TEACHING ETIQUETTE COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS TO STUDENTS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE[1]

Oleg Tarnopolsky

Dnepropetrovsk Academy (Ukraine)

This paper attempts to prove the necessity of teaching etiquette communicative behavior characteristic of English-speaking nations to students of English as a foreign/second language. The notion of communicative etiquette (developed by English-speaking speech communities) is analyzed, and component parts of this etiquette are discussed. Communicative etiquette is shown to be the basis of more or less standardized etiquette communicative behavior used by native speakers of the language. Communicative behavioral patterns are postulated as practical representatives of communicative etiquette and etiquette communicative behavior in actual communication. Ways of classifying communicative behavioral patterns for teaching purposes are demonstrated, and lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns are singled out as the most essential ones for teaching English as a foreign/second language to all categories of learners. Some approaches to teaching such patterns in practice are discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the time Hymes formulated the notion of "speech community", understanding it as "a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech" (1986: 54), learning foreign and second languages is considered in sociolinguistic studies as primarily aimed at acquiring such rules of conduct and interpretation. This line in sociolinguistics is especially diligently pursued in relation to teaching English as a foreign or second language (EFL/ESL; see, for instance the works by McKay and Hornberger 1996, Wolfson 1989, and others). The line of thinking in question inextricably links teaching language to teaching culture because

---

[1] The article is a revised and enlarged version of the paper read in Russian at Linguapax (VIII conference organized by the UNESCO in Kiev, Ukraine, 18- 20 September 2000).

"rules of conduct and interpretation" are in fact rules derived from the culture of a given community.

The idea of integrating language and culture in EFL/ESL teaching is not at all new. This idea began to be practically implemented as far back as the 50s after the publication of Lado's famous book on linguistics across cultures (1957). In the 80s, especially after Damen's (1987) work on culture as the fifth dimension in language instruction had appeared, teaching/learning culture of English-speaking nations became one of the most important things in EFL/ESL classrooms worldwide (see, for instance, Byram 1989). Teaching culture in language programs means not so much teaching "high culture" or "culture with a big C", i.e., history, art, literature, and the like, as teaching students "how *the English* (whoever they are) act in given situations, which may distinguish them from *the Japanese* etc." (Killick 1999: 4). That is just what is meant by Hymes's "rules of conduct and interpretation".

Such rules are often understood in a sense too narrow to embrace all aspects of communication. For instance, Wolfson (1989) introduces the notion of the "rules of speaking", meaning that they are the principal thing a learner should acquire in order to conform to the rules of conduct and interpretation characteristic of English-speaking speech communities. Another term for the rules of speaking which means the same and is traditionally used in EFL/ESL teaching, is "speech etiquette". Even the terms themselves ("rules of speaking", "speech etiquette") show that only the verbal aspect of communication is taken into account. But social and cultural norms regulating communication embrace more than the verbal aspect of human intercourse. For instance, every kind of communication, even mostly verbal ones, practically always has a number of paralinguistic features, such as gesticulation, a definite distance between interlocutors, and a number of others. All these paralinguistic characteristics are also socially and culturally regulated, that is, they follow some norms accepted in a community, some rules of conduct and interpretation. Those rules embracing both verbal and non-verbal (paralinguistic) aspects of communication may justly be called "etiquette" if we accept the definition of etiquette given in *New Webster's Dictionary* (1993: 325) as "the rules of behavior standard in ... society". (It should be noted in brackets that New Webster's Dictionary speaks about "polite society" when considering the notion of etiquette. But the adjective "polite" seems quite superfluous here because etiquette as a certain code of behavior exists in any society or community —even in criminal ones— since, without it, coexistence of human beings in groups would become impossible).

Speaking about etiquette in human verbal and non-verbal intercourse, the term *communicative etiquette* should be used instead of the current term "speech etiquette"; only by using it can all socially and culturally norm-regulated aspects of communication be embraced (verbal and non-verbal rules of conduct and interpretation). These aspects form the components of communicative etiquette.

2. COMMUNICATIVE ETIQUETTE AND ITS COMPONENTS AS REGULATORS OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOR

The communicative etiquette of a nation may be postulated to have at least seven main components. Though these components have not been explicitly discussed in the professional literature heretofore, their presence is so self-evident that it does not need any special argumentation:

1. *General* (non-specific for communication or any other activity, but universal for a given community) *rules of behavior in society*, based on most general social, cultural, and moral norms. Such rules are not identical for different peoples, countries, and speech communities, and therefore, underlie certain differences in organizing communication in different languages. For instance, in English-speaking countries, a question about a person's income or earnings is absolutely inadmissible. It is not quite so in Eastern European countries, like Russia or Ukraine, where this question, though impolite, is still possible. This difference is due to the fact of greater respect for personal privacy which is one of the basic social, cultural, and moral norms of English-speaking communities.

