

Reading Chapter 2: A Century of Language Teaching

Directions: Read the relevant textbook chapter. Then answer the questions below. Please provide specific examples from your own experiences when applicable. Turn in your answers either by email (jbrown67@gmail.com).

1. What are the main principles and characteristics of the Grammar Translation Method (GTM)? Please provide specific example of activities or techniques that are common in GTM.

2. How do your own language learning experiences reflect the principles and characteristic of GTM? Please provide specific example from your own language learning experience.

3. What are the main principles and characteristics of the Direct Method (DM)? Please provide specific example of activities or techniques that are common in DM.

4. How do your own language learning experiences reflect the principles and characteristic of DM? Please provide specific example from your own language learning experience.

A CENTURY OF LANGUAGE TEACHING

Questions for Reflection

- What is the historical timeline of language teaching methodology?
- What is the difference between an *approach* and a *method*?
- How are teaching methods *derived* from a theory of SLA?
- How do methods, in turn, *contribute* to our knowledge of SLA?
- What are the distinguishing characteristics of various methods? Which of those attributes continue to be valid approaches and techniques today?
- How does a *communicative* approach differ from the succession of methods of the twentieth century?

An informative step toward understanding what language teaching is all about is to turn back the clock a little over a hundred years. Looking at the historical cycles and trends that have brought us to the present day will help you analyze the class session you just observed in Chapter 1. For the better part of this chapter we focus on methods as the identifying characteristics of many decades of language teaching efforts. How do methods of teaching reflect various trends of disciplinary thought? How does current research on language learning and teaching help us to distinguish, in our history, between passing fads and “the good stuff”? These are some of the questions we’ll address here.

In Chapter 3, our historical overview culminates in a close look at the current state of the art in language teaching. Above all, you will come to see how language pedagogy is now more aptly characterized by a number of widely researched “approaches” rather than by competing, context-restricted methods. Those approaches will be described in detail, along with some of the current professional jargon associated with it.

As you read on, you will encounter references to concepts, constructs, issues, and models that are normally covered in a course in second language acquisition (SLA). Whether or not you have already taken or are currently taking such a course, you may wish to consult our companion volume, *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, Sixth Edition (Brown, 2014), or a book like Mitchell, Myles, and Marsden’s (2013) *Second Language Learning Theories*, which summarizes current topics and issues in SLA. Throughout this book we

will refer occasionally to certain chapters of the *Principles* book (*PLLT*) for background review or reading.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY METHOD?

For the century spanning the mid-1880s to the mid-1980s, the language-teaching profession may be aptly characterized by a series of methods (or perhaps pedagogical trends) that rose and declined in popularity. Some practitioners in this time period hoped to define the *ultimate* method, one that would be generalizable across widely varying audiences, contexts, and languages (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Historical accounts of the profession tend to describe a succession of methods, each of which was more or less discarded as a new method took its place (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Before turning to that history of language teaching, let's explain what we mean by **method**.

Over five decades ago Edward Anthony (1963) described method as the second of three hierarchical elements: An **approach**, according to Anthony, was a set of assumptions dealing with the nature of language, learning, and teaching. **Method** was described as an overall plan for systematic presentation of a language course based on a selected approach. **Techniques** were the specific activities manifested in a curriculum that were consistent with a method and therefore were in harmony with an approach as well.

In Anthony's terms, a teacher may, for example, at the approach level, affirm the ultimate importance of learning in a relaxed state of mental awareness just above the threshold of consciousness. The method that follows might resemble Suggestopedia (a description follows in this chapter). Techniques could include playing baroque music while reading a passage in the foreign language, getting students to sit in the yoga position while listening to a list of words, or having learners adopt a new name in the classroom and role-play that new person.

Today, Anthony's (1963) terms are still in relatively common use among language teachers, but with a multitude of varying definitions. Just two decades after Anthony's publication, for example, Richards and Rodgers (1982) proposed to call Anthony's method a *design*, and his technique a *procedure*. They still maintained the importance of the "interrelation of theory and practice" (p. 154), in which assumptions, beliefs, and theories about the nature of language and language learning lay at the foundation of classroom practice, but the terminology, in some ways, only muddied the waters.

What followed were a few decades of arguments about the irrelevance of methods in the "narrow, pejorative sense" (Bell, 2007, p. 141) in which they were touted in the 1960s and 1970s. Eventually, with the proclamation of a **postmethod** era, language teachers were encouraged to focus on a "pedagogy of particularity" (Kumaravivelu, 2001, p. 538), that is, a sensitivity to learners, goals, context, and social milieu.

Then even more recently, Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011), were quite comfortable with using the term method to mean "a coherent set of principles

linked to certain techniques and procedures” (p. xvi). In so doing, they echoed Bell’s (2007) endorsement of method as “techniques which realize a set of principles or goals” and that offer “practical solutions to problems in a particular teaching context” (p. 141).



CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

In your experience taking an L2 course, how would you describe your teacher’s *method*? Was it clearly identifiable? Was it unified? Cohesive? Did you experience activities or techniques that you felt were grounded in a plausible *approach*, that is, justifiable from what we know about effective language teaching?

What did we learn from this checkered history and its accompanying lexicographic confusion? That *principled* language teaching involves an essential link between what we know about SLA in its variety of contexts and the practical everyday techniques that characterize our language classrooms. We’ll return to a full development of this all-important connection in the next chapter.

Meanwhile, to avoid any further confusion in this book, we’ll use some common terms in the following way:

Methodology. Pedagogical practices in general (including theoretical underpinnings and related research). Whatever considerations are involved in “how to teach” are methodological.

Approach. Theoretical positions and beliefs about teaching, language, language learning, learners, institutional and societal factors, purposes of a course, and the applicability of all to a specific educational context.

Method. A set of classroom specifications for accomplishing linguistic objectives. Methods tend to identify teacher and student roles, linguistic and subject-matter objectives, sequencing, and materials.

Curriculum. Specifications for carrying out a particular language program. Features include a primary concern with linguistic and subject-matter objectives, sequencing, and materials to meet the needs of a designated group of learners in a defined context. (The term **syllabus** is used more commonly in the United Kingdom to refer to what is usually called a curriculum in the United States.)

Technique (also commonly referred to by other terms). Any of a wide variety of exercises, activities, procedures, or tasks used in the language classroom for realizing lesson objectives.

