rewrite the text of the first setting using the language of the second, thus establishing a firmer basis for negotiation between salesman-guest and client-host. Once again, this moves them further along the "process-product spiral".

5.2 Conclusions

Initially we have described this work as being a "process-product spiral". Our reason for choosing this label is that once learners have created a second text as a result of their reformulation and reformatting work, there is no limit to the number of times they can repeat this process. Indeed, on commercial one-to-one courses the production of one specific text-product - say a commercial presentation, or an interview dialogue - has become the basis of a thirty-hour programme. The resources available to the trainer, and his capacity to analyze and refine language on all levels - phonological, syntactic, pragmatic, and paralinguistic - along with the learners commitment to the outcome of the process, are the only limitations which exist. The final product may not appear until a sixth or seventh version has been created, but each revision of that product will give way to new approaches to the learner's needs.

6 Postscript

Robert Di Pietro ends Strategic Interaction with an invitation to teachers to communicate their experiences to him for, as he says, there is "much mutual benefit to be gained from sharing information about the ways it [Strategic Interaction] is being implemented in the classroom" (1987:147). I hope that by sharing this report with you we go some way towards fulfilling his wish.

1 Bibliography

- BARTRAM, M.; WALTON, R.: *Correction*. Hove: Language Teaching Press, 1991.
BROWN, G.; YULE, G.: *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: CUP, 1983b
BROWN, G.; YULE, G.: *Teaching the Spoken Language*. Cambridge: CUP, 1983a
COOK, G.: "Top-down misunderstanding" in *Actas de las Jornadas Internacionales de Linguística Aplicada*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, forthcoming.
CRYSTAL, D.: *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell 3rd edition 1991
DI PIETRO, R.J.: *Strategic Interaction*. Cambridge: CUP, 1987.
DUFEU, B.: "Psychodrama" in *The Teacher Trainer Vol 2 No 1*. Canterbury: Pilgrims English Language Courses, 1988.
DUFEU, B.: *Teaching Myself*. Oxford: OUP, 1992.
FERNANDEZ-BARRIENTOS MARTIN, J.; ORTEGA ARJONILLA, E.: *Aportaciones a la lingüística aplicada: Robert J. Di Pietro*. Granada: Alhambra Longman/Universidad de Granada, 1993.
GRICE, H.P.: "Logic and conversation". In COLE, P.; MORGAN, J. (eds.): *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 3*. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
GRUNDY, P.: "Gone to teachers every one", in *The Teacher Trainer Vol 3 No 2 & 3*. Canterbury: Pilgrims English Language Courses, 1989.
HALLIDAY, M.A.K.; HASAN, R.: *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976.
JONES, L.: *Eight Simulations*. Cambridge: CUP, 1983.
ROBINSON, B.J.: "Soaps", in *Practical English Teaching Vol 10 No 4*. London: Mary Glasgow Publishing, 1990
ROBINSON, B.J.: *Product and process - a resources book for teachers*. Unpublished manuscript
STEVICK, Earl W.: *Humanism in Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP, 1990.
WILBERG, P.: *One to One*. Hove: Language Teaching Press, 1987.

LEXICAL REPETITION, ASSOCIATIONS AND LITERARY IMPACT

Adelina Sánchez Espinosa.
Universidad de Granada (España).

INTRODUCTION

First and foremost, I would like to state that my field of research is not linguistics but literature and therefore the thrust of this paper will address literary rather than purely linguistic considerations. The field of applied linguistics is, nevertheless, shared ground between both disciplines and this fact allows people like myself to make a contribution, however little, to this conference.

Linguistics can indeed help the study of literature and vice versa. I came to this realisation whilst taking an MPhil in English at the University of Birmingham. It was then that I had the opportunity of attending Michael Hoey's lectures on the interaction between lexis and discourse and it was also then that I became acquainted with some of the research done in this area, particularly that of Michael McCarthy and Ronald Carter.