2. *General speech etiquette,* embracing all verbal communication in any area, i.e., what may be called general norms or rules of verbal behavior, meaning rules governing the choice of linguistic means to get the message through. For instance, in Russian adding an equivalent of "please" to a request (like in "Open the window, please") makes it quite polite and formal. In English the imperative mood is not acceptable in a polite and formal request, and structures like "Do you mind opening the window?" or "Would you please open the window?" are required.

3. *Specific speech etiquette in definite areas of communication* (including peculiarities of situations and personal relationships of interlocutors talking to each other on issues within the scope of such areas). It determines those peculiarities of verbal behavior that distinguish communication in different areas (for instance, the area of professional communication and relations as distinct from verbal contacts with family members, friends, etc). In the latter case a person may be much more casual or even careless in the choice of vocabulary, structures, style of speaking, etc. than in the former case. If you are speaking English, it is quite possible to invite a friend to your party by asking him or her, "Do you fancy coming to my party on Saturday?", but the structure of this invitation would be unacceptable for inviting a business partner to a business lunch. Specific speech etiquette also determines the choice of linguistic means depending on situations of communication within a certain area. The same professional problem may be discussed using different language in informal and in formal situations (e.g., official business talks or meetings). People who are not only colleagues or partners, but friends as well will discuss a professional problem using different vocabulary as compared to people whose relationships are exclusively professional and official.

4. *General paralinguistic etiquette* that embraces rules of non-verbal behavior in communication. First of all, it regulates which gestures, body language, or distance between interlocutors are admissible within a given speech community

without making communication incomprehensible, insulting, offending, or simply unpleasant to other people. The differences in different cultures are quite striking in that respect. For instance, the cultures of English-speaking nations require direct eye contact between interlocutors. On the contrary, Japanese culture considers direct eye contact offensive and must be avoided. General paralinguistic etiquette also codifies the meaning of gestures and body language for the given speech community, and, here again, striking cultural differences can be found. For example, nodding your head once or twice means "Yes" for English-speaking people and most Europeans. But it means "No" for the Bulgarians.

5. *Specific paralinguistic etiquette in definite areas of communication.* This determines peculiarities of non-verbal behavior that are manifested in different norms and rules depending on the area of communication and the situation in which the intercourse is taking place. These norms and rules regulate area and situation-specific permissibility of certain paralinguistic features in communication. They also take into account people's relationships. For instance, communication between friends at a party allows for "freer", less restrained, gesticulation and closer, more intimate, distance between communicators than communication in the area of professional activities (e.g., in business talk). But here again much depends on specific situational features, on the greater or lesser formality of the situation.

6. *Specific communicative (verbal and non-verbal) etiquette of definite activities in certain areas of communication,* i.e., rules of verbal and non-verbal behavior depending on current activity. For instance, in the area of professional intercourse, actually working on some task in cooperation with colleagues requires less formal verbal and non-verbal behavior in communication than the activity of officially reporting the results of the task to superiors.

7. *Specific communicative (verbal and non-verbal) etiquette of different groups within one and the same nation speaking the same language.* This nation may be considered as one big speech community. The majority of people belonging to it follow those rules of verbal and non-verbal behavior in communication that are determined by the components of communicative etiquette discussed above. But there is an infinite number of groups within such a big speech community, each forming a smaller speech community (teenage groups, professional groups, marginal groups, etc.). Most of these groups have their own communicative (verbal and non-verbal) etiquette used for communication only with the other members of the same group. For "outside" communication, all-national communicative etiquette is followed because intragroup slang, forms of expressions and relationships, "masonic" gestures, etc., may be incomprehensible or offensive to outsiders. Teenagers do not speak and behave in the same manner to adults as among themselves. Physicists and physicians, when they communicate professionally with their colleagues, follow the all-national rules of verbal and non-verbal behavior in communication, including the specific rules of professional intercourse (see components 3, 5, and 6 above). But the professional communication of physicians is somewhat different in its etiquette features from that of physicists, and these features are proper only to the speech community of physicians and to no other professional

speech community. So, there are specific group rules of verbal and non-verbal behavior in communication followed only by this group, and not by the nation as a whole.

