Reading Chapter 3: Contextualizing Communicative Approaches

Directions: Read the relevant textbook chapter. Then answer the questions below. Please provide specific examples from your own experiences when applicable. Turn in you answers either by email (jbrawn67@gmail.com).

1) How does the concept of the post-method condition lead to Brown's idea of an informed eclectic approach? What is the post-method condition? What is the informed eclectic approach? How did one idea lead to the other?

2) How is learner-centered classrooms different from teacher-centered classrooms? Which is better for teaching declarative knowledge? Which is better for teaching procedural knowledge?

3) What is task-based learning? How is a task different from other language learning activities? Can you give me an example of a possible task?

CONTEXTUALIZING COMMUNICATIVE APPROACHES

<div style="background:#ccc">

Questions for Reflection

- What does the concept of "postmethod" imply in a historical context?
- Why has the dichotomizing of "theory" and "practice" been dysfunctional?
- What does it mean to be an "informed eclectic" in choosing and evaluating techniques for a communicative L2 course?
- What are the characteristics and contexts of a variety of *general* communicative approaches to methodology?
- What are some of the more *specific* contexts in which communicative approaches apply?

</div>

The history of language teaching described in the previous chapter, characterized by a succession of methodological milestones, had changed its course by the mid-1980s. Ironically, the methods that were such strong signposts of a century-old history were no longer the benchmarks that they once were. The profession had learned some profound lessons from its past journeys.

We became cognizant of the paramount importance of incorporating a communicative component into our language courses. We had learned to be cautiously eclectic in making informed choices of teaching practices that were solidly grounded in the best of what we knew about L2 learning and teaching. And perhaps more importantly, we became acutely aware of a multiplicity of *contexts* for L2 teaching, which brought with it myriad adaptations, applications, and localized approaches—all within the spirit of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

A look back today over several decades of these communicative approaches, techniques, and related research boggles the mind! In a mushrooming of research and classroom practices, we seem to have addressed every imaginable audience, age, proficiency level, and special purpose for L2 learning. And we have not ignored the importance of localizing language teaching to country, institution, socioeconomic level, political motive, and social-psychological variables at play in the teaching-learning dialogue.

In this chapter we'll address a good deal of this contextualization of language teaching by examining a variety of *methodological options* within the

framework communicative approaches. Of course, in the process, we may omit one or two of your favorites, but we will at least have provided a picture of the amazing diversity of this field!

But first, let's take a look at the philosophical foundations undergirding the many manifestations of CLT approaches since the mid-1980s.

THE POSTMETHOD CONDITION

We seem to have an infatuation with "post" conditions, perhaps an indication of the human yearning to "get over" our past and look optimistically into the future. You may have heard enough about post-colonial, post-modern, post-structural, post-behavioral, post-cognitive, and even *post-linguistic* (Nelson & Kern, 2012) conditions, and more! But there is one more "post" condition that we cannot ignore here.

The notion of a **postmethod** era of language teaching was a concept that arose around the turn of the twenty-first century that described the need to put to rest the limited concept of method as it was used in the previous century. David Nunan (1991b), noting that there may never be a "method for all," summed it up nicely: "The focus in recent years has been on the development of classroom tasks and activities which are consonant with what we know about second language acquisition, and which are also in keeping with the dynamics of the classroom itself" (p. 228).

Kumaravadivelu (2001) was even more specific in calling for a "pedagogy of particularity," that is, being "sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular social milieu" (2006, p. 538). Others (Brown, 1993; Clarke, 1994; Richards & Rodgers, 2001) had earlier expressed the need for soundly conceived pedagogical approaches that attended to the particularities of contexts.

Was the proclamation of a postmethod condition merely a matter of semantic quibbling? Maybe. Bell (2003) astutely observed that we have too many definitions attached to the word method, and attempted to clear the muddied waters by differentiating method with a lowercase *m*, any of a wide variety of classroom practices, from Method with an uppercase *M*, "a fixed set of classroom practices that serve as a prescription" (p. 326). What are we to make of the confusion? Happily, Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011), among others, remain comfortable with maintaining the notion of methods (with a small *m*) as long as we are clear about the referent.