The study of the interaction between discourse and lexis offers an interesting potential for practical uses. Let us take, for example, the case of the teaching of English for Proficiency Level such as is the case with third year students of philology at the University of Granada. From this stage on these students will be expected to command a fairly extensive vocabulary load. This, in its turn, requires them to become familiar with some, not many, literary texts. Literature is introduced in order to open up a path for a more specific study in the fourth year and to give students some practice in approaching literary discourse. Some other written discourse - authentic material such as newspaper articles, classified adverts, etc. - is also instrumental to the purpose. This being the case, the combination of language and literature needed at this level can only be provided by an eclectic method. It is at this point that the above mentioned theories may usefully serve their needs.

The present paper is a brief review of such theories and of their possible applications for TEFL. As such it is divided into three parts: first, a theoretical introduction; then an illustration of these views; finally, some comments upon how this analysis can satisfy the needs specified above.

In 'The Interaction of Discourse and Lexis', an article included in the collection Styles of Discourse edited by Nikolas Coupland (1988), Michael Hoey remarks that literary discourses are more elegantly or complexly

SOURCES OF MOTIVATION IN THE EFL CLASSROOM: THE TEACHER.

Daniel Madrid, Bryan Robinson, Encarnación Hidalgo, Annette Gomis,
M^a José Verdejo, José Luis Ortega.
University of Granada (Spain).

1 TEACHERS AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

It is currently assumed that success or failure in learning a foreign language depends on some fundamental factors:

- a) The learner's social context: sociocultural and socioeconomic factors.
- b) The learner's personal characteristics: age, cognitive and affective characteristics, and personality traits.
- c) The learning process: quality of strategies, techniques, and cognitive operations.
- d) Conditions under which learning takes place, which includes EFL and/or ESL situations.

Our work has been done in EFL contexts, that is, in Spanish classrooms where English is taught as a compulsory curriculum subject, in a non-supportive environment. In these situations, results depend very much on the didactic treatment applied by the teacher:

- Types of objectives that teacher and students aim to achieve.
- Contents selected to obtain the objectives
- Strategies and techniques employed in the classroom
- Materials and resources used

But not only the didactic treatment in itself is important, the personal characteristics and personality traits of the person that applies that treatment in the classroom, his/her teaching style, attitudes and personal qualities are also fundamental.

Dunkin and Biddle's model of teaching (1974:38) suggests the outcome of the teaching and learning process depends on three major sets of variables:

- a) The teacher's characteristics (presage variables)
- b) The pupil's properties (context variables)
- c) The classroom teaching (process variables: including teacher and students' classroom behaviour)

According to this model, EFL teachers cause certain effects (presage variables) depending on their characteristics as individuals, their formative experiences, their training, etc. EFL teachers' classroom behaviour and teaching styles are considered process variables and are influenced by the former.

Stern (1984:500) maintains the major variables identified by Dunkin and Biddle (1974) but introduces some changes in the model he proposes. The teacher's characteristics, together with those of the learner are considered presage variables, and influence the process variables.

Both of these models can be included within the process-product paradigm (see for example Gage 1978, Brophy 1983, Good 1979, Wittrock 1986), and consider that the teacher's didactic and personal qualities have a great influence on the learning process and, consequently, on the learning product. The influence on the learning process is exerted not only through effective teaching strategies and techniques, but also by generating positive attitudes and motivation for learning the FL.

2 TEACHERS AS MOTIVATORS

Finocchiaro has identified twenty-four hallmarks of superior teachers, some of which are related to personal and affective factors (1988:3-5):

- Making learners feel loved, respected and secure, and that they can achieve success by concentrating on the teacher's comprehensible input and tasks.
- Keeping students' motivation at a high level.
- Offering a relaxing atmosphere for learning.