CHANGING WINDS AND SHIFTING SANDS

We now return to our historical sketch. A glance through the past century or so of language teaching will give an interesting picture of how varied the interpretations have been of the best way to teach additional languages. As disciplinary schools of thought—psychology, linguistics, and education, for example—have come and gone, so have language-teaching methods waxed and waned in popularity. With the many theoretical positions that have been proposed over the last hundred years, it should come as no surprise to discover a wide variety of these methods, some in total philosophical opposition to others.

Albert Marckwardt (1972, p. 5) saw these “changing winds and shifting sands” as a cyclical pattern in which a new method emerged about every quarter of a century. Each new method broke from the old but took with it some of the positive aspects of the previous practices. A good example of this cyclical nature of methods is found in the “revolutionary” Audiolingual Method (ALM) (a description follows) of the mid-twentieth century. The ALM borrowed tenets from its predecessor, the Direct Method, by almost half a century while breaking away entirely from the Grammar Translation Method. Within a short time, however, ALM critics were advocating more attention to thinking, to cognition, and to rule learning, which to some smacked of a return to Grammar Translation!

What follows is a sketch of these changing winds and shifting sands.

THE “EARLY” YEARS

Classical and Grammar Translation Methods

For centuries, there were few if any theoretical foundations of language learning upon which to base teaching methodology. In the Western world, foreign language learning in schools was synonymous with the learning of Latin or Greek. Latin, thought to promote intellectuality through “mental gymnastics,” was until relatively recently held to be indispensable to an adequate education. Similarly, in Asian countries, foreign language courses consisted of a focus on reading various languages, attained through translation and attention to rules and definitions of words (Chan, Chin, & Suthiwan, 2011). This genre of pedagogy came to be called the **Classical Method**: teacher centered, with memorization of grammatical rules and vocabulary, translations of texts, and written exercises.

As other languages began to be taught in educational institutions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Classical Method was adopted as the chief means for teaching foreign languages. Little thought was given at the time to teaching someone how to speak the language; after all, languages were not being taught primarily to learn oral/aural communication, but to learn for the sake of being “scholarly” or for gaining reading proficiency. Because there was little if any theoretical research on SLA in general or on the acquisition of reading proficiency, foreign languages were taught as any other skill was taught.

By the late nineteenth century, the Classical Method came to be known as the **Grammar Translation Method**. There was little to distinguish Grammar Translation from centuries-long foreign language teaching practices beyond a focus on grammatical rules as the basis for translating from the second to the native language. Remarkably, the Grammar Translation Method withstood attempts at the turn of the twentieth century to “reform” language-teaching methodology (see below), and to this day it is practiced in too many educational contexts. Prator and Celce-Murcia (1979, p. 3) listed major characteristics of Grammar Translation:

Characteristics of the Grammar Translation Method

- Classes are taught in the students’ L1.
- Attention is given to lists of isolated vocabulary and grammar rules.
- Reading is given almost exclusive focus, with related grammatical analysis.
- Translation exercises (usually from the L2 to the L1) are performed.
- Little or no attention is given to oral production.



CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

Have you taken a language course that followed, even partially, Grammar Translation methodology? If so, how successful were you in learning the language? Why or why not? If not, can you imagine any “redeeming” value in Grammar Translation methodology in today’s language courses?

It’s ironic that this method has until very recently been so stalwart among many competing models. It is “remembered with distaste by thousands of school learners, for whom foreign language learning meant a tedious experience of memorizing endless lists of unusable grammar rules and vocabulary and attempting to produce perfect translations of stilted or literary prose” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 6). On the other hand, one can understand why Grammar Translation remains attractive. It requires few specialized skills on the part of teachers. Tests of grammar rules and of translations are easy to construct, can be objectively scored, and don’t require fluent knowledge of the L2 by the test designer or teacher.

However, as Richards and Rodgers (2001) pointed out, “it has no advocates. It is a method for which there is no theory. There is no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory” (p. 7). As you continue to examine language-teaching methodology in this book, you will understand more fully the “theorylessness” of the Grammar Translation Method.

Gouin’s Series Method

The history of “modern” foreign language teaching may be said to have begun in the late 1800s with François Gouin, a French teacher of Latin with remarkable insights. History doesn’t normally credit Gouin as a founder of language-teaching methodology because, at the time, his influence was overshadowed by that of Maximilian Berlitz, the popular German founder of the Direct Method. Nevertheless, some attention to Gouin’s unusually perceptive observations about language teaching helps us to set the stage for the development of language-teaching methods for the century following the publication of his book, *The Art of Learning and Studying Foreign Languages*, in 1880.

Gouin had to go through a very painful set of experiences in order to derive his insights. Having decided in mid-life to learn German, he took up residency in Hamburg for one year. But rather than attempting to converse with the natives, he decided upon arrival in Hamburg to *memorize* a German grammar book and a table of the 248 irregular German verbs—all in the isolation of his room! He did this in a matter of only ten days, and hurried to “the academy” (the university) to test his new knowledge. “But alas!” he wrote, “I could not understand a single word, not a single word!” (Gouin, 1880, p. 11). Undaunted, he rememorized his grammar and verbs, only to fail again.

In the course of the year in Germany, Gouin memorized books, translated Goethe and Schiller, and even memorized 30,000 words in a German dictionary, all in the isolation of his room, only to be crushed by his failure to understand German afterward. Only once did he try to “make conversation” as a method, but this caused people to laugh at him, and he was too embarrassed to continue that method. At the end of the year Gouin, having reduced the Classical Method to absurdity, was forced to return home, a failure.

But there was a happy ending. After returning home, Gouin discovered that his three-year-old nephew had, during that year, gone through the wonderful stage of child language acquisition in which he went from saying virtually nothing at all to becoming a veritable chatterbox of French. How was it that this little child succeeded so easily, in a first language, in a task that Gouin, in a second language, had found impossible? The child must hold the secret to learning a language! So Gouin spent a great deal of time observing his nephew and other children and came to the conclusion that language is a means of *thinking* and of representing reality!



CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

From what you know about child (L1) language acquisition, what are some of the key characteristics of child language acquisition? What attributes of that process do you think are directly applicable to *adult* L2 classes? Which aspects are not plausibly applicable?

