

**THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY
SPECIAL EDUCATION OF UZBEKISTAN**

**KARSHI STATE UNIVERSITY
THE FACULTY OF ROMAN-GERMAN PHILOLOGY
THE CHAIR OF THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

QUALIFICATION PAPER

On the theme: Approaches to Communicative Language Teaching

Written by: student of group 403, Jalilova Go'zal

Scientific supervisor: Nashirova Sh

“ Recommended for defence ”

The dean of Roman - German philology

faculty _____ dots. D. Jo`rayev

“ _____ ” _____ 2014

Karshi 2014

Approaches to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Contents

Chapter I. Characteristics of Communicative Language Teaching approaches in language acquisition

- 1.1. The background of CLT its main guiding principles and the goals of implementing it.....
- 1.2. Process-Based CLT Approaches –Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Instruction.....
- 1.3. Product-Based CLT Approaches –Text-Based Instruction and Competency-Based Instruction.....

Chapter II. Communicative Language Teaching as a tool of mastering communicative competence

- 2.1. Classroom activities that best facilitate learning.....
- 2.2. Experiences practiced in implementing CLT.....
- Conclusion.....
- Literature.....

Introduction

Since the early days of independence, Uzbekistan has been gradually conducting the policy of reforming the sphere of education as a key link of the ongoing course of reforms and renewal of society, as the necessary and mandatory condition for democratic transformations in society, consistent development of economy, and the country's integration into the world community.

At the moment, The National Program for Cadre Training is a single educational complex which covers the entire process of educating and rising the younger generation, where a special place and is reserved for each link in the education system. The implementation of the Program as a whole and the achievement of certain objectives depend on the state and level of development of each link, as well as to what extent they are mutually attended.

Along with that, as analysis shows, the lagging of the school education behind as the most important primary stage, turns out to be the weakest link in the single chain of continuous education.

With an aim to address the lagging behind of school education and eliminate the serious problems on developing the logistical basis of schools and forming an integral single system of continuous education as the most important condition for the successful implementation of the National Program for Cadre Training the Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On the State National Program for developing the school education for 2004-2009" has been adopted.

On December 10, 2012 President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov signed a decree "On measures to further improvement of foreign language learning system".¹ It is noted that in the framework of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On education" and the National Program for Training in the country, a comprehensive foreign languages' teaching system, aimed at creating harmoniously developed, highly educated, modern-thinking young generation, further integration of the country to the world community, has been

¹"On measures to further improvement of foreign language learning system" Xalq so'zi December 10, 2012.

created. During the years of independence, over 51.7 thousand teachers of foreign languages graduated from universities, English, German and French multimedia tutorials and textbooks for 5-9 grades of secondary schools, electronic resources for learning English in primary schools were created, more than 5000 secondary schools, professional colleges and academic lyceums were equipped with language laboratories.

However, analysis of the current system of organizing language learning shows that learning standards, curricula and textbooks do not fully meet the current requirements, particularly in the use of advanced information and media technologies. Education is mainly conducted in traditional methods. Further development of a continuum of foreign languages learning at all levels of education; improving skills of teachers and provision of modern teaching materials are required. According to the decree, starting from 2013/2014 school year foreign languages, mainly English, gradually throughout the country will be taught from the first of schooling in the form of lesson-games and speaking games, continuing to learning the alphabet, reading and spelling in the second year (grade).

Actuality of QP: Communicative Language Teaching can be understood as a set of principles about goals of language teaching ,how learners learn a language ,the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom. It is clear that CLT has had a thoroughly beneficial effect since it reminded teachers that people learn languages not so that they know about them ,but so that they can communicate with them. This QP deals with a methodological field that is CLT as a tool second language acquisition. With CLT began a movement away from traditional lesson formats where the focus was on mastery of different items of grammar and practice through controlled activities such as memorization of dialogues and drills, and role plays, group work activities and project work.

The topicality of QP consists of:

-the researching approaches towards CLT at all ages

-establishing a new critical view at the methods of CLT

-discussing CLT from the perspective of intermediate level

The subject of this research is around the approaches towards CLT. The object of the present work is developing CLT approaches in the classroom. To get benefits during the lesson.

The aim of the QP is to conduct the overview of the main CLT approaches and to provide the researchers, teachers and students with necessary materials to implement for their investigation and learning process.

The following **objectives** have been settled so that to achieve this aim:

-to define principles of developing CLT

-to study the approaches to CLT

-to find out ways and skills of obtaining communicative skill to become a proficient speaker

-to suggest conditions for effective communication

-to analyze the methods of CLT at all levels

-to reveal the peculiarities of CLT

Investigations of QP. This problem was investigated by many scientists. H.Alyousef, D. Glenn, C. Harrison, A. Johnson, K. Lems, Admondson, Leather, Harmer, McCloskey, Philips are among them.

Scientific novelty and practical value. This research paper involves new methods of CLT that is very essential and important in teaching and learning. Nowadays CLT methods are very crucial. The actuality of this QP is to investigate various ways of obtaining fluent speech.

The theoretical value of the QP lies in the analysis of CLT approaches at all levels as a methodological issue and in the conducting overview of the CLT.

The material of the present research paper may be applicable at the general courses on Methodology of English Teaching. Moreover it may be highly useful for elaboration of programs and classes on teaching speaking at all levels. In addition, it may serve as a basis for further research what illustrates the practical value of the course paper.

Construction of QP: It consists of introduction, 2 chapters, conclusion, summary and list of literature. The first chapter explores the main features and approaches of CLT. The second chapter deals with the classroom activities that best facilitate the classroom and experiences done by some teachers to implement CLT in the lessons. The total amount of the QP consists of 67 pages.

Chapter I. Characteristics of Communicative Language Teaching approaches in language acquisition

1.1. The background of CLT and the goals of implementing it

Communicative language teaching rose to prominence in the 1970s and early 1980s as a result of many disparate developments in both Europe and the United States. First, there was an increased demand for language learning, particularly in Europe. The advent of the European Common Market led to widespread European migration, and consequently there was a large population of people who needed to learn a foreign language for work or for personal reasons. At the same time, children were increasingly able to learn foreign languages in school. The number of secondary schools offering languages rose worldwide in the 1960s and 1970s as part of a general trend of curriculum-broadening and modernization, and foreign-language study ceased to be confined to the elite academies. In Britain, the introduction of comprehensive schools meant that almost all children had the opportunity to study foreign languages.

This increased demand put pressure on educators to change their teaching methods. Traditional methods such as grammar translation assumed that students were aiming for mastery of the target language, and that students were willing to study for years before expecting to use the language in real life. However, these assumptions were challenged by adult learners who were busy with work, and by schoolchildren who were less academically able. Educators realized that to motivate these students an approach with a more immediate payoff was necessary.

The trend of progressivism in education provided a further pressure for educators to change their methods. Progressivism holds that active learning is more effective than passive learning, and as this idea gained traction in schools there was a general shift towards using techniques where students were more actively involved, such as group work. Foreign-language education was no exception to this trend, and teachers sought to find new methods that could better embody this shift in thinking.

The development of communicative language teaching was also helped by new academic ideas. In Britain, applied linguists began to doubt the efficacy of situational language teaching, the dominant method in that country at the time. This was partly in response to Chomsky's insights into the nature of language. Chomsky had shown that the structural theories of language prevalent at the time could not explain the creativity and variety evident in real communication. In addition, British applied linguists such as Christopher Candlin and Henry Widdowson began to see that a focus on structure was also not helping language students. They saw a need for students to develop communicative skill and functional competence in addition to mastering language structures.

In the United States, the linguist and anthropologist Dell Hymes developed the concept of communicative competence. This was a reaction to Chomsky's concept of the linguistic competence of an ideal native speaker. Communicative competence redefined what it meant to "know" a language; in addition to speakers having mastery over the structural elements of language, according to communicative competence they must also be able to use those structural elements appropriately in different social situations. This is neatly summed up by Hymes's statement, "There are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless." Hymes did not make a concrete formulation of communicative competence, but subsequent authors have tied the concept to language teaching, notably Michael Canale.

An influential development in the history of communicative language teaching was the work of the Council of Europe in creating new language syllabuses. Education was a high priority for the Council of Europe, and they set out to provide syllabuses that would meet the needs of European immigrants. Among the studies used by the council when designing the course was one by the British linguist, D. A. Wilkins, that defined language using "notions" and "functions", rather than more traditional categories of grammar and vocabulary. Notional categories include concepts such as time, location, frequency, and

quantity, and functional categories include communicative acts such as offers, complaints, denials, and requests. These syllabuses were widely used.

Communicative language-learning materials were also developed in Germany. There was a new emphasis on personal freedom in German education at the time, an attitude exemplified in the philosophy of Jürgen Habermas. To fulfill this goal, educators developed materials that allowed learners to choose what they wanted to communicate freely. These materials concentrated on the various different social meanings a given item of grammar could have, and were structured in such a way that learners could choose how to progress through the course themselves. The materials were used in teacher training courses and workshops to encourage teachers to change to using a communicative syllabus. Two similar projects were also undertaken by Candlin at Lancaster University, and by Holec at the University of Nancy.

Meanwhile, at the University of Illinois, there was a study that investigated the effects of the explicit teaching of learning strategies to language learners. The study encouraged learners to take risks while communicating, and to use constructs other than rote memorized patterns. At the study's conclusion, students who were taught communicatively fared no worse on grammatical tests than students that had been taught with traditional methods, but they performed significantly better in tests of communicative ability. This was the case even for beginners. As a result of this study, supplemental communicative activities were created for the French CRÉDIF course *Voix et Visages de la France*. These materials focused on classroom autonomy, and learners were taught various phrases they could use to negotiate meaning, such as "What's the word for ..." and "I don't understand".

CLT is usually characterized as a broad approach to teaching, rather than as a teaching method with a clearly defined set of classroom practices. As such, it is most often defined as a list of general principles or features. One of the most recognized of these lists is David Nunan's (1991) five features of CLT:

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the learning process itself.
4. An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
5. An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom.

These five features are claimed by practitioners of CLT to show that they are very interested in the needs and desires of their learners as well as the connection between the language as it is taught in their class and as it used outside the classroom. Under this broad umbrella definition, any teaching practice that helps students develop their communicative competence in an authentic context is deemed an acceptable and beneficial form of instruction. Thus, in the classroom CLT often takes the form of pair and group work requiring negotiation and cooperation between learners, fluency-based activities that encourage learners to develop their confidence, role-plays in which students practise and develop language functions, as well as judicious use of grammar and pronunciation focused activities.

In the mid 1990s the Dogma 95 manifesto influenced language teaching through the Dogma language teaching movement, who proposed that published materials can stifle the communicative approach. As such the aim of the Dogma approach to language teaching is to focus on real conversations about real subjects so that communication is the engine of learning. This communication may lead to explanation, but that this in turn will lead to further communication.