Prodromou (1991) aimed to discover students' views of good and bad language teachers and found out that students

<u>like teachers to</u>	<u>dislike teachers to</u>
be friendly	be very strict
know how to treat them	be too authoritarian
be forceful, but not strict	be very serious
be educated	be bad tempered
be funny	talk too much
believe in students	speak in a flat monotone
be proud of students	be distant from students
have a personality of their own	treat kids like objects
be good advisers	be too sarcastic and ironic
be experienced	make them feel anxious

We believe that all these attitudes towards the foreign language teacher, and others too, have a strong influence on the student's motivational state because motivational factors determine to a great extent the degree of learning success.

Gardner, in his social-educational model (1985:147), relates student outcomes to four individual differences: intelligence, language aptitude, attitudes and motivation, and situational anxiety. In previous works, he summarized the major components of motivational characteristics. He distinguishes a set of variables (1975:58):

1. Group specific attitudes. In our case, attitudes towards English-speaking communities and the desire to integrate into those societies.
2. Attitudes toward English as a subject in comparison with other curricular subjects.
3. Attitudes toward the foreign language teacher
4. Attitudes toward the classroom methodology: activities, tasks and teaching resources.
5. Influence of parents and the social environment as sources of motivation.

3 OUR RESEARCH WORK

We have made a survey of these variables in the Spanish educational context and have presented some provisional results in Madrid et al. (1993). In this paper, we focus our attention on the teacher as a source of motivation.

3.1 Variables controlled

3.1.1 The first questionnaire provides information about the motivational agents or factors that most influence student's interests and attitudes toward the study of English:

- Tasks carried out in the EFL classroom
- EFL teacher's qualities

- Parents
- Characteristics of the subject in itself, as a linguistic discipline
- The desire to integrate and live in the foreign country
- The instrumental importance of English in present day society

3.1.2 Open questionnaire. This gave us reasons why students like or dislike their EFL teacher and their opinion about the fundamental characteristics and qualities of good English teachers.

3.1.3 Closed questionnaire. This was administered in order to find out, firstly, which of the following characteristics were more relevant to students:

- The English teacher's physical appearance
- His/her scientific knowledge
- The teacher's didactic preparation
- Personality traits

And secondly, which specific qualities and behaviours from among the following, were liked and disliked:

<i>Physical appearance:</i>	17 Preventing anxiety
1 Being handsome/pretty	18 Offering oral activities
2 Being elegant	19 Assigning written tasks
<i>Scientific preparation:</i>	20 Using the students' names
3 Having a deep knowledge of the subject	21 Testing students frequently
4 Having good pronunciation	<i>Personality traits</i>
5 Being fluent	22 Tolerant and flexible
<i>Teaching performance:</i>	23 Hard, rigid, strict
6 Preparing classes	24 Hardworking
7 Informing about objectives and contents	25 Authoritarian
8 Trying to motivate students	26 Fair and just
9 Explaining with clarity	27 Available and helpful
10 Following an adequate pace	28 Kind and polite
11 Organizing games	29 Active
12 Being fair with grades	30 Original and creative
13 Encouraging participation	31 Responsible
14 Assigning homework	32 Balanced and quiet
15 Controlling discipline	33 Firm and confident
16 Assigning pair work	34 Tidy and careful
	35 Happy, optimistic and friendly

3.2 Sample

The three questionnaires were administered at the three educational levels, in centres in the city and province of Granada: in primary education (7th & 8th grades); secondary education (3rd & 4th); and at university (1st year).

4 RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Primary Education (7th grade, age 12-13; 34 learners; private, church-sponsored school)

The instrumental value of the language in society, followed by parental influence and classroom activities were, in that order, the three most important sources of motivation. At the opposite end of the scale came the teacher's qualities, the subject itself, and the integrative motive.

A large majority of the learners stated that they liked their current teacher (88%). The reasons given were that "She understands learners", and "She feels very confident and explains well." In support of this they indicated that the qualities of the teacher which they most highly valued were that he/she should be "pleasant", and that they should "use the FL in class".