So perhaps by now the profession has attained a modicum of maturity where we recognize that the diversity of language learners in multiple worldwide contexts demands an eclectic blend of tasks, each tailored for a specified group of learners studying for particular purposes in geographic, social, and political contexts.

CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

Imagine a language course that announced it was following a particular method, let's say, TPR or Suggestopedia. In such a course, how *different* would the actual adaptation of that method be across varying contexts? For example, a "traditional" teacher-centered institution or system versus a school that had more "open" definitions of teacher roles? Children versus adults? Academic language versus survival skills?

THE DYSFUNCTION OF THE THEORY-PRACTICE DICHOTOMY

The now discarded concept of Method (with a capital *M*) as a discrete set of unified techniques designed to apply to multiple contexts, carried with it, in some opinions (Clarke, 1994; Kumaravadivelu, 2006a), an implicit assumption about the relationship between what we have customarily called "theory" and "practice." *Theory*, in both philosophical and scientific inquiry, implies an organized set of hypotheses presumed to explain an observed phenomenon. In language teaching, an application of a theory may come in the form of a methodological set of practical options that follow from the theory.

All too often in our history of L2 teaching, we have seen the theory-building part of the formula carried out by researchers who may have been only distantly familiar with the practicalities of classroom teaching. Likewise, the *practice* part of the formula was thought to be the province of classroom teachers who accepted (or rejected) the theorist's pronouncements about the how's and why's of SLA. The relationship between the theorist and practitioner was—and in some cases, still is—similar to that of a producer of goods and a consumer.

Mark Clarke (1994) eloquently argued against such a relationship in analyzing the *dysfunction* of the theory-practice relationship. He and others since then (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Nunan, 2003; Kumaravadivelu, 2006a; Larsen-Freeman, 2012) offered strong arguments against perpetuating this "misleading dualism" (Hedgcock, 2002, p. 308). Not only does such an understanding promote the notion of "a privileged class of theorists and an underprivileged class of practitioners," (Kumaravadivelu, 2006b, p. 166), but it also connotes a separation of researchers and teachers, and at worst, a one-way communication line from the former to the latter.

Recent work in the language teaching profession shows a marked departure from the artificial dichotomy of theory and practice (Murphy & Byrd,

2001; McKay, 2006; Alsagoff et al., 2012; Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014; Graves, 2014). In this mode of viewing the profession, teachers *are* researchers and are charged with the responsibility of *reflecting* on their own practice (Murphy, 2014). Calls for "action research" and "classroom-based research" (Bailey, 2014) reflect a new and healthier "reconfiguring [of] the relationship between theorizers and practitioners" (Nelson & Kern, 2012, p. 47).

It has become increasingly inauthentic for researchers with PhDs to generate ideas from the "ivory tower" without experiencing them in person in the classroom. Likewise, more and more teachers are engaging in the process of systematic observation, experimentation, analysis, and reporting of their own experiences in classrooms around the world. More detail on the language teacher as *researcher* is offered in Chapter 22 of this book.

As you continue to read on in this and following chapters, it's important to view yourself as a capable observer of your own and others' practice. You need not think of theorists as people that are removed from the arena of classroom reality, nor of teachers as anything less than essential participants in a dialogue.

AN INFORMED ECLECTIC APPROACH

It should be clear from the foregoing that as both an informed and eclectic teacher, you think in terms of a number of possible pedagogical options at your disposal for tailoring classes to particular contexts. Your *approach*, or rationale for language learning and teaching, therefore takes on great importance. Your approach includes a number of basic principles of learning and teaching (such as those that will be elaborated in Chapter 4) on which you can rely for designing and evaluating classroom lessons. Your approach to language-teaching methodology is a theoretically well-informed global understanding of the process of learning and teaching. It is inspired by the interconnection of all your reading and observing and discussing and teaching, and that interconnection underlies everything that you do in the classroom.

