

# A NEW LOOK AT COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING: Prospects for Taiwan, ROC

Miriam K. Li

厲 耿 桂 芳\*

## 摘 要

「溝通式語言教學法」係特別強調以學習者為主體，自然互動地融入日常生活，而能在不自覺的情況下習得語言。晚近數十年來，廣被應用於第二語言及外語教學，目前在各家語言教學法中，已蔚為風潮，儼然成為主流。

本文擬從歷史背景、語言學觀點、以及世界宏觀角度簡析「溝通式語言教學法」之風貌，透過其沿革、理論架構、具體精義、及在世界各地實際教學反應與經驗，探討其教學法之優缺利弊。有別於一般研究論述對於其利多所著墨，本文除對中國大陸、日本、新加坡等非英語系國家教育體系下從事英語教學者及學習者所面臨之障礙及困境作一綜合分析，認為有待克服外，更對於「溝通式語言教學法」行之於我國，提出初步之觀察及有所期待。

## Preface

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is an approach in second-and-foreign-language teaching which emphasizes that the main goal of language learning is to acquire, in Hymes' (1972) words, "*communicative competence*." Learners unconsciously develop the target-language system as a result of using the language for real communication (Richard and Rodgers 1986:72). The expression has also been referred to by Brumfit and Johnson (1979) and Savignon (1991) as a term to cover a variety of developments in syllabus design which embrace the processes of classroom learning. Among recent developments, CLT is emerging as a major trend in contemporary methodology, and has received the widest attention both in discussions in the literature and in classroom practice for nearly three decades. It has marked a drastic shift in pedagogical emphasis from the structural form and usage of language to the interactive, negotiating, and meaningful use of language in social contexts.

This paper attempts to look into CLT from an international perspective, with specific reference to Taiwan, Republic of China. The organization of the paper is as follows. First, a brief retrospective which reviews both historical and linguistic background is presented, in particular, theoretical assumptions. Second, the paper outlines some important components which compose the basic principles of CLT. Third, in order to demonstrate the value of CLT, the advantages of this approach are illustrated. Fourth, a careful discussion of some problems, which apparently have emerged or potentially may pose difficulties to teaching English-as-a-foreign-language, is particularly presented.

---

\* 作者為本校語視中心講師兼華語組組長

Fifth, the paper proposes some suggestions based on observations of current practical problems. The prospects of CLT in Taiwan, which serve as an example of regional norms, are given in the sixth section. Finally, a call for the adoption of CLT concludes the paper.

It is hoped that language teachers who have an understanding of CLT, not only from the perspective of its merits but also from the perspective of its limitations, will be able to adapt and approach it more effectively in their language teaching. It is also hoped that by examining some implications, which usually have been neglected in our profession, we will attract more attention and research in this area, thus better promoting the effectiveness of Communicative Language Teaching.

## **I. A Brief Retrospective: Historical and Linguistic Background**

### **Why did CLT develop?**

Communicative Language Teaching can be said to be a historical and an innovative product of the collective wisdom and advocacy of many distinguished applied linguists. It originated in the 1950s and 1960s on both sides of the Atlantic with concurrent developments, and has become well-known since the 1970s. It was cultivated at a time and under a climate of general dissatisfaction when doubt was being raised toward the linguistic theory underlying the British Situational Approach and the American Audiolingual Approach. It was also prompted by the prevailing influences of the Council of Europe and the involvement of many other notable contributors.

In Situational Language Teaching, which was the standard methodology and had run its course in Britain at that time, learners were taught by practicing basic structures in situation-based activities. Although it contained systematic principles of selection, gradation, and presentation, British applied linguists, as reported by Howatt (1984), seriously challenged this teaching-method, arguing that it was without a future and not worthy of continuation. They advocated a departure from Situational Language Teaching, which was heavily based on behaviorist habit-learning theory. They felt strongly that there was a need to restudy the nature of language and learning theory and to return to the traditional concept that utterances carried meaning in and of themselves (Howatt 1984:280, cited in Richards and Rodgers 1986:64).

In the United States, a parallel change resulted as a response to Noam Chomsky's sharp attacks on structural linguistics in his 1957 *Syntactic Structures* and on the language acquisition theory of behavioral psychology in his 1959 review of B. F. Skinner's *Verbal Behavior*. This twin assault powerfully attacked the description of language and the basic notion of how language is acquired. Chomsky viewed language as rule-governed

and language acquisition as a creative process requiring considerable learner initiative. The Audiolingual Method, with the concept of language learning as a set of habits which manipulates learners through mimicry, rote memorization, pattern-drill, and overlearning, was suddenly shaken and rejected due to its apparent limitations. Consequently, there was a strong consensus and awareness among linguists and educators to look for new alternatives (Bowen, Madsen, and Hilferty 1985:37-38).

The Council of Europe, in order to meet the increasing language needs of a great number of immigrants and guest workers pouring into Europe, adopted the semantic and communicative concepts of Wilkins' (1976) *Notional Syllabuses* at the first level of the communicative language syllabus. Along with the *Threshold Level English* of van EK and Alexander (1980), these scholars had exerted a significant impact on the development of CLT, especially in syllabus design (Richards and Rodgers 1986:6).

In Germany, philosopher Jurgen Habermas (1970) advocated the concept of communicative competence. Methodologists like Candlin (1978) led a systematic collection of classroom materials which were oriented toward learners' choice and increasing autonomy. Their exercises were designed to exploit a variety of social meanings (Savignon 1991:264).

In the United States, teaching materials adapted from the French CREDIF, *Voix et Visages de la France*, have included a collection of role plays, games, and other communicative activities. Teachers are encouraged to help learners participate in the negotiation of meaning. The use of interactive activities such as games, role play, pair work, and small-group work has gradually gained acceptance and is widely applied in language classroom (Savignon 1990:210). Richards and Rodgers (1986:65) have pointed out that the rapid utilization of newly designed textbooks, the equally rapid acceptance of the new ideas and principles set by English applied linguists and curriculum development centers, and the prominent support given by governments nationally and internationally have contributed to the formation of what is referred to as Communicative Language Teaching.

## **Theoretical Assumptions - "communicative competence" as goal**

### **1. Theory of Language**

In expressions of discontent with Chomsky's (1965) restricted linguistic theory, i.e. the distinction between "competence" and "performance", Hymes (1972) and other

linguists, such as Campbell and Wales (1970), proposed a broader notion of *communicative competence*. This redefinition (Canale and Swain 1980:4) included not only grammatical competence (implicit and explicit knowledge of the rules of grammar) but also contextual or sociolinguistic competence (knowledge of the rules of language use). Hymes believed that a speaker needs to know when to speak, how to speak, to whom to speak, and in what manner to speak in order to be communicatively competent. He claimed (1971), “there are rules of use without which the rule of grammar would be useless” (cited in Brumfit and Johnson 1979:14). Hymes’ notion of including the norms of appropriateness of an utterance within a sociocultural context has exerted great influence and prompted a number of reactions.

Halliday’s (1973) definition of language as “meaning potential” (Brumfit and Johnson 1979:25), which is similar to Hymes’ *communicative competence* and draws upon the systemic linguistic principles of Firth, focuses on the importance of semantic and pragmatic aspects of language (Morley 1991:83). His seven basic language functions — instrumental, regulatory, interactional, personal, heuristic, imaginative, and representational — are seen to be of great significance in understanding the theory of language and in pedagogical language teaching (Halliday 1975:11-17).

