

The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2015–2, 22-36

English-teachers' Teaching Perspectives and Their Use of Methods to Foster Students' Communicative Competence: A Comparison between Chile and Germany

Thomas Lehmann¹

Tanja Weber²

Abstract

The impact of teachers' understanding of efficient teaching has become an important field of research in various countries and domains over the last decade. However, there have been few cross-cultural comparisons in the context of English language teaching (ELT). Additionally, the question how teachers may foster the development of communicative competence in English as a foreign language (EFL) is also still in debate. In order to provide more insight in the characteristic teaching perspectives of EFL-teachers and to identify where they differ in their use of methods for ELT, this paper reports results of a cross-cultural questionnaire study with 68 EFL-teachers from Chile and Germany. The findings show interesting differences in the predominance of specific teaching perspectives. Furthermore, differences in the use of foreign language teaching methods such as interlingual communication tasks and text work were found between Chilean and German EFL-teachers. The results of the study are discussed and conclusions for teacher training and future research are drawn.

Keywords: Teaching perspectives, communicative competence, English language teaching (ELT), English as a foreign language (EFL)

© Association of Gazi Foreign Language Teaching. All rights reserved

1. Introduction

Due to the increased connection of people, regimes, countries' economies, and scientific institutions there is a basic need for a common language. English is the language that became the main *lingua franca* (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey, 2011), a language that makes private conversations, diplomacy, administration, trade, and science possible around the world beyond first language borders. As a result, today we are able to observe a widely spread multilingualism with English as a second language (e.g.,

¹ University of Bremen, Germany, e-mail: tlehmann@uni-bremen.de

² University of Freiburg, Germany, email: tweber@lehr-lern-forschung.de

McKay, 2003; Crystal, 1997). In the near future, we may even surpass the point where there are more English speakers that acquired their English skills not growing up as a native speaker (Graddol, 1999). Thus, there is general agreement on the importance of learning English in order to communicate in the globalized world we live in today (e.g., Jenkins et al., 2011; Gonzales, 2004; Warschauer, 2000). However, learning English is not only beneficial in terms of being able to communicate in today's world. Since the last decade, various authors (e.g., Ku & Zussman, 2013; Azam, Chin & Prakash, 2013; Lee, 2012; Alfred & Martin, 2007; Munshi & Rosenzweig, 2006; Grin, 2003) have repeatedly provide support and to some extent empirical evidence for the assumption that the higher the English skills of a state's people, the higher is their personal economic status and the more likely is the country's economic development. These findings increase the importance of English as a foreign language (EFL) and English language teaching (ELT) in general, as well as people's communication skills in EFL in particular.

In Germany there was an enlarged consideration of *communicative competence* from the 1970s on due to the need for having communication skills. Today, it is a widely held view that communicative competence is crucial for the targeting and planning of ELT in Germany. Edelhoff (1996), one of the leading figures in German research on communicative competence, stated that the communicative approach has become the undisputed foundation of modern foreign language teaching. This approach integrates the new understanding of languages as social actions into the instructional design of foreign language teaching, especially regarding ELT (Piepho, 1974, 1979). The main goal of any communicative situation and thus the main goal of communicative English-teaching is the skill to successfully inform about individual intentions, opinions, views, and feelings. Subsequently, the use of the target language English became one of the highest duties of teachers in Germany (Weskamp, 2011). In Chile, however, there clearly is a lack of use of English in classrooms (Barahona, 2014).

From a pedagogical-psychological perspective, there is general agreement that teachers' beliefs respectively perspectives determine what actually happens in classrooms (e.g., Preiss, 2009; Baumert & Kunter, 2006; Pratt, 2005, 2002; Pratt & Associates, 1998; Calderhead, 1996, 1988; Pajares, 1992; Anning, 1988; Wahl, 1979; Hoy & Rees, 1977). In this regard, teaching perspectives are defined as an interrelated set of beliefs and intentions that guides teachers' attention and serves as a basis for planning decisions as well as for actions in the classroom (Pratt, 2005).

The question emerges what is different in the school-based development of English skills between Germany and Chile. Do German and Chilean English-teachers provide different perspectives on how effective teaching is carried out? Do they differ in their use of teaching methods that aim at developing communicative competence? According to these questions, this paper addresses (1) a comparison of German and Chilean English-teachers' teaching perspectives, and (2) their frequency of the use of teaching methods that foster students' communicative competence in ELT.

2. English language teaching with regard to teaching perspectives and communicative competence

Over the last 50 years, Germany has increasingly incorporated *communicative competence* as a central learning objective in the curricula for ELT. The concept of communicative competence is marked by Hymes (1966), who argues against Chomsky (1965) that system and rule knowledge do not transfer to a correct use of language. Hymes (1966, 1972) concludes that form and function of language cannot be separated from each other. He accordingly defines communicative competence as the appropriate use of language, which is the intuitive functional knowledge and control of the principles language use. However, communicative competence does not replace but complement what Chomsky (1965) understood as being the "linguistic competence" – that is the knowledge of a language's grammar and vocabulary for spoken language, plus the conventions of script and orthography for written language.

Germany's increased consideration of communicative competence as a teaching objective in school taught English was supported by the more learner centered approach to teaching that came along with the shift to a cognitive-constructive understanding of learning in general. Accordingly, teaching and learning English as a foreign language changed from merely being a knowledge transfer of language rules, memorizing vocabulary and writing text translations to arranging realistic, problem-based, social learning settings and acquiring skills for conversations (Müller-Hartmann & Schocker, 2011; Ehlerding, 2010; Haß, 2006; Kiper & Mischke, 2006; Legutke & Schocker-Ditfurth, 2003). Thus, teaching English as a foreign language itself took a shift from a teacher-centered approach with a focus on linguistic competence to a learner-centered approach that aims at provoking communicative competence. As a consequence, English became the primary teaching language in Germany's English classrooms and the use of teachers' and students' native language declined to a minimum (Weskamp, 2011). These conceptual changes in the understanding of good teaching and how learning should take place are also implemented in the currently valid school curricula in Germany (e.g., Ministry for Culture, Youth and Sport, 2004). Besides, these curricula are in line with Hymes' concept of communicative competence and they comply with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR; Verhelst et al., 2009).