But your approach to language pedagogy is not just a set of static principles "set in stone." It is, in fact, a dynamic composite of well-informed beliefs that change across time (as you learn more and more about the art of teaching) and that adapt themselves to whatever *situated contexts* in which you are teaching. The interaction between your approach and your classroom practice is the key to effective, authentic teaching.

If you have little or no experience in teaching and are perhaps now in a teacher education program, you may feel you cannot yet describe your own approach to L2 learning and teaching. On the other hand, you might just surprise yourself at the intuitions you already have about pedagogical foundations.

Look at the list below of a number of questions you may need to consider in designing a lesson. On the basis of what you know so far about SLA and teaching, and for a particular context you're familiar with, which side of a continuum of possibilities would you generally lean toward, and why? And what contextual variables might influence a change away from your general inclination?

QUESTIONS TO PONDER IN DESIGNING AND TEACHING L2 LESSONS

1. Should the course focus on meaning or form or both?
2. Will analysis or intuition benefit my students more?
3. As a teacher should I be tough and demanding or gentle and empathetic?
4. Should I directly correct students' errors or try to get them to self-correct?
5. Should a communicative course give more attention to accuracy or fluency?

Were you able to respond to these items? For example, the first item offers a choice between "meaning" and "form" for a focus. While you might lean toward meaning because you know that too much focus on form could detract from communicative acquisition, certain classroom techniques or tasks might demand a focus on formal aspects, such as grammar, phonology, or lexicon. Or your context (say, a test preparation course that helps students to pass a grammar test) might dictate your emphasis.

CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

Suppose you're teaching in an educational context or culture in which teachers must not appear too empathetic lest students lose their respect for you. How would that modify your answer to item #3 above? What other contexts of teaching (age, skill level, culture, purpose) can you think of that would dictate an adaptation of your approach?

If you could make a choice within each item, it indicates that you do indeed have some intuitions about teaching, and perhaps the rudiments of an approach. Your approach is guided by several key factors. Consider the following list.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO YOUR *APPROACH* TO LANGUAGE TEACHING

- the particular needs and goals of your students
- your own experience as a learner in classrooms
- whatever teaching experience you may already have had
- classroom observations you have made
- books you have read
- previous courses in the field

But more importantly, if you found that in almost every choice you wanted to add something like "but it depends on . . .," then you are on the way toward developing an *informed* approach to language learning and teaching. Your approach to language teaching must always account for specific contexts of teaching, or what Kumaravadivelu (2001) called a pedagogy of "particularity," as mentioned earlier. Rarely can we say with absolute certainty that a methodological set of techniques applies to all learners in all contexts for all purposes.

GENERAL APPROACHES

In the remainder of this chapter we will take you on a "tour" of language teaching options that represent the diversity of L2 pedagogy across the globe. All of our brief "stopovers" provide sketches of methodological approaches that can quite plausibly be subsumed under the rubric of CLT. Moreover, all of the approaches are *current*, in that they are being practiced, in a variety of interpretations, in L2 teaching today.

Some approaches are more *general* in nature: They are being used across many different contexts, countries, institutions, ages, and proficiency levels. Task-based language teaching, for example, is broadly applicable to an enormous variety of contexts. Other approaches are more *specific*: Certain identifiable contextual factors must be present for them to be of utility in a language program. Thus, workplace L2 teaching obviously is limited to a restrictive audience and purpose.

We turn first to the more broadly applicable approaches.

Learner-Centered Instruction

> When Gary Adkins walked into the first class hour of his advanced French grammar and reading class as a junior in college, his classmates quietly sat in their seats, stone faced, eyes fixed on the teacher. Professor Bouchard, in silence, sternly eyed the newest student, who took his seat as quickly as possible. Attendance was duly recorded, and with dispatch, the professor described the course, the prerequisites (mainly having completed second-year French), course requirements, and the grading system.
>
> "Any questions?" he asked, still sternly eyeing the students, but nary a person dared to stick a neck out.
>
> "Good. Now open your books to page 3, where you will find our first reading passage. Monsieur Adkins, read the first paragraph aloud."
>
> Trembling, unprepared, Gary read the paragraph. Quite well, he thought. Professor Bouchard had another opinion.
>
> "Monsieur Adkins, you must read more loudly next time. You mispronounced several words, and you must learn to read with more emphasis. . . . Now, Mademoiselle Allen, translate the first paragraph into English."