Widdowson’s work *Teaching Language as Communication* (1978) presents classical views, such as the distinction between language usage and language use, coherence, proposition and illocutionary force in discourse beyond the sentence level, and linguistic skills and communicative abilities. It sets forth many important principles and practices for language teachers with emphasis on the use of language for different purposes. However, it was Canale and Swain’s (1980) integrative model of *communicative competence*, upon which Canale expanded in 1983, that has had the most far-reaching influence and has been cited most frequently as a new “theoretical orthodoxy.” *Communicative competence* is defined as consisting of four essential components: *grammatical competence*, the knowledge and use of vocabulary, phonology and syntax; *sociolinguistic competence*, the knowledge of speech acts and the appropriate use of language; *discourse competence*, the ability to produce coherent and cohesive texts; and *strategic competence*, the ability to initiate, terminate, maintain, repair and redirect communication (Fiksdal 1992:578; Richards and Rodgers 1986:71).

Distinguished works such as Munby (1978), Littlewood (1981), Yalden (1983), Brumfit and Johnson (1979), Savignon (1983, 1990, 1991) and many others have all devoted and contributed, if somewhat eclectically, to the enrichment of the base of theoretical foundations on CLT. Overall, some salient features of the communicative view on *language* given by Richards and Rodgers (1986:71) are listed below:

1. Language is a system for the expression of meaning.

2. The primary function of language is for interaction and communication.
3. The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses.
4. The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse.

## 2. Theory of Learning

In contrast to the rich literature on the exploration of *language* theory, as Richards and Rodgers (1986) comment, literature on the dimension of *learning* theory concerning CLT is not as widely available. Those who do write on the subject elaborate on the conditions needed to enhance language learning rather than the processes of language acquisition. However, Richards and Rodgers suggest that “elements of an underlying learning theory can be discerned in some CLT practices” (1986:72). There are three elements that can contribute to the learning theory: 1) the communicative principle: activities that involve real communication promote learning; 2) the task principle: activities to be carried out in tasks promote learning; and 3) the meaningfulness principle: meaningful activities promote the learning process (Richards and Rodgers 1986:72). Savignon’s (1971) research, for example, can be seen as support for the learning theory. She found that learners who had been encouraged to ask for information, to seek clarification, to use circumlocution, to negotiate meaning, to take risks, and to stick to the communicative task, significantly surpassed learners who had no such practice (Savignon 1990:209-210). In her 1983 survey on second language acquisition, she discusses the role of linguistic, social, cognitive, and individual variables in language acquisition. Littlewood’s (1984) *learning* theory defines the acquisition of communicative competence in a language within the cognitive aspect (internalization) and the behavioral aspect (automation), and suggests practice as a way of developing fluent communicative skills (Littlewood 1984:74, cited in Richards and Rodgers 1986:72-73).

There do exist a few popular contemporary theories of second language learning which, though they may not have a direct connection, are in some way compatible with the principles of CLT. Among these, for example, are Krashen’s (1978, 1985) acquisition-learning and affective filter hypotheses, Schumann’s (1978) acculturation theory, and some recently changing views toward the earlier notion that speaking and writing were active skills and reading and listening were passive skills.

Krashen posits a hypothesis of the differentiation between *acquisition* and *learning* of linguistic knowledge. He refers to the former as a subconscious process in developing

the target-language system similar to children's acquiring their first language, and the latter as a conscious knowledge of the explicit grammatical rules and a state of being aware of these rules having resulted from instruction. Krashen's analysis as well as others' theories in second language acquisition particularly stress that the acquisition of language derives from using language communicatively rather than from practicing the separate language skills (Richards and Rogers 1986:72; Waldspurger 1989:2). Dulay and Burt (1977) and Krashen (1985) hold a view that the presence of an affective filter also plays an important role in determining the extent of language proficiency: a high filter impedes while a low filter enhances language acquisition. The humanistic view of lowering learners' anxiety, which is theoretically supported by psychology, seems to be accepted by the majority of researchers.

The valuable concepts from Schumann's (1978) acculturation model are useful for CLT learning theory. He holds that the success or failure in acquiring a second language lies in crucial social and psychological factors, whether positive or negative. Second-language learning can be facilitated if learners share a positive attitude or are culturally congruent or similar to the target language group. In this sense, it seems to be optimal to integrate cultural elements in foreign language classes.

There is a general consensus that language teaching and learning aims at developing the four basic skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. However, the traditional concept of dichotomy, which regards speaking and writing as active skills and listening and reading as passive skills, has changed. Today, learners, including listeners and readers, are seen to have actively participated in the negotiation of meaning. Savignon (1991:262) gives a very good example in which she says, "The interest of a football game lies not in the football, but the moves and strategies of the players as they fake, pass, and punt their way along the field." Similarly, the interest of learners lies in the interactive nature of communication: to interpret, to express, and to negotiate the meanings collaboratively.

While CLT defines itself in terms of an increasing need to focus on learners, an understanding of learners' motivation can be discerned from Gardner's (1988) distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation, and Deci's (1975) two powerful extreme-end concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Evidence can be found in an overwhelming body of research that learners who are motivated intrinsically display greater success in learning (Brown 1991:246-247). It is essential for language teachers to learn from research findings that learners need to be given ample opportunities to perform tasks, to use real-life language, and to use language meaningfully, purposefully, competently, and communicatively.

As Savignon (1991:265) comments, CLT can be seen "to derive from a

multidisciplinary perspective that includes, at least, linguistics, psychology, philosophy, sociology, and educational research.” Theories and practices are to be expanded and revised within the framework to achieve the goal of CLT “*communicative competence*”.

## II. General Principles of CLT

1. Language in communication is interactive, unpredictable, purposeful, creative, authentic, and related to the behavior of the participants and others. The goal of CLT is to help learners develop and acquire *communicative competence*. It focuses on the learners’ meaningful use of real language to communicate effectively and appropriately.

2. *Communicative competence* constitutes at least three components: grammatical competence (e.g. in Chomsky’s sense), sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence. In addition to these three components, discourse competence is defined by Canale and Swain (1980).

3. CLT focuses on the learners. It recognizes the learners’ needs and individual variation. Learners are given opportunities for self-investment in learning activities. They are encouraged to engage in unrehearsed discourse in real context, to transact communication of personal interest, and to interact and negotiate meaning on real topics by using real language in real situations.

4. CLT encourages learners to involve themselves actively and participate in task-based, content-centered, or goal-oriented activities such as discussion, problem-solving, role-playing, games, songs, pair and group work, information gap, and even assignment of communicative tasks outside the classroom.

5. CLT is a humanistic approach which emphasizes the importance of creating a low-anxiety classroom environment. Mistakes are not always considered to be mistakes (Morrow 1981:65). Learners are motivated to produce or are rewarded for producing real language, and thus immediate and direct error correction is not regarded as necessary. Learners’ performance is not judged on the basis of linguistic accuracy, but on the basis of accomplishing the task itself.

6. In CLT, teachers are less central. Basically, they have two main roles: to facilitate the communication process and to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group (Breen and Candlin 1980:99; cited in Richards and Rodgers 1986:77). The teacher may be a consultant to diagnose students’ language and communication needs; an informant to supply gaps in lexis, grammar, and strategy; a counselor to provide feedback; or a director or manager to proceed or organize learning settings for effective communicative activities.

7. The use of a variety of authentic materials supplemented by audio-visual programs and the seemingly flexible and open-ended curricula are prominent features of CLT.

8. A holistic teaching approach which presents “whole language” places equal importance on all four skills, although listening and speaking are critical and fluency is encouraged. CLT does not treat the language skills separately in the classroom (Whitley 1993:139).