Chile, on the other hand, is aware of its lack of English skills and the need for improvements in its language education sector (Avalos & Aylwin, 2007). Beside the deficit regarding students' English proficiency, the country also suffers cultural issues that hinder the development of English skills: "English still seems to be considered 'the (second) language of the posh, upper-class' ('los cuicos') by many" (Glass, 2013, p. 13). Therefore, the Ministry of Education realized a nationwide reform plan in 2004, the so called *Programa Inglés Abre Puertas* ("English opens doors program"), which included teacher trainings and improvements in schools in order to increase teachers' professionalism and students' motivation to learn English. Moreover, Chile's Ministry of Education revised the English curriculum completely in 2005. For the first time standardized level and competence descriptions were established that comply with the criteria of the Association of Language Testers of Europe (ALTE). However, the impact of the reform program and the revised curriculum did not reach classroom practices as in Germany. The skill level of Chilean students remained below the hopes as shown by the *Sistema de Medición de Calidad de la Educación* (SIMCE; the Education Quality Measurement System) (Ministerio de Educación, 2012). The level descriptions of ALTE were also introduced for teachers and set to third level ("independent user"), which corresponds to CEFR level B2. Yet, English proficiency of Chilean teachers is also very low (Abrahams & Farías, 2009) and they often do not even reach the minimum proficiency level set by their Ministry of Education³. Nonetheless, it is not the English proficiency of teachers that is solely accountable for the lack of Chilean students' English skills (see Park & Lee, 2006; Shulman, 1986).

2.1. Teaching perspectives – A general review

As aforementioned, there is an empirical reason to assume that teaching perspectives influence what happens the classroom, and subsequently, how (efficient) students' learning takes place (e.g., Baumert & Kunter, 2006; Calderhead, 1996). The concept of teaching perspectives focuses on Kember's (1997) argumentation on teaching *conceptions* and Chan's (1994) operationalization via teachers' *beliefs, intentions, and actions*. Furthermore, it is based on various observation and interview studies with instructors of numerous subjects and domains (Pratt, 2005, 2002; Pratt & Collins, 2000; Pratt & Associates, 1998). Pratt and associates (1998) conclude that teaching consists of five basic elements, which they form to their General Model of Teaching. These elements are (a) the learners, (b) the teacher, (c) the content, (d) the context, and (e) the ideals. Depending on the individual commitment of a teacher to one or more of

³ In comparison, Germany assumes that the B2 competence level is already achieved by high school graduates, while teachers should have the C2 level, the latter corresponds to the highest ALTE level.

these elements, the relationship between them changes. Moreover, Pratt and Collins (2000) describe five different dimensions of an overall teaching perspective that serve as an interrelated set of beliefs and intentions and “govern what we do as teachers and why we think such actions are worthy or justified. They are indicated by commitment toward one, or more, of the elements and relationships within the General Model of Teaching and expressed through actions, intentions, and beliefs” (Pratt, 2005, p. 10). The five dimensions are (1) *Transmission*, (2) *Apprenticeship*, (3) *Developmental*, (4) *Nurturing*, and (5) *Social Reform*. Table 1 provides short descriptions of the first three dimension that are relevant for the present study.

Table 1

A description of the transmission, developmental, and apprenticeship perspective (cf. Pratt, 2002, p. 6).

Teaching perspective	Description
Transmission	<p>“From the transmission perspective, effective teaching starts with a substantial commitment to the content or subject matter, so it is essential for transmission-oriented teachers to have mastery over their content.</p> <p>[...] Some tend to think of the [] learner as a ‘container’ to be filled with something (knowledge). This knowledge exists outside the learner, usually within the text or in the teacher. Teachers are to efficiently and effectively pass along (teach) a common body of knowledge and way of thinking similar to what is in the text or the teacher.</p> <p>[...] From the transmission perspective, learners are expected to learn the content in its authorized or legitimate forms, and teachers are expected to take learners systematically through a set of tasks that lead to mastery of the content. To do this, teachers, beginning with the fundamentals, must provide clear objectives and well-organized lectures, adjust the pace of lecturing, make efficient use of class time, clarify misunderstandings, answer questions, correct errors, provide reviews, summarize what has been presented, direct students to appropriate resources, set high standards for achievement, and develop objective means of assessing learning.”</p>
Apprenticeship	<p>“The apprenticeship view of teaching may be familiar to many, especially those who have gone through an apprenticeship or internship. As we learn more about why so little classroom learning transfers to work sites, this view becomes increasingly relevant. From an apprenticeship perspective, learning is facilitated when people work on authentic tasks in real settings of application or practice.</p> <p>[...] Learning therefore is a matter of developing competence and identity in relation to other members of a community of practice. Learners’ progress is marked by their skilled performance and their movement from the periphery (as novice or beginner) to the center (as experienced members) of the social life and practices of a community. As new members come into a community, the community itself undergoes changes in defining and enacting appropriate roles, responsibilities, and relationships.</p> <p>[...] The instructor’s responsibility is to see that learners work on tasks that are meaningful and relevant to the community of practice. One of the principal strategies by which they do this is scaffolding: breaking the performance or work into tasks and sequences that progress from simple and marginal to complex and central to the work of the community. Ideally, all of the scaffolding of learning should be integral to the work and legitimate in the eyes of other workers.”</p>
Developmental	<p>“The constructivist orientation to learning is the foundation for this perspective on teaching. From the developmental perspective, the primary goal of education or training is to develop increasingly complex and sophisticated ways of reasoning and problem solving within a content area or field of practice.</p> <p>[...] Behind this view lies a constructivist tenet that learners use what they already know</p>

to filter and interpret new information. In effect, this means that learners construct their understanding rather than reproduce the teacher's understanding. Making sense of the world by relating it to what one already knows has implications for teaching. Foremost, it means that teachers must genuinely value learners' prior knowledge and understand how they think about the content before presenting new material. Once this is accomplished, developmental teachers employ two common strategies: the judicious use of effective questioning that challenges learners to move from relatively simple to more complex forms of thinking and the use of meaningful examples. Questions, problems, cases, and examples form the bridge that teachers use to transport learners from previous ways of thinking and reasoning to new, more complex, and sophisticated forms of reasoning and problem solving."