So Gouin set about devising a teaching method that would follow from these insights. And thus the **Series Method** was created, a method that taught learners *directly* (without translation) and conceptually (without grammatical rules and explanations) a “series” of connected sentences that are easy to perceive. The first lesson of a foreign language taught a series of linked sentences such as “I walk to the door. I stop at the door. I stretch out my arm. I take hold of the handle.” And other sentences followed, all with an unconventionally large number of grammatical properties, vocabulary items, word orders, and complexity. This is no simple lesson! Yet Gouin was successful with such lessons because the language was easily understood, stored, recalled, and related to reality.

Unfortunately, Gouin was a man ahead of his time, and his brilliant insights were largely lost in the shuffle of Berlitz’s popular Direct Method. But as we look back now over more than a century of language-teaching history, we can appreciate the contributions of this most unusual language teacher.

The Direct Method

Either the world wasn’t ready for the Series Method or Gouin wasn’t a good businessman. So it took none other than contemporary Maximilian Berlitz (1887) to capitalize (literally) on naturalistic approaches to language learning in the form of the now well-known **Direct Method**. The basic premise of the Direct Method was that foreign language learning should be more like first language learning—lots of oral interaction, spontaneous use of the language, no translation between first and second languages, and little or no analysis of grammatical rules. Richards and Rodgers (2001, p. 12) summarized the principles of the Direct Method.

Characteristics of the Direct Method

- Instruction was conducted exclusively (directly) in the L2.
- Oral communication and listening skills were taught in small classes.
- Methodology consisted mainly of modeling and practice.
- Everyday, easily identified vocabulary was used.
- Grammar was taught inductively.

The Direct Method enjoyed considerable popularity in the United States and Europe at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As its popularity increased, it soon became known as the Berlitz Method, and to this day “Berlitz” is a household word with language schools thriving in every country of the world. Today, from Bucharest to Beijing to Buenos Aires, little storefront Berlitz language schools—teaching every conceivable language—can be found with ease.

Despite its success in private enterprise, the Direct Method did not take well in public education, where the constraints of budget, classroom size, time, and teacher background made such a method difficult to use. Moreover, its success may have been more a factor of the skill and personality of the teacher than of the methodology itself. So, for public education worldwide, the Direct Method was not as practical as Grammar Translation or methods that only emphasized reading skills.

The Audiolingual Method

Up through the middle of the twentieth century, Grammar Translation and reading methods prevailed in educational institutions worldwide, with few if any attempts to teach oral communication (Bowen, Madsen, & Hilferty, 1985). Then, in an ironic twist, one of the most visible of all language teaching “revolutions” in the modern era, the **Audiolingual Method** (ALM), burst into the headlines. Ironic, because much of the ALM borrowed tenets of the then half-century-old Direct Method!

An offshoot of what started as a United States military-sponsored program during World War II to teach oral proficiency in other languages, the ALM spread into broader educational contexts as a means to teach long neglected aural/oral skills. Characteristic of these courses was a great deal of oral activity—pronunciation drills, pattern practice, and exercises in rudimentary conversations—with virtually none of the grammar and translation found in traditional classes. By the 1950s the ALM—in a variety of offshoots that highlighted oral-aural activity—was widely used globally (Rivers, 1964) as air transportation “shrank” the world and ushered in an era of convenient travel, a greater awareness of other languages and cultures, and an immediate communicative use for foreign languages.

The ALM was firmly grounded in the linguistic and psychological theory of the era. Structural linguists of the 1940s and 1950s were engaged in what they claimed was a “scientific descriptive analysis” of various languages. Teachers and course developers saw a direct application of such analysis to the pattern practice drills that were the hallmark of the University of Michigan’s English Language Institute (Fries, 1945). At the same time, behavioral psychologists advocated conditioning and habit-formation models of learning that were perfectly married with the “mim-mem” (mimicry-memorization) drills of audiolingual methodology.

The characteristics of the ALM may be summed up in the following characteristics (adapted from Prator & Celce-Murcia, 1979).

Characteristics of the Audiolingual Method

- Most language material was presented directly, with as little use of the students' L1 as possible.
- New material was usually presented in (spoken) dialogue form.
- Mimicry, memorization, and overlearning of language patterns were emphasized, with an effort to get students to produce error-free utterances.
- Grammatical structures were sequenced by means of contrastive analysis.
- Grammar and vocabulary were taught by inductive analogy and contextualized in dialogs.
- Great importance was attached to pronunciation.
- Courses capitalized on the use of tapes, language labs, and visual aids.



CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

Have you experienced ALM-type drills in language courses that you have taken? Were they effective? Did you ever feel they were overused? Judging from your experiences learning or teaching an L2, how much drilling do you think is appropriate to use in a classroom? What aspects of SLA does drilling help to reinforce?

For a number of reasons, the ALM enjoyed many years of popularity, and even to this day, adaptations of the ALM are found in contemporary methodologies. For example, many language courses advocate occasional, quick repetition drills to acquaint students with the phonology of the L2. The ALM was firmly rooted in respectable theoretical perspectives of the time. And “success” could be overtly experienced by students as they practiced dialogs in off-hours.

But the popularity was not to last forever. In an eloquent book-length criticism, Rivers (1964) exposed numerous misconceptions of the ALM and cited its ultimate failure to teach long-term communicative proficiency. We discovered that language was not really acquired through a process of habit formation and overlearning, that errors were not necessarily to be avoided at all costs, and that structural linguistics did not tell us everything about language that we needed to know. But in the shifting sands of methodological change, language teachers ultimately reaped some positive benefits from the ALM.

THE “DESIGNER” METHODS ERA

One benefit was a collective challenge to the profession to inject new life into language classrooms full of weary students reciting endless drills, sometimes with no awareness whatsoever of the meaning of their “prefabricated patterns.” The profession needed some spice and verve, and innovative minds from the mid-1960s to the 1970s were up to the challenge.

This time period was historically significant on two counts. First, perhaps more than at other moment in modern language-teaching history, research on second language learning and teaching grew from an offshoot of linguistics into a discipline in its own right. As more and more scholars specialized in SLA studies, our knowledge of how people learn languages inside and outside the classroom mushroomed. Second, in a spirited atmosphere of pioneering research, a number of innovative methods were conceived. These “designer” methods, to borrow a term from Nunan (1989a, p. 97), soon were marketed by entrepreneurs as the latest (and greatest?) applications of the multidisciplinary research findings of the day.