About this time Gary wondered why he had to be born into a family whose name began at the top of the alphabet! Miss Allen had similar thoughts as she stumbled through the translation, with a performance riddled with errors, causing Professor Bouchard to embark on a tirade about the intricacies of the present and past perfect tenses in French. You can imagine how the rest of the class hour went, and how thankful every student was when the bell rang—and how especially thankful were those whose last name began with "z"—they did not have to "recite" on this day!

Teacher-centered instruction has been with us for centuries, if not millennia. The teacher controls everything; students speak only when asked to; the teacher is an authority who is not to be questioned. But around the middle of the twentieth century, this model began to erode as educators probed new models of pedagogy. In the words of Weimer (2013), students "needed to find their way past self-doubt, awkwardness, and the fear of failure to a place where they could ask a question in class, make a contribution to a group, and speak coherently in front of peers" (p. 5). By the end of the twentieth century, **learner-centered instruction** was a catchword for a new model of education across many disciplines. Language teaching soon proved to be an ideal subject matter to put the forward-thinking model into practice, as aptly demonstrated in Nunan's (1988) manual describing curriculum design that incorporated collaboration between student and teacher.

Learner-centered instruction turned teacher-centered models "upside down" by playing down the all-knowing, authoritative role of the teacher, and giving opportunities to students to participate in a classroom without fear of being scolded or belittled by a teacher. Some of the hallmarks of learner-centered teaching included the following:

> ## Characteristics of Learner-Centered Instruction
> - a focus on learners' needs and goals
> - understanding individual differences among learners in a classroom
> - gauging the curriculum to learners' styles and preferences
> - creating a supportive, nonfearful, nondefensive atmosphere
> - offering students choices in the types and content of activities
> - giving some control to the student (e.g., group work)

Because language teaching often presupposes a classroom where students have very little language proficiency with which to *negotiate* with the teacher, teachers may be wary of giving learners the "power" associated with a learner-centered approach. Such reluctance may not be necessary for two reasons. First, by conducting a formal or informal *needs assessment* at the beginning of a course, teachers can be relatively well-directed in the first few sessions of a class. Second, even in beginning level classes, teachers can still adhere to the goals of a curriculum while giving students opportunities to "try out" language.

In learner-centered classrooms, teachers are not being asked to relinquish *all* control, only to allow for student innovation, creativity, and eventually their autonomy. All of these efforts help to give students a sense of "ownership" of their learning and thereby add to their sense of *agency* and *identity*.

> ### CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS
>
> Your students are in the first week or so of a beginning language class, and their ability is limited to a few words and phrases. How might what you say and do, what students say and do, and some of the activities all reflect a learner-centered approach? Remember, your students are beginners with limited language. Can yours still be a learner-centered classroom?

Task-Based Language Teaching

One of the most prominent perspectives within the CLT framework is **Task-Based Language Teaching** (TBLT). Ellis (2003) asserted that TBLT is at the very heart of CLT by placing the use of tasks at the core of language teaching. In Nunan's (2014) words, "CLT addresses the question *why?* TBLT answers the question *how?*" (p. 458). While there is a good deal of variation among experts on how to describe or define a **task**, Peter Skehan's (1998a, p. 95) concept of task still captures the essentials. The following lists the attributes of a successful task.

Characteristics of Effective Tasks

- meaning is primary
- there is a communication problem to solve
- there is a relationship to comparable real-world activities
- task completion has some priority
- the assessment of the task is in terms of outcome

Perhaps more simply put, "a task is an activity which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective" (Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001, p. 11). A task may comprise several techniques. For example, a problem-solving task may include the techniques of grammatical explanation, teacher-initiated questions, small group-work, and an oral reporting procedure. Tasks are usually "bigger" in their ultimate ends than techniques.