Although Pratt and Collins (2000) advise against certain teaching perspectives to be classified as negative, there is empirical evidence for learner-centered teaching perspectives (i.e., developmental and apprenticeship) that are more favorable to the acquisition of competences (Braun & Hannover, 2008; Dubberke et al., 2008; Hartinger, Kleickmann & Hawelka, 2006). Additionally, Coffey and Gibbs (2002) show that teachers with a more learner-centered teaching perspective provide a larger repertoire of teaching methods. Students also seem to prefer a more learner-focused approach of teaching compared to teacher-centered imparting of information and knowledge (Hativa & Birenbaum, 2000; Kember, 1997).

2.2. Teaching methods that foster communicative competence

Over the last three decades, different researchers have aimed at developing quality criteria by which one can determine efficient teaching methods (e.g., Helmke, 2006; Creemers, 1994; Slavin, 1994; Helmke, Schneider & Weinert, 1986). Although empirical research gathered many findings on general criteria for lesson designs and interdisciplinary teaching approaches such as cooperative learning, there are only few findings on specific teaching methods in the field of foreign language teaching and with regard to fostering communicative competence. Hence, the literature on foreign language didactics is full of theoretical models and guidelines, which mainly favor learner-oriented teaching methods, but these works seem to especially found on practical experience instead of empirical examinations. This lack of empirical evidence for the efficiency of specific teaching methods is also criticized by the DESI (German English Student Performances International) consortium as well as other international scientists of the field (e.g., Klieme, 2008; Klieme & Beck, 2007). For example, Hancock (2001) states: "L2 [second language] professionals are often confronted with very basic questions for which the field does not have clear-cut answers. [...] Given the very embryonic nature of L2 research into second language acquisition broadly defined, formal research is needed from multiple perspectives" (p. 359). Against this background, it is hard to provide an empirically valid evaluation of methods for ELT. Hence, the following section is concerned with a theoretical breakdown of the concept of communicative competence first in order to identify and match specific teaching methods that prompt preferred learning processes for the obtainment of communicative competence.

2.2.1. A theoretical breakdown of communicative competence

Although the understanding of the concept of communicative competence appears to be quite modern to the field of foreign language teaching with its emphasis on authentic situations and interactions in the foreign language, it already has a longer tradition in applied linguistics. As proposed by Hymes (1966, 1972), to be communicatively competent means not only to be able to express him-/herself in a foreign language – which opposes Chomsky (1965) –, but also that one can filter out or read

the speech intention into complex speech acts of native speakers. Accordingly, communicative competence is defined as the ability to interact with another person by linguistic means, which one learned to see through and to estimate their effects, without fear or complexes and to understand others' communicative intentions, even if they are transmitted in a code that one does not master and is only partially in his/her idiolect (cf. Piepho, 1974, p. 10). Hence, learners should not only acquire *linguistic* knowledge and skills, but also *pragmatic* knowledge and skills to be able to speculate about missing information in communicative situations. They should also gain *sociolinguistic* knowledge and skills to see through statements of their communicative counterparts. Finally, they should also attain *strategic* knowledge and skills so that they can bridge communication problems to fill gaps that result from their incomplete knowledge regarding the foreign language code (Bachman, 1990; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980). Table 2 provides a summary on the four sub-competencies that form communicative competence.

Table 2

Sub-competencies of communicative competence

Sub-competence	Description
Linguistic competence	The linguistic competence refers to the ability to express oneself properly on a formal level that is lexical, grammatical, semantic and phonological.
Sociolinguistic competence	The sociolinguistic competence describes the ability to act in various social settings of communication and thereby comply with socio-cultural rules and norms.
Pragmatic competence	Pragmatic competence refers to the ability to insert missing or not understood utterances into the overall context and to put together a meaningful whole as a result. This is particularly important at the beginning of foreign language learning, as beginners will encounter lacks of understanding that have to be filled.
Strategic competence	Strategic competence describes the ability to shape and control situations of communication. This capability allows to ensure that own communicative intentions have been understood by the conversation partner. Hence, strategic competence includes the methods inquiring, paraphrasing and repeating. These help to cope with problems of understanding and to ensure that the interaction does not terminate due to missing linguistic resources.

2.2.2. *Teaching methods for the four sub-competencies of communicative competence*

As aforementioned, there are no empirically validated collections of teaching methods that suit the competence development of communicative skills in foreign language learning. Yet, as confirmed by Hancock (2001), there is agreement on the assets of teaching methods that support autonomous and learner-centered learning environments. Based on practical literature of foreign language didactics (e.g., Müller-Hartmann & Schocker, 2011; Haß, 2006; Legutke & Schocker-Ditfurth, 2003) and with regard to the concept of communicative competence, we identified five groups of teaching methods that differ in their appropriateness for fostering communicative competence:

- (1) *Simulated, interactive communication situations*, e.g., short dialogues, role plays (eventually with everyday life scenarios), e-mail correspondences, interactive plays,
- (2) *listening tasks*, e.g., listening comprehension, videos, speeches, presentations,

- (3) *text work*, e.g., literal translations, connecting sentences, right or wrong evaluation tasks, written commentary tasks, interpretations,
- (4) *grammar exercises*, e.g., cloze texts, gap filling tasks, reformulating sentences, short text writing, translations of single sentences, and
- (5) *interlingual communication tasks*, e.g., rough translations, provide essential information of a native language text in English, and vice versa.