However, not all courses that utilize the Communicative Language approach will restrict their activities solely to these. Some courses will have the students take occasional grammar quizzes, or prepare at home using non-communicative drills,

for instance. William Glasser's "control theory" exemplifies his attempts to empower students and give them voice by focusing on their basic, human needs: Unless students are given power, they may exert what little power they have to thwart learning and achievement through inappropriate behavior and mediocrity. Thus, it is important for teachers to give students voice, especially in the current educational climate, which is dominated by standardization and testing (Simmons and Page, 2010)

One of the most famous attacks on communicative language teaching was offered by Michael Swan in the *English Language Teaching Journal* in 1985. Henry Widdowson responded in defense of CLT, also in the *ELT Journal* (1985 39(3):158-161). More recently other writers (e.g. Bax) have critiqued CLT for paying insufficient attention to the context in which teaching and learning take place, though CLT has also been defended against this charge (e.g. Harmer 2003).

Often, the communicative approach is deemed a success if the teacher understands the student. But, if the teacher is from the same region as the student, the teacher will understand errors resulting from an influence from their first language. Native speakers of the target language may still have difficulty understanding them. This observation may call for new thinking on and adaptation of the communicative approach. The adapted communicative approach should be a simulation where the teacher pretends to understand only what any regular speaker of the target language would and reacts accordingly (Hattum 2006).

In planning a language course, decisions have to be made about the content of the course, including decisions about what vocabulary and grammar to teach at the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels, and which skills and microskills to teach and in what sequence. Decisions about these issues belong to the field of syllabus design or course design. Decisions about how best to teach the contents of a syllabus belong to the field of methodology.

Language teaching has seen many changes in ideas about syllabus design and methodology in the last 50 years, and CLT prompted a rethinking of

approaches to syllabus design and methodology. We may conveniently group trends in language teaching in the last 50 years into three phases:

Phase 1: traditional approaches (up to the late 1960s)

Phase 2: classic communicative language teaching (1970s to 1990s)

Phase 3: current communicative language teaching (late 1990s to the present)

Let us first consider the transition from traditional approaches to what we can refer to as classic communicative language teaching.

Phase 1: Traditional Approaches (up to the late 1960s)

Traditional approaches to language teaching gave priority to grammatical competence as the basis of language proficiency. They were based on the belief that grammar could be learned through direct instruction and through a methodology that made much use of repetitive practice and drilling.

The approach to the teaching of grammar was a deductive one: students are presented with grammar rules and then given opportunities to practice using them, as opposed to an inductive approach in which students are given examples of sentences containing a grammar rule and asked to work out the rule for themselves. It was assumed that language learning meant building up a large repertoire of sentences and grammatical patterns and learning to produce these accurately and quickly in the appropriate situation. Once a basic command of the language was established through oral drilling and controlled practice, the four skills were introduced, usually in the sequence of speaking, listening, reading and writing. Techniques that were often employed included memorization of dialogs, question-and-answer practice, substitution drills, and various forms of guided speaking and writing practice. Great attention to accurate pronunciation and accurate mastery of grammar was stressed from the very beginning stages of language learning, since it was assumed that if students made errors, these would quickly become a permanent part of the learner's speech.

Methodologies based on these assumptions include Audiolingualism

(in North America) (also known as the Aural-Oral Method), and the Structural-Situational Approach in the United Kingdom (also known as Situational Language Teaching). Syllabuses during this period consisted of word lists and grammar lists, graded across levels. In a typical audiolingual lesson, the following procedures would be observed:

1. Students first hear a model dialog (either read by the teacher or on tape) containing key structures that are the focus of the lesson. They repeat each line of the dialog, individually and in chorus. The teacher pays attention to pronunciation, intonation, and fluency. Correction of mistakes of pronunciation or grammar is direct and immediate. The dialog is memorized gradually, line by line. A line may be broken down into several phrases if necessary. The dialog is read aloud in chorus, one half saying one speaker's part and the other half responding. The students do not consult their book throughout this phase.

2. The dialog is adapted to the students' interest or situation, through changing certain key words or phrases. This is acted out by the students.

3. Certain key structures from the dialog are selected and used as the basis for pattern drills of different kinds. These are first practiced in chorus and then individually. Some grammatical explanation may be offered at this point, but this is kept to an absolute minimum.

4. The students may refer to their textbook, and follow-up reading, writing, or vocabulary activities based on the dialog may be introduced.

5. Follow-up activities may take place in the language laboratory, where further dialog and drill work is carried out. (Richards and Rodgers 2001, 64–65)

In a typical lesson according to the situational approach, a three-phase sequence, known as the P-P-P cycle, was often employed: Presentation, Practice, Production.

Presentation: The new grammar structure is presented, often by means of a conversation or short text. The teacher explains the new structure and checks students' comprehension of it.

Practice: Students practice using the new structure in a controlled context, through drills or substitution exercises.

Production: Students practice using the new structure in different contexts, often using their own content or information, in order to develop fluency with the new pattern.

The P-P-P lesson structure has been widely used in language teaching materials and continues in modified form to be used today. Many speaking- or grammar-based lessons in contemporary materials, for example, begin with an introductory phase in which new teaching points are presented and illustrated in some way and where the focus is on comprehension and recognition. Examples of the new teaching point are given in different contexts. This is often followed by a second phase in which the students practice using the new teaching point in a controlled context using content often provided by the teacher. The third phase is a free practice period during which students try out the teaching point in a free context and in which real or simulated communication is the focus.

The P-P-P lesson format and the assumptions on which it is based have been strongly criticized in recent years, however. Skehan (1996, p.18), for example, comments:

The underlying theory for a P-P-P approach has now been discredited. The belief that a precise focus on a particular form leads to learning and automatization (that learners will learn what is taught in the order in which it is taught) no longer carries much credibility in linguistics or psychology.

Under the influence of CLT theory, grammar-based methodologies such as the P-P-P have given way to functional and skills-based teaching, and accuracy activities such as drill and grammar practice have been replaced by fluency activities based on interactive small-group work. This led to the emergence of a “fluency-first” pedagogy (Brumfit 1984) in which students’ grammar needs are determined on the basis of performance on fluency tasks rather than predetermined by a grammatical syllabus. We can distinguish two phases in this development,

which we will call classic communicative language teaching and current communicative language teaching.

Phase 2: Classic Communicative Language Teaching (1970s to 1990s)

In the 1970s, a reaction to traditional language teaching approaches began and soon spread around the world as older methods such as Audiolingualism and Situational Language Teaching fell out of fashion. The centrality of grammar in language teaching and learning was questioned, since it was argued that language ability involved much more than grammatical competence. While grammatical competence was needed to produce grammatically correct sentences, attention shifted to the knowledge and skills needed to use grammar and other aspects of language appropriately for different communicative purposes such as making requests, giving advice, making suggestions, describing wishes and needs, and so on. What was needed in order to use language communicatively was communicative competence. This was a broader concept than that of grammatical competence, included knowing what to say and how to say it appropriately based on the situation, the participants, and their roles and intentions. Traditional grammatical and vocabulary syllabuses and teaching methods did not include information of this kind. It was assumed that this kind of knowledge would be picked up informally.

The notion of communicative competence was developed within the discipline of linguistics (or more accurately, the subdiscipline of sociolinguistics) and appealed to many within the language teaching profession, who argued that communicative competence, and not simply grammatical competence, should be the goal of language teaching. The next question to be solved was, what would a syllabus that reflected the notion of communicative competence look like and what implications would it have for language teaching methodology? The result was communicative language teaching. Communicative language teaching created a great deal of enthusiasm and excitement when it first appeared as a new approach to language teaching in the 1970s and 1980s, and language teachers and teaching institutions all around the world soon began to rethink their

teaching, syllabuses, and classroom materials. In planning language courses within a communicative approach, grammar was no longer the starting point. New approaches to language teaching were needed.

Rather than simply specifying the grammar and vocabulary learners needed to master, it was argued that a syllabus should identify the following aspects of language use in order to be able to develop the learner's communicative competence:

1. As detailed a consideration as possible of the purposes for which the learner wishes to acquire the target language; for example, using English for business purposes, in the hotel industry, or for travel

2. Some idea of the setting in which they will want to use the target language; for example, in an office, on an airplane, or in a store

3. The socially defined role the learners will assume in the target language, as well as the role of their interlocutors; for example, as a traveler, as a salesperson talking to clients, or as a student in a school

4. The communicative events in which the learners will participate: everyday situations, vocational or professional situations, academic situations, and so on; for example, making telephone calls, engaging in casual conversation, or taking part in a meeting

5. The language functions involved in those events, or what the learner will be able to do with or through the language; for example, making introductions, giving explanations, or describing plans

6. The notions or concepts involved, or what the learner will need to be able to talk about; for example, leisure, finance, history, religion

7. The skills involved in the "knitting together" of discourse: discourse and rhetorical skills; for example, storytelling, giving an effective business presentation

8. The variety or varieties of the target language that will be needed, such as American, Australian, or British English, and the levels in the spoken and written language which the learners will need to reach

9. The grammatical content that will be needed

10. The lexical content, or vocabulary, that will be needed (van Ek and Alexander 1980)

This led to two important new directions in the 1970s and 1980s – proposals for a communicative syllabus, and the ESP movement.

A traditional language syllabus usually specified the vocabulary students needed to learn and the grammatical items they should master, normally graded across levels from beginner to advanced. But what would a communicative syllabus look like?

Several new syllabus types were proposed by advocates of CLT. These included:

A skills-based syllabus: This focuses on the four skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and breaks each skill down into its component microskills. For example, the skill of listening might be further described in terms of the following microskills:

- Recognizing key words in conversations
- Recognizing the topic of a conversation
- Recognizing speakers' attitude toward a topic
- Recognizing time reference of an utterance
- Following speech at different rates of speed
- Identifying key information in a passage

Advocates of CLT however stressed an integrated-skills approach to the teaching of the skills. Since in real life the skills often occur together, they should also be linked in teaching, it was argued.

A functional syllabus: This is organized according to the functions the learner should be able to carry out in English, such as expressing likes and dislikes, offering and accepting apologies, introducing someone, and giving explanations. Communicative competence is viewed as mastery of functions needed for communication across a wide range of situations. Vocabulary and grammar are then chosen according to the functions being taught. A sequence of activities

similar to the P-P-P lesson cycle is then used to present and practice the function. Functional syllabuses were often used as the basis for speaking and listening courses.

Other syllabus types were also proposed at this time. A notional syllabus was one based around the content and notions a learner would need to express, and a task syllabus specified the tasks and activities students should carry out in the classroom.

It was soon realized, however, that a syllabus needs to identify all the relevant components of a language, and the first widely adopted communicative syllabus developed within the framework of classic CLT was termed Threshold Level (Van Ek and Alexander 1980). It described the level of proficiency learners needed to attain to cross the threshold and begin real communication. The threshold syllabus hence specifies topics, functions, notions, situations, as well as grammar and vocabulary.

Advocates of CLT also recognized that many learners needed English in order to use it in specific occupational or educational settings. For them it would be more efficient to teach them the specific kinds of language and communicative skills needed for particular roles, (e.g., that of nurse, engineer, flight attendant, pilot, biologist, etc.) rather than just to concentrate on more general English. This led to the discipline of needs analysis – the use of observation, surveys, interviews, situation analysis, and analysis of language samples collected in different settings – in order to determine the kinds of communication learners would need to master if they were in specific occupational or educational roles and the language features of particular settings. The focus of needs analysis is to determine the specific characteristics of a language when it is used for specific rather than general purposes. Such differences might include:

- Differences in vocabulary choice
- Differences in grammar
- Differences in the kinds of texts commonly occurring
- Differences in functions

-Differences in the need for particular skills

ESP courses soon began to appear addressing the language needs of university students, nurses, engineers, restaurant staff, doctors, hotel staff, airline pilots, and so on.