Today, as we look back at these methods, we can applaud their creators for innovative flair, for an attempt to rouse the language-teaching world out of its audiolingual slumber, and for stimulation of even more research as we sought to discover why they were, in the end, *not* the godsend that their inventors and marketers hoped they would be. The scrutiny that the designer methods underwent has enabled us today to refine current communicative approaches to language teaching.

Community Language Learning

In the 1950s, psychologist Carl Rogers (1951) proposed a “person-centered” view of education that placed the focus on *learners*, in opposition to the teacher-centered viewpoints that had dominated educational philosophy. Inspired by Rogers, Charles Curran (1972, 1976) regarded students as a *community* of learners and raised our awareness of the social dynamics of classrooms. As students and teacher joined together in a *team* effort, participants lowered their defenses and potential anxiety by means of a supportive classroom community. The key was for teachers not to be perceived as a threat, but rather, as *counselors*, to assist learners to reach their goals in a non-defensive atmosphere. Curran’s Counseling–Learning model of education was extended to language learning contexts in the form of **Community Language Learning (CLL)**.

While particular adaptations of CLL were numerous (LaForge, 1971), the basic methodology was explicit. The group of clients (for instance, beginning learners of English), having first established in their native language (say, Japanese) an interpersonal relationship and trust, are seated in a circle with the counselor (teacher) on the outside of the circle. When one of the clients wishes to say something to the group or to an individual, he or she says it in the native language

(Japanese) and the counselor translates the utterance back to the learner in the second language (English). The learner then repeats the English sentence as accurately as possible. Another client responds, in Japanese; the utterance is translated by the counselor into English; the client repeats it, and the conversation continues. If possible, the conversation is recorded for later listening, and at the end of each session, the learners inductively attempt together to glean information about the new language. If desirable, the counselor might take a more directive role and provide some explanation of certain linguistic rules or items.

Affectively, CLL was an attempt to put the philosophy of Carl Rogers into action and to overcome some of the threatening affective factors in a language classroom: the all-knowing teacher, making blunders in the L2 in front of classmates, competing against peers. The counselor allowed the learner to determine the topic and tenor of conversation and to analyze the foreign language inductively. And in some cases learners ended up spontaneously helping each other.

There were some practical and theoretical problems with CLL. The counselor-teacher could become too nondirective, leaving the student to a time-consuming and sometimes fruitless struggle. While some intense inductive processing is a beneficial component of SLA, the initial grueling days and weeks of floundering in CLL might have been alleviated by a more directive approach. And the success of CLL depended largely on the translation expertise of the counselor. A mistranslation could lead to unnecessary confusion.

Today, virtually no one uses CLL in a language curriculum. It was soon discovered that CLL was far too restrictive for institutional language programs. However, the principles of forming a classroom community, learning by discovery, creating student-centered classrooms, and developing student autonomy all remain viable in their application to language classrooms. As is the case with virtually any method, the theoretical underpinnings of CLL may be creatively adapted to your own situation.



CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

In language classes that you have taken, to what extent did you feel threatened by the teacher or by your classmates? How do you think a teacher could lessen or soften those threats? On the other hand, would you like to learn a language completely inductively in a CLL classroom? In a context that you're familiar with, what would you think might be problematic in using CLL?

Suggestopedia

Other new methods of the era were not quite as strictly affective as CLL. **Suggestopedia**, for example, was a method that was derived from Bulgarian psychologist Georgi Lozanov's (1979) contention that the human brain could

process great quantities of material if given the right conditions for learning, among which are a state of relaxation and giving over of control to the teacher.

Drawing on insights from Soviet psychological research on extrasensory perception and from yoga, Lozanov's Suggestopedia (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011, p. 71 prefer to call it *Desuggestopedia*) capitalized on relaxed states of mind for maximum retention of material. Music, especially Baroque music with its 60 beats per minute and its specific rhythm, created the kind of "relaxed concentration" that led to efficient retention due to an increase in alpha brain waves and a decrease in blood pressure and pulse rate.

In applications of Suggestopedia to L2 learning, Lozanov and his followers experimented with the presentation of vocabulary, readings, dialogs, roleplays, drama, and a variety of other typical classroom activities. These "concert sessions" were carried out in soft, comfortable seats, accompanied by soft music that induced relaxed states of consciousness.

Suggestopedia was criticized on a number of fronts. Suggestopedia became a business enterprise of its own, and it made promises in the advertising world that were not completely supported by research. Scovel (1979) questioned the validity of Lozanov's data, which reported astounding results. The practicality of using Suggestopedia was an issue in settings where music and comfortable chairs were not available. More serious was the reliance on memorization for language learning (Scovel, 1979) during the concert sessions.

On the other hand, other researchers, including Schiffler (1992), offered a more moderate position, advocating the advantage of states of relaxation for learning. In the final analysis, through this method we may have been prodded to believe in the power of the human brain, to experiment with induced states of relaxation in the classroom, and more specifically to try using music as a way to get students to sit back and relax.



CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

How might you see aspects of Suggestopedia applied to an L2 course that you have taken, or taught, or might some day teach? Besides music, what are some other ways to induce states of relaxation in a classroom? To what extent is it worth trying such techniques in a classroom?

The Silent Way

Like Suggestopedia, the **Silent Way** rested on more cognitive than affective arguments for its theoretical sustenance. While founder Caleb Gattegno was said to be interested in a "humanistic" approach (Chamot & McKeon, 1984, p. 2) to education, much of the Silent Way was characterized by a problem-solving

approach to learning. Richards and Rodgers (2001, p. 81) summarized the theory of learning behind the Silent Way as the facilitation of learning through:

- encouraging inductive learning by discovery
- engaging in problem solving, using new language material
- relating (mediating) physical objects to the new language

Discovery learning, a popular educational trend of the 1960s (Bruner, 1961), advocated less learning “by being told” and more learning by discovering for oneself various facts and principles. Ausubel’s (1968) subsumption theory (*PLLT*, Chapter 4) could also be said to underlie Silent Way methodology. Gattegno (1972) believed that learners should develop independence, autonomy, and responsibility. At the same time, learners in a Silent Way classroom had to cooperate with each other in the process of solving language problems. And for physical props, the Silent Way typically utilized a set of small colored rods of varying lengths and a series of colorful wall charts.