It becomes obvious that listening tasks and text work fit Chomsky's understanding of language skill whereas the other groups of methods are in line with Hymes (1966, 1972) and subsequent models of what characterizes language use (Bachman, 1990; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980). Although some groups of methods are considered to be more effective in provoking students' communicative competence, it must be mentioned that there is not the only right teaching method, because communicative competence is multidimensional and complex in itself. Consequently, foreign language teaching should always provide an appropriate mixture of methods that address the various sub-competencies as well as different learning preferences.

2.3. Connecting teaching perspectives and communicative competence in Chile's and Germany's ELT

In Chile, teachers mainly believe in the transfer of knowledge as an effective way of teaching (Preiss, 2009). Thus, they may be characterized by a predominant transmission perspective on teaching. Related to teaching English as a foreign language, this is teachers' delivering of system and rule knowledge via text work and grammar tasks. At the same time, a strong transmission perspective may reduce the apprenticeship perspective that sees effective teaching as a process of socializing students into new behavioral norms and ways of working; it may also reduce the developmental perspective, which assumes that effective teaching is based on considering the way of learners' thinking and reasoning about the content (Pratt, 2005). However, these two perspectives seem to be more suitable for English-teaching that aims on fostering communicative competence as described by Hymes (1966, 1972) via simulated, interactive communication situations, listening tasks, and interlingual communication tasks.

On the other hand, in Germany input-oriented teaching as caused by a predominant transmission perspective is regarded as being inadequate since the shift to a cognitive-constructivist understanding of learning in general (e.g., Aebli, 1963, 1983) and competence-oriented teaching in particular (Klieme, 2004). Correspondingly, as Weinert (2001) argues, input-oriented teaching is less effective and results in tacit knowledge, which is not assessable in problem solving or application situations. Therefore, teachers need to arrange real-life, cross-disciplinary, social, and problem-based contexts for learning in order to provoke language competence development instead of providing input for knowledge acquisition (Kiper & Mischke, 2006). These postulations correspond to (1) what is needed to promote communicative competence (Legutke & Schocker-Ditfurth, 2003; Piepho, 1979, 1974) and to (2) the apprenticeship and the developmental dimensions of the teaching perspectives model (Collins & Pratt, 2011; Pratt, 2005, 2002).

3. Aims of the study and hypotheses

The first research objective of the present study is to clarify the present understanding of effective teaching of German and Chilean EFL-teachers according to their teaching perspectives. Based on the above described theoretical background (e.g., Collins & Pratt, 2011; Pratt, 2005, 2002; Pratt & Associates, 1998) and previous findings (e.g., Preiss, 2009; Braun & Hannover, 2008; Dubberke et al., 2008; Hartinger et al., 2006; Baumert & Kunter, 2006), we assume that Chilean EFL-teachers have a more input-oriented understanding of effective teaching than German EFL-teachers (hypothesis 1). More specifically, we assume that Chilean EFL-teachers provide a stronger transmission perspective on teaching (hypothesis

1a), a weaker apprenticeship perspective (hypothesis 1b) as well as a weaker developmental perspective (hypothesis 1c) compared to German EFL-teachers.

Secondly, the present study aims at identifying differences in the use of methods that support students' development of communicative competence in EFL. Based on the language model of (applied) linguistics (Bachman, 1990; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Piepho, 1979, 1974; Hymes, 1972, 1966) and the practical literature of foreign language teaching (e.g., Müller-Hartmann & Schocker, 2011; Haß, 2006; Legutke & Schocker-Ditfurth, 2003; Hancock, 2001), we assume that Chilean and German EFL-teachers differ in the frequency of the use of foreign language teaching methods (hypothesis 2). More specifically, we assume Chilean EFL-teachers use simulated, interactive communication situations (hypothesis 2a), listening tasks (hypothesis 2b), and interlingual communication tasks (hypothesis 2c) significantly less often than German EFL-teachers. However, we do not assume any significant differences in the frequency of use of text work (hypothesis 3) and grammar exercises (hypothesis 4), because both these groups of language teaching methods aim primarily at formal linguistic competence development.

4. Method

4.1. Participants and Design

Seventy-four English-teachers from Chile and Germany voluntarily took part in the present questionnaire study, which was realized as a non-equivalent group online survey. Six respondents had to be eliminated due to missing data. Thus, the total sample underlying our analyses comprises $N = 68$ English-teachers from Germany and Chile. 35 participants (22 female and 13 male) were working at public secondary schools in Germany. Their average age was 40.10 years ($SD = 11.81$) and they had an average teaching experience of 11.83 years ($SD = 10.10$). The Chilean sub-sample consisted of 33 participants (26 female and 7 male). 21 were teaching at public secondary schools and seven at private schools. They had a mean age of 41.27 ($SD = 12.30$) and an average teaching experience of 16.52 years ($SD = 11.10$).

4.2. Instruments

4.2.1. Teaching Perspectives Inventory

A German and a Spanish adaption of the *Teaching Perspectives Inventory* (TPI; Pratt & Collins, 2000; Collins & Pratt, 2011) were used to assess the participants' individual teaching perspectives. The TPI consists of 45 items in total. It is divided into three parts (beliefs, intentions, and actions) with 15 items each. The TPI addresses five teaching perspectives: (a) transmission, (b) apprenticeship, (c) developmental, (d) nurturing, and (e) social reform, each via nine items in total, three within each part. Item ratings may range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) in the beliefs part and from 1 (never) to 5 (always) in the intentions as well as in the actions parts. Cronbach's α reliabilities for the German version range from .71 to .80 (Hanke et al., 2011) and for the Spanish version from .70 to .83 (Rodríguez & Fajardo, 2011), suggesting satisfying reliability.