### III. Advantages of CLT

1. **Enrichment and Comprehensiveness:** Richards and Rodgers (1986:83) comment that CLT is best described as an “approach” rather than a “method.” It is an approach because it generates principles and relationships between theory of the nature of language (theoretical linguistics), theory of the nature of language learning (applied linguistics), and theory of the nature of language teaching (educational linguistics). It differs from audiolingualism and other methods which specifically set a fixed model for practice universally. Yet it is clear that the goal of CLT is to achieve *communicative competence*. As Brumfit (1987:5) says, “Communicative language teaching thus becomes no more than the name for a shared set of general assumptions.” Moreover, the fact that CLT has no canonical texts and clearly defined boundaries is what some commentators have seen as one of its “greatest strengths” (1987:5). Richards and Rodgers (1986:83) see the merit of CLT as being that “there is much greater room for individual interpretation and variation than most methods permit.” As we analyze the development of CLT, we realize that it has incorporated a wide range of theories from linguistics, philosophy, sociology, psychology, anthropology, educational research, sociolinguistic and ethnographic perspectives on language and language use. As Howatt (1987:25) has said, CLT has adopted all the major principles of 19th century reform and has broadened extra dimensions to traditional progressive methodology. Many fundamental ideas of CLT derive from the traditional heritage of language teaching (e.g. learner autonomy, task orientation). On the other hand, various earlier traditions in language teaching continuously exist or find a place under the framework or umbrella of *communicative competence* (Mitchell 1987:109).

2. **Flexibility and Adaptability:** The lack of a rigid set of methodological procedures allows practitioners to interpret, adapt, and apply with more freedom in a relatively varied way. The widely diverse acceptance of CLT can be illustrated in Savignon’s example when she quotes Montaigne, “Without methods, without a book, without grammar or rules, without a whip and without tears, I had learned a Latin as proper



as that of my schoolmaster” (1983:47). Any device, as long as it helps promote learners’ acquisition of the target language, is not rejected. It tolerates language variation in the classroom, even to the extent of mixing mother tongue and target language use (Brumfit 1987:5). It also tolerates learners’ errors with a view that language is created by the individual often through trial (Finocchiaro and Brumfit 1983:91-93, cited in Richards and Rodgers 1986:68). The different developments of CLT with the common goal of bringing learners into closer contact with the target-language community — for instance, Howatt’s (1984) strong version and weak version and Stern’s (1981) L approach (L for linguistic) and P approach (P for psychological or pedagogic) — provide self-evident examples to illustrate the great flexibility of CLT (Howatt 1984:279; Stern 1981:141).

3. *Communicatively Competent Learners*: A number of writers have observed that many learners fail to communicate competently in the target language despite years of learning. They cannot utilize their learned intellectual knowledge of grammar when communicating. In other words, they are unable to transfer successfully their mechanical control of structural patterns to real-life situations (Taylor 1987:45-55). The inability to communicate appropriately and effectively is vividly expressed by Newmark’s (1966) famous example of “asking for a light from a stranger.” He criticizes a methodology that produces the “structurally competent student — the one, that is, who has developed the ability to produce grammatically correct sentences - yet who is unable to perform a simple communicative task” (cited in Johnson 1981:1). The result of traditional teaching methods which exclusively teach students how to “form” correctly seems to lack “something else” as Johnson comments (1981:2). In CLT, the ability to be grammatical is important, but is only a part of *communicative competence* (Johnson 1981, Allright 1979, Brumfit 1981, cited in Taylor 1987:46). The most significant contribution of CLT is that it has incorporated both old and new insights. The content and goal of CLT have expanded to help learners acquire the whole language, not only the knowledge of the “mastery of language structure” but also the “meanings” and “uses.” It is the combination of “form” and “function.”

4. *Humanistic View*: One of the weaknesses of the Audiolingual Approach, which was criticized most by researchers and many who have experienced the method, is the absence of humanism. Learners are seen as stimulus-response mechanisms whose learning is a direct product of repetitive practice (Long and Richards 1987:150). Learners very quickly become bored and lose much of their motivation. Communicative Language Teaching, on the other hand, respects and treats students as creative “language learners and users,” not mechanically excessive drillers. They are given human dignity and freedom from artificiality, affective filter, and wasted effort of learning (Stevick

1990:131-135). Communicative Language Teaching concerns stress reduction and rapprochement in the classroom. Humanism is embodied in its essential concept of learner-centeredness. Learners are seen as active participants and are given ample opportunities to interact and negotiate meanings with partners. The judicious use of native language, the tolerance of trial and error, the selection of topics based on learners' interests, the encouragement given to promote fluency (product), and the shared experience of learning fully reflect the humanistic aspects of CLT.

5. Practical and Meaningful Communicatively-Oriented Activity: Howatt (1987:25) comments that "the most significant change that CLT has brought to the classroom has been the inclusion of communicative activities in the repertoire of practice exercises." Communicative Language Teaching is characterized by its rich kinds of alternative activities for learners to do in the classroom. Johnson's (1982:163-175) five principles for designing communicative activities are particularly influential. Among the five, research findings reveal that the jigsaw principle and information gap are probably the most effective and useful pedagogical techniques (Taylor 1987:53; Pica 1988:76). In the jigsaw principle, according to Johnson (1982), two or more students work with different bits of information to accomplish a task. It is used primarily in group activities which are of a task-oriented or problem-solving nature. Different students engage in different sub-tasks, and then all students need to pool their information before they are able to jointly complete the final task (Taylor 1987:53). The definition of information gap given by Johnson (1982) is that the speaker/writer must convey information to a native receiver — someone who does not know in advance the context of what is being said or written. According to Pica's classroom-observation study, information gap activities as a way to encourage participants to negotiate toward mutual understanding have shown "significantly greater amounts of negotiation than had been found in the decision-making activities of both group-work and teacher-directed interaction" (1988:76). CLT's communicatively-oriented activities are thus extremely beneficial.

6. Contextualized and Authentic Teaching Materials: The notion of using natural language in real communication, which places emphasis on developing skills of discourse in real-life contexts, is believed to have direct impact on CLT's use and selection of authentic materials in the classroom. Howatt (1987:25) concludes that CLT "emphasizes the value of authentic (spoken and written) texts and the importance of choosing texts which suit the needs and interests of learners." The use of real language implies the requirement of "authenticity" for language materials which are, in a loose sense, as close an approximation as possible to the world outside the classroom (McDonough and Shaw 1993:43). From this perspective, the use of authentic materials has a wide range of resources, including journals, periodicals, lectures, airport announcements,

magazine articles, newspaper reports, TV and radio interviews, road signs, and other texts actually encountered in real-life situations. In addition, CLT also encourages the use of lively audio-visual programs as a supplementary aid which enriches the teaching materials as well as promotes the interest, enjoyment, and motivation of learners.

#### **IV. Problems and Implications**

Communicative Language Teaching has been hailed as an innovation or a revolution. It has made significant advances in the field of language teaching, particularly at the levels of syllabus design and pedagogy. There are a number of studies which report that CLT helps language teachers to maximize learners' potential in the classroom (e.g. Kumaravadivelu 1993:12-21; Savignon 1991:264-265). However, there is a limited body of research which discusses CLT's implications from various perspectives. In this section, focus is given to problems with CLT and further possible implications. Hopefully, with an understanding of the practical implications of CLT, we will have a sense, as Whitley (1993:142) comments, that "the communicative innovation has not been disseminated and implemented," and possibly find ways to bridge the gap between the theory and practice, thus promoting CLT to greater success. The following are synthesized samples of reactions:

1. A Potential Threat to Non-Native Speaking Teacher: Because of the dynamic, spontaneous, unrehearsed, and unpredictable nature of the CLT approach which requires language teachers to be highly proficient in the target language including an understanding of the sociocultural elements, Brown (1987:213) claims that one of the disadvantages of CLT is that non-native speaking teachers who are not competent in the second language may feel uncomfortable and inadequate in departing from the earlier or more traditional teaching methods which they are accustomed to. These same views are expressed by Richards and Rodgers (1986:79). Burnaby and Sun have documented a typical response from a Mainland Chinese teacher as follows, "If I am asked to give more explanations on the language and cultural differences, it's impossible for me" (1989:228). Lu (1987:33) records another Mainland Chinese teacher's response as, "I have studied English for 50 years; but my English, being out of practice, is unnatural and halting" (cited in Anderson 1993:477). Consequently, it is also often difficult for non-native teachers to create an English-speaking atmosphere in the classroom. In addition to language proficiency, as we can imagine, lack of or limited knowledge of appropriate cultural contexts and relevant sociolinguistic aspects indeed also poses great difficulties for non-native speaking teachers. Nevertheless, as suggested by Brown (1987:213), teachers

can overcome these difficulties by taking advantage of technology, such as films, videos, television, audio tapes and computer software.