Oddly, the teacher was silent much of the time, thus the name of the method. Teachers were to resist their instinct to spell everything out in black and white and to come to the aid of students at the slightest downfall. They had to “get out of the way” while students worked out solutions. The teacher provided single-word stimuli or short phrases and sentences, once or maybe twice, and then the students refined their understanding of meanings and pronunciation among themselves, with minimal corrective feedback from the teacher.

In one sense, the Silent Way was too harsh a method and the teacher too distant to encourage a communicative atmosphere. Silent Way practitioners often found that students needed more guidance and overt correction than the method advocated. And because the rods and charts wore thin after a few lessons, teachers ended up introducing other materials, at which point the Silent Way classroom looked like any other language classroom.

And yet, some underlying principles of the Silent Way were valid. All too often we’re tempted as teachers to provide everything for our students, neatly served up on a silver platter. We could benefit from injecting healthy doses of discovery learning into our classroom activities and from providing less teacher talk than we usually do to let the students work things out on their own. In recent years, for example, we have come to appreciate the value of students’ *self-correction* stimulated by a teacher’s feedback (Ellis & Collins, 2009).

Total Physical Response and the Natural Approach

You will recall from earlier in this chapter that well over a century ago, Gouin designed his Series Method on the premise that language associated with a series of simple actions will be easily retained by learners. Much later, psychologists developed the “trace theory” of learning in which it was claimed that memory is increased if it is stimulated, or “traced,” through association with

motor activity. It was this very idea that James Asher (1977) capitalized on in developing the **Total Physical Response** (TPR).

TPR drew in part on principles of child language acquisition, namely, that children learning their L1 appear to do a lot of listening before they speak, and that their listening is accompanied by physical responses (reaching, grabbing, moving, looking, and so forth). Asher was also convinced that language classes were often the locus of too much anxiety, so he wished to devise a method that was as stress-free as possible, where learners would not feel overly self-conscious and defensive. The TPR classroom, then, was one in which students did a great deal of listening and acting.

Typically, TPR heavily utilized imperatives, even into more advanced proficiency levels: *Open the window, Close the door, Stand up, Pick up the book, Give it to John*, and so on. More complex syntax could be injected: *Draw a rectangle on the chalkboard, Walk quickly to the door and hit it*; or more humorously: *Walk slowly to the window and jump*, (Asher, 1977, p. 55). Interrogatives also were used effectively: *Where is the book? Who is John?* Eventually students would feel comfortable enough to venture verbal responses to questions, then to ask questions themselves, and to continue the process.

The **Natural Approach**, a method undergirded by similar principles, was inspired by Asher's (1977) advocacy of a *comprehension-based* approach, but developed somewhat later in the early 1980s. Krashen and Terrell (1983) felt that learners would benefit from delaying production until speech “emerges,” that learners should be as relaxed as possible in the classroom, and that a great deal of communication and “acquisition” should take place, as opposed to analysis. Their Natural Approach advocated the use of TPR activities at the beginning level of language learning when “comprehensible input” is essential for triggering the acquisition of language.

The Natural Approach was aimed at developing everyday language communication skills—conversations, shopping, listening to the radio, and the like. The initial task of the teacher was to provide comprehensible input, that is, spoken language that is understandable to the learner or just a little beyond the learner's level. Learners were not prodded to speak until they feel ready to do so. The teacher was the source of the learners' input and the creator of an interesting and stimulating variety of classroom activities—commands, games, skits, and small-group work.



CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

Have you ever taken a language course that used TPR or Natural Approach techniques? If so, how effective were they? How would you feel about being in a class in which you were never *asked* by your teacher to speak, and you spoke only when you were ready to do so?

Neither method dominated language classrooms around the world (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Both seemed to be especially effective in the beginning levels of language proficiency, but lost their distinctiveness as learners advanced in their competence. Further, after students overcame the fear of speaking out, classroom conversations and other activities proceeded as in almost any other communicative language classroom. The most controversial aspects of the Natural Approach were its advocacy of a “silent period” (delay of oral production) and its heavy emphasis on comprehensible input (Gibbons, 1985).

On the other hand, like every other method we have encountered, TPR and the Natural Approach offered new insights to the language teaching profession. Basing methods on healthy doses of listening to a new L2 eventually prodded SLA researchers to examine the crucial role of *input* in learning an L2. The de-emphasis on nonstop oral production, a reaction to the ALM, helped us to design language courses with carefully structured *listening comprehension* components. In later proposals for more communicative methods, we saw the importance of meaningful language that students could relate to the *real world*. And, of course, the *anxiety* experienced by learners in many language courses was a factor that both methods attempted to reduce.

Innovative methods such as the above “designer” methods expose us to principles and practices that you can sift through, weigh, and adapt to multiple contexts. Your responsibility as a teacher is to choose the best of what others have experimented with and then adapt your insights to your own situation. Those insights and intuitions can become a part of your own principled approach to language teaching.

THE DAWNING OF A NEW ERA

As the innovative methods of the 1970s were being touted by some and criticized by many, some significant foundations for future growth were being laid in the form of a number of emerging approaches that were built solidly on research findings in what was still the budding new field of SLA. From grassroots SLA conclaves and late night discussions at conferences, the field mushroomed in the 1970s and 1980s into a professional discipline that soon boasted worldwide conferences, presentations in every corner of the earth, and volumes of articles, books, dictionaries, and encyclopedias. Out of this vibrant incipient field of study came some distinctive methodological options that were later to catapult language teachers and researchers into the twenty-first century with principle-based, enduring innovations.

Notional-Functional Syllabuses

One of the most fruitful movements of the late twentieth century was embodied in what came to be known as the **Notional-Functional Syllabus**, or more commonly the **Functional Syllabus**. Beginning with the work of the Council of Europe (Van Ek & Alexander, 1975) and later followed by numerous interpretations of

“notional” syllabuses (Wilkins, 1976), Notional-Functional Syllabuses (NFS) began to be used in the United Kingdom in the 1970s.

The distinguishing characteristics of the NFS were its attention to functions (see *PLLT*, Chapter 9) as the organizing elements of English language curriculum, and its contrast with a structural syllabus in which sequenced grammatical structures served as the organizers. Reacting to methods that attended too strongly to grammatical form, the NFS focused on the pragmatic purposes to which we put language. As such, it was not a method at all. It was closer to what we have called approach, but it was more specifically focused on curricular structure than any of its predecessors.