As well as rethinking the nature of a syllabus, the new communicative approach to teaching prompted a rethinking of classroom teaching methodology. It was argued that learners learn a language through the process of communicating in it, and that communication that is meaningful to the learner provides a better opportunity for learning than through a grammar-based approach. The overarching principles of communicative language teaching methodology at this time can be summarized as follows:

-Make real communication the focus of language learning.

-Provide opportunities for learners to experiment and try out what they know.

-Be tolerant of learners' errors as they indicate that the learner is building up his or her communicative competence.

-Provide opportunities for learners to develop both accuracy and fluency.

-Link the different skills such as speaking, reading, and listening together, since they usually occur so in the real world.

-Let students induce or discover grammar rules.

In applying these principles in the classroom, new classroom techniques and activities were needed, and as we saw above, new roles for teachers and learners in the classroom. Instead of making use of activities that demanded accurate repetition and memorization of sentences and grammatical patterns, activities that required learners to negotiate meaning and to interact meaningfully were required. These activities form the focus of the next chapter. The ever-growing need for good communication skills in English has created a huge demand for English teaching around the world. Millions of people today want to improve their command of English or to ensure that their children achieve a good command of English. And opportunities to learn English are provided in many different ways

such as through formal instruction, travel, study abroad, as well as through the media and the Internet. The worldwide demand for English has created an enormous demand for quality language teaching and language teaching materials and resources. Learners set themselves demanding goals. They want to be able to master English to a high level of accuracy and fluency. Employers, too, insist that their employees have good English language skills, and fluency in English is a prerequisite for success and advancement in many fields of employment in today's world. The demand for an appropriate teaching methodology is therefore as strong as ever.

In this QP we will examine the methodology known as communicative language teaching, or CLT, and explore the assumptions it is based on, its origins and evolution since it was first proposed in the 1970s, and how it has influenced approaches to language teaching today. Since its inception in the 1970s, CLT has served as a major source of influence on language teaching practice around the world. Many of the issues raised by a communicative teaching methodology are still relevant today, though teachers who are relatively new to the profession may not be familiar with them. This booklet therefore serves to review what we have learned from CLT and what its relevance is today.

Perhaps the majority of language teachers today, when asked to identify the methodology they employ in their classrooms, mention "communicative" as the methodology of choice. However, when pressed to give a detailed account of what they mean by "communicative," explanations vary widely.

1. People learn a language best when using it to do things rather than through studying how language works and practicing rules.
2. Grammar is no longer important in language teaching.
3. People learn a language through communicating in it.
4. Errors are not important in speaking a language.
5. CLT is only concerned with teaching speaking.
6. Classroom activities should be meaningful and involve real communication.
7. Dialogs are not used in CLT.

8. Both accuracy and fluency are goals in CLT.

9. CLT is usually described as a method of teaching.

Communicative language teaching can be understood as a set of principles about the goals of language teaching, how learners learn a language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning, and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom. Let us examine each of these issues in turn.

Communicative language teaching sets as its goal the teaching of communicative competence. What does this term mean? Perhaps we can clarify this term by first comparing it with the concept of grammatical competence. Grammatical competence refers to the knowledge we have of a language that accounts for our ability to produce sentences in a language. It refers to knowledge of the building blocks of sentences (e.g., parts of speech, tenses, phrases, clauses, sentence patterns) and how sentences are formed. Grammatical competence is the focus of many grammar practice books, which typically present a rule of grammar on one page, and provide exercises to practice using the rule on the other page. The unit of analysis and practice is typically the sentence. While grammatical competence is an important dimension of language learning, it is clearly not all that is involved in learning a language since one can master the rules of sentence formation in a language and still not be very successful at being able to use the language for meaningful communication. It is the latter capacity which is understood by the term communicative competence.

Communicative competence includes the following aspects of language knowledge:

-Knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions

-Knowing how to vary our use of language according to the setting and the participants (e.g., knowing when to use formal and informal speech or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication)

-Knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts (e.g., narratives, reports, interviews, conversations)

-Knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one's language knowledge (e.g., through using different kinds of communication strategies)

Our understanding of the processes of second language learning has changed considerably in the last 30 years and CLT is partly a response to these changes in understanding. Earlier views of language learning focused primarily on the mastery of grammatical competence. Language learning was viewed as a process of mechanical habit formation. Good habits are formed by having students produce correct sentences and not through making mistakes. Errors were to be avoided through controlled opportunities for production (either written or spoken). By memorizing dialogs and performing drills, the chances of making mistakes were minimized. Learning was very much seen as under the control of the teacher.

In recent years, language learning has been viewed from a very different perspective. It is seen as resulting from processes such as:

- Interaction between the learner and users of the language
- Creating meaningful and purposeful interaction through language
- Negotiation of meaning as the learner and his or her interlocutor arrive at understanding
- Learning through attending to the feedback learners get when they use the language
- Paying attention to the language one hears (the input) and trying to incorporate new forms into one's developing communicative competence
- Trying out and experimenting with different ways of saying things

1.2. Process-Based CLT Approaches –Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Instruction

We will examine two current methodologies that can be described as extensions of the CLT movement but which take different routes to achieve the goal of communicative language teaching – to develop learners’ communicative competence. We refer to them as process-based methodologies since they share as a common starting point a focus on creating classroom processes that are believed to best facilitate language learning. These methodologies are content-based instruction (CBI) and task-based instruction (TBI).

Content-Based Instruction. We noted above that contemporary views of language learning argue that communication is seen as resulting from processes such as:

- Interaction between the learner and users of the language
- Collaborative creation of meaning
- Creating meaningful and purposeful interaction through language
- Negotiation of meaning as the learner and his or her interlocutor arrive at understanding
- Learning through attending to the feedback learners get when they use the language
- Paying attention to the language one hears (the input) and trying to incorporate new forms into one’s developing communicative competence
- Trying out and experimenting with different ways of saying things

Advocates of CBI believe that the best way to do so is by using content as the driving force of classroom activities and to link all the different dimensions of communicative competence, including grammatical competence, to content. Krahnke (1987, 65) defines CBI as “the teaching of content or information in the language being learned with little or no direct or explicit effort to teaching the language itself separately from the content being taught.”

Content refers to the information or subject matter that we learn or communicate through language rather than the language used to convey it. Of course, any language lesson involves content, whether it be a grammar lesson, a reading lesson, or any other kind of lesson. Content of some sort has to be the vehicle which holds the lesson or the exercise together, but in traditional approaches to language teaching, content is selected after other decisions have been made. In other words grammar, texts, skills, functions, etc., are the starting point in planning the lesson or the course book and after these decisions have been made, content is selected. For example, a lesson may be planned around the present perfect tense. Once this decision has been made, decisions about the context or content for practicing the form will be decided. Content-based teaching starts from a different starting point. Decisions about content are made first, and other kinds of decisions concerning grammar, skills, functions, etc., are made later. Content-based instruction is based on the following assumptions about language learning:

- People learn a language more successfully when they use the language as a means of acquiring information, rather than as an end in itself.

- CBI better reflects learners' needs for learning a second language.

- Content provides a coherent framework that can be used to link and develop all of the language skills.

Content-based instruction can be used as the framework for a unit of work, as the guiding principle for an entire course, as a course that prepares students for mainstreaming, as the rationale for the use of English as a medium for teaching some school subjects in an EFL setting, and as the framework for commercial EFL/ESL materials.

As the framework for a unit of work: Content-based instruction need not be the framework for an entire curriculum but can be used in conjunction with any type of curriculum. For example, in a business communication course a teacher may prepare a unit of work on the theme of sales and marketing. The teacher, in conjunction with a sales and marketing specialist, first identifies key topics

and issues in the area of sales and marketing to provide the framework for the course. A variety of lessons are then developed focusing on reading, oral presentation skills, group discussion, grammar, and report writing, all of which are developed out of the themes and topics which form the basis of the course.

As the guiding principle for an entire course: Many university students in an EFL context are required to take one or two semesters of English in their first year at a university. Typically, a mainstream, multiskilled course book is chosen as the basis for such a course and the course covers the topics that occur in the book. Any topics that occur are simply incidental to practicing the four skills, etc., of the course book. Such courses, however, are sometimes organized around content. At one European university, for example, the first-year English course consists of a sequence of modules spread over the academic year. The topics covered are:

1. Drugs
2. Religious persuasion
3. Advertising
4. AIDS
5. Immigration
6. Native Americans
7. Modern architecture
8. Microchip technology
9. Ecology
10. Alternative energy
11. Nuclear energy
12. Dracula in novels and films
13. Professional ethics

The topics are chosen so that they provide a framework around which language skills, vocabulary, and grammar can be developed in parallel.

As a course that prepares students for mainstreaming: Many courses for immigrant children in English-speaking countries are organized around a CBI framework. For example, non-English-background children in schools in Australia and New Zealand are usually offered an intensive language course to prepare them to follow the regular school curriculum with other children.

Such a course might be organized around a CBI approach. An example of this approach is described by Wu (1996) in a program prepared for ESL students in an Australian high school. Topics from a range of mainstream subjects were chosen as the basis for the course and to provide a transition to mainstream classes. Topics were chosen primarily to cater to the widest variety of students' needs and interests. Linguistic appropriateness was another factor taken into account. Topics

that fulfilled these criteria include multiculturalism, the nuclear age, sports, the Green movement, street kids, and teenage smoking.

As the rationale for the use of English as a medium for teaching some school subjects: A logical extension of the CBI philosophy is to teach some school subjects entirely in English. For example, in Malaysia, where the medium of instruction is Bahasa Malaysia (i.e., Malay), a decision was recently taken to use English as the medium of instruction for math and science in primary school and also for some courses at the university level. When the entire school curriculum is taught through a foreign language, this is sometimes known as immersion education, an approach that has been used for many years in part of English-speaking Canada.

Parents from English-speaking families in some parts of Canada can thus opt to send their children to schools where French is the medium of instruction. This approach seeks to produce children who are bilingual in French and English, since they acquire English both at home and in the community.

As the framework for commercial EFL/ESL materials: The series Cambridge English for Schools (Littlejohn and Hicks 1996), is the first EFL series in which content from across the curriculum provides the framework for the course. My own conversation course Springboard (Richards 1998) is also a content-based course with themes and topics serving as the framework. The topical syllabus was chosen through surveys of the interests of Asian college students.

Content-based instruction raises a number of issues. A central issue is the extent to which focusing on content provides a sufficient basis for the development of the language skills. It has been pointed out, for example, that when English is used as the basis for teaching school subjects, learners often bypass grammatical accuracy since their primary concern is mastery of content rather than development of accurate language use. This has been a common complaint in places like Hong Kong, where English has traditionally been the main medium for teaching school subjects in many schools. Another issue concerns whether language teachers have the necessary subject-matter expertise to teach specialized content areas such as

marketing, medicine, ecology, etc., and the inevitable “dumbing down” of content in such cases. Lastly, a key issue is that of assessment.