2. A Tendency Toward Fluency at the Expense of Accuracy: Brumfit (1984:50-68) and Brown (1987:213) have raised their concerns over the consequences resulting from overemphasis on fluency due to the demand that a great deal of authentic and spontaneous language be used. In Brumfit's (1984:50-57) proposition, "accuracy" is generally not problematic, though "fluency" is. Morrow (1979:145) sees it as a question of quantity versus quality. Wilkins (1990:540) charges that it is wrong to concentrate attention on linguistic product rather than the right sort of process. Richards and Rodgers (1986:79) believe that "the focus on fluency and comprehensibility in Communicative Language Teaching may cause anxiety among teachers." The findings of Savignon's (1972) experimental study of college students reveal that integrative motivation significantly drops when emphasis is put on getting one's meaning across rather than on grammaticality (cited in Canale and Swain 1980:11). Scholars of proficiency-oriented instruction argue that accuracy suffers if errors are ignored entirely, and show concern that the inaccurate language due to the reinforcement for content alone could lead to fossilization (Whitley 1993:140-141). The two extreme-end attitudes or split views on the subject of fluency/accuracy reveal another aspect of the implications entailed in CLT.

3. A Different Attitude of Teachers Toward Error Correction: The insight that errors are a natural and inevitable part of the learning process highlights an important shift away from conventional behaviorist psychology. Theoretically influenced by the concepts of interlanguage, the learners' mistakes are rectified in the normal course of the learning process. This is to say that learners, under the notion of mistake-making, are allowed to try their hand and make mistakes (Parkinson and Maher 1987:129). In order to encourage students to use and produce real language, an immediate and direct error correction is regarded as inappropriate according to the principles of CLT. Nevertheless, there is a great disparity between the new concepts and practice in the classroom. Gerngross and Puchta (1983) have reported that a common teacher attitude appears to be that errors must be corrected directly and immediately (Savignon and Berns 1983:101). Richards and Rodgers (1986:79) have observed some teachers who are "accustomed to seeing error suppression and correction as the major instructional responsibility, and who see their primary function as preparing learners to take standardized or other kinds of tests." Stone (1961:126) aims his comments at teachers who have failed to respond to the change, "(They) have acted as if their chief task were to keep students from using incorrect English, rather than to help them use English more effectively." Apparently, a change in teachers' attitudes and an awareness of when and what strategies are to be used are very important in handling students' errors appropriately.

and effectively. This area deserves teachers' special attention and additional research.

4. Absence of An Explicit and Fixed Set of Methodological Procedures: The theoretical foundations of CLT, as noted earlier, have incorporated a number of insights of the rich heritage of British notional-functional approaches (e.g. Wilkins 1976), such as sociolinguistic research, linguistics, and psychology. It is somewhat unlike other methods -- the Direct Method and the Audiolingual Method for instance -- which have a specific set of procedures to follow. Communicative Language Teaching, as Omaggio (1993:105) says, "represents a repertoire of teaching ideas rather than a fixed set of methodological procedures." And as such, CLT is not easily defined and tends to get teachers confused and frustrated. In Anderson's (1993:478) survey, Mainland Chinese teachers have complained about the absence of "an explicit syllabus model" which could give them a sense of security in teaching. Morley (1991:96) comments, "The openness of this approach to variation and the charge of unprincipled eclecticism has been a major criticism."

5. A Shortage of Appropriate Teaching Materials and Supports in Some Countries: According to Richards and Rodgers (1986:79-80), there are three kinds of materials currently used in CLT: 1) text-based -- such as Morrow and Johnson's *Communicate* (1979), Watcyn-Jones' *Pair Work* (1981), Malaysian *English Language Syllabus* (1975), and *Interaction* (1990); 2) task-based -- a variety of games, role plays, simulations, and jigsaws; and 3) realia -- the use of signs, magazines, advertisements, and newspapers, the so-called authentic and real-life materials. The selection of textbooks, the adoption of games, and the adaptation of realia to be used in the classroom may seem not to be a problem for Western countries, since materials are readily at hand. However, in some countries, as Morrow (1979:141) states, "there exists a considerable imbalance between the resources available to language teachers (at least in E.F.L.) in terms of teaching materials." For instance in Mainland China, the lack of appropriate texts and materials are major drawbacks (Anderson 1993:473). It would be impossible or a burden for some non-native speaking teachers to obtain or produce teaching materials which constitute authentic and meaningful real-life language since they have few or no channels to get those resources. Also, the needed facilities to support the CLT, such as audio and video equipment, are not available. Burnaby and Sun (1989:230) witness that "some were shocked at how wastefully foreign teachers used equipment such as photocopiers." Implications also include the questions of the authenticity of text-based materials in particular and the suitability for students of various levels. Pica's (1988:74) research, which is based on twenty adult ESL classroom observations, points out that observers "were surprised to find so little negotiation" in many popular textbooks designed to provide functional use of English.

6. A Potential Problem of Classroom Management: An increasing number of reports has shown that classroom management is quite problematic. Nolasco and Arthur (1986) indicate that one of the reasons for teachers' resistance to adopting CLT is discipline problems (cited in McDonough and Shaw 1993:238). Pica concludes that "some group members dominated decision-making (activity), while other students said very little. As a result, many group participants had little motivation to contribute to the decision and little necessity to make their meanings understood" (1988:75). Studies of Markham (1987), Chau and Chung (1987), and Anderson (1993) have indicated that part of the students' problems derives from the fear of participating in interactive activities which seem unpredictable and unmanageable to them. It is interesting to note that some Mainland Chinese students, for instance, react negatively to CLT because they do not like to engage in conversations or play communication games. They think games are not serious studies. On many occasions, they insist on taking conventional exams. When teachers continued to use the innovative way, students would be absent from the class (Anderson 1993:472-473). Apparently, the traditional approach which places no emphasis on real language use can account for their limited ability in communicative activities. Also, it deserves our attention that, in Mainland China, a class normally consists of an average of 50-70 students. Many researchers agree that this is not an ideal size, since it is very likely to jeopardize the effectiveness of small-group activities. Teachers would be exhausted, as Markham (1987:218) says, in their attempts "to help the students stay on task by directing all their chatter into proper channels." Problems go beyond the above-mentioned. Pica's analysis reveals that "there was an unequal distribution of responsibilities between teachers and students during activities." In other words, the teachers may speak too much and the students may not have opportunities to ask for clarification or seek confirmation of what they heard (1988:75). Other pitfalls may include students using their native language in pair discussions, time constraints, noise problems, or overzealousness causing problems of class control, etc. (Green 1993:1-10)