Notions, according to Van Ek and Alexander (1975), are both general and specific. General notions are abstract concepts such as existence, space, time, quantity, and quality. They are domains in which we use language to express thought and feeling. Within the general notion of space and time, for example, are the concepts of location, motion, dimension, speed, length of time, and frequency. *Specific notions* correspond more closely to what we have become accustomed to calling “situations.” Personal identification, for example, is a specific notion under which name, address, phone number, and other personal information are subsumed. Other specific notions include travel, health and welfare, education, shopping, services, and free time.

The *functional* part of the NFS corresponded to language functions. Curricula were organized around such functions as identifying, reporting, denying, accepting, declining, asking permission, and apologizing. Van Ek and Alexander listed some seventy different language functions.



CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

One of the challenges of the NFS was finding the appropriate *sequence* of functions in a curriculum that stretched across possibly many weeks. What kinds of criteria can you think of that would underlie a sequence? Frequency of occurrence? Usefulness? Grammatical complexity? Intuition? How might such criteria vary depending on the *context* of the L2 class?

The NFS quickly provided popular underpinnings for the development of communicative textbooks and materials in English language courses. The functional basis of language programs has continued to the present day. In Saslow and Ascher’s (2011) *Top Notch* series, for example, the following functions are covered in the first several lessons of a beginner’s textbook:

- Introducing self and other people
- Exchanging personal information
- Asking how to spell someone’s name

- Asking about the location of places
- Giving and getting directions
- Identifying and describing people
- Talking about time

A typical unit in textbooks like this includes a blend of conversation practice with a classmate, interactive group work, role-plays, grammar and pronunciation focus exercises, information-gap techniques, Internet activities, and extra class interactive practice.

The NFS was, strictly speaking, a curriculum. While it was clearly a precursor to Communicative Language Teaching (see below), as a curriculum (syllabus) it still presented language as an *inventory* of functional units. Therefore, the danger that the NFS could simply be “structural lamb served up as notional-functional mutton” (Campbell, 1978, p. 18) was ever-present. However, the NFS set the stage for bigger and better things. By attending to the functional purposes of language, and by providing contextual (notional) settings for the realization of those purposes, it provided a link between a dynasty of methods that were declining and a new era of language teaching.

Communicative Language Teaching

In 1972, Dell Hymes published an essay on communicative competence, which may have been the coining of the now household phrase in SLA. Almost a decade later, Canale and Swain (1980) delivered their seminal 50-page treatise on the theoretical bases of communicative competence (CC). In brief, they proposed four major components of CC (Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983):

Canale and Swain's (1980) Components of Communicative Competence

- **Grammatical.** Knowledge of and ability to use the forms of language.
- **Discourse.** Knowledge of and ability to comprehend and produce stretches of language across sentences in both oral and written modes.
- **Sociolinguistic.** Applying sociocultural contexts to communication, including participants' roles, information they share, and the function of a communicative act.
- **Strategic.** Use of verbal and nonverbal tactics to accomplish a communicative goal, including compensation for breakdowns.

About that same time a cluster of publications spelled out the practical ramifications of a communicative approach to language teaching (Widdowson, 1978; Brumfit & Johnson, 1979; Breen & Candlin, 1980; Littlewood, 1981;

Savignon, 1983). Soon **Communicative Language Teaching** (CLT) was a byword in language teaching. With these and a plethora of other publications, the language teaching profession was to undergo a slow but solid revolution—from grasping at a method here and there to a research-based, virtually universal understanding of basic tenets of effective communicative language pedagogy.

Today CLT continues to be recognized globally as what is best described as a broadly based *approach* (not a method) to language teaching that interweaves a cluster of principles and foundation stones of SLA. CLT extends beyond the merely grammatical elements of communication into the social, cultural, and pragmatic features of language. It is an approach that encourages “real-life” communication in the classroom. It aims to develop linguistic fluency, and not just the accuracy that once consumed its methodological predecessors. CLT promotes classroom practices that equip students with tools for generating unrehearsed language performance “out there” when they leave the womb of the classroom. CLT seeks to facilitate lifelong language learning among students that extends well beyond classroom activities. Learners are partners in a cooperative venture. And CLT-based classroom practices seek to intrinsically spark learners to reach their fullest potential.

It is difficult to offer a formal definition of an approach as all-encompassing as CLT. From the earlier seminal works in CLT (cited above) up to more recent work (Savignon, 2005, 2007; Harmer, 2007; Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Ur, 2012; Brown, 2014; Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014) we have interpretations enough to send us reeling. For the sake of simplicity and directness, in the chart below we offer seven interconnected characteristics as a description of CLT, drawn from all the above sources:

Characteristics of Communicative Language Teaching

1. **Overall goals.** CLT suggests a focus on *all* of the components (grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic) of communicative competence. Goals therefore must intertwine the organizational (grammatical, discourse) aspects of language with the pragmatic (sociolinguistic, strategic) aspects.
2. **Relationship of form and function.** Language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes. Organizational language forms are not the central focus, but remain as important components of language that enable the learner to accomplish those purposes.
3. **Fluency and accuracy.** A focus on students’ “flow” of comprehension and production and a focus on the formal accuracy of production are seen as complementary principles.

At times fluency may have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use. At other times the student will be encouraged to attend to correctness. Part of the teacher's responsibility is to offer appropriate corrective feedback on learners' errors.

4. **Focus on real-world contexts.** Students in a communicative class ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts outside the classroom. Classroom tasks must therefore equip students with the skills necessary for communication in those contexts.
5. **Autonomy and strategic involvement.** Students are given opportunities to focus on their own learning process through raising their awareness of their own styles (strengths, weaknesses, preferences) of learning and through the development of appropriate strategies for production and comprehension. Such awareness and action will help to develop autonomous learners capable of continuing to learn the language beyond the classroom and the course.
6. **Teacher roles.** The role of the teacher is that of facilitator and guide, not an all-knowing font of knowledge. The teacher is an empathetic "coach" who values the best interests of students' linguistic development. Students are encouraged to construct meaning through genuine linguistic interaction with other students and with the teacher.
7. **Student roles.** Students are active participants in their own learning process. Learner-centered, cooperative, collaborative learning is emphasized, but not at the expense of appropriate teacher-centered activity.