Academic training took priority over other aspects of the "ideal" teacher, followed by didactic abilities, personal characteristics, and appearance, in that order.

These children liked their English teacher. Their opinion was that of informed learners as many of them attended private classes outside of the school. As a consequence, they had had experience of (an)other English classes, given by (an)other teacher. They were therefore aware of a number of classroom activities which their school teacher did not use. This explains why the activities they stated that they would like to do in class were not those they actually did.

In this group the use of the FL in class was an important source of motivation. Some students had demanded this of the teacher, although she had insisted - and they recognised - that most of them would not understand her. After having read these results, the teacher's solution to this problem, was to use English from the lowest level, in order to make the students feel more comfortable when having to use the FL in class.

4.2 Primary Education (8th grade, age 13-14)

When students were questioned in relation to their sources of motivation, it was obvious that the figure of the teacher did not seem to be very important compared to other potential motivating factors. Instrumental and integrative incentives, the influence of the parents etc. were regarded by students as more attractive sources of motivation. We should not forget that the learning of a second language differs broadly from other disciplines also imparted in a classroom setting. Obviously, the main difference lies in the very peculiar circumstances surrounding this particular subject. Indeed, the attractiveness intrinsic to the learning of a second language contributes to the existence of a significant increase in the degree of motivation. In this specific case, we are not just dealing with the teacher and the student somehow isolated in the classroom. The learning of a second language is not only restricted to the subject itself. On the contrary, it also implies the acquisition of a vast amount of cultural input reflecting different aspects of an idiosyncratic nature. A possibility to communicate with other individuals belonging to completely different cultures, the opportunity to understand different ways of expression, music, traditions and customs, all undeniably lessen the strength of the teacher as a potential source of motivation.

Nevertheless, we should take into consideration that, when students were asked to evaluate their attitude towards their teacher, the result, surprisingly, could be regarded as fairly positive. This teacher's interventions in class do not, therefore, seem to have had a negative effect on motivation. 42.1 % of the class asserted that they liked their teacher; 44.7 % of them selected the second choice (I like him/her a little bit), whereas just 13.1 % of the students chose the third alternative (I do not like him/her). A striking fact to be underlined is that the students configuring this 13.1 % were characterized by a high level of academic achievement. However, a significant number of the subjects who showed a

preference for the first option controversially presented a low level of academic achievement. How are we supposed to interpret this? In a different section of the test, students were asked to justify, in very specific terms, their positive attitude towards the teacher. Two factors were constantly repeated: "She explains well", and "She is nice".

Congeniality, as we can infer from the outcome of the tests, is one of the most important aspects for these teenage students. On the other hand, it becomes clear that students pursue an ideal teacher with a good academic/professional standing and, at the same time, a more casual way of implementing his/her work. They want a good teacher (in a stricter academic sense) but they also want a good communicator as their instructor; a person who shares their problems and goals and who, to a certain extent, becomes their friend.

In relation to the physical features, it is interesting to point out that even though they are taken into consideration by the students, they are not highlighted as an issue of outstanding relevance. However, those qualities referring to the personal, didactic and scientific aspects were regarded as decisive by a significant number of individuals. Consequently, we can infer the importance not only of a good academic standing but also the relevance of the teacher's personality. The classroom, it is important not to forget, is a living body formed by emotional individuals. This reflects a need for a teacher who offers positive feedback and responds to very specific requirements of support, help and understanding.

In relation to the scientific training of the teacher, the subjects of our study regarded "having good pronunciation" as a key quality in the teacher, even more important than for instance "having a good knowledge of the subject". When asked about the didactic aspect, the students considered that "explaining with clarity" and "creating a relaxed atmosphere" in conjunction with "organizing games in the classroom" and "being fair and equitable", were very significant features in a teacher. Other options such as "assigning homework regularly", "setting exams" and "organizing a significant number of written activities", were not very popular.