7. Testing and Evaluation: How to establish and measure the communicative competence of the learners is another challenge. Researchers generally agree that it is extremely hard to construct competence-oriented tests which are valid, reliable and practical. According to Wilkins (1990:546), implications of testing communicative competence involve at least two areas: 1) constructing the tests: they tend to be more elaborate and cumbersome than multiple-choice tests and consequently are more difficult to administer; 2) evaluating the performance: assessments of performance are partly subjective and therefore may not reach the levels of scorer reliability that characterize more objective tests. Morrow (1979) states that "a test which perfectly satisfies criteria

of content, construct or concurrent validity may nonetheless fail to show in any interesting way how well a candidate can perform in or use the target language” (cited in Brumfit and Johnson 1979:147). In sum, other reactions include the criticism that the CLT approach is more difficult to evaluate than other approaches (Anderson 1993:473). Also, mention is made of the frustration, for instance, expressed by U. S. educators that teachers are under pressure to teach their students to do well on the existing large-scale standardized or multiple-choice tests (Savignon 1990:211). This is particularly true with Mainland Chinese teachers, where they are under greater pressure from both the school administrations and the students to teach test-taking skills in order to cope with the acute competition surrounding the college entrance examination (Burnaby and Sun 1989:228). Teachers are also reported, particularly in Asian countries such as Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Japan, to have the same problems and pressures due to their countries’ special examination systems. Tests of this kind seldom contain the characteristics of real language in use. The implications for communicative testing seem to be very pragmatic. The contents and settings of the tests are always in a range of artificiality (Wesche 1987:377), which is also one of the areas to be criticized for lacking authenticity.

8. Vague Notion of CLT: “What is meant by CLT?” If we are asked to consider this question carefully, we probably have different definitions by different researchers. Communicative Language Teaching represents a philosophy in language teaching and learning which stresses the importance of language use. The goal of communicative competence seems to be very broad and elusive. Some teachers see “communicative” as somehow being opposed to traditional teaching techniques (Schulz 1986:187-193, cited in Whitley 1993:144). Wolf and Riordan (1991:471-478) report that most teachers they visited do not have a clear and concrete picture of CLT. They also observed that teachers continue to rely on traditional or idiosyncratic approaches in the classroom (cited in Whitley 1993:137). In Howatt’s (1984) sense, CLT has a weak and a strong version: the former is described as “learning to use” English, the latter is defined as “using English to learn it” (cited in Richards and Rodgers 1986:66). The strong version, which requires teachers and students to use the target language, is very likely to pose difficulty for non-native learners. A study by Chau and Chung (1987:47) indicates that the most crucial factor affecting the use of CLT is “students’ English proficiency.” In reviewing the different perceptions among researchers as well as the widespread confusion in the publishing market (Whitley 1993:142), it is not surprising to see why teachers ask “what’s going on?” From this perspective, CLT appears to be more understandable if it is taken loosely, in a non-English speaking environment, to reflect the views of the majority of teachers who define and apply an approach that encourages students to communicate through real communication.

## V. Some Suggestions

1. Equal Emphasis on Language Usage and Language Use: Language is used not only in interpersonal communication, but also for the conceptualization of thoughts, ideas, beliefs, and desires that individuals communicate to one another. Linguistic skills like lexis and grammar are considered to be the means through which the learners realize the ideational and interpersonal functions of language. Widdowson (1978) makes a distinction between language usage and language use, in which he defines language usage to mean the language system and language use to mean the manifestation of that system. Some practitioners may have misinterpreted these terms. Utterances convey messages. Language behavior is the production of utterances in contexts for specific purposes. It is impossible to separate language usage and language use, since they are both necessary for a complete description of language behavior.

Widdowson (1978:3) contends, "we are generally required to use our knowledge of the language system in order to achieve some kind of communicative purpose. That is to say, we are generally called upon to produce instances of language use" (cited in Berns 1990:93-94). From this perspective, the heated debate of whether it is more important to teach form or function seems to have little or no significance.

There are a number of articles that have discussed issues of communicative function and grammar (e.g. Kirkpatrick 1985:171-191; Melrose and Melrose 1989:41-52; Johnson 1992:180-189). Arguments tend to support the idea that grammar is a necessary but not a sufficient component of language proficiency. Communicative Language Teaching, under Widdowson's discourse concept, bears some resemblance to the Direct Method and the Natural Approach, for learners learn best by doing, by using the language, and not simply by learning about it (Berns 1990:92-95). It is believed that focus on use of language in the classroom has resulted in greater attention to cognitive skills. In language teaching, the grammar-based and communicative approaches are often complementary. Communicative teaching has the advantage of helping learners develop cross-cultural awareness and learn communicative strategies. The most effective instructions seem to be those which combine language usage and language use successfully (Valette 1993:173-178).

2. Suitable and Multilevel Textbook Design and Production: There has been a wide variety of teaching materials used to direct and support CLT. Among them, realia are readily and easily available from real life as long as teachers have creativity and are willing to use them. Magazines and newspapers, for instance, are a rich source of obtaining authentic materials. Realia do not have a standard or a fixed form. However, text-based and task-based materials are usually presented in the form of textbooks which



include a teacher's book, student's book, and accompanying audio or visual programs. Due to their systematic gradation and sequencing, teachers in particular may find them helpful in providing guidelines and resources for conducting language teaching. Research has shown, as reported by Gerngross and Puchta (1983:86), that textbooks are essential factors in influencing what goes on in the classroom. However, many textbooks, which have been promoted as encouraging the goal of *communicative competence*, do not always manifest the principles and features of CLT. Many of the communication activities, for instance, as pointed out by Rossner, are artificially created and not relevant to learners' lives. A whole critical dimension of communication is missing (1987:160). In addition, currently published textbooks are mostly designed for the use of novice-low to intermediate-high level learners in native contexts. The apparent inadequacy of advanced-level textbooks in the marketplace seems to pose a potential problem particularly for non-native teachers. For example, some fluent commentaries on social issues or on literature require high levels of proficiency. Also there is an increasing demand to address the need to develop materials for regional non-native learners (e.g. Kirkpatrick 1985 for Mandarin speakers in Singapore) and for special language-learning groups such as scientists (e.g. Light 1985:56). I believe that good textbooks suitable for various purposes and different levels are important and influential for the implementation and effectiveness of CLT. The English threshold-level specification of Van Ek and Alexander (1980), in which they use Wilkin's (1976) concept of a notional syllabus as a basis, has served as the model for descriptions of a number of European languages (Berns 1990:80-81). Other examples like Savignon and Berns' (1983) proposal for a set of materials *English Around the World* for Japanese learners based on Savignon's interactional approach, and Prabhu's (1987) communicational language teaching project set in the context of South India and based on Widdowson's discourse-based approach, may provide some insights and directions for the future design and production of materials (Berns 1990:106-109 and 133-164).

However, the production of textbooks, which incorporates theories into a variety of teaching contexts, is not an easy task. It requires that all levels of experts and people get involved. The involvement of publishers is particularly important. As publishers in the U.K. and U.S. have demonstrated in recent years, they have influence and are regarded as the powerful impulse behind promoting the communicative movement. One would hope that in the future: 1) more international as well as local publishers begin to dedicate themselves to the improvement of communicative materials; 2) the content of materials is kept free from distortion or bias against sex, race, and religion, such as portraying women as weak and inferior; and 3) language theorists, educators, teachers, writers, publishers, and learners learn to work together to determine, specify,

and design materials that are relevant and fulfill the real needs of different targets and levels of learners both in native and nonnative contexts.