Task-based instruction, or TBI (also known as task-based teaching), is another methodology that can be regarded as developing from a focus on classroom processes. In the case of TBI, the claim is that language learning will result from creating the right kinds of interactional processes in the classroom, and the best way to create these is to use specially designed instructional tasks. Rather than employ a conventional syllabus, particularly a grammar-based one, advocates of TBI argue that grammar and other dimensions of communicative competence can be developed as a by-product of engaging learners in interactive tasks. Of course, most teachers make use of different kinds of tasks as part of their regular teaching. Task-based instruction, however, makes strong claims for the use of tasks and sees them as the primary unit to be used, both in planning teaching (i.e., in developing a syllabus) and also in classroom teaching.

The notion of task is a somewhat fuzzy one, though various attempts have been made to define it. Some of the key characteristics of a task are the following:

- It is something that learners do or carry out using their existing language resources.

- It has an outcome which is not simply linked to learning language, though language acquisition may occur as the learner carries out the task.

- It involves a focus on meaning.

In the case of tasks involving two or more learners, it calls upon the learners' use of communication strategies and interactional skills.

Many of the activities proposed in the early days of CLT can be described as tasks according to the definition above, i.e., information-gap and information-sharing activities that we find in many course books and ELT materials. From the point of view of TBI, two kinds of tasks can usefully be distinguished:

Pedagogical tasks are specially designed classroom tasks that are intended to require the use of specific interactional strategies and may also require the use of specific types of language (skills, grammar, vocabulary). A task in which two

learners have to try to find the number of differences between two similar pictures is an example of a pedagogical task. The task itself is not something one would normally encounter in the real world. However the interactional processes it requires provides useful input to language development.

Real-world tasks are tasks that reflect real-world uses of language and which might be considered a rehearsal for real-world tasks. A role play in which students practice a job interview would be a task of this kind.

Willis (1996) proposes six types of tasks as the basis for TBI:

1. Listing tasks: For example, students might have to make up a list of things they would pack if they were going on a beach vacation.

2. Sorting and ordering: Students work in pairs and make up a list of the most important characteristics of an ideal vacation.

3. Comparing: Students compare ads for two different supermarkets.

4. Problem-solving: Students read a letter to an advice columnist and suggest a solution to the writer's problems.

5. Sharing personal experience: Students discuss their reactions to an ethical or moral dilemma.

6. Creative tasks: Students prepare plans for redecorating a house.

There are many other taxonomies of tasks based on particular features of tasks, such as whether they are one way, two way, simple, or complex. Many classroom activities do not share the characteristics of tasks as illustrated above and are therefore not tasks and are not recommended teaching activities in TBI. These include drills, cloze activities, controlled writing activities, etc., and many of the traditional techniques that are familiar to many teachers. Despite the extensive recent literature on tasks, however, there are virtually no published teacher resources containing tasks that meet the criteria proposed in TBI. How does TBI in practice differ from more traditional teaching approaches? Recall our earlier discussion above of the principles of a P-P-P lesson or teaching format:

Presentation: The new grammar structure is presented, often by means of a

conversation or short text. The teacher explains the new structure and checks students' comprehension of it.

Practice: Students practice using the new structure in a controlled context, through drills or substitution exercises.

Production: Students practice using the new structure in different contexts often using their own content or information, in order to develop fluency with the new pattern.

Advocates of TBI reject this model on the basis that (a) it doesn't work; and (b) it doesn't reflect current understanding of second language acquisition. They claim that students do not develop fluency or progress in their grammatical development through a P-P-P methodology. They also argue that second language learning research has shown that language learning results from meaningful interaction using the language and not from controlled practice. With TBI the focus shifts to using tasks to create interaction and then building language awareness and language development around task performance.

Willis proposes the following sequence of activities:

Pretask Activities:

Introduction to Topic and Task. T helps Ss to understand the theme and objectives of the task, for example, brainstorming ideas with the class, using pictures, mime, or personal experience to introduce the topic. Ss may do a pre-task, for example, topic-based, odd-word-out games. T may highlight useful words and phrases, but would not pre-teach new structures. Ss can be given preparation time to think about how to do the task. Ss can hear a recording of a parallel task being done (so long as this does not give away the solution to the problem). If the task is based on a text, Ss read a part of it.

Task Cycle. The task is done by Ss (in pairs or groups) and gives Ss a chance to use whatever language they already have to express themselves and say whatever they want to say. This may be in response to reading a text or hearing a recording. T walks around and monitors, encouraging in a supportive way

everyone's attempt at communication in the target language. T helps Ss to formulate what they want to say, but will not intervene to correct errors of form.

The emphasis is on spontaneous, exploratory talk and confidence building, within the privacy of the small group. Success in achieving the goals of the tasks helps Ss' motivation.

Planning. Planning prepares for the next stage where Ss are asked to report briefly to the whole class how they did the task and what the outcome was. Ss draft and rehearse what they want to say or write. T goes around to advise students on language, suggesting phrases and helping Ss to polish and correct their language. If the reports are in writing, T can encourage peer-editing and use of dictionaries.

The emphasis is on clarity, organization, and accuracy, as appropriate for a public presentation. Individual students often take this chance to ask questions about specific language items.

Report. T asks some pairs to report briefly to the whole class so everyone can compare findings, or begin a survey. (N.B: There must be a purpose for others to listen). Sometimes only one or two groups report in full; others comment and add extra points. The class may take notes. T chairs, comments on the content of their reports, rephrases perhaps, but gives no overt public correction.

Analysis. T sets some language-focused tasks, based on the texts students read or on the transcripts of the recordings they hear. Examples include the following: Find words and phrases related to the topic or text. Read the transcript, find words ending in "s" and say what the "s" means. Find all the words in the simple past form. Say which refer to past time and which do not. Underline and classify the questions in the transcript. T starts Ss off, then students continue, often in pairs. T goes around to help. Ss can ask individual questions. In plenary, T then reviews the analysis, possibly writing relevant language up on the board in list form; Ss may make notes.

Practice. T conducts practice activities as needed, based on the language analysis already on the board, or using examples from the text or transcript.

Practice activities can include: Choral repetition of the phrases identified and classified. Memory challenge games based on partially erased examples or using lists already on blackboard for progressive deletion. Sentence completion (set by one team for another). Matching the past-tense verbs (jumbled) with the subject or objects they had in the text. Dictionary reference with words from text or transcript.

Task-based instruction can, in theory, be applied in a number of different ways in language teaching:

As the sole framework for course planning and delivery: This appears to be the strategy proposed by Willis. Such an approach was used in a program described by Prabhu (1987) in which a grammar-based curriculum was replaced by a task-based one in a state school system, albeit only for a short period.

As one component of a course: A task strand can also serve as one component of a course, where it would seek to develop general communication skills. This is the approach described by Beglar and Hunt (2002) in their study of a 12-week course for second-year Japanese university students. The task strand was based on a survey. Students designed a survey form, then collected data, analyzed it, and presented the results. In this case “task” is being used in ways others would use the term “project.” At the same time, students were also involved in classroom work related to a direct approach to teaching speaking skills, receiving explicit instruction in some of the specific strategies and microskills required for conversation.

As a technique: Teachers who find the procedures outlined by Willis unrealistic and unmanageable over a long period could still use task work from time to time as one technique from their teaching repertoire.

Many issues arise in implementing a task-based approach. To begin with, there is little evidence that it works any more effectively than the P-P-P approach it seeks to replace. Criteria for selecting and sequencing tasks are also problematic, as is the problem of language accuracy. Task work may well serve to develop fluency at the expense of accuracy, as with some of the other activities suggested

within a CLT framework. Content issues are also of secondary importance in TBI, making it of little relevance to those concerned with CBI or mainstreaming. The fact that TBI addresses classroom processes rather than learning outcomes is also an issue. In courses that have specific instructional outcomes to attain (e.g., examination targets) and where specific language needs have to be addressed rather than the general communication skills targeted in task work, TBI may seem too vague as a methodology to be widely adopted.

1.3. Product-Based CLT Approaches –Text-Based Instruction and Competency-Based Instruction

In this part we will examine two approaches which focus more on the outcomes or products of learning as the starting point in course design than on classroom processes. They start by identifying the kinds of uses of language the learner is expected to be able to master at the end of a given period of instruction. Teaching strategies are then selected to help achieve these goals.

Text-based instruction, also known as a genre-based approach, sees communicative competence as involving the mastery of different types of texts. Text here is used in a special sense to refer to structured sequences of language that are used in specific contexts in specific ways. For example, in the course of a day, a speaker of English may use spoken English in many different ways, including the following:

- Casual conversational exchange with a friend
- Conversational exchange with a stranger in an elevator
- Telephone call to arrange an appointment at a hair salon
- An account to friends of an unusual experience
- Discussion of a personal problem with a friend to seek advice.

Each of these uses of language can be regarded as a text in that it exists as a unified whole with a beginning, middle, and end, it conforms to norms of organization and content, and it draws on appropriate grammar and vocabulary. Communicative competence thus involves being able to use different kinds of spoken and written texts in the specific contexts of their use. This view of language owes much to the work of the linguist Michael Halliday. According to Feez and Joyce (1998), TBI is thus based on an approach to teaching language which involves:

- Teaching explicitly about the structures and grammatical features of spoken and written texts
- Linking spoken and written texts to the cultural context of their use

-Designing units of work which focus on developing skills in relation to whole texts

-Providing students with guided practice as they develop language skills for meaningful communication through whole texts vocabulary, topics, and functions; hence, it is a type of mixed syllabus, one which integrates reading, writing, and oral communication, and which teaches grammar through the mastery of texts rather than in isolation.

A text-based approach has been adopted in Singapore and forms the framework for the 2002 syllabus for primary and secondary schools. In the Singapore context, the text types that are identified can be understood as forming the communicative building blocks Singapore children need in order to perform in an English-medium school setting.

The text types in the syllabus are:

Procedures e.g., procedures used in carrying out a task

Explanations e.g., explaining how and why things happen

Expositions e.g., reviews, arguments, debates

Factual recounts e.g., magazine articles

Personal recounts e.g., anecdotes, diary/journal entries, biographies, autobiographies

Information reports e.g., fact sheets

Narratives e.g., stories, fables

Conversations and short e.g., dialogs, formal/informal letters, postcards, functional texts e-mail, notices.

Feez and Joyce (1998, 28–31) give the following description of how a textbased approach is implemented:

Phase 1: Building the Context In this stage, students:

-Are introduced to the social context of an authentic model of the text type being studied

-Explore features of the general cultural context in which the text type is used and the social purposes the text type achieves

-Explore the immediate context of situation by investigating the register of a model text which has been selected on the basis of the course objectives and learner need. An exploration of register involves:

-Building knowledge of the topic of the model text and knowledge of the social activity in which the text is used, e.g., job seeking.

-Understanding the roles and relationships of the people using the text and how these are established and maintained, e.g., the relationship between a job seeker and a prospective employer.

-Understanding the channel of communication being used, e.g., using the telephone, speaking face-to-face with members of an interview panel.

Context-building activities include:

-Presenting the context through pictures, audiovisual materials, realia, excursions, field-trips, guest speakers, etc.

-Establishing the social purpose through discussions or surveys, etc.