From what was said above it is clear that communicative etiquette is a collection of socially and culturally determined norms and rules that regulate human behavior in communication within a given speech community. Behavior in communication meeting those requirements, norms, and rules can be called *etiquette communicative behavior*. A student of English as a foreign/second language may be said to have acquired the etiquette communicative behavior characteristic of an English-speaking speech community if her/his behavior while communicating in English meets all the general and specific norms and rules regulating verbal and non-verbal aspects of communication within this community. It should be noted that teaching etiquette communicative behavior to EFL/ESL students means orientation at a *definite* English-speaking speech community —e.g., to the Americans, the British, or the Australians— because there is no common "English-speaking" etiquette communicative behavior. As Killick (1999: 4) has pointed out, "the British, the Americans, the Australians, the Irish etc, after all, operate a 'common language', but remain, at many levels, divided culturally".

3. ETIQUETTE COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS AND FACTORS DETERMINING THEIR DEVELOPMENT

It may be said that communicative etiquette and its components set patterns of human etiquette behavior in communication. Such patterns make this behavior meet the etiquette requirements of a given speech community and may be called *etiquette communicative behavioral patterns*. Therefore, teaching communicative etiquette and etiquette communicative behavior characteristic of English-speaking speech communities means teaching etiquette communicative behavioral patterns regularly used in those communities. It is first of all necessary to analyze how they are developed and what factors determine that development.

When singling out the determining factors, it should be taken into account that any socially and culturally conditioned communicative behavioral pattern acquires some individual coloring when it is used by an individual with her or his life experience, habits, attitudes, emotions, etc. The individual constituent of a communicative behavioral pattern need not and cannot be taken into consideration when teaching this pattern. But it cannot be missed when analyzing it for research or any other purposes. Following this assumption, four basic and general factors determining communicative behavioral patterns may be distinguished; these factors are positioned along a scale that begins with purely social factors (historical, traditional, cultural) and ends with factors of an individual nature that are characteristic only of a particular individual participating in communication:

The first is the *history-culture* factor, that may be defined as *norm-setting*; this is a strictly social factor. It determines the characteristics of any communicative behavioral pattern that are conditioned by the common history of a given speech

community or of certain groups within it, by the common historically shaped culture of the community, its traditions, etc. Hence, it is just this factor that sets the social norms of communicative behavior and shapes every communicative behavioral pattern. It regulates the degrees of admissible individual deviations, i.e., how much every individual pattern is allowed to deviate from the standard to remain socially acceptable.

The second is the *situation-relationship* factor and may be called *attitude-setting*. It determines communicative behavior under the influence of definite situations of communication and existing relationships between communication participants (superior / inferior, young / old, official person / private citizen, parent / child.). The influence of this factor is mainly conditioned by social circumstances, but the influence is considerably modified by the personalities of the participants and their personal life experience. For instance, if two people talking at the office are discussing a purely business problem and one of them is the superior of the other, their communicative behavior during the discussion will be primarily determined socially, by the social situation of discussion and their official relationships. But if these people are also good friends and often meet in their out-of-the-office hours, their behavior will be more relaxed and informal than they would be when the interlocutors have no other personal relationships than the official ones. The same concerns the situational influence exercised by this factor. Communicative situations are mainly social in nature and are socially determined. But at the same time all of them have a personal component, even in what concerns their origin and emergence. For instance, if you occasionally encounter an acquaintance of yours at a bus stop and engage in "small talk", the social component prevails. You talk and behave in accordance with the social situation, making you recognize an acquaintance, greet her or him, and exchange some words —even if you have no personal interest in either meeting this person or talking to him or her. But the situation would be quite different if you were making efforts to meet the person for some purpose: for instance, specially waiting for her or him at the bus stop near her or his home. In this case, the encounter and the communication are much more personally determined. All this interplay of social and personal determinants makes the situation-relationship factor the one that influences speakers' attitude to communication, thereby modifying their behavior in that communication (attitude-setting factor).

The third factor is the factor of *motivation and purposes* or the *purpose-setting factor*. It modifies communicative behavioral patterns and communicative behavior in general, in accordance with the personal motives of communicators and the goals they pursue in communication. It is clear that a person talking to another person with the aim of soliciting something will behave differently from a person whose aim in talking is to grant a favor. The factor in question demonstrates an interplay of social and individual (personal) components which is quite different from that observed in the factor above. It is true that personal motives and goals are to a great extent socially determined. But they are at least as much personally determined: by personality, personal experience, etc. The manner of implementing these motives

and aims in behavior is a still more personal matter. Therefore, the factor of motivation and purposes is much closer to the individual end of the above mentioned scale of factors, and it is much further from its social end than the situation-relationship factor (positioned just in the middle of the scale).