Finally, we can generalise by saying that when dealing with personality, qualities such as being nice and polite, congenial, funny and optimistic were considered very important. Other qualities such as being demanding and authoritarian, which obviously denote a stricter view of the system were characterized by an evident lack of popularity.

4.3 Secondary Education (3rd grade, age 16-17; 28 students; state secondary school)

In this case, the context in which we carried out our survey compelled us to modify to some extent Gardner's conclusions (1985) on which it was based. It was then that we could observe how important the teacher was in the language learning process as an influence on the student's motivational state.

It was easy to confirm that the main source of motivation was none other than an instrumental one, after which came others concerned, firstly, with the learning situation - the subject itself, the classroom work, the teacher's qualities, and finally, with a very distant integrative motive and an apparently irrelevant parental encouragement.

From this we conclude that, first of all, when students do not have any

real contact with the language they necessarily are interested in it or moved towards it simply because of some practical reasons; and secondly, that, as a consequence, the teacher must be ascribed an important role in this process for introducing the student to the foreign language as a subject, for becoming the closest and most decisive representative of both of these in a non-supportive context. And finally, for moulding, whether consciously or not, the student's attitude towards these through his/her own attitude shown in the classroom.

Considering this, we have studied the student's attitude towards the teacher. Our results differed according to the different motivational states of the students, but on average they were rather good; correlating closely with the students' rates of achievement.

The less motivated students (21%) took into consideration the teacher's less positive personal features ("being occasionally angry", "elitist") rather than academic ones, in order to explain their dislike. Some of them also added their dislike of the methodology used ("somewhat boring"). The more motivated ones, however, looked on her academic abilities to express both their liking for her ("teaching well", "planning well", "keeping herself up-to-date with methodology") and their criticism ("limited use of English in the classroom", "over-theoretical lessons").

In spite of the different points focused on by these students, their "ideal" teacher was very alike. Her/his main characteristics were having a knowledge of English, an ability to teach it, and showing kindness in carrying out the process. They preferred a teacher who could master both didactic and academic skills, such as: good pronunciation, fluency, clear explanation, fair marking, using new exercises -especially oral ones-, or helping less advanced students; and appearing personally engaging and encouraging the student's interest. Thus, other questions such as either scientific preparation and physical appearance, or more precise features such as their homework and the excessive control of the class were quite irrelevant.

Accordingly, we come to the conclusions that the teacher seemed to have a key role in the LL process, and that both personal and academic features were taken into account by students as motivating or demotivating tokens. Although it was somewhat easy to make up the image of the archetypal teacher, it is really hard to achieve an ideal when so many contextual constraints are involved.

4.4 Secondary Education (4th grade, age 17-18; 17 students)

"If students aren't learning it is assumed to be the fault of the method, the materials or the teacher. Yet the success of a learning program involves far more than the mere act of teaching" (Richards, 1990:1).

An in-depth study of the motivating forces in a group of language students should prove to be a very useful tool in understanding important attitudes for language learning. The study may be conducted at the beginning of the course, in which case it will provide information vital to the teacher conducting needs analysis; or mid-term, for the teacher to take stock of the situation and effect any changes deemed necessary in the light of the results; or at the end of the course, to investigate past methodology. The results, if studied carefully, will offer insights that should not fail to be revealing.

These students were studying English because they had to, a foreign language being a compulsory part of the curriculum, and this may or may not have coincided with their wanting to study a language. The group had had the same teacher for the two preceding years and some of them for longer. The teacher was placed fifth in order of importance only ahead of the influence of their parents. This negative attitude towards the importance of the teacher was borne out by the analysis of their comments on what they considered to be the qualities of a good teacher.