3. The Non-linguistic Aspect in Teacher Training and Education: Despite rich resources on the theory of CLT, one of the major obstacles to the effective use of this approach comes from teacher training and education. Teacher education programs, as Richards (1990:3) indicates, typically include a knowledge base, drawn from linguistics and language-learning theory, and a practical component, based on language teaching methodology and opportunity for practice teaching. However, somewhat limited success of such programs has been reported. Freeman (1989:27) has pointed out that “language teacher education has become fragmented; too often, its efforts focus on ancillary areas such as applied linguistics, methodology, or language acquisition while overlooking the core —teaching itself.” An ad hoc program, which serves only short-term goals, particularly lacks a practical component for trainees. Effective teacher education, either preservice or inservice, should include not only language but also pedagogy and culture. In particular, the training of the non-linguistic strategies, as emphasized by Hoekje and Williams (1992:263), is more important than the narrow sense of language skill training. Due to trainees’ lack of classroom experience, these trainees need such strategies to help overcome their fear of classroom silence, the pressure of keeping up pacing, the difficulty of exercising independent judgement, and the inadequacy of a teaching task. The need to take trainees’ feelings and belief systems into consideration suggests that future training programs and teacher education should focus more on confidence building and ability to cope with a variety of teaching contexts. Bailey (1984) has documented in her study that the international teaching assistant (ITA) rated best by students was not the one who had perfect language skills. On the contrary, the popularity of this ITA was his exceptional pedagogical and interpersonal skills which made him overcome his language problems (cited in Hoekje and Williams 1992:259). The framework of *communicative competence* in which sociolinguistic strategies have been emphasized can serve as a guideline to meet trainees’ needs. Of course, the success of such training programs depends on many other factors, such as adequately trained trainers, the attitude and policy of educational institutions which have a budget adequate to cover the high cost, and sufficient human resources to support teacher education on a permanent basis.

4. Fuller Cross-Cultural Research and Research on Testing: As we endeavor to deal as adequately as possible with CLT, we need vigorous research agenda to closely examine, shape, support, and refine a number of related issues. As claimed by Casmir (1994:131), individuals and language systems are two components which make sense of the processes human beings develop when communicating. We need to investigate,

for instance, the role of teachers and students; the relationships between instructional processes and learning results; the causes of discrepancy in value systems that students and teachers ascribe to CLT differently. It has been pointed out by Hartzell (1988:384) that there is a higher, or more complex, level of communication, which is considerably beyond the direct correspondence from one language to another. For instance, there are so many Chinese words and expressions for which we are unable to find true equivalents in English and vice versa (Hartzell 1988:385-435). He further argues that “one’s language skills is (are) not always tantamount to improving one’s communications skills” (1988:384). In this sense, it seems to be necessary for us to look into individuals’ ways of looking at the world, approaches to problem solving, formations of concepts, etc. The complex functions and different conceptions of English used across cultures suggest that teaching and learning English in British or American contexts presents only an incomplete picture. Further in-depth cross-cultural research on the relationships of the English language system and regional norms is vital for a better understanding of the problems and solutions. The other research area, which has been and always will be a central concern in our profession, is testing. It deserves further research into areas, such as its implications and applicability for school settings, effect on instruction, and making tests “more” communicative (Wesche 1987:389).

5. Changing Attitudes — Recognition and Acceptance of Variation: Maley (1984:159) points out, “at least 90% of the contexts for teaching ESL/EFL in the world are of a non-innovatory, traditional type. We (westerners) are a tiny minority. The vast majority of teachers of English throughout the world are either ignorant of or unconcerned by (with) the issues which so inflame us.” We probably have never thought that some non-native learners view our “method (as) ridiculous and inappropriate” (Anderson 1993:473). It seems true that a lag or gap inevitably exists in the introduction of new insights and their practical applications.

It has been brought to our attention that an increasing amount of research has expressed concern about the potential difficulties in implementing goals of *communicative competence* specifically from the non-Anglo-Saxon culturally oriented countries (e.g. Sano 1984 for Japan; Shen 1989 for Mainland China, Lai 1993 for Hong Kong, Valdes 1991 for Cuba). Since teachers encounter failures and students do not have a pressing need and opportunity to spontaneously use English, such goals seem irrelevant and too distant for them. In light of such a reality, Shaw’s (1992:9-25) insight, in which he perceives that “Both nonnative and native speakers of a language vary in their knowledge and control of the elements of communicative competence,” is helpful in adjusting our attitudes toward recognizing and accepting the diversity particularly in non-native contexts. According to him, some elements of communicative competence

are “universal” and available to all speakers of all languages, while others are “culture-specific” and not equally available to all speakers (1992:9). Firth (1935 [1957]:29) rejects a monolithic view of language, believing that “unity is the last concept that should be applied” (cited in Berns 1990:11). I hold the same view and see that the viability of CLT lies in the recognition that it cannot be conceived of in monolithic terms or be understood and imitated in an exclusive British or North American model. It is an encouraging sign that scholars, for example, Brumfit (1991:1-9), have identified the problems and called for the tolerance of language variation in the classroom. As mentioned earlier, the lack of uniformity of CLT is a significant advantage. Communicative Language Teaching will lend itself well to responsiveness and flexibility. It will be able to accommodate the diversity of contexts in which languages are taught and used. It is feasible and predictable that CLT moves and evolves into a culturally and socially responsive language teaching which does not dictate or prescribe a syllabus type, teaching materials, or models of teaching methodology (Berns 1990:103, 169). It has become apparent that the practice of CLT currently found, for instance, in Japan, West Germany, India (Berns 1990:50-68), and Taiwan (Liou 1992) is evidence of two significant dimensions: 1) CLT has the potential to meet different needs of different situations; 2) CLT reflects and is evolving into a new orientation: the acceptance of diversity or variation.

## **VI. Prospects of CLT in Taiwan, ROC**

In Taiwan, for example, the level of linguistic and pedagogical sophistication is, unfortunately, unsatisfactory. For many teachers, the “traditional” Grammar-Translation Approach is the only practical way of teaching. This approach places heavy reliance on the written text, and makes little demand on the teacher’s proficiency in the target language. It requires intensive grammatical and translation work on the part of the student, and pays little or no attention to pronunciation, oral production or listening comprehension. The needs of the students are ignored and meaningful communication is discouraged.

For some teachers in Taiwan, the now outmoded and somewhat discredited Audiolingual Approach would be considered an innovation in the ESL/EFL area. The Direct Method is impossible because teachers themselves do not have the proficiency necessary to impart the language skills to their students. In addition to Grammar Translation, the Reading Approach is used exclusively, because it requires relatively little allocation of time in an otherwise very crowded curriculum. Nevertheless, people

still seem to be learning English. This undoubtedly results from strong motivation on the part of students as well as educators using English as a lingua franca in academic as well as commercial environments. The spread of English as a world language is nowhere better demonstrated than in Taiwan, where the teaching of English for special purposes, specifically for business and technology, is very much valued and in great demand.

Despite the comparatively unsophisticated level of instruction and of teacher education in Taiwan, there is cause for hope. A new professionalism is beginning to emerge among teachers and renewed curiosity and diligence among students. The newly-established organization of Teachers of English, affiliated with the American TESOL, is bringing teachers at all levels together to share ideas, competence and knowledge. The Ministry of Education has recognized this need and is supporting it in a number of ways. Teacher-education programs such as those at National Taiwan Normal University and National Chengchi University are beginning to exert great influence throughout the country. Faint tinglings are beginning to develop into a rising enthusiasm for improvement. The ideas contained in CLT are slowly being disseminated. Although there is a danger of resistance from more conservative sources of the educational establishment, and although some of the ideas contained in CLT — e.g. learner centeredness, interaction, negotiation of meaning, etc. — may be difficult to accept by a traditional Chinese society, the emerging professionalism among teachers promises to have an important impact on the teaching and learning of English and in education as a whole.