Task-based teaching makes an important distinction between **target tasks**, which students must accomplish beyond the classroom, and **pedagogical tasks**, which form the nucleus of the classroom activity. Target tasks are not unlike the functions of language that are listed in Notional-Functional Syllabuses (see Chapter 2, here, and Chapter 8 of *PLLT*). For example, "giving personal information" is a communicative function for language, and an appropriately stated target task might be "giving personal information in a job interview." Notice that the task specifies a context.

Pedagogical tasks include any of a series of techniques designed ultimately to teach students to perform the target task. The ultimate pedagogical task usually involves students in some form of simulation of the target task itself (say, through a role-play simulation in which certain roles are assigned to learners). More elaborate tasks might involve planning an itinerary for a trip (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011, p. 149), which requires consulting transportation routes, ascertaining hotel rates, deciding on the best sights to see, and mapping out daily schedules.

🌐 CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

Suppose you have been asked to teach a unit to intermediate-level learners (choose any context) in which the ultimate task was for small groups to each present an advertisement for a tour of Antarctica. What are some of the pedagogical tasks that might be important to include as steps toward the ultimate goal of the unit?

Pedagogical tasks are distinguished by their specific objectives that cumulatively point beyond the language classroom to the target task. They may, however, include both formal and functional techniques. A pedagogical task designed to teach students to give personal information in a job interview might, for example, involve

1. exercises in comprehension of *wh-* questions with *do-*insertion ("When do you work at Macy's?").
2. drills in the use of frequency adverbs ("I usually work until five o'clock.").
3. listening to extracts of job interviews.
4. analyzing the grammar and discourse of the interviews.
5. modeling a typical interview protocol.
6. role-playing a simulated interview with students in pairs.

While you might be tempted to consider only the ultimate task (#6) as the one fulfilling the criterion of pointing beyond the classroom to the real world, all of the techniques build toward enabling the students to perform the final technique.

A task-based curriculum, then, specifies what a learner needs to do with the English language in terms of target tasks and organizes a series of pedagogical tasks intended to reach those goals. An important criterion in task-based curricula is pedagogical soundness in the development and sequencing of tasks. The teacher and curriculum planner are called upon to consider communicative dimensions such as goal, input from the teacher, interaction, teacher and learner roles, and assessment (Ellis, 2003; Skehan, 2003; Nunan, 2004, 2014; Kumaravadivelu, 2006b).

Task-based instruction is not a new method. Rather, it puts task at the center of one's methodological focus. It views the learning process as a set of communicative tasks that are directly linked to the curricular goals they serve, the purposes of which extend beyond the practice of language for its own sake.

Research on task-based learning has pursued the following objectives (Van den Branden, 2006; Samuda & Bygate, 2008; Kim 2009; Robinson, 2011):

- identifying types of tasks that enhance learning (such as open-ended, structured, teacher-fronted, small group, and pair work)
- defining task-specific learner factors (for example, roles, proficiency levels, and styles)
- examining teacher roles and other variables that contribute to successful achievement of objectives
- specifying task complexity

Task-based instruction is a perspective within a CLT framework that urges you to carefully consider all the techniques that you use in the classroom in terms of a number of important pedagogical purposes:

> ## Characteristics of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)
>
> - Tasks ultimately point learners beyond the forms of language alone to real-world contexts.
> - Tasks specifically contribute to the communicative goals of learners.
> - Their elements are carefully designed and not simply haphazardly or idiosyncratically thrown together.
> - Their objectives are well specified so that you can at some later point accurately determine the success of one task over another.
> - Tasks engage learners, at some level, in genuine problem-solving activity.