The overall rating for the teacher was of 1.3 (in a scale ranging from 0 to 2), and was explained by the students in the following way. Forty per cent stated that the teacher had shown marked preferences towards certain members of the group (the academically good ones) and despised and looked down upon the others. Thirty-six per cent of the group also thought the teacher was impatient and moody, and did not use good teaching methods,

On the same scale, scientific knowledge obtained a rating of 1.8, didactic preparation 1.6, personality traits 1.5, and physical appearance 0.5. Forty per cent considered that the language teacher ought to be good-tempered, pleasant, patient and interesting. Thirty per cent emphasised the importance of explaining well and assessing fairly, while twelve per cent stressed the importance of knowing the subject well and being able to maintain discipline.

These results show how a teacher who receives a low rating in the questionnaire can affect the learners' feelings about the teacher's role, and in particular how the teacher is considered to be a relatively unimportant motivating factor in the language learning process.

Allwright & Bailey (1991:162) point out that "a teacher may be liked as a person, and well respected as a professional, and yet not teach in a way that suits everybody in the class, to the extent that some learners may find that teacher quite useless to them". So it appears to be important to discover what activities and learning strategies suit a particular group as well as to understand what profile they expect in a competent teacher. This study revealed significant ideas about the language teacher as seen from the learners' point of view.

4.5 University level (1st year; 32 students)

Frequently two teacher "types", known as the *instructor*, and the *socializer*, are described (Brophy 1985). Essentially these are opposites, which we might call the stereotypes of the university teacher (*instructor*) and the primary school teacher (*socializer*). Characteristically, the former presents academic content and supervises what is learnt, whereas the latter aims to develop learners' mental capabilities, promotes good interpersonal relations and a good inter-group atmosphere, and prepares learners to be good citizens. Some of the differences in their behaviour are that *instructors* emphasize academic input; are impersonal in their relations with learners; put the blame for problems on factors other than themselves; and promote the idea of the teacher as a just, authoritarian figure. In contrast, *socializers* emphasize the socializing of learners; pay attention to personal and behavioral problems; personalize their interaction with learners; put the blame for problems on family or social background; promote qualities of patience, love for learners, and so on, as being those of the teacher; consider the classroom to be where learning should take place, and where human relations should be developed.

In the light of this division, we begin by placing the teacher in context,

when compared with other motivating factors. Then, we describe how participants saw their teacher - whether as an *instructor* or a *socializer* - and examine their preferences for an "ideal" teacher, in the same terms.

On the basis of the average scores recorded in the rank-ordering exercise, we establish that the instrumental motive is the most important (4.94, out of a possible 6), the subject matter itself second (4.48), and the integrative motive third (4.32). The qualities of the teacher ranks fourth, scoring 3.46; and the other two factors are significantly less important still. Moreover, 25% of the sample did not respond to this item.

Participants gave the teacher an average score of 2, meaning that the person in question was very popular. The lists of reasons supporting this, and of preferred qualities and characteristics show that participants clearly considered their teacher a *socializer*, with 61.3% of responses falling in this bracket, and only 15.3% in that of the *instructor*. The remaining responses could be attributed to either category. This preference was carried over when the question was depersonalized: 62.1% of the total responses can be classified in the *socializer* category, and only 14.1% in that of the *instructor*.

Average scores of 2, for didactic preparation, 1.94 for scientific knowledge (more *instructor* than *socializer* characteristics), and 1.88 for personality traits (more *socializer* than *instructor* characteristics) indicate that participants perceived little difference between each of these. Physical appearance (0.03) was not even considered.

In contrast to what was indicated by the open questionnaire, the most highly rated characteristics were all of the *instructor* type. Ten items were specifically attributable to each type of teacher, and the average percentage score giving *instructor* characteristics most importance was 52.6%, with a range from 97% to 0%. For *socializer* characteristics, the average was 46.3%, with a narrower range of between 78% and 28%.