-Cross-cultural activities, such as comparing differences in the use of the text in two cultures

-Comparing the model text with other texts of the same or a contrasting type, e.g., comparing a job interview with a complex spoken exchange involving close friends, a work colleague or a stranger in a service encounter.

Phase 2: Modeling and Deconstructing the Text.

In this stage, students:

-Investigate the structural pattern and language features of the model

-Compare the model with other examples of the same text type

Feez and Joyce (1998) comment that “modeling and deconstruction are undertaken at both the whole text, clause, and expression levels. It is at this stage that many traditional ESL language teaching activities come into their own.”

Phase 3: Joint Construction of the Text.

In this stage:

-Students begin to contribute to the construction of whole examples of the text type.

-The teacher gradually reduces the contribution to text construction, as the students move closer to being able to control text type independently.

Joint-construction activities include:

-Teacher questioning, discussing and editing whole class construction, then scribing onto board or overhead transparency.

-Skeleton texts

-Jigsaw and information-gap activities

-Small-group construction of texts

-Dictogloss

-Self-assessment and peer-assessment activities

Phase 4: Independent Construction of the Text

In this stage:

-Students work independently with the text.

-Learner performances are used for achievement assessment.

Independent construction activities include:

-Listening tasks, e.g., comprehension activities in response to live or recorded material, such as performing a task, sequencing pictures, numbering, ticking or underlining material on a worksheet, answering questions

-Listening and speaking tasks, e.g., role plays, simulated or authentic dialogs

-Speaking tasks, e.g., spoken presentation to class, community organization, or workplace

-Reading tasks, e.g., comprehension activities in response to written material such as performing a task, sequencing pictures, numbering, ticking or underlining material on a worksheet, answering questions.

-Writing tasks which demand that students draft and present whole texts

Phase 5: Linking to Related Texts

In this stage, students investigate how what they have learned in this teaching/ learning cycle can be related to:

-Other texts in the same or similar context

-Future or past cycles of teaching and learning

- Activities which link the text type to related texts include:
- Comparing the use of the text type across different fields
- Researching other text types used in the same field
- Role-playing what happens if the same text type is used by people with different roles and relationships
- Comparing spoken and written modes of the same text type
- Researching how a key language feature used in this text type is used in other text types

As can be seen from the above summary, a text-based approach focuses on the products of learning rather than the processes involved. Critics have pointed out that an emphasis on individual creativity and personal expression is missing from the TBI model, which is heavily wedded to a methodology based on the study of model texts and the creation of texts based on models. Likewise, critics point out that there is a danger that the approach becomes repetitive and boring over time since the five-phase cycle described above is applied to the teaching of all four skills.

Competency-based instruction is an approach to the planning and delivery of courses that has been in widespread use since the 1970s. The application of its principles to language teaching is called competency-based language teaching (CBLT) – an approach that has been widely used as the basis for the design of work-related and survival-oriented language teaching programs for adults. It seeks to teach students the basic skills they need in order to prepare them for situations they commonly encounter in everyday life. Recently, competency based frameworks have become adopted in many countries, particularly for vocational and technical education. They are also increasingly being adopted in national language curriculum, as has happened recently in countries such as Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines.

What characterizes a competency-based approach is the focus on the outcomes of learning as the driving force of teaching and the curriculum. Auerbach

(1986) identifies eight features involved in the implementation of CBLT programs in language teaching:

1. A focus on successful functioning in society. The goal is to enable students to become autonomous individuals capable of coping with the demands of the world.

2. A focus on life skills. Rather than teaching language in isolation, CBLT teaches language as a function of communication about concrete tasks. Students are taught just those language forms/skills required by the situations in which they will function. These forms are normally determined by needs analysis.

3. Task- or performance-oriented instruction. What counts is what students can do as a result of instruction. The emphasis is on overt behaviors rather than on knowledge or the ability to talk about language and skills.

4. Modularized instruction. Language learning is broken down into meaningful chunks. Objectives are broken into narrowly focused subobjectives so that both teachers and students can get a clear sense of progress.

5. Outcomes are made explicit. Outcomes are public knowledge, known and agreed upon by both learner and teacher. They are specified in terms of behavioral objectives so that students know what behaviors are expected of them.

6. Continuous and ongoing assessment. Students are pre-tested to determine what skills they lack and post-tested after instruction on that skill. If they do not achieve the desired level of mastery, they continue to work on the objective and are retested.

7. Demonstrated mastery of performance objectives. Rather than the traditional paper-and-pencil tests, assessment is based on the ability to demonstrate prespecified behaviors.

8. Individualized, student-centered instruction. In content, level, and pace, objectives are defined in terms of individual needs; prior learning and achievement are taken into account in developing curricula. Instruction is not time-based; students progress at their own rates and concentrate on just those areas in which they lack competence.

There are two things to note about competency-based instruction. First, it seeks to build more accountability into education by describing what a course of instruction seeks to accomplish. Secondly, it shifts attention away from methodology or classroom processes, to learning outcomes. In a sense, one can say that with this approach it doesn't matter what methodology is employed as long as it delivers the learning outcomes.

As we saw above, CBLT is often used in programs that focus on learners with very specific language needs. In such cases, rather than seeking to teach general English, the focus is on the specific language skills needed to function in a specific context. This is similar to an ESP approach and to some versions of a task-based approach. The starting point in course planning is therefore an identification of the tasks the learner will need to carry out within a specific setting (e.g., in the role of factory worker, restaurant employee, or nurse) and the language demands of those tasks. The competencies needed for successful task performance are then identified and used as the basis for course planning. For example, part of a specification of competencies for a job training course includes the following:

The student will be able to:

- Identify different kinds of jobs using simple help-wanted ads
- Describe personal work experience and skills
- Demonstrate ability to fill out a simple job application with assistance
- Produce required forms of identification for employment
- Identify Social Security, income tax deductions, and tax forms
- Demonstrate understanding of employment expectations, rules, regulations, and safety
- Demonstrate understanding of basic instructions and ask for clarification on the job
- Demonstrate appropriate treatment of co-workers (politeness and respect).

Critics of CBLT have argued that this approach looks easier and neater than it is. They point out that analyzing situations into tasks and underlying

competencies is not always feasible or possible, and that often little more than intuition is involved. They also suggest that this is a reductionist approach. Language learning is reduced to a set of lists and such things as thinking skills are ignored.

Chapter II. Communicative Language Teaching as a tool of mastering communicative competence

2.1. Classroom activities that best facilitate learning

With CLT began a movement away from traditional lesson formats where the focus was on mastery of different items of grammar and practice through controlled activities such as memorization of dialogs and drills, and toward the use of pair work activities, role plays, group work activities and project work.

The type of classroom activities proposed in CLT also implied new roles in the classroom for teachers and learners. Learners now had to participate in classroom activities that were based on a cooperative rather than individualistic approach to learning. Students had to become comfortable with listening to their peers in group work or pair work tasks, rather than relying on the teacher for a model. They were expected to take on a greater degree of responsibility for their own learning. And teachers now had to assume the role of facilitator and monitor. Rather than being a model for correct speech and writing and one with the primary responsibility of making students produce plenty of error-free sentences, the teacher had to develop a different view of learners' errors and of her/his own role in facilitating language learning.

Since the advent of CLT, teachers and materials writers have sought to find ways of developing classroom activities that reflect the principles of a communicative methodology. This quest has continued to the present, as we shall see later in the booklet. The principles on which the first generation of CLT materials are still relevant to language teaching today, so in this chapter we will briefly review the main activity types that were one of the outcomes of CLT.

Accuracy Versus Fluency Activities. One of the goals of CLT is to develop fluency in language use. Fluency is natural language use occurring when a speaker engages in meaningful interaction and maintains comprehensible and ongoing communication despite limitations in his or her communicative competence. Fluency

is developed by creating classroom activities in which students must negotiate meaning, use communication strategies, correct misunderstandings, and work to avoid communication breakdowns.

Fluency practice can be contrasted with accuracy practice, which focuses on creating correct examples of language use. Differences between activities that focus on fluency and those that focus on accuracy can be summarized as follows:

Activities focusing on fluency:

- Reflect natural use of language
- Focus on achieving communication
- Require meaningful use of language
- Require the use of communication strategies
- Produce language that may not be predictable
- Seek to link language use to context

Activities focusing on accuracy

- Reflect classroom use of language
- Focus on the formation of correct examples of language
- Practice language out of context
- Practice small samples of language
- Do not require meaningful communication
- Control choice of language

The following are examples of fluency activities and accuracy activities. Both make use of group work, reminding us that group work is not necessarily a fluency task (see Brumfit 1984).

Fluency Tasks. A group of students of mixed language ability carry out a role play in which they have to adopt specified roles and personalities provided for them on cue cards. These roles involve the drivers, witnesses, and the police at a collision between two cars. The language is entirely improvised by the students, though they are heavily constrained by the specified situation and characters. The teacher and a student act out a dialog in which a customer returns a faulty object

she has purchased to a department store. The clerk asks what the problem is and promises to get a refund for the customer or to replace the item. In groups, students now try to recreate the dialog using language items of their choice. They are asked to recreate what happened preserving the meaning but not necessarily the exact language. They later act out their dialogs in front of the class.

Accuracy Tasks. Students are practicing dialogs. The dialogs contain examples of falling intonation in Wh-questions. The class is organized in groups of three, two students practicing the dialog, and the third playing the role of monitor. The monitor checks that the others are using the correct intonation pattern and corrects them where necessary.

The students rotate their roles between those reading the dialog and those monitoring. The teacher moves around listening to the groups and correcting their language where necessary. Students in groups of three or four complete an exercise on a grammatical item, such as choosing between the past tense and the present perfect, an item which the teacher has previously presented and practiced as a whole class activity. Together students decide which grammatical form is correct and they complete the exercise. Groups take turns reading out their answers.

Teachers were recommended to use a balance of fluency activities and accuracy and to use accuracy activities to support fluency activities. Accuracy work could either come before or after fluency work. For example, based on students' performance on a fluency task, the teacher could assign accuracy work to deal with grammatical or pronunciation problems the teacher observed while students were carrying out the task. An issue that arises with fluency work, however, is whether it develops fluency at the expense of accuracy. In doing fluency tasks, the focus is on getting meanings across using any available communicative resources. This often involves a heavy dependence on vocabulary and communication strategies, and there is little motivation to use accurate grammar or pronunciation. Fluency work thus requires extra attention on the part of the teacher in terms of preparing students for a fluency task, or follow-up activities that provide feedback on language use.

While dialogs, grammar, and pronunciation drills did not usually disappear from textbooks and classroom materials at this time, they now appeared as part of a sequence of activities that moved back and forth between accuracy activities and fluency activities. And the dynamics of classrooms also changed. Instead of a predominance of teacher-fronted teaching, teachers were encouraged to make greater use of small-group work. Pair and group activities gave learners greater opportunities to use the language and to develop fluency.

Mechanical, Meaningful, and Communicative Practice. Another useful distinction that some advocates of CLT proposed was the distinction between three different kinds of practice – mechanical, meaningful, and communicative.

Mechanical practice refers to a controlled practice activity which students can successfully carry out without necessarily understanding the language they are using. Examples of this kind of activity would be repetition drills and substitution drills designed to practice use of particular grammatical or other items.