The last factor is positioned at the furthest individual end of the social-individual factor scale. It is the *individual distinctions* factor that may be called *individual distinction-setting*. This factor fully determines all the purely personalized, individualized peculiarities in implementing socially determined communicative behavioral patterns. The peculiarities in question may be conditioned either biologically or by details of personal history and experience (and by many other causes). They are those that individually distinguish one person from another. It is the whole complex structure of such peculiarities that makes every human being and her or his behavior unique.

The interaction of all four factors is the reason why communicative behavioral patterns, being generally standardized, are always somewhat differently used by different individuals within one and the same speech community.

4. CLASSIFICATION OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS

As has already been said, the individualized nature of communicative behavioral patterns is important for research, but is not significant for teaching them. In the latter case, only that which is standard has to be acquired by students. But if such patterns are to be taught at all, they need to be classified.

The classification may follow several levels. Taking into account the components of communicative etiquette as shown above, the topmost level would naturally be the division of communicative behavioral patterns according to the areas of communication where they are used. Vladimir Skalkin, a Ukrainian scholar in applied linguistics (teaching English as a foreign language) divided communication into eight most general broad areas: the area of everyday social communication, the area of private family communication, the area of professional communication, the area of cultural activities communication, the area of public activities communication, the area of communication in administration and law, the area of communication while playing games and pursuing hobbies, and the area of communication in entertainment (Skalkin, 1981: 61-67). Following this broad division, eight corresponding communicative behavioral patterns can be distinguished.

Classification at a lower level would require dividing the communicative behavioral patterns of a certain area of communication according to current activities and situations of their use (taking into account the personal relationships of interlocutors). For instance, in the area of professional communication, people speaking American English often address each other formally (using titles, Mr., Ms with the last name, etc.) if an issue is discussed during an official meeting with many participants. But if they work together they mostly use first names to address each other when discussing the same question in a less official situation.

Classification of patterns according to the social groups that use them is also possible, but relevant only for advanced levels of language learning.

Classification at the lowest level would probably divide communicative behavioral patterns into 1) verbal, 2) non-verbal, and 3) combined. A good example of a purely verbal communicative behavioral pattern is the way people from different cultural environments answer the simple everyday question of "How are you?" (the area of social everyday life communication). In Eastern Slavonic cultures there is a great degree of freedom in choosing an answer to this question, and the answers may range from very optimistic to very pessimistic ones. American culture makes only an optimistic answer acceptable, i.e., an answer like "I'm fine, thank you". A pessimistic response may estrange the interlocutor and stimulate her/him to avoid further contacts.

Non-verbal communicative behavioral patterns are best illustrated by the so-called "comfort zone" or "body bubble" (see Levine and Adelman 1993). The comfort zone is the closest admissible distance between communicators in the process of communication in different areas, while doing different activities in different situations. Entering the comfort zone of your interlocutor usually causes a negative reaction in her/him. This reaction is far from being always explicitly shown, and quite often it is not even consciously realized, but it can cause a negative attitude or even antipathy. The comfort zone differs in different cultures; for instance, in some Southern European cultures it is more reduced than in the cultures of Great Britain and North America. Another example is less universal as it belongs only to the area of everyday social communication. It is the customary distance between people standing in line (for instance, when booking railway tickets or paying for purchases in a shop). In Eastern Slavonic countries this distance is very short —about the length of a hand— while in English-speaking communities approaching the person in front closer than an outstretched arm's length is impolite. It may also be interpreted as a desire to intrude on this person's privacy or even to steal something from him or her. Thus, the impression of bad intention may be communicated to surrounding people.

Combined (both verbal and non-verbal) communicative behavioral patterns may be exemplified in situations of people greeting each other, seeing each other off, taking leave, and many others. For instance, greetings belong to different areas of communication and different activities, such as socializing. In some European cultures when men (not women) who know each other meet, they not only greet each other by using some customary verbal formulas, but also exchange a handshake. The British exchange a handshake only on formal occasions or in first meetings, and practically never on later encounters. But even in Great Britain greeting people is also a combined communicative behavioral pattern because verbal greetings should be accompanied by a nod, a smile, etc.