A clear and consistent impression of the learners' image of a "good FL teacher" as a *socializer* comes from the results of the open questionnaire. However, this is contradicted by their thoughts on the "ideal" teacher. In order to put this into perspective there are two points that we will make before drawing specific conclusions. Firstly, it is clear that a highly popular teacher can distract learners' attention from their initial objectives even in an examination-specific class. Secondly, on a clearly instrumental course of this type, participants could have been expected to be concerned about their teacher's ability to prepare them to work as translators. However, this does not appear in any responses. Perhaps this clarity is lacking as learners had yet to verbalise their expectations of the course.

Perhaps, then, the principal message of this sample is that teachers, whichever their personal style, should be aware of the needs of their learners, and that they should be able to broaden their approach so as to provide learners with both *socializer*-type and *instructor*-type teaching.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allwright, D. & K.M. Bailey (1991). *Focus on the Language Classroom*. CUP.
- Ames, C. and Ames R. (1985). *Research on Motivation in Education, vol 2: The Classroom Milieu*. Academic Press, Inc
- Brophy, J. E. (1983). "Classroom organization and management". *Elementary School Journal*, 83 (4), 265-286.
- Brophy, J. E. (1985). "Teachers' expectations, Motives, and Goals for Working with problems Students" in Ames, C and Ames R. (1985).
- Dunkin, M. J. and Biddle, B. J. (1974). *The Study of Teaching*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Finocchiaro, M. (1988). "Teacher development: a continuum process". *English Teaching Forum*, vol XXVI, 3, 2-5.
- Gage, N. L. (1978). *The Scientific Basis of the Act of Teaching*. New York. Teachers College Press, University of Columbia.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Madrid, D., Ortega, J. L., Jiménez, S., Pérez, M. C., Gomis, A., Fernández, J., Pérez, M. E., García M. M., Hidalgo, E., Verdejo, M. J. and Robinson, B. (1993). "Sources of motivation in the EFL classroom". VIII Granada Teachers Association Conference (GRETA).
- Good, T.L. (1979). "Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school: what we know about it now". *Journal of Teacher Education*, 30, 52-64.
- Prodromou, L. (1991). "The good language teacher". *English Teaching Forum*, vol. XXIX, 2, 2-7.
- Richards, J.C. (1990) *The Language Teaching Matrix*. CUP.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Wittrock, M. C. (1986). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. New York: MacMillan.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AND TEACHERS' TRAINING IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS: THE ITALIAN EXPERIENCE

Virgilio Marrone.
Italian Ministry of Education Inspector (Italy).

INTRODUCTION

Before dealing in some details with the specific topic of my paper, I think it may be useful to hint briefly at those features of the Italian educational system which are relevant to the topic itself.

After that, I will present the main points of the experimental phase of FLT (Foreign Language Teaching) in Italian primary schools.

The third part will deal with the new primary school curriculum and the FL syllabus. Both will be analysed, the latter in some depth.

The fourth point will focus briefly on the problem of FL continuity with the lower secondary school.

The fifth, final part of the paper will be about the experience I have lived in the teachers' in-service training courses in my region. These courses will be analysed in their contents, methodology and evaluation (both of the trainees and of the trainer).

1. THE ITALIAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

As I have just mentioned, I will consider those features of the Italian educational system which are relevant to the topic of this paper.

From this point of view, I think it may be useful to remember that compulsory education, in Italy, starts at the age of 6 and lasts 8 years. This means that children are compelled to go to school from the age of 6 to 14. That implies that they have to attend:

- 5 years of primary school
- 3 years of lower secondary school.

After that, they can either go to one of the many types of higher secondary schools or start working, if they are lucky to find a job.

Until 1991, one or more foreign languages were included only in secondary schools curricula.

As far as lower secondary schools are concerned, their curriculum has only one foreign language. There is to say, however, that pressures from parents have led the Lower Secondary School General Directorate to authorize an increasing number of schools (which we call *scuola media* and whose pupils are aged between 11 and 14) to introduce a second foreign language (L3) into their curriculum. At present, out of about 7,000 schools all over Italy, more than 1,000 are carrying out that experimental project.