Meaningful practice refers to an activity where language control is still provided but where students are required to make meaningful choices when carrying out practice. For example, in order to practice the use of prepositions to describe locations of places, students might be given a street map with various buildings identified in different locations. They are also given a list of prepositions such as across from, on the corner of, near, on, next to. They then have to answer questions such as “Where is the book shop? Where is the cafe?” etc. The practice is now meaningful because they have to respond according to the location of places on the map.

Communicative practice refers to activities where practice in using language within a real communicative context is the focus, where real information is exchanged, and where the language used is not totally predictable. For example, students might have to draw a map of their neighborhood and answer questions about the location of different places, such as the nearest bus stop, the nearest cafe, etc. students’ performance on a fluency task, the teacher could assign accuracy work to deal with grammatical or pronunciation problems the teacher

observed while students were carrying out the task. An issue that arises with fluency work, however, is whether it develops fluency at the expense of accuracy. In doing fluency tasks, the focus is on getting meanings across using any available communicative resources. This often involves a heavy dependence on vocabulary and communication strategies, and there is little motivation to use accurate grammar or pronunciation. Fluency work thus requires extra attention on the part of the teacher in terms of preparing students for a fluency task, or follow-up activities that provide feedback on language use. While dialogs, grammar, and pronunciation drills did not usually disappear from textbooks and classroom materials at this time, they now appeared as part of a sequence of activities that moved back and forth between accuracy activities and fluency activities.

And the dynamics of classrooms also changed. Instead of a predominance of teacher-fronted teaching, teachers were encouraged to make greater use of small-group work. Pair and group activities gave learners greater opportunities to use the language and to develop fluency.

Exercise sequences in many CLT course books take students from mechanical, to meaningful, to communicative practice. The following exercise, for example, is found in Passages 2 (Richards and Sandy 1998).

Superlative adjectives. Superlative adjectives usually appear before the noun they modify.

1. The funniest person I know is my friend Bob.
2. The most caring individual in our school is the custodian.
3. They can also occur with the noun they modify
4. Of all the people in my family, my Aunt Ruth is the kindest.
5. Of all my professors, Dr. Lopez is the most inspiring.

Superlatives are often followed by relative clauses in the present perfect.

1. My cousin Anita is the most generous person I've ever met.
2. The closest friend I've ever had is someone I met in elementary school.

A. Complete these sentences with your own information, and add more details. Then compare with a partner.

1. One of the most inspiring people I've ever known is ...

One of the most inspiring people I've ever known is my math teacher. She encourages students to think rather than just memorize formulas and rules.

2. The most successful individual I know is ...

3. Of all the people I know is the least self-centered.

4. The youngest person who I consider to be a hero is ...

5. The most moving speaker I have ever heard is ...

6. The most important role model I've ever had is ...

7. Of all the friends I've ever had is the most understanding.

8. One of the bravest things I've ever done is ...

B. Use the superlative form of these adjectives to describe people you know.

Write at least five sentences.

brave honest interesting smart generous inspiring kind witty

C. Group work

Discuss the sentences you wrote in Exercises A and B. Ask each other follow-up questions.

A. My next-door neighbor is the bravest person I've ever met.

B. What did your neighbor do, exactly?

A. She's a firefighter, and once she saved a child from a burning building ...

If students read and practice aloud the sentences in the grammar box, this constitutes mechanical practice. Exercises A and B can be regarded as meaningful practice since students now complete the sentences with their own information. Exercise C is an example of communicative practice since it is an open-ended discussion activity.

The distinction between mechanical, meaningful, and communicative activities is similar to that given by Littlewood (1981), who groups activities into two kinds:

Pre-communicative activities. Communicative activities.

Structural activities. Functional communication activities.

Quasi-communicative activities. Social interactional activities.

Functional communication activities require students to use their language resources to overcome an information gap or solve a problem (see below). Social interactional activities require the learner to pay attention to the context and the roles of the people involved, and to attend to such things as formal versus informal language.

Information-Gap Activities. An important aspect of communication in CLT is the notion of information gap. This refers to the fact that in real communication, people normally communicate in order to get information they do not possess. This is known as an information gap. More authentic communication is likely to occur in the classroom if students go beyond practice of language forms for their own sake and use their linguistic and communicative resources in order to obtain information. In so doing, they will draw available vocabulary, grammar, and communication strategies to complete a task. The following exercises make use of the information-gap principle:

Students are divided into A-B pairs. The teacher has copied two sets of pictures. One set (for A students) contains a picture of a group of people. The other set (for B students) contains a similar picture but it contains a number of slight differences from the A-picture. Students must sit back to back and ask questions to try to find out how many differences there are between the two pictures. Students practice a role play in pairs. One student is given the information she/he needs to play the part of a clerk in the railway station information booth and has information on train departures, prices, etc. The other needs to obtain information on departure times, prices, etc. They role-play the interaction without looking at each other's cue cards.

Jigsaw activities. These are also based on the information-gap principle. Typically, the class is divided into groups and each group has part of the information needed to complete an activity. The class must fit the pieces together to complete the whole. In so doing, they must use their language resources to communicate meaningfully and so take part in meaningful communication practice. The following are examples of jigsaw activities:

The teacher plays a recording in which three people with different points of view discuss their opinions on a topic of interest. The teacher prepares three different listening tasks, one focusing on each of the three speaker's points of view. Students are divided into three groups and each group listens and takes notes on one of the three speaker's opinions. Students are then rearranged into groups containing a student from groups A, B, and C. They now role-play the discussion using the information they obtained. The teacher takes a narrative and divides it into twenty sections (or as many sections as there are students in the class). Each student gets one section of the story. Students must then move around the class, and by listening to each section read aloud, decide where in the story their section belongs. Eventually the students have to put the entire story together in the correct sequence.

Many other activity types have been used in CLT, including the following:
Task-completion activities: puzzles, games, map-reading, and other kinds of classroom tasks in which the focus is on using one's language resources to complete a task.

Information-gathering activities: student-conducted surveys, interviews, and searches in which students are required to use their linguistic resources to collect information.

Opinion-sharing activities: activities in which students compare values, opinions, or beliefs, such as a ranking task in which students list six qualities in order of importance that they might consider in choosing a date or spouse.

Information-transfer activities: These require learners to take information that is presented in one form, and represent it in a different form. For example, they may read instructions on how to get from A to B, and then draw a map showing the sequence, or they may read information about a subject and then represent it as a graph.

Reasoning-gap activities: These involve deriving some new information from given information through the process of inference, practical reasoning, etc.

For example, working out a teacher's timetable on the basis of given class timetables.

Role plays: activities in which students are assigned roles and improvise a scene or exchange based on given information or clues.

Emphasis on Pair and Group Work. Most of the activities discussed above reflect an important aspect of classroom tasks in CLT, namely that they are designed to be carried out in pairs or small groups. Through completing activities in this way, it is argued, learners will obtain several benefits:

- They can learn from hearing the language used by other members of the group.

- They will produce a greater amount of language than they would use in teacher-fronted activities.

- Their motivational level is likely to increase.

- They will have the chance to develop fluency.

Teaching and classroom materials today consequently make use of a wide variety of small-group activities.

Since the language classroom is intended as a preparation for survival in the real world and since real communication is a defining characteristic of CLT, an issue which soon emerged was the relationship between classroom activities and real life. Some argued that classroom activities should as far as possible mirror the real world and use real world or "authentic" sources as the basis for classroom learning. Clarke and Silberstein (1977, 51) thus argued:

Classroom activities should parallel the "real world" as closely as possible. Since language is a tool of communication, methods and materials should concentrate on the message and not the medium. The purposes of reading should be the same in class as they are in real life. Arguments in favor of the use of authentic materials include:

- They provide cultural information about the target language.

- They provide exposure to real language.

- They relate more closely to learners' needs.

-They support a more creative approach to teaching.

Others (e.g., Widdowson 1987) argued that it is not important if classroom materials themselves are derived from authentic texts and other forms of input, as long as the learning processes they facilitated were authentic. Critics of the case for authentic materials point out that:

-Created materials can also be motivating for learners.

-Created materials may be superior to authentic materials because they are generally built around a graded syllabus.

Authentic materials often contain difficult and irrelevant language. Using authentic materials is a burden for teachers. However, since the advent of CLT, textbooks and other teaching materials have taken on a much more “authentic” look; reading passages are designed to look like magazine articles (if they are not in fact adapted from magazine articles) and textbooks are designed to a similar standard of production as real world sources such as popular magazines.

Product of learning, the ultimate goal of learning is to be able to use the new language both accurately and fluently. Learners develop their own routes to language learning, progress at different rates, and have different needs and motivations for language learning. Successful language learning involves the use of effective learning and communication strategies. The role of the teacher in the language classroom is that of a facilitator, who creates a classroom climate conducive to language learning and provides opportunities for students to use and practice the language and to reflect on language use and language learning. The classroom is a community where learners learn through collaboration and sharing.

Current approaches to methodology draw on earlier traditions in communicative language teaching and continue to make reference to some extent to traditional approaches. Thus classroom activities typically have some of the following characteristics:

-They seek to develop students’ communicative competence through linking grammatical development to the ability to communicate. Hence, grammar is not taught in isolation but often arises out of a communicative task, thus creating a

need for specific items of grammar. Students might carry out a task and then reflect on some of the linguistic characteristics of their performance.

- They create the need for communication, interaction, and negotiation of meaning through the use of activities such as problem solving, information sharing, and role play.

- They provide opportunities for both inductive as well as deductive learning of grammar.

- They make use of content that connects to students' lives and interests.

- They allow students to personalize learning by applying what they have learned to their own lives.

Classroom materials typically make use of authentic texts to create interest and to provide valid models of language.

Approaches to language teaching today seek to capture the rich view of language and language learning assumed by a communicative view of language. Jacobs and Farrell (2003) see the shift toward CLT as marking a paradigm shift in our thinking about teachers, learning, and teaching. They identify key components of this shift as follows:

1. Focusing greater attention on the role of learners rather than the external stimuli learners are receiving from their environment. Thus, the center of attention shifts from the teacher to the student. This shift is generally known as the move from teacher-centered instruction to learner-centered instruction.

2. Focusing greater attention on the learning process rather than the products that learners produce. This shift is known as the move from product-oriented to process-oriented instruction.

3. Focusing greater attention on the social nature of learning rather than on students as separate, decontextualized individuals.

4. Focusing greater attention on diversity among learners and viewing these difference not as impediments to learning but as resources to be recognized, catered to, and appreciated. This shift is known as the study of individual differences.

5. In research and theory-building, focusing greater attention on the views of those internal to the classroom rather than solely valuing the views of those who come from outside to study classrooms, investigate and evaluate what goes on there, and engage in theorizing about it. This shift is associated with such innovations as qualitative research, which highlights the subjective and affective, the participants' insider views, and the uniqueness of each context.

6. Along with this emphasis on context comes the idea of connecting the school with the world beyond as means of promoting holistic learning.

7. Helping students to understand the purpose of learning and develop their own purpose.

8. A whole-to-part orientation instead of a part-to-whole approach. This involves such approaches as beginning with meaningful whole text and then helping students understand the various features that enable texts to function, e.g., the choice of words and the text's organizational structure.