It is to be wished that the CLT Approach, with its emphasis on real, authentic communication, will provide the kind of cross-cultural communication and mutual educational exchange among the people of Taiwan, the U.S., and the rest of the world, which is needed for international understanding and, eventually, world peace.

## VII. Conclusion

The introduction of the concept of *communicative competence* as the goal of second-and-foreign language teaching has resulted in an innovation, which differs greatly with the traditional teaching methods. The contributions of CLT are its general principles which govern students' interactions. CLT maximizes students' potential and helps them move from passive to active mastery of language.

As changes in our living surroundings continue to accelerate the world toward a global village, far more complex interpersonal skills are required by individuals to

interact when communicating in a variety of contexts. Conventional approaches for teaching and learning English — for example, the Grammar-Translation Method and the Audiolingual Method — do not emphasize the function of English as a medium for international communication. Hartzell (1988:379) has identified language difficulties for Chinese students stating that they “translate what their ears hear into their own language as part of the comprehension process.” Apparently, the biggest disadvantage of the Grammar-Translation Method is its side effect of turning students’ minds, in Hartzell’s words, “in the translation mode” (1988:379). The Audiolingual Method, which has prevailed as equally important as the Grammar-Translation Method, particularly in Taiwan (Lin 1992:17-110) and Japan (Berns 1990:7), has shown limitations, since it does not significantly improve the students’ communicative abilities either.

The concepts of “*communicative competence*” and “*language as communication*” in CLT have gained a wide range of attention in Asian countries for quite some time (e.g. Kuo 1985 for Taiwan; Burnaby and Sun 1989 for Mainland China; Keitges 1987 for Japan; Eskey 1989 for Thailand). As generally agreed upon by language specialists, however, the major obstacle to changes in language teaching is the current system of college entrance examinations. Unless change is made in the examination system, CLT will never be fully adopted at all levels of language courses in these countries, at least for the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, the increasing needs of internationalization, which require the ability to use English in a world context, will no doubt gain consensus and momentum to promote the communicative movement.

As language teachers, we should have a sense of responsibility and commitment to continuously improve our language teaching. We need to be more competent and sensitive about students’ achievement goals and have a better sense of what constitutes a well-taught language course. Communicative Language Teaching, with its interdependency of individuals, language, culture, and society, will serve as a guideline or framework, which is sufficiently flexible and adequately responsive, to be adopted in diverse language-teaching and learning contexts. This paper is concerned with the propagation and development of CLT as we approach the 21st century. It is hoped that a brief look at CLT and a discussion of its advantages and implications will attract more responses and wise suggestions.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, Jan. 1993. "Is a communicative approach practical for teaching English in China? Pros and cons." System 21(4):471-479.
- Bailey, K. M. 1984. "A typology of teaching assistants." In K. M. Bailey, F. Pialorsi, and J. Zukowski/Faust (eds.), Foreign Teaching Assistants in U.S. Universities, Washington, D.C.: NAFAA. 110-125.
- Berns, Margie. 1990. Contexts of Competence: Social and Cultural Considerations in Communicative Language Teaching, New York and London: Plenum Press.
- Bowen, J. Donald, Harold Madsen, and Ann Hilferty. 1985. TESOL Techniques and Procedures, Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1987. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Second Edition, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Regents.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1991. "TESOL at twenty-five: What are the issues?" TESOL Quarterly 25(2):245-260.
- Brumfit, Christopher. 1984. Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The Role of Fluency and Accuracy, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Brumfit, Christopher. 1987. "Applied linguistics and communicative language teaching." In Robert. B. Kaplan (Editor-in-Chief), Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 8. Cambridge University Press. 3-13.
- Bumfit, Christopher. 1991. "Teaching communicative competence." Franco-British Studies 11(Spring):1-9.
- Brumfit, Christopher. J. and Keith Johnson (eds.). 1979. The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burnaby, Barbara and Yilin Sun. 1989. "Chinese teacher's views of western language teaching: Context informs paradigms." TESOL Quarterly 23(2):219-238.
- Campbell, Robin and Roger Wales. 1970. "The study of language acquisition." In John Lyons (ed.), New Horizons in Linguistics, Harmondsworth, U.K.: Penguin Books. 242-260.
- Canale, Michael and Merrill Swain. 1980. "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing." Applied Linguistics 1(1):1-47.
- Canale, Michael. 1983. "From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy." In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt (eds.), Language and Communication, New York: Longman. 2-27.
- Candlin, Christopher. 1978. The Communicative Teaching of English: Principles and An Exercise Typology, London: Langenscheidt-Longman.
- Casimir, Fred L. (ed.). 1994. Building Communication Theories: A Socio/Cultural Approach, Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chau, Lai-mui and Choi-man Chung. 1987. "Diploma in education graduates' attitude towards communicative language teaching." Chinese University Education 15(2):45-51. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. Syntactic Structures, The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1959. "Review of Skinner's verbal behavior." Language 35:26-58.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Cambridge, MA.: M.I.T. Press.
- Deci, Edward L. 1975. Intrinsic Motivation, New York: Plenum Press.
- Dulay, Heidi and Marina Burt. 1977. "Remarks on creativity in language acquisition." In Marina

- Burt, Heidi Dulay, and Mary Finocchiaro (eds.), Viewpoints on English as a Second Language. New York: Regents.
- Eskey, David. 1989. "ESL in the 21st century." PASSA 19(2):8-12.
- Fiksdal, Susan. 1992. "Book review: Developing communicative competence in a second language." Robin C. Scarcella, Elaine S. Anderson, and Stephen D. Krashen (eds.). 1990. New York: Newbury House. TESOL Quarterly 26(3):576-578.
- Firth, J. R. 1935. "The technique of semantics." In J. R. Firth (1957) pp. 7-33. (Reprinted from Transactions of the Philological Society, 36-72).
- Firth, J. R. 1957. Papers in Linguistics 1934-1951. London: Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, Donald. 1989. "Teacher training, development, and decision making: A model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education." TESOL Quarterly 23(1):27-45.
- Gardner, Robert C. 1988. "The socio-educational model of second language learning: Assumptions, findings, and issues." Language Learning 38(1):101-126.
- Gerngross, G. and H. Puchta. 1983. "Beyond notions and functions: Language teaching or the art of letting go." In Sandra J. Savignon and Margie S. Berns (eds.), Studies in Language Learning 4(2):85-103.
- Green, John M. 1993. "Student attitudes toward communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together?" The Modern Language Journal 77(1):1-10.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1970. "Toward a theory of communicative competence." Inquiry 13:360-375.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1973. "Toward a sociological semantics." Chapter 4 on Exploration in the Functions of Language. London: Edward Arnold. 64-94.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1975. Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hartzell, Richard W. 1988. Harmony in Conflict. Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China: Caves Books, Ltd.
- Hoekje, Barbara and Jessica Williams. 1992. "Communicative competence and the dilemma of international teaching assistant education." TESOL Quarterly 26(2):243-269.
- Howatt, A. P. R. 1984. A History of English Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howatt, A. P. R. 1987. "From structural to communicative." In Robert B. Kaplan (Editor-in-Chief), Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 8. Cambridge University Press. 14-29.
- Hymes, D. H. 1972. "On communicative competence." In J. B. Pride and Janet Holmes (eds.), Sociolinguistics: Selected readings. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin. 269-293.
- Johnson, Helen. 1992. "Defossilizing." ELT Journal 46(2):180-189.
- Johnson, Keith. 1981. "Some background, some key terms, and some definitions." In Keith Johnson and Keith Morrow (eds.), Communication in the Classroom. Harlow, U.K.: Longman Group Ltd. 1-12.
- Johnson, Keith. 1982. Communicative Syllabus Design and Methodology. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Keitges, David J. 1987. "Language proficiency interview testing: An overview." In Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richards (eds.), Methodology in TESOL. London: Newbury House. 396-406.
- Kirkpatrick, T. A. 1985. "The role of communicative language teaching in secondary schools—with special reference to teaching in Singapore." In Bikram K. Das (ed.), Selected Papers