4.2.2. Use of Language Teaching Methods questionnaire

The participants' use of teaching methods was assessed via self-ratings on a German respectively Spanish version of the *Use of Language Teaching Methods* (ULTM) questionnaire (Weber, 2013). This instrument consists of five one-item Likert scales, each representing a group of teaching methods for foreign language teaching with a specific objective. As described in section 2.2.2, these groups of methods

are (a) simulated, interactive communication situation, (b) listening tasks, (c) text work, (d) grammar exercises, and (e) interlingual communication tasks. Participants' self-ratings can range from 1 (very rarely) to 5 (very often). Retest-reliabilities were tested in a pilot study ($N = 12$) with a three-week interval in between and account for reliability coefficients between $r = .88$ (simulated, interactive communication situation) and $r = .93$ (grammar exercises). Interscale correlations vary between $-.16$ and $.30$ for the scales that focus on teaching methods that are conducive to communicative competence. Interscale correlations between the groups of teaching methods that either aim on communicative aspects – as described by Hymes (1966, 1972) – or on formal linguistic aspects – as described by Chomsky (1965) – range from $-.07$ to $.20$. The correlation between the two formal-oriented scales (text work and grammar exercises) is at $.21$. These coefficients indicate that, although partially related, the ULTM scales assess distinct groups of teaching methods, which suggests satisfying discriminant and convergent validity.

4.3. Procedure

In order to reach German and Chilean EFL-teachers from different schools and regions, approximately 100 schools were contacted via e-mail and requested to forward the included call for study participation to their English-teachers. The call informed about the scope of the study, that participation is voluntary, and that all responses would be treated confidentially without the possibility to draw conclusions about the particular person or the particular school he/she is from. Participants who wanted to take part in the study followed a hyperlink to the online questionnaire where they were instructed on how to complete the survey. Then they completed a short demographic data questionnaire (2 min), the ULTM (4 min), and the TPI (10 min). Once the questionnaires were completed the participants pressed a "Send"-button which led to a server-based storage of their responses and a "Thank you for your support!"-message on the participants' screen.

4.4 Data analysis

We conducted initial data checks to ensure that the dependent variables satisfy the assumptions underlying the analysis procedures. Dependent on the data's distribution we applied either parametric or non-parametric analyses to check our hypothesis. All effects are measured at the .05 level. As effect size measure, we used Rosenthal's r for non-parametric analyses respectively Cohen's d for parametric analyses.

5. Results

First, we investigated whether Chilean EFL-teachers differ in their characteristic values of the transmission, apprenticeship, and developmental perspective from German EFL-teachers. For an overview, Table 3 includes the means and standard deviations of these teaching perspectives separately for the two sub-samples.

Table 3
Means and standard deviations for the three relevant teaching perspectives

Teaching Perspective	Group			
	Chilean EFL-teachers		German EFL-teachers	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Transmission	36.12	3.57	30.46	3.29
Apprenticeship	37.49	2.82	36.40	2.64
Developmental	34.49	5.45	36.86	3.33

For testing our first hypothesis, the teaching perspective measures were investigated by two independent t-tests (transmission and apprenticeship perspective normally distributed) and one independent Mann-Whitney test (developmental perspective not normally distributed). Results showed that Chilean English-teachers ($M = 36.12$; $SD = 3.57$) provided a significantly more dominant transmission perspective than German English-teachers ($M = 30.46$; $SD = 3.29$), $t(66) = -6.807$, $p < .001$, $d = -1.65$ (strong effect). Furthermore, results showed a statistical tendency which suggests that Chilean EFL-teachers ($Mdn = 29.76$) possessed a weaker developmental perspective than German EFL-teachers ($Mdn = 38.97$), $U = 421.0$, $z = -1.928$, $p = .054$, $r = -.23$ (small effect). No significant differences were found regarding the apprenticeship perspective of Chilean ($M = 37.49$; $SD = 2.82$) and German EFL-teachers ($M = 36.40$; $SD = 2.64$), $t(66) = -1.640$, $p > .05$, although there was a small effect ($d = .40$). According to these results, hypothesis 1a and hypothesis 1c were accepted and hypothesis 1b was rejected.

Second, we investigated whether English-teachers from Chile differ in the frequencies of use of teaching methods that aim on fostering communicative competence (hypothesis 2) or on formal linguistic competencies (hypothesis 3) compared to EFL-teachers from Germany. Table 4 provides an overview of the ULTM scale scores for the Chilean and the German group of English-teachers.

Table 4
Means and standard deviations for the ULTM measures

ULTM measure	Group			
	Chilean EFL-teachers		German EFL-teachers	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Simulated, interactive communication situations	3.73	.72	3.57	.85
Listening tasks	3.97	.81	3.97	.66
Text work	3.61	.66	3.91	.66
Grammar exercises	3.70	.77	3.71	.52
Interlingual communication tasks	1.97	1.10	3.20	1.05

We conducted five independent Mann-Whitney tests to test our hypotheses (data of the ULTM measures not normally distributed). The results indicated that German EFL-teachers ($Mdn = 44.00$) make significantly more often use of interlingual communication tasks than Chilean EFL-teachers ($Mdn = 24.42$), $U = 245.0$, $z = -4.204$, $p < .001$, $r = -.51$ (strong effect). Regarding simulated, interactive communicative situations and listening tasks, results suggested neither significant differences nor effects in the frequency of these groups of teaching methods' use (simulated, interactive communicative situations: $U = 535.0$, $z = -.565$, $p > .05$, $r = -.07$; listening tasks: $U = 559.0$, $z = -.253$, $p > .05$, $r = -.03$). Accordingly, hypothesis 2c was accepted and hypotheses 2a and 2b were rejected.