9. An emphasis on the importance of meaning rather than drills and other forms of rote learning.

10. A view of learning as a lifelong process rather than something done to prepare students for an exam Jacobs and Farrell suggest that the CLT paradigm shift outlined above has led to eight major changes in approaches to language teaching. These changes are:

1. Learner autonomy: Giving learners greater choice over their own learning, both in terms of the content of learning as well as processes they might employ. The use of small groups is one example of this, as well as the use of self-assessment.

2. The social nature of learning: Learning is not an individual, private activity, but a social one that depends upon interaction with others. The movement known as cooperative learning reflects this viewpoint.

3. Curricular integration: The connection between different strands of the curriculum is emphasized, so that English is not seen as a stand-alone subject but is

linked to other subjects in the curriculum. Text-based learning (see below) reflects this approach, and seeks to develop fluency in text types that can be used across the curriculum. Project work in language teaching also requires students to explore issues outside of the language classroom.

4. Focus on meaning: Meaning is viewed as the driving force of learning. Content-based teaching reflects this view and seeks to make the exploration of meaning through content the core of language learning activities (see Chapter 5).

5. Diversity: Learners learn in different ways and have different strengths. Teaching needs to take these differences into account rather than try to force students into a single mold. In language teaching, this has led to an emphasis on developing students' use and awareness of learning strategies.

6. Thinking skills: Language should serve as a means of developing higher-order thinking skills, also known as critical and creative thinking. In language teaching, this means that students do not learn language for its own sake but in order to develop and apply their thinking skills in situations that go beyond the language classroom.

7. Alternative assessment: New forms of assessment are needed to replace traditional multiple-choice and other items that test lower-order skills.

2.2. Experiences practiced in implementing CLT

In the 1970s, though, educators began to question if they were going about meeting the goal in the right way. Some observed that students could produce sentences accurately in a lesson, but could not use them appropriately when genuinely communicating outside of the classroom. Others noted that being able to communicate required more than mastering linguistic structures. Students may know the rules of linguistic usage, but be unable to use the language (Widdowson 1978). It became clear that communication required that students perform certain functions as well, such as promising, inviting, and declining invitations within a social context (Wilkins 1976). In short, being able to communicate required more than linguistic competence; it required communicative competence (Hymes 1971)- knowing when and how to say what to whom. Such observations contributed to a shift in the field in the late 1970s and early 1980s from a linguistic structure-centered approach to a Communicative Approach (Widdowson 1990).

Communicative Language Teaching aims broadly to apply the theoretical perspective of the Communicative Approach by making communicative competence the goal of language teaching and by acknowledging the interdependence of language and communication. What this looks like in the classroom may depend on how the tenets are interpreted and applied. Nevertheless, we will follow our usual way of understanding the theory and associated practices by visiting a class in which a form of Communicative Language Teaching is being practiced. The class we will visit is one being conducted for adult immigrants to Canada. These twenty people have lived in Canada for two years and are at a high-intermediate level of English proficiency. They meet two evenings a week for two hours each class.

1. The teacher greets the class and distributes a handout. There is writing on both sides. On one side is a copy of a sports column from a recent newspaper, in which the reporter discusses who he thinks will win the World Cup. The teacher asks the students to read it and then to underline the predictions the reporter has made. He gives all instructions in the target language. When the students have

finished, they read what they have underlined. The teacher writes the predictions on the blackboard. Then he and the students discuss which predictions the reporter feels more certain about and which predictions he feels less certain about.

Malaysia is very likely to win the World Cup this year.

Italy can win if they play as well as they have lately.

France probably will not be a contender again.

England may have an outside chance.

Then he asks the students to look at the first sentence and to tell the class another way to express this same prediction. One student says, 'Malaysia probably will win the World Cup.' 'Yes,' says the teacher. 'Any others?' No one responds. The teacher offers, 'Malaysia is almost certain to win the World Cup.' 'What about the next?' he asks the class. One student replies, 'It is possible that Italy will win the World Cup.' Another student offers, 'There's a possibility that Italy will win the World Cup.' Each of the reporter's predictions is discussed in this manner. All the paraphrases the students suggest are evaluated by the teacher and the other students to make sure they convey the same degree of certainty as the reporter's original prediction.

Next, the teacher asks the students to turn to the other side of the handout. On it are all the sentences of the article that they have been working on. They are, however, out of order. For example, the first two sentences on this side of the handout are:

England may have an outside chance.

In the final analysis, the winning team may simply be the one with the most experience.

The first sentence was in the middle of the original sports column. The second was the last sentence of the original column. The teacher tells the students to unscramble the sentences, to put them in their proper order by numbering them. When they finish, the students compare what they have done with the original on the other side of the handout.

The teacher next announces that the students will be playing a game. He

divides the class into small groups containing five people catching hands each group a deck of thirteen cards. Each card has a picture (it is a piece of sports equipment. As the students identify the items, the teacher writes each name on the blackboard: basketball, soccer ball, volleyball, tennis racket, skis, ice skates, roller skates, football, baseball hat, golf clubs, bowling ball, badminton racket, and hockey stick.

The cards are shuffled and four of the students in a group are dealt three cards each. They do not show their cards to anyone else. The extra card is placed face down in the middle of the group. The fifth person in each group receives no cards. She is told that she should try to predict what it is that Dumduan (one of the students in the class) will be doing the following weekend. The fifth student is to make statements like, 'Dumduan may go skiing this weekend.' If one of the members of her group has a card showing skis, the group member would reply, for example, 'Dumduan can't go skiing because I have her skis.' If, on the other hand, no one has the picture of the skis, then the fifth student can make a strong statement about the likelihood of Dumduan going skiing. She can say, for example, 'Dumduan will go skiing.' She can check her prediction by turning over the card that was placed face down. If it is the picture of the skis, then she knows she is correct.

The students seem to really enjoy playing the game. They take turns so that each person has a chance to make the predictions about how a classmate will spend his or her time.

For the next activity, the teacher reads a number of predictions like the following:

In 2008, Quebec will vote to remain part of Canada.

By 2020, solar energy will replace the world's reliance on fossil fuels.

By 2050, people will be living on the moon.

The students are told to make statements about how probable they think the predictions are and why they believe so. They are also asked how they feel about the prediction. In discussing one of the predictions, a student says he does not think

that it is like that a world government will be in place by the twenty-second century. The teacher and students ignore his error and the discussion continues.

Next, the teacher has the students divide into groups of three. Since there are twenty students, there are six groups of three students and one group of two. One member of each group is given a picture strip story. There are six pictures in a row on a piece of paper, but no words. The pictures tell a story. The student with the story shows the first picture to the other members of his group, while covering the remaining five pictures.

The other students try to predict what they think will happen in the second picture. The first student tells them whether they are correct or not, He then shows them the second picture and asks them to predict what the third picture will look like. After the entire series of pictures has been shown, the group gets a new strip story and they change roles, giving the first student an opportunity to work with a partner in making predictions.

For the final activity of the class, the students are told that will do a role play. The teacher tells them that they are to be divided into groups of four. They are to imagine that they are all employees of the same company. One of them is the others' boss. They are having a meeting to discuss what will possibly occur as a result of their company merging with another company. Before they begin, they discuss some possibilities together. They decide that they can talk about topics such as whether or not some of the people in their company will lose their jobs, whether or not they will have to move, whether or not certain policies will change, whether or not they will earn more money. 'Remember,' reminds the teacher, 'that one of you in each group is the boss. You should think about this relationship if, for example, he or she makes a prediction that you don't agree with.'

For fifteen minutes the students perform their role play. The teacher moves from group to group to answer questions and offer any advice on what the groups can discuss. After it's over, the students have an opportunity to pose any questions. In this way, they elicit some relevant vocabulary words. They then discuss what language forms are appropriate in dealing with one's boss. 'For example,' the

teacher explains, 'what if you know that your boss doesn't think that the vacation policy will change, but you think it will. How will you state your prediction? You are more likely to say something like 'I think the vacation policy might change,' than 'The vacation policy will change.'

'What if, however,' the teacher says, 'it is your colleague with whom you disagree and you are certain that you are right. How will you express your prediction then?' One student offers, 'I know that the vacation policy will change.' Another student says, 'I am sure that the vacation policy will change.' A third student says simply, 'The vacation policy will change.'

The class is almost over. The teacher uses the last few minutes to give the homework assignment. The students are to listen to the debate between two political candidates on the radio or watch it on television that night. They are then to write (in English) their prediction of who they think will win the election and why they think so. They will read these to their classmates at the start of the next class.

2. Now we step into the classroom, where a sixth grade class in an international school in Taipei is studying both geography and English through content-based instruction. Most of the students are Chinese speakers, but there are several native speakers of Japanese and a few Korean. The teacher asks the students in English what a globe is. A few call out 'world.' Others make a circle with their arms. Others are silent. The teacher then reaches under her desk and takes out a globe. She puts the globe on her desk and asks the students what they know about it.

They call out answers enthusiastically as she records their answers on the blackboard. When they have trouble explaining a concept, the teacher supplies the missing language. Next, she distributes a handout that she has prepared based on a video, 'Understanding Globes.' The top section on the handout is entitled Some vocabulary to know. Listed are some key geographical terms used in the video. The teacher asks the students to listen as she reads the ten words: degree, distance, equator, globe, hemisphere, imaginary, latitude, longitude, model, parallel.

Below this list is a modified cloze passage. The teacher tells the students to read the passage. They should fill in the blanks in the passage with the new vocabulary where they are able to do so. After they are finished, she shows them the video. As they watch the video, they fill in the remaining blanks with certain of the vocabulary words that the teacher has read aloud.

The passage begins:

A _____ is a three-dimensional _____ of the earth. Points of interest are located on a globe by using a system of lines. For instance, the equator is an imaginary line that divides the earth in half. Lines that are parallel to the equator are called lines of _____. Latitude is used to measure _____ on the earth north and south of the equator...

After the video is over, the students pair up to check their answers.

Next, the teacher calls attention to a particular verb pattern in the cloze passage: are located, are called, is used, etc. She tells students that these are examples of the present passive, which they will be studying in this lesson and ones to come this week. She explains that the passive is used to defocus the agent or doer of an action. In fact, in descriptions of the sort that they have just read, the agent of the action is not mentioned at all.

The teacher then explains how latitude and longitude can be used to locate any place in the world. She gives them several examples. Then the students use latitude and longitude co-ordinates to locate cities in other countries. By stating 'This city is located at latitude 60° north and longitude 11° east,' the teacher integrates the present passive and the content focus at the same time. Hands go up. She calls on one girl to come to the front of the room to find the city. She correctly points to Oslo, Norway on the globe. The teacher provides a number of other examples.

Later, the students play a guessing game. In small groups, they think of the names of five cities. They then locate the city on the globe and write down the latitude and longitude co-ordinates. Later, they read the coordinates out loud and see if the other students can guess the name of the city. The first group says: 'This

city is located at latitude 5° north and longitude 74° west.' After several misses by their classmates, group 4 gets the correct answer: Bogota. Group 4 then give the others new co-ordinates 'This city is located at 34° south latitude and 151° east longitude.' The answer: Sydney!

For homework, the students are given a map and a description of Australia. They have to read the description and label the major cities and points of interest on the map.