As can be seen, it is on the lowest level of classification that the practical description of actual communicative behavioral patterns is obtained. Another conclusion is that many such patterns may be used in different areas of

communication, different situations, and for different activities (like the patterns of greeting). These patterns can be called *multi-function* ones. However, there are other patterns used only in one area of communication, in a limited number of situations, and for a limited number of activities (like the pattern of standing in line). These are *single-function patterns*. So, if the question of teaching communicative behavioral patterns to students of English as a foreign/second language is discussed, the selection of patterns to be taught should follow a definite procedure.

First, it should be decided on what area (areas) of communication teaching/learning is to be focused so as to select only those multi-function and single-function communicative behavioral patterns that are relevant to that area(s). The second step is to decide in what typical situations and for what typical activities communication is to be taught so as to further limit the number of patterns selected. Finally, a list and description of all verbal, non-verbal, and combined communicative behavioral patterns can be compiled and their distribution in the course done.

5. TEACHING LIFESTYLE COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS TO STUDENTS OF ENGLISH

Some illustration may be given concerning the organization of teaching communicative behavioral patterns proper to English-speaking speech communities. Only the area of everyday social communication will be dealt with, as it is the focus of attention of almost all EFL/ESL programs from the elementary up to the intermediate level. The area covers most communication in everyday life, except family life and professional activities. It is in this area that people make acquaintances, socialize, use public transport, eat at public places, shop, make different payments, book hotel rooms, rent apartments, request and obtain medical service and all the other kind of services, and so on and so forth; it is difficult even to list everything that belongs here. It may be said that in this case we are dealing with the simplest everyday things, with the everyday functioning of a culture —the culture with a small but not a big "c", that same culture that, strictly speaking, determines the style of a nation's everyday life. That is why communicative behavioral patterns "working" in this area may be called *lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns*.

The importance of acquiring such patterns is obvious. Without them, a person is often helpless in the simplest everyday situations relating to the organization of her/his everyday life. S/he can make blunders and can be misunderstood when contacting people; there may be a lot of problems while shopping, using public transport, making payments, etc. This is very often the case with foreigners, even if they speak the language of the country they are visiting.

That is why it is so important to teach American or British (or Australian, Canadian, Irish) lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns. Whatever the students' specific personal goals for learning are, when they arrive in an English-speaking country they will all have to communicate in the area of social everyday life.

Acquiring such patterns will free students from many blunders in the future that they would otherwise be sure to commit. And the absence, or a great reduction, in the number of cultural blunders makes it possible to either totally avoid or greatly soften the cultural shock experienced by many people in an alien cultural community.

To select lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns for a program of English, the students' home culture should be taken full account of. Its greater or lesser differences from the cultures of the English-speaking nations will either substantially increase or considerably decrease the number of lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns to be taught.

Lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns related to getting and using different services may be considered a good example. For instance, if a German is learning English in her or his own country for entering an American university, she or he may need to learn very few specific American patterns of behavior required for obtaining desired services. In the West there is a trend towards globalization and unification of lifestyle patterns connected with services, and a German goes shopping, uses public transport, or makes everyday payments, in much the same way as an American or an Englishman does. So, for such students, the focus should be on other lifestyle patterns (unrelated to services) from the area of social everyday life communication (like peculiarities of greetings, ways of meeting new people, ways of conducting small talk, etc.). For instance, if in the course of a serious conversation an American takes off his jacket and rolls up his shirt-sleeves, it means that for him all preliminaries and ceremonies are over, and he is seriously getting down to business. But for a German this communicative behavioral pattern means quite the opposite: a desire to relax, to leave the business on hand unattended for a while. It is just patterns like this that should be taught and learned first of all in the case under discussion.

But there are cultures where people behave very differently when getting and using services as compared to Western Europe and North America. This concerns primarily the post-Communist countries of the former Soviet Union, and also some countries of the third world. In Russia or Ukraine, shopping, using public transport, having meals in restaurants, tipping, etc., are done in quite a different manner compared to the United States or Great Britain. For instance, in the United States tipping waiters, taxi drivers, porters, hairdressers, tour guides, and other people who serve you is practically obligatory if you are satisfied with the service. The customary size of the tip is usually about 15% of the bill. A waiter will be offended if he is not tipped when he feels that he deserves it because it deprives him of his legitimate earnings. In the former USSR, tipping was illegal, and there were no customs and rules for tipping. As a result, even now the Russians or Ukrainians, when they go to the USA, either do not tip at all (thinking it not necessary or offensive to people who serve them) or tip too much or too little, thus putting themselves into awkward or ridiculous situations.