Regarding the frequency of the use of teaching methods that aim on fostering formal linguistic competencies, results showed a statistical tendency for a more frequent use of text work of German EFL-teachers ($Mdn = 38.60$) compared to Chilean EFL-teachers ($Mdn = 30.15$), $U = 434.0$, $z = -1.941$, $p = .052$, $r = -.24$ (small effect). Accordingly, hypothesis 3a was rejected as no differences were assumed regarding the use of methods that aim on fostering formal linguistic competencies. Moreover, results suggested that there are no significant differences in the use of simulated, interactive communicative situations between German ($Mdn = 35.50$) and Chilean EFL-teachers ($Mdn = 33.44$), $U = 542.5$, $z = -.477$, $p > .05$, $r = -.06$ (no effect). Thus, hypothesis 3b was accepted.

6. Discussion

In the present article, we reported a questionnaire study examining the differences between Chilean and German EFL-teachers' teaching perspectives and their use of teaching methods that aim either on communicative competence or on formal linguistic competencies. Chilean and German English-teachers that took part in the online survey replied to the Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI) and the Use of Language Teaching Methods (ULTM) questionnaire. The results can be summarized as follows.

The Chilean sub-sample possessed a significantly more dominant transmission perspective. Furthermore, there was a statistical tendency that suggested that Chilean EFL-teachers provide a weaker developmental perspective than German EFL-teachers. The differences found are in line with the assumptions that teachers from Chile focus more on content and subsequently provide input instead of supporting the emergence of increasingly complex and sophisticated ways of reasoning and problem solving within communicative ELT settings. In contrast, German EFL-teachers were more learner-oriented inasmuch as they provided comparably prevalent apprenticeship and development perspectives alongside a relatively weak transmission value.

Regarding the use of teaching methods that aim on communicative competence in ELT, we found a significant difference for the use of interlingual communication tasks between German and Chilean EFL-teachers. While German EFL-teachers seem to make use of this group of teaching methods almost as regular as other kinds of language teaching methods, Chilean teachers tend to not use these kinds of teaching methods. This means that German EFL-teachers implement teaching methods which train the abilities to reproduce important information from what is heard or read in their own words and to filter out and communicate relevant information from conversations with others better. Thus, German EFL-teachers put a greater emphasis on the skill development of their students that allows them to deal with others' information in their own free speaking and writing compared to Chilean English-teachers. Aside from this difference, results showed that the Chilean and German sub-samples utilize simulated, interactive communication situations and listening tasks, which both also aim at the development of communicative competence, with about the same frequency. In addition, results indicated a statistical tendency for a difference in the frequency of the use of text work. This was against our hypothesis, as we assumed that Chilean and German English-teachers do not differ with regard to groups of teaching methods that aim on formal linguistic competence development. However, contrary to our hypothesis, German EFL-teachers seem to make use of text work in their English lessons more often than Chilean teachers. This result may be due to the fact that teachers can also combine the different teaching methods measured in a meaningful manner, e.g., by using text work in order to prepare subsequent methods such as listening exercises, or simulated, interactive communication tasks thematically.

Overall, the present study demonstrated that German and Chilean EFL-teachers certainly differ in their characteristic teaching perspectives and that the frequencies of the use of specific kinds of foreign language teaching methods also vary between them. However, we need to acknowledge certain limitations of the study before a final conclusion can be drawn.

6.1 Limitations

First, the most important limitation lies in the fact that all findings of the present study are based on data that resulted from teachers' self-ratings. Regarding the assessed teaching perspectives, this seems not to be a substantial limitation, because previous studies showed considerable connections between teaching perspectives and the behavior of teachers (Baumert & Kunter, 2006; Calderhead, 1996). However, one still needs to consider that social desirability may have decreased the transmission values of our German sub-sample, because input-oriented teaching is criticized heavily in Germany's school and

teacher education context. Future studies, thus, may consider external ratings with regard to the use of distinct foreign language teaching methods to complement the present findings, for example via observational research.

Second, the assessment of the use of foreign language teaching methods does neither allow any conclusions about how the methods are implemented nor about the intensity of their usage, both time-wise and with regard to the demands they pose for students. Therefore, the results are limited to the frequency of the teaching methods' use.

Third, there are differing school forms in Chile and in Germany as well that were not incorporated in our analyses. In Chile, about 40 percent of schools are run privately and their reputation is strongly influenced by their results in SIMCE and universities' selection tests (*Prueba de Selección Universitaria*; PSU). This may lead to a "teaching to test" (Popham, 2001) approach within private schools. However, private schools can provide higher quality learning environments for financial and structural reasons. In contrast, the conditions for teaching and learning at public schools are very difficult considering that there are class sizes with up to 60 students. In Germany, the differences between school forms are not that drastic as almost all schools are state-run. Still, there are differences due to the three-tiered school system. This limitation means that study findings need to be interpreted cautiously. It is recommended that further research considers teachers' school-type in a follow up comparison of teaching perspectives and the use of methods between and within countries.

7. Conclusion

The present article provides evidence for differences in the understanding of how effective teaching should take place between Chilean and German EFL-teachers. While German English-teachers provide a well-balanced learner-oriented teaching perspective, Chilean EFL-teachers possessed a significantly more input-oriented, teacher-centred as well as a less constructivist teaching perspective. Compared to German EFL-teachers, the study additionally shows that Chilean EFL-teachers make less use of interlingual communication tasks, which directly aim at students' development of communicative competence, and they also make less use of text work, which contributes to communicative competence indirectly via fostering formal linguistic sub-competencies. Therefore, it is desirable that Chilean EFL-teacher training takes the preexisting teaching perspectives of teacher students as well as from a learning scientific standpoint desirable beliefs more into consideration. It should be made explicit for future foreign language teachers which perspectives effect how they approach their lesson planning, didactical decisions, and classroom activities and how significant they are. Moreover, teacher students should be trained in their reflection skills to evaluate their own teaching beliefs and their use of teaching methods and actions in relation to empirically found approaches that incorporate a more reasonable perspective on teaching.