A New Look at Communicative Language Teaching: Prospects for Taiwan, ROC

- from the RELC Seminar on Communicative Language Teaching, Singapore, April 23-27, 1984. Singapore: Singapore University Press. 171-194.
- Kumaravadizelu, B. 1993. "Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom." English Language Teaching 47(1):12-21.
- Kuo, Zhi-hua. 1985. "A profile of communicative competence and communicative language teaching." In Ching-chi Chen, et al. (eds.), Papers from The Second Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China: The Crane Publishing Co. 279-295.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1978. "The monitor model for second-language acquisition." In R. Gingsras (ed.), Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching, Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Kashen, Stephen D. 1985. The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications, New York: Longman.
- Lai, Cecilia. 1993. "Communication failure in the language classroom: An exploration of causes." Research Report 25:i-49. City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, Department of English.
- Light, Richard. 1985. "TESOL and approaches to the development of communicative proficiency." In Arnulfo G. Ramirez (ed.), Teaching Languages in College: Communicative Proficiency and Cross-Cultural Issues, 1(Spring):44-60. Albany, New York: State University of New York.
- Lin, Bo-ying. 1992. "An experimental study of how to utilize the student-centered concept of individualization into the selective English Listening and Speaking Lab Course." Unpublished research report, Mandarin version, of the National Council of Science, Taiwan, Republic of China.
- Liou, Hsien Chin. 1992. "Theory-based interactive videodisc for EFL learning: design considerations." Paper presented at the 26th Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Vancouver, Canada, March 3-7, 1992.
- Littlewood, William. 1981. Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, William. 1984. Foreign and Second Language Learning: Language Acquisition Research and Its Implications for the Classroom, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, Michael H and Jack C. Richards. (eds.). 1987. Methodology in TESOL, London: Newbury House Publisher.
- Maley, A. 1984. "On chalk and cheese, babies and bathwater and squared circles: Can traditional and communicative approaches be reconciled?" In P. Larson, E. Judd and D. Messerschmitt (eds.), On TESOL '84: a brave new world for TESOL, Selected papers from the Eighteenth Annual Convention of TESOL, Houston, TX. 6-11.
- McDonough, Jo and Christopher Shaw. 1993. Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Melrose, Robin and Susan F. Melrose. 1989. "Discourse and negotiation of meaning in communicative language teaching." International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Testing 27(1):41-52.
- Mitchell, Rosamond. 1987. "Research into communicative language teaching." In Robert B. Kaplan (Editor-in-Chief), Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 8. Cambridge University Press. 109-125.
- Morley, Joan. 1991. "Current directions in second-language teaching." In William Grabe and Robert B. Kaplan (eds.), Introduction to Applied Linguistics, New York: Addison-Wesley. 79-105.
- Morrow, Keith. 1981. "Principles of communicative methodology." In Keith Johnson and Keith

- Morrow (eds.), Communication in the Classroom. London: Longman. 59-66.
- Morrow, Keith. 1979. "Communicative language teaching: Revolution or evolution?" In C. J. Brumfit and K. Johnson (eds.), The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching. London: Oxford University Press.
- Munby, John. 1978. Communicative Syllabus Design: A Sociolinguistic Model for Defining the Content of Purpose – Specific Language Programmes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Omaggio Hadley, Alice. 1993. Teaching Language in Context, Second Edition. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Parkinson, Brian and John Maher. 1987. "Communicative language teaching and related approaches." In Robert B. Kaplan (Editor-in-chief), Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 8. Cambridge University Press. 126-139.
- Pica, Teresa P. 1988. "Communicative language teaching: An aid to second language acquisition? Some insights from classroom research." The English Quarterly 21(2):70-80.
- Prabhu, N. S. 1987. Second Language Pedagogy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, Jack C. 1990. "The dilemma of teacher education in second language teaching." In Jack C. Richards and David Nunan (eds.) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3-15.
- Richards, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. 1986. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press.
- Rosner, Richard. 1987. "Materials for communicative language teaching and learning." In Robert B. Kaplan (Editor-in-Chief), Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 8. 140-163.
- Sano, Masayuki, Masao Takahashi, and Asaji Yoneyama. 1984. "Communicative language teaching and local needs." ELT Journal 38(3):170-177.
- Savignon, Sandra J. 1983. Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.
- Savignon, Sandra J. 1990. "Communicative language teaching: Definitions and directions." In James E. Alatis (ed.), Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 207-217.
- Savignon, Sandra J. 1991. "Communicative language teaching: State of the art." TESOL Quarterly 25(2):261-272.
- Schumann, John H. 1978. "The acculturation model for second language acquisition." In Rosario C. Gingras (ed.), Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Schulz, Renate. 1986. "From achievement to proficiency through classroom instruction: Some caveats." Hispania 69:187-193.
- Shaw, Philip. 1992. "Variation and universality in communicative competence: Coseriu's mode." TESOL Quarterly 26(1):9-25.
- Shen, Chen. 1989. "Language and culture: Two goals of foreign language teaching in China." Australian Review of Applied Linguistics 12(1):36-60.
- Stevick, Earl W. 1990. Humanism in Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 131-144.
- Stern, H. H. 1981. "Communicative language teaching and learning: Toward a synthesis." In James E. Alatis, Howard B. Altman, and Penelope M. Alatis (eds.), The Second Language Classroom. New York: Oxford University Press. 133-148.
- Stone, Jr., George Winchester. (ed.), 1961. Issues, Problems, & Approaches in the Teaching

A New Look at Communicative Language Teaching: Prospects for Taiwan, ROC

- of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Taylor, Barry P. 1987. "Teaching ESL: Incorporating a communicative, student-centered component." In Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richards (eds.), Methodology in TESOL. London: Newbury House. 45-59.
- Van Ek, J. and L. G. Alexander. 1980. Threshold Level English. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Valdes, Antonio Irizar and Ada Chiappy Jhones. 1991. "Introduction of communicative language teaching in tourism in Cuba." TESL Canada Journal 8(2):7-63.
- Valette, Rebecca M. 1993. "The challenge of the future: Teaching students to speak fluently and accurately." Canadian Modern Language Review 50(1):173-178.
- Waldspurger, Theresa A. 1989. "Communicative foreign language teaching and computer-assisted language learning: An augmented transition network for Hindi." Ph.D. dissertation. Georgetown University.
- Wesche, M. Bingham. 1987. "Communicative testing in a second language." In Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richards (eds.), Methodology in TESOL. London: Newbury House. 373-390.
- Whitley, M. Stanley. 1993. "Communicative language teaching: An incomplete revolution." Foreign Language Annals 26(2):137-154.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1978. Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, David. 1976. Notional Syllabuses: A Taxonomy and Its Relevance to Foreign Language Curriculum Development. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, David. 1990. "Second languages: How they are learned and taught." In N. E. Collinge (ed.), An Encyclopedia of Language. London: Routledge. 518-550.
- Wolf, Jr., W. C. and Kathleen M. Riordan. 1991. "Foreign language teachers' demographic characteristics, in-service training needs, and attitudes toward teaching." Foreign Language Annals 24:471-478.
- Yalden, Janice. 1983. The Communicative Syllabus: Evolution, Design and Implementation. Oxford: Pergamon.