For residents of such countries, the ways of life of the English-speaking nations —and, consequently, the lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns that embody

those ways of life in everyday communication— are often almost directly opposite to their own, as was shown above by the conflicting tipping tradition. Therefore, for a person from that country just knowing English is absolutely not enough in order to feel comfortable and function normally in an English-speaking speech community. S/he has to acquire most of the lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns characteristic of an English-speaking nation. But the problem is that most EFL programs do not teach full lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns, only fragments of them, and leave many important patterns totally unattended to. This can be illustrated by the content matter of coursebooks, even the best and very popular ones like *Matters* by Bell and Gower (1999) or *Headway* by Soars and Soars (1996). These coursebooks teach a student how to make an order in a restaurant, but say nothing about how a waiter or a waitress should be tipped and do not discuss different types and kinds of restaurants in an English-speaking country (what can be expected in each of those types). They teach how to talk to a shop assistant in a store, but do not discuss different types of stores, how to stand in line in a supermarket or how to use coupons (money savers), get discounts, etc. No mention is made of specific features of using public transport, and a lot of other things. It is just not knowing such simple everyday things that may cause a cultural shock to the student of English who goes to an English-speaking country whose culture is very different from her or his own.

This neglect of teaching lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns is due not only to the fact that the English-teaching professionals worldwide are not as yet fully aware of their importance, but also to the fact that coursebooks do not (often cannot) take into account students' cultural differences. As has already been pointed out, when English is taught as a foreign language, Germans, French, Spanish, or Russians need to be taught different lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns, depending on how different their own ways and styles of everyday life are in comparison with those of the Americans, the British, the Australians. When it concerns teaching English to people living in the former Soviet Union, there are too many new lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns to be taught to include them all in the content matter of a regular course of English.

A special short course may have to be included in an English program in such a case. This course should be focused exclusively on lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns characteristic of English-speaking speech communities. It should not just explain and demonstrate the new (alien) patterns; it should also train them, because communicative behavioral patterns belonging to a person's own culture become an integral part of her/his personality. These patterns are most often used unconsciously and seem to be the only possible natural behavior. To behave differently, in a way acceptable to a different speech community, a student must fully realize the difference between her/his own customary behavior and that required of her/him in the target culture. The only way to such realization and acquisition of new patterns is to compare and contrast them with those of the home culture, discussing the new patterns in a comparative way, and role-playing them in different communicative situations. It requires the course on lifestyle communicative

behavioral patterns to be taught once students have reached the intermediate level of learning English. In this case, pattern demonstration, explanation, and training can be carried out using only English with no recourse to the learners' mother tongue —an essential factor contributing to efficient and natural pattern acquisition.

The first coursebook and course for teaching North American lifestyle communicative behavioral patterns to intermediate and advanced students of English in Ukraine and Russia have already been developed and introduced into teaching practice (see Tarnopolsky and Sklyarenko 2000). They were designed along the lines discussed above. Their success and popularity in practice testify to the fact that the time has come for EFL professionals to teach not just English and communication in it, but also the entirety of communicative behavioral patterns, especially lifestyle ones, proper to English-speaking speech communities. They should be made an integral part of every EFL program.

WORKS CITED

Bell, Jan and Gower, Roger 1999: *Matters Intermediate. Student's Book*. Harlow: Longman.

Byram, Michael 1989: *Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Education*. Clevedon (England): Multilingual Matters.

Damen, Louise 1987: *Culture Learning: The Fifth Dimension in the Language Classroom*. Reading: Addison Wesley.

Hymes, Dell 1986: "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life". *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Eds. John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd. 35-71.

Killick, David 1999: "Culture and Capability: Crossing the Divide". *IATEFL Issues* 148: 4-7.

Lado, Robert 1957: *Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Levine, Deena R. and Mara B. Adelman 1993: *Beyond Language: Cross-Cultural Communication*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents.

McKay, Sandra L. and Nancy H. Hornberger, eds. 1996: *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

New Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language 1993: Danbury (CT): Lexicon Publications.

Skalkin, Vladimir L. 1981: *Fundamentals of Teaching Oral Speech in a Foreign Language* (the original is in Russian). Moscow: Russky Yazik.

Soars, Liz and John Soars 1996: *Headway Elementary. Student's Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarnopolsky, Oleg and Nina Sklyarenko 2000: *Lifestyle Communicative Behavioral Patterns in the USA*. Kyiv: The Publishing Center of Kyiv State Linguistic University.

Wolfson, Nessa 1989: *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

⬆INDICE