3. The following lesson is one that has been adapted and expanded from Prabhu (1987). It takes place in Southern India. The class consists of 40 ten-year-old children who are advanced beginners in English. As we enter the classroom, the teacher is speaking:

'We are going to do a lesson today on timetables. OK?'

The teacher draws the columns and rows of a class timetable on the blackboard. At the head of the first column, she writes 9:30-10:15. The students understand that the teacher has written the duration of the first class period of the day.

'What should I write here?' asks the teacher, pointing to the head of the second column. The students respond, 'Ten fifteen.' And then 'Eleven o'clock,' as the teacher moves her finger across the top row. The teacher points in turn to the top of each column and the students chorus the time that each class period begins and ends.

Then the teacher asks: 'Who will write the names for the days of the week here?' Several students raise their hands. The teacher calls on one. 'Come,' she says. The student she has called on comes to the front of the room, takes the chalk, and writes the names of each weekday beside each row, Monday to Friday, correctly, as the rest of the class helps with the spelling.

'Is that correct?' the teacher asks. 'Correct!' the students chorus back. 'What about Saturday? Do we have school on Saturday?' The students reply in unison, 'No ... holiday.' The teacher responds, 'Holiday. Yes. Saturday's a holiday.'

Next the teacher divides the class into eight groups of five students. Each

student in a group receives a card with the schedule for one day of the week. The students' task is to complete the week's schedule by sharing the information on their cards with each other. There is much discussion as each group works to draw up a full schedule. As she moves about the room listening to the groups, the teacher reminds the class to speak in English. The first group that is finished comes to the blackboard and writes the schedule on the board.

After the students have checked their work, the teacher collects each group's timetable so she can read it and return it to them the next day. She checks their timetables mainly to see that the content is correct.

Next, still working in their groups, the students are told that they are to find a way to survey their classmates' preferences of their favorite school subjects. They must find out which are the three most popular subjects among class members. Each group is to discuss ways they might find out the information. They might design a questionnaire, for instance, or go around the room interviewing other students. After they have completed their survey, they have to summarize and report the results. They have to determine how to do this. For example, they may use percentages, a bar graph, a pie chart, or some other visual display. Once again, much interaction takes place. Students are busily talking about how they will gather the information they need to complete the task and later report their findings.

Conclusion

Since its inception in the 1970s, communicative language teaching has passed through a number of different phases. In its first phase, a primary concern was the need to develop a syllabus and teaching approach that was compatible with early conceptions of communicative competence. This led to proposals for the organization of syllabuses in terms of functions and notions rather than grammatical structures. Later the focus shifted to procedures for identifying learners' communicative needs and this resulted in proposals to make needs analysis an essential component of communicative methodology. At the same time, methodologists focused on the kinds of classroom activities that could be used to implement a communicative approach, such as group work, task work, and information-gap activities.

Today CLT can be seen as describing a set of core principles about language learning and teaching, as summarized above, assumptions which can be applied in different ways and which address different aspects of the processes of teaching and learning.

Some focus centrally on the input to the learning process. Thus content-based teaching stresses that the content or subject matter of teaching drives the whole language learning process. Some teaching proposals focus more directly on instructional processes. Task-based instruction for example, advocates the use of specially designed instructional tasks as the basis of learning.

Others, such as competency-based instruction and text-based teaching, focus on the outcomes of learning and use outcomes or products as the starting point in planning teaching. Today CLT continues in its classic form as seen in the huge range of course books and other teaching resources that cite CLT as the source of their methodology. In addition, it has influenced many other language teaching approaches that subscribe to a similar philosophy of language teaching.

References

1. I. A. Karimov, The concept of further deepening the democratic reforms and establishing civil society in the country, Uzbekistan, 2012
2. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On the National Program for the Cadre Training”, 1997 August 29.
3. I. A. Karimov’s decree “On measures to further improvement of foreign language learning system”. December 10, 2012
4. Auerbach, E. R. (1986). Competency-Based ESL: One Step Forward or Two Steps Back? *TESOL Quarterly*, 20 (3).
5. Beglar, David, and Alan Hunt (2002). Implementing task-based language teaching. In Jack Richards and Willy Renandya (eds). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
6. Brumfit, Christopher (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, M., and S. Silberstein (1977). Toward a realization of psycholinguistic principles in the ESL reading class. *Language Learning*, 27 (1), 48–65.
7. Feez, S., and H. Joyce (1998). *Text-Based Syllabus Design*. Australia: Macquarie University
 6. Krahnke, K. (1987). *Approaches to Syllabus design for Foreign Language Teaching*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
 7. Littlejohn, A., and D. Hicks (1996). *Cambridge English for Schools*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 8. Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
 9. Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 10. Richards, Jack C., and Theodore Rodgers (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. New York: Cambridge University

Press.

11. Richards, Jack C., and Charles Sandy (1998). *Passages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

12. Skehan, P. (1996). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis and D. Willis (eds). *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.

13. Van Ek, J., and L. G. Alexander (1980). *Threshold Level English*. Oxford: Pergamon.

14. Widdowson. H. (1987). Aspects of syllabus design. In M. Tickoo (ed). *Language Syllabuses: State of the Art*. Singapore: Regional Language Centre.

15. Willis, Jane (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Harlow: Longman.

4. Burnett, Cathy, and Julia Myers. *Teaching English*. London: 2004.

5. *Cambridge Movers 2 - Cambridge Young Learners English Tests*. Cambridge, 2001.

6. Collins, Rita. *English Teaching Forum* 2009.

7. Edmondson, Patricia. "Scaffolding: Strategies for Improving Reading Comprehension Skills.", 2010.

www.phschool.com/eteach/language_arts

8. Ellis, Gail, and Jean Brewster. *Tell It Again*, 2002.

9. Halliwell, Susan. *Teaching English in the Primary Classroom*, 1992.

10. Harmer, Jeremy. *How to Teach English*. Harlow: 2001.

11. Leather, Sue. "Reading and Elementary Learners." *TeachingEnglish*. British Council, 2004.

12. McCloskey, Mary Lou. "Scaffolding for Reading." 2010.

www.mindspring.com/~mlmcc/Scaffolding.

13. McRae, John. *Literature with a Small "I"* London: MacMillan, 1991.

14. Newberry, Clare Turlay. *Herbert The Lion*. New York: Smithmark, 1998.

15. Phillips, Sarah. *Young Learners*. Oxford University Press, 1993.

16. Scott, Wendy A., and Lisbeth H. Ytreberg. Teaching English to Children. Harlow,1990.
17. "Second Language Acquisition Theory." Your Dictionary.com. 2010.
18. Teaching English. British Council, 2010.
www.teachingenglish.org.uk
19. Alyousef H. S. Teaching Reading Comprehension to ESL/EFL Learners, 2002
20. Archer A. L. Before Reading Practices, 1996
21. Beatrice S. Teaching reading in a second Language, 2008.
22. Brindley S. Teaching English, London, 1994.
23. Calhoun E. F. Teaching Beginning Reading and Writing with the picture word inductive model, 1999.
24. Donan Glenn. Children's Books and Reading [Look and Say teaching Method]. 2012
25. Hager A. Techniques for Teaching Beginning-Level Reading to Adults, 2001.
26. Harmer J. How to teach English / J. Harmer. – London, 2001
27. Harmer J. The practice of English language teaching: third edition, Longman, 2001.
28. Harrison C. Methods of Teaching Reading: Key Issues in Research and Implications for Practice, 1996.
29. Johnson A. P. Teaching Reading and Writing, Toronto, 2008.
30. Lems K. Teaching Reading to English Language Leners, The Guilford Press, 2010.
31. Moreillon J. Collaborative Strategies for Teaching Reading Comprehension Chicago: American Library Association, 2007
32. Power T. Reading in the Second language, 2004
33. Rogova G. V. Methods of teaching English, 1986
34. Sweeney S. The importance of reading in foreign language teaching , 1993.
35. Nutley S. Teaching children to read: eighth report of session 2004-2005.
36. Teaching the Alphabet Games and Activities, 2008
37. Willis J. Teaching English through English London: Longman, 1981.

ANNOTATION

O`zbekistonda mustaqillikning ilk kunlaridanoq jamiyatda demokratik o`zgarishlar, iqtisodiyotning barqaror rivojlanishi, respublikaning jahon hamjamiyatiga integratsiyalashuvining muhim va zarur shartlari sifatida ta`lim sohasini uzviylik bilan isloh qilish siyosati amalga oshirilmoqda.

Kadrlar tayyorlash milliy dasturi yosh avlod uzluksiz ta`lim va tarbiyasining butun jarayonini qamrab oluvchi yagona ta`lim majmui hisoblanadi. Dasturning to`laqonli bajarilishi, unda qo`yilgan vazifalarga erishish har bir ta`lim turi holati va rivojlanish darajasi, ularning o`zaro yaqin aloqasiga bog`liq.

Mening bitiruv malakaviy ishim tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitishning yondashuvlariga bag`ishlanadi. Tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitish bo`yicha yondashuvlar barcha yoshdagi tilni o`rganuvchilar uchun muhim bosqichdir. Bu ishimning sub`yekti tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitishning yondashuvlari to`g`risida. Tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitishning yondashuvlarini rivojlantirish esa uning ob`yektidir.

Bitiruv malakaviy ishim mavzusidan bir qancha sharq va g`arb olimlari izlanishlar olib borishgan. Rogova, Hoshimov, Zaripov, J. Jalolov, J. Richards, S. Thornburry, H. Alyousef, D. Glenn, C. Harrison, A. Johnson, K. Lems, Admondson, Leather, Harmer, Philips shular jumlasidandir. Bitiruv malakaviy ishimning maqsadi tilni kommuikativ tarzda o`qitish bo`yicha yondashuvlar ustidan tahlil olib borishdan iboratdir.

Bunda quyidagi prinsiplarga e`tibor qaratish lozim:

- tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitish bo`yicha yondashuvlarni rivojlantirish prinsiplarini aniqlash;
- tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitish bo`yicha yondashuvlarni tahlil qilish;
- ravon va to`g`ri muloqotga ega bo`lish usullarni taklif qilish;

- barcha bosqichlarda tilni kommunikativ tarzda o'rganuvchilar uchun turli metodlarni tahlil qilish

Bitiruv malakaviy ishim kirish qismi, 2 ta bo`lim, xulosa va adabiyotlar ro`yxatidan iborat. Birinchi bob tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitishning yondashuvlari haqida. Ikkinchi bob tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitish bo`yicha yondashuvlardan foydalangan holda darsda qo`llaniladigan turli usullarga bag`ishlanadi.

Bu mavzuda ish olib borib shunga amin bo`ldimki, barcha bosqichda o`rganuvchilariga tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitish uchun yuqorida keltirilgan metod va uslublardan keng foydalanish maqsadga muvofiqdir. Mening fikrimga ko`ra tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitish barcha ta`lim muassasalarida joriy qilish juda foydalidir. Bitiruv malakaviy ishim tilni kommunikativ tarzda o`qitishning yondashuvlari haqida bo`lgani uchun, barcha bosqichda o`rganuvchilar bu metodlardan kengroq foydalanishni tavsiya qilaman. Ularning tez fursatda muloqotga kirishishni o`rganishlari, keyingi davrlarda ingliz tilida ravon va tog`ri gapirishlarida qiyinchiliklarga uchramasliklari uchun bu juda muhim bosqichdir.