These seven characteristics underscore some major departures from earlier methods and approaches. Structurally (grammatically) sequenced curricula were a mainstay of language teaching for centuries. CLT suggests that grammatical structure might better be subsumed under various pragmatic categories. A great deal of use of authentic language is implied in CLT, as learners attempt to build fluency—but not at the expense of a healthy focus on accuracy. In communicative classrooms, students are encouraged to deal with unrehearsed situations under the guidance, but not control, of the teacher. The importance of learners' developing a strategic approach to acquisition is a turnabout from earlier methods that never broached the topic of strategies-based instruction. And, finally, a teacher's facilitative role and students' collaborative roles in CLT are the product of two decades or more of slowly recognizing the importance of learner initiative in the classroom.

CLT has not been without some drawbacks. The authenticity implied in CLT continues to pose challenges for non-native speaking teachers whose own

ability may be less than fluent (Kramsch, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2006a). However, with more widespread current access to technological media (video, television, audio, Internet, computer software, smart phones, and the social media), both teachers and students can benefit from language input well beyond the teacher and (printed) course material.

A related criticism of CLT centered on its “Western” origins and questions about its relevance in non-Western cultures, especially those in which nondirective, student-centered cooperative learning might be quite alien (Bax, 2003; Harmer, 2007). In recent years, however, a whole host of research from Asian, African, and Middle-Eastern countries has begun to show a positive turn-around from earlier years of skepticism (Littlewood, 2011). Pham (2007) noted that “while teachers in many parts of the world may reject the CLT techniques transferred from the West, it is doubtful that they reject the *spirit* of CLT” (p. 196).



CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

What do you think underlies the criticism that CLT is too Western a concept for some cultures? If an educational system presumes the essentially *authoritarian* role of the teacher, do you think CLT necessarily undermines that authority (and power)? How can a teacher still be in *control* of a classroom yet offer collaborative, student-centered activities?

Another issue involves the frequent mismatch between CLT goals and standardized testing, in which the latter does not always successfully incorporate communicative features (McNamara & Roever, 2006). Assessment methods have, over the last two decades or so, qualitatively improved their communicative validity, but many students around the world are still perplexed by having to face the dreaded “examination day” and its discrete-point, grammar-based test questions (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010).

Finally, one can easily argue that now, after almost half a century of seeing the term CLT incorporated into virtually every language methodology textbook, the term has lost its meaning (Bax, 2003; Harmer, 2003; Spada, 2007). With a multiplicity of definitions coupled with a “postmethod” (See Chapter 3) malaise at the beginning of the twenty-first century, CLT was deemed by some to be too watered down to be a viable construct (Bax, 2003). Others, most notably Littlewood (2011), argued that “the value of CLT as an ‘umbrella term’ should not be underestimated. . . . CLT still serves as a valuable reminder that the aim of teaching is not to learn bits of language but to improve students’ ability to communicate” (p. 542).

Littlewood (2011) then continued with an eloquent case for fruitful research and development within a CLT framework, or what he calls a “transnational ideoscape” in which CLT is not so much a specific set of practices as it is an

“ideational landscape that provides a location for deepening and extending the ‘cosmopolitan conversation’ about second language pedagogy” (p. 552).



Chapter 3 describes many of the manifestations of CLT that have been advocated and used in classrooms over the last few decades. All of these options are in keeping with the spirit of CLT, but are not separate methods. Rather, they address a multiplicity of contexts, situations, and specializations, reflecting the complexity of the “state of the art” as we know it today.

As an aid to your recollection of the characteristics of some of the methods reviewed earlier, you may wish to refer to Table 2.1 (pp. 36–37), in which the various methods described in this chapter are summarized.

Looking back over almost one and a half centuries of meandering history, you can no doubt see the cycles of changing winds and shifting sands alluded to earlier. In this remarkable succession of changes, we learned something in each generation. We did not allow history simply to deposit new dunes exactly where the old ones lay. So our cumulative history has taught us to appreciate the value of “doing” language interactively, of the emotional (as well as cognitive) side of learning, of absorbing language automatically, of consciously analyzing it only when useful and appropriate, and of pointing learners toward the real world where they will use English communicatively.

FOR THE TEACHER: ACTIVITIES (A) & DISCUSSION (D)

Note: For each of the “Classroom Connections” in this chapter, you may wish to turn them into individual or pair-work discussion questions.

1. **(D)** Because this chapter refers to some basic principles and research findings that are normally covered in a course in second language acquisition (SLA), you may wish to review such material (see Brown, 2014) as you discuss this chapter. For example, varied theories of learning are implied in all the methods just reviewed; the role of affective factors in second language acquisition is highlighted in some methods; conscious and subconscious (or focal and peripheral) processing assumes various roles, depending on the method in question. If you feel that your students encountered concepts or issues that they need to brush up on in order to comprehend this chapter, consider making some time for a thorough review.
2. **(A)** Ask your students to look back at the lesson observed and described in Chapter 1. Divide the class into pairs, and ask them to brainstorm *any* aspects of the lesson in Chapter 1 that are examples of *any* of the methods described in this chapter—or that they think might have been “inspired” by a method. As they report their findings to the rest of the class, ask them to justify their comparisons. If appropriate, list their findings on the board.

3. **(D)** Ask the class for specific examples of the three levels of *approach*, *method*, and *technique* in any class activities or tasks that they have recently observed or taught themselves. For example, if they cite a group work information gap exercise that requires small groups to solve a set of problems collaboratively, what principles are at work at the approach level, what if any method is being used, and what specific techniques are used to carry out the task? You might want to list their ideas on the board for further discussion.
4. **(D)** Richards and Rodgers (2001, p. 7) said Grammar Translation “is a method for which there is no theory.” Is this too harsh a judgment? Ask students if they agree with the “theorylessness” of Grammar Translation and to justify their opinion.
5. **(A)** Consider the Series Method, the Direct Method, and the Audiolingual Method. Assign a different method to each of several small groups. Ask each group to list the theoretical foundations (assumptions about language, learning, and teaching) on which the method rested and share findings with the whole class. Consider listing their responses on the board.
6. **(A)** Assign the four “designer” methods (CLL, Suggestopedia, the Silent Way, and TPR/Natural Approach) to separate small groups of students. The groups’ task (which may require some extra-class research beyond what is provided in this chapter) is to specify (as much as possible from the information given) the following descriptors (adapted from Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011, p. 9) for the method assigned to them:
 - a) The overall goals of the method
 - b) The roles of teacher and students
 - c) The nature of teacher-student and student-student interaction
 - d) The ways in which students’ feelings and emotions are handled
 - e) The language skills that are emphasized
 - f) The role of the native language of students
 - g) The way the teacher responds to student errors
 - h) The way assessment is accomplished

Each group can then report their findings to the rest of the class. Students may find it useful to see the information in chart form (on the blackboard or developed into a computer-generated chart) like others in this chapter. An alternative to this exercise would be to assign it as extra-class work to be performed by students on their own. In this case, you might assign just *one* method per student.