References

- Abrahams, M. J., & Farías, M. (2009). *Struggling for change in Chilean EFL teacher education*. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Language Teacher Education, Washington, DC, USA.
- Aebli, H. (1963). *Psychologische Didaktik. Didaktische Auswertung der Psychologie von Jean Piaget*. Stuttgart: Klett.
- Aebli, H. (1983). *Zwölf Grundformen des Lehrens*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Anning, A. (1988). Teachers' theories about children's learning. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Teachers' professional learning* (pp. 128-145). London: Falmer Press.
- Azam, M., Chin, A., & Prakash, N. (2013). The returns to English-language skills in India. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 61(2), 335-367. doi:10.1086/668277
- Alfred, M. V., & Martin, L. G. (2007). The development of economic self-sufficiency among former welfare recipients: lessons learned from Wisconsin's welfare to work program. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 11(1), 2-20. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2419.2007.00266.x
- Avalos, B., & Aylwin, P. (2007). How young teachers experience their professional work in Chile. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(4), 515-528. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.003
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barahona, M. (2014). Exploring the curriculum of second language teacher education (SLTE) in Chile: A case study. *Perspectiva Educacional. Formación de Profesores*, 53(2), 45-67. Retrieved from www.perspectivaeducacional.cl/index.php/peducacional/article/viewFile/261/113
- Baumert, J., & Kunter, M. (2006). Stichwort: Professionelle Kompetenz von Lehrkräften. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 9(4), 469-520.
- Braun, E., & Hannover, B. (2008). Zum Zusammenhang zwischen Lehr-Orientierung und Lehrgestaltung von Hochschuldozierenden und subjektivem Kompetenzzuwachs bei Studierenden. *Perspektiven der Didaktik, Sonderheft der Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 9, 277-291.
- Calderhead, J. (1988). The contribution of field experiences to student primary teachers' professional learning. *Research in Education*, 40, 33-49.
- Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and Knowledge. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (pp. 709-725). New York: Macmillan.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). New York: Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47. doi:10.1093/applin/I.1.1
- Chan, C. H. (1994). *Operationalization and prediction of conceptions of teaching in adult education*. Vancouver, BC: The University of British Columbia.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Coffey, M., & Gibbs, G. (2002). Measuring teachers' repertoire of teaching methods. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(4), 383-390. doi:10.1080/0260293022000001382
- Collins, J. B., & Pratt, D. D. (2011). The Teaching Perspectives Inventory at 10 years and 100,000 respondents: Reliability and validity of a teacher self-report inventory. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 61(4), 358-375. doi:10.1177/0741713610392763
- Creemers, B. P. M. (1994). Effective instruction: An empirical basis for a theory of educational effectiveness. In D. Reynolds (Ed.), *Advances in school effectiveness research and practice* (pp. 189-205). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ditton, H. (2002). Unterrichtsqualität – Konzeptionen methodischer Überlegungen und Perspektiven. *Unterrichtswissenschaft*, 30(3), 197-212.
- Dubberke, T., Thamar, M., McElvany, N., Brunner, M., & Baumert, J. (2008). Lerntheoretische Überzeugungen von Mathematiklehrkräften: Einflüsse auf die Unterrichtsgestaltung und den Lernerfolg von Schülerinnen und Schülern. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie*, 22(3), 193-206.
- Edelhoff, C. (1996). Zur Revision der Übungstypologie. In C. Edelhoff (Ed.), *Kommunikativer Englischunterricht: Prinzipien und Übungstypologie* (pp. 1-5). München: Langenscheidt-Longman.
- Ehlerding, H. (2010). *Changing norms in English Language Teaching. The present and future of foreign language education at German 'Gymnasien'*. Freiburg: FreiDok. Retrieved from <http://www.freidok.uni-freiburg.de/volltexte/8014/>

- Glass, K. (2013). Teaching English in Chile. A study of teacher perceptions of their professional identity, student motivation and pertinent learning contents. In R. Ahrens, M. Eisenmann & L. Volkmann (Eds.), *Anglo-American Studies* (Vol. 45). Frankfurt: Peter Lang Edition.
- Gonzales, V. (2004). *Second language learning. Cultural adaptation processes in international graduate students in U.S. Universities*. New York; NY: University Press of America.
- Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. In D. Graddol & U. H. Meinhof (Eds.), *English in a Changing World: AILA Review 13* (pp. 57-68). Oxford: AILA.
- Grin, F. (2003). English as economic value: Facts and fallacies. *World Englishes*, 20(1), 65-78. doi:10.1111/1467-971X.00196
- Hanke, U., Lehmann, T., Schwarz, L., Joest, K., & Miratschijski, I. (2011, Februar). *Übersetzung des "Teaching Perspectives Inventory" ins Deutsche und Validierung*. Talk held at the 75th Congress for Empirical Research on Education (AEPF), Bamberg, Germany.
- Hancock, C. R. (2001). The teaching of second languages: Research trends. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 358-369). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Hartinger, A., Kleickmann T., & Hawelka, B. (2006). Der Einfluss von Lehrervorstellungen zum Lernen und Lehren auf die Gestaltung des Unterrichts und auf motivationale Schülervariablen. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 9(1), 110-126.
- Haß, F. (2006). *Fachdidaktik Englisch – Tradition, Innovation, Praxis*. Stuttgart: Ernst-Klett Verlag.
- Hativa, N., & Birenbaum, M. (2000). Who prefers what? Disciplinary differences in students preferred approaches to teaching and learning styles. *Research in Higher Education*, 41, 209-236. doi:10.1023/A:1007095205308
- Helmke, A. (2006). Was wissen wir über guten Unterricht? *Pädagogik*, 2, 42-45.
- Helmke, A., Schneider, W., & Weinert, F. E. (1986). Quality of instruction and classroom learning outcomes: The German contribution to the IEA Classroom Environment Study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2(1), 1-18. doi:10.1016/0742-051X(86)90002-8
- Hoy, W., & Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(1), 23-26. doi:10.1177/002248717702800107
- Hymes, D. H. (1966). Two types of linguistic relativity. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 114-158). The Hague: Mouton.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics. Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281-315. doi:10.1017/S0261444811000115
- Kember, D. (1997). A reconceptualisation of the research into university academics/conceptions of teaching. *Learning and Instruction*, 7(3), 255-275. doi:10.1016/S0959-4752(96)00028-X
- Kiper, H., & Mischke, W. (2006). *Einführung in die Theorie des Unterrichts*. Weinheim: Beltz.
- Klieme, E. (2004). Begründung, Implementation und Wirkung von Bildungsstandards: Aktuelle Diskussionenlinien und empirische Befunde. Einführung in den Thementeil. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 50, 625-634.
- Klieme, E. (Ed.) (2008). *Unterricht und Kompetenzerwerb in Deutsch und Englisch. Ergebnisse der DESI-Studie*. Weinheim: Beltz.
- Klieme, E., & Beck, B. (Eds.) (2007). *Sprachliche Kompetenzen – Konzepte und Messung*. Weinheim: Beltz.
- Ku, H., & Zussman, A. (2013). Lingua franca: The role of English in international trade. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 75(2), 250-260. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2010.03.013
- Lee, C. G. (2012). English language and economic growth: Cross-country empirical evidence. *Journal of Economic and Social Studies*, 2(1), 5-20. doi:10.14706/JECOSS11211
- Legutke, M., & Schocker-Ditfurth, M. (2003). *Kommunikativer Fremdsprachenunterricht: Rückblick nach vorn*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- McKay, S. L. (2003). Teaching English as an international language: the Chilean context. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 57(2), 139-148. doi:10.1093/elt/57.2.139
- Ministerio de Educación (2012). Estudiantes de 3° medio rinden Simce de Inglés. *Gobierno Informa*. Retrieved from <http://www.gob.cl/informa/2012/11/14/estudiantesde-3%C2%B0-medio-rinden-simce-de-ingles.htm>
- Ministry for Culture, Youth and Sport (2004). *Bildungsplan 2004*. Retrieved from http://www.bildung-staerkt-menschen.de/service/downloads/Bildungsplaene/Gymnasium/Gymnasium_Bildungsplan_Gesamt.pdf

- Müller-Hartmann, A., & Schocker, M. (2011). Lehrprozesse verstehen, Lehrkompetenzen entwickeln. In O. Börner & C. Christa (Eds.), *Kommunikativer Fremdsprachenunterricht: Positionen - Perspektiven - Postulate* (pp. 18-24). Braunschweig: Diesterweg.
- Munshi, K., & Rosenzweig, M. (2006). Traditional institutions meet the modern world: Caste, gender, and schooling choice in a globalizing economy. *American Economic Review*, 96(4), 1225-1252. doi:10.1257/aer.96.4.1225
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332. doi:10.3102/00346543062003307
- Park, G.-P., & Lee, H.-W. (2006). The characteristics of effective English teachers as perceived by high school teachers and students in Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7(2), 236-248. doi:10.1007/BF03031547
- Piepho, H. E. (1974). *Kommunikative Kompetenz als übergeordnetes Lernziel im Englischunterricht*. Dornburg-Frickhofen: Frankonius-Verlag.
- Piepho, H. E. (1979). *Kommunikative Didaktik des Englischunterrichts*. Limburg: Frankonius.
- Popham, W. J. (2001). Teaching to test. *Educational Leadership*, 58(6), 16-20.
- Pratt, D. D. (2002). Good teaching: One size fits all? *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 93, 5-15. doi:10.1002/ace.45
- Pratt, D. D. (2005). *Five perspectives on teaching in adult and higher education*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Pratt, D. D., & Associates (1998). *Five Perspectives on Teaching in Adult and Higher Education*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Pratt, D. D., & Collins, J. B. (2000). The Teaching Perspectives Inventory. In T. J. Sork, V.-L. Chapman & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 41st Adult Education Research Conference* (pp. 346-350). Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia.
- Preiss, D. D. (2009). The Chilean instructional pattern for the teaching of language: A video-survey study based on a national program for the assessment of teaching. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 19(1), 1-11. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2008.08.004
- Rodríguez, J. E. C., & Fajardo, R. J. B. (2011). Perspectivas acerca de la enseñanza de docentes ed Educación Superior. *Educación y Ciencia*, 1(39), 7-18.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14. doi:10.3102/0013189X015002004
- Slavin, R. E. (1994). Quality, appropriateness, incentive, and time: A model of instructional effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 21(2), 141-157. doi:10.1016/0883-0355(94)90029-9
- Verhelst N., Van Avermaet, P., Takala, S., Figueras, N., & North, B. (2009). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/framework_en.pdf
- Wahl, D. (1979). Methodische Probleme bei der Erfassung handlungsleitender und handlungsrechtfertigender subjektiver psychologischer Theorien von Lehrern. *Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und pädagogische Psychologie*, 11(3), 208-217.
- Warschauer, M. (2000). The changing global economy and the future of English teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(3), 511-535. doi:10.2307/3587741
- Weber, T. (2013). *Die Bedeutung kommunikativer Kompetenzen und der Einsatz von Unterrichtsmethoden*. Unpublished Thesis at the Department of Education. Freiburg: Albert-Ludwigs-Universität.
- Weinert, F. E. (2001). Concept of competence. A conceptual clarification. In D. S. Rychen & L. Salganik (Eds.), *Defining and selecting key competences* (pp. 45-65). Seattle: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Weskamp, R. (2011). Autonomes Fremdsprachenlernen im Klassenzimmer – revisited. In O. Börner & C. Candlin (Eds.) *Kommunikativer Fremdsprachenunterricht: Positionen - Perspektiven - Postulate* (pp. 56-65). Braunschweig: Diesterweg.