7. **(D)** Ask your students to suggest what novel approaches were brought to the L2 teaching profession with the Notional-functional Syllabus. What did Campbell (1978) mean by saying we should beware of “structural lamb served up as notional functional mutton”?

Table 2.1 Characteristics of Methods

Method	Theoretical Foundations	Goals	Learner-Teacher Roles
<i>Grammar-Translation</i>	Classical assumptions about education as a “discipline” Learning a foreign language is the mark of educated persons	Vocabulary memorization Grammar rules Translation of passages Reading proficiency	Teacher as controller
<i>Series and Direct Methods</i>	L2 and L1 learning similarity Meaningful associations	Oral fluency Conversation ability	Teacher-directed Learners respond to modeled language
<i>Audiolingual Method (ALM)</i>	Habit formation through repetition Primacy of oral communication	Oral communication skills Pronunciation Fluency (within limited stretches of discourse)	Highly teacher-directed Learners respond to modeled language Learners practice target language on their own
<i>Community Language Learning (CLL)</i>	Whole-person, counseling-learning model of education Class members bond as a community Inductive learning	Oral communicative proficiency	Teacher is a counselor Teacher is a source of information Learner is a client Learners progress from dependence to independence
<i>Suggestopedia</i>	Relaxed states of consciousness create low anxiety Power of “suggestion”	Oral communication Conversational exchange Reading ability Acquisition of vocabulary	Highly teacher-directed Teacher initiates “concert” sessions and oral models Learners acquire subconsciously
<i>Silent Way</i>	Discovery learning Use of mediating physical objects Problem-solving approach	Oral communication Conversational exchange Reading ability Acquisition of vocabulary	Highly teacher-directed Teacher is mostly “silent” Learners are responsible for initiating clarification questions
<i>Total Physical Response (TPR) and The Natural Approach</i>	L1 and L2 learning are similar Comprehension-based approach Language connects with physical action	Listening comprehension Oral communicative skills	Teacher-directed Learners respond to modeled language Learners collaborate to perform simple routines

Typical Activities	Strengths	Weaknesses
Explaining rules Memorizing vocabulary Translating reading passages	Reading proficiency Become familiar with the written form of a language	No oral practice or fluency Reliance on memorization No SLA research to undergird it
Repeating teacher models Practicing dialogues, whole class	Cognitive associations Real-world relevance Common survival language is practiced	Limited in scope Learner creativity is not encouraged Writing not emphasized
Repeating teacher-modeled prescribed dialogues Oral pattern practice Pronunciation drilling Practicing memorized dialogues in pairs	Emphasis on oral language Building learner confidence Use of taped dialogues provides models	Little room for creativity Emphasis on error-free production Writing/reading not emphasized
Learners initiate desired language in their L1 Teacher provides translation into the L2 Learners request linguistic rules/information	Burden is on the learner to initiate language Learners decide topics Class builds community collaboratively Teacher is a resource	No set curriculum, so progress is dependent on student initiative Tedious, trial-and-error process Overly nondirective
“Concert” session with music in background Learners listen quietly in state of relaxation Repetition drills, role plays, dialogue practice	Low-anxiety situations Relaxation states offer optimal reception Appreciation of literary texts	Highly structured curriculum Over-reliance on assumptions about relaxation Wears thin after the first few weeks
Teacher modeling of target language items Use of colored objects, charts, diagrams Learners collaborate to refine understanding	Learning by discovery facilitates autonomy & collaboration Learners are not “spoon fed”	Teacher can become too distant Tedious, trial-and-error process Wears thin after the first few weeks
Imperative commands given to learners Learners respond with actions Role plays	Low-anxiety situations Physical-linguistic connections Learners not forced to speak too early Community building	Advocacy of “silent period” Overemphasis on physical actions, imperatives Wears thin after the first few weeks

8. (A) Ask pairs to look at the seven features used as a general definition of CLT in the list on page 31 and to brainstorm some practical classroom examples of each of the seven factors. Should any characteristics be added to the list? Or changed?
9. (A) Have students observe an ESL class and use the seven characteristics of CLT as a gauge of how closely the lesson approximates CLT. Ask students to share their observations in small groups.
10. (D) Ask students to review the cycles of “shifting sands” since Gouin’s time. Table 2.1 on pages 36–37 may help to refresh memories. How did each new method borrow from previous practices? What did each reject in previous practices? On the board, you might reconstruct the historical progression in the form of a time line with characteristics listed for each “era.” If time permits, try to determine what the prevailing *social*, *intellectual*, and *political* mood was when certain methods were flowering. For example, the ALM was a product of a post-WWII military training program and flourished during an era when scientific solutions to all problems were diligently sought. Are there some logical connections here?

FOR YOUR FURTHER READING

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Both volumes offer detailed summaries of the methods described in the present chapter. They analyze each method with a focus on teacher goals, roles of the teacher, the nature of student-teacher interaction, undergirding theories of language and culture, assessment, and other topics.

Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.

An informative historical perspective on the early conception of the Notional-Functional Syllabus, precursor to CLT.

Brumfit, C., & Johnson, K. (1979). *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, W. (2011). Communicative language teaching: an expanding concept for a changing world. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: Volume II* (pp. 541–557). New York, NY: Routledge.

A perspective on CLT is offered in the form of Brumfit and Johnson’s detailed summary of communicative principles and practice in 1979, then in more recent reflections by Littlewood in 2011. You will note some interesting developments over the 30 years in between.