Theme-Based Instruction

When language courses are organized around meaningful situations or topics, they may be said to be **theme-based**, sometimes referred to as **topic-based** curricula. Theme-based instruction provides an organizing framework for a language course that transcends formal or structural requirements in a curriculum. Theme-based curricula can serve multiple interests of students in a classroom and can offer a focus on *content* while still adhering to institutional requirements for, let's say, coverage of grammatical criteria. Brinton (2013) puts theme-based teaching under the rubric of content-based language teaching (to be discussed below), but cautiously notes that there are variations in interpretation of the model (p. 4).

So, for example, an intensive English course for intermediate pre-university students might deal with topics of current interest such as public health, environmental awareness, or world economics. In the classroom students read articles or chapters, view video programs, discuss issues, propose solutions, and carry out writing assignments on a given *theme*, but the primary focus of the curriculum is not on *content* (e.g., medicine, business, science workplace)

Numerous current L2 textbooks, especially at the intermediate to advanced levels, offer theme-based courses of study. Challenging topics in these textbooks engage the curiosity and increase motivation of students as they grapple with an array of real-life issues ranging from simple to complex and also improve their linguistic skills across all four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Consider just one of an abundance of topics that have been used as themes through which language is taught: *environmental awareness and action*. With

this topic, you are sure to find immediate intrinsic motivation—we all want to survive! Here are some possible theme-based activities:

- Use environmental statistics and facts for classroom reading, writing, discussion, and debate.
- Carry out research and writing projects.
- Have students create their own environmental awareness material.
- Arrange field trips.
- Conduct simulation games.

In these activities, all four skills are actively in use. Students can get excited about solutions to real problems, some of which may be uncomfortably "close to home." They can use language for genuine communicative purposes, and are actively involved in learner-centered collaboration. And they can absorb a surprising number of "required" linguistically based curricular objectives.

Experiential and Project-Based Learning

In yet another of the many facets of CLT-inspired perspectives on language teaching, **experiential learning** offers a dimension that may not necessarily be implied in the concepts already discussed here. Experiential learning, also known as **project-based learning**, highlights giving students *concrete experiences* in which they must use language in order to fulfill the objectives of a lesson (Eyring, 1991; Stoller, 2006). Both models include activities that contextualize language, integrate skills, and point toward authentic, real-world purposes, as in the following examples:

> ### ✎ EXAMPLES OF EXPERIENTIAL AND PROJECT-BASED ACTIVITIES
>
> - hands-on projects (e.g., constructing a diorama)
> - field trips and other on-site visits (e.g., to a factory or museum)
> - research projects (e.g., the value of solar power)
> - extra-class dinner groups (e.g., learning about Vietnamese cuisine)
> - creating a video advertising a product (e.g., organic fruit)

Experiential learning emphasizes the psychomotor aspects of language learning by involving learners in physical actions into which language is subsumed and reinforced. Through action, students are drawn into a utilization of multiple skills. The educational foundations of experiential learning lie in the advantages of "learning by doing," discovery learning, and inductive learning.

🌐 **CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS**

Imagine a unit in an L2 that involves advanced adult students in a research project on nuclear nonproliferation (disarming countries of nuclear weapons). What might some of the objectives (across all four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing) be for such a unit? What pedagogical tasks could you see being used in this unit?

A specialized form of experiential learning that is still used in some circles is the **Language Experience Approach** (LEA) (Van Allen & Allen, 1967), an integrated-skills approach initially used in teaching native language reading skills, but more recently adapted to second language learning contexts. With widely varying adaptations, students' personal experiences (a trip to the zoo, a movie, a family gathering at a park, etc.) are used as the basis for discussion, and then students, with the help of the teacher, write about the "experience," which is preserved in the form of a "book." The benefit of the LEA is in the intrinsic involvement of students in creating their own stories rather than being given other people's stories. As in other experiential techniques, students are directly involved in the creative process of fashioning their own products, and all four skills are readily implied in carrying out a project.

Strategies-Based Instruction

Ever since Paolo Freire (1970) and others introduced the concept of student *responsibility* for their own achievement of outcomes, educational theory has done an about-face across disciplines. In L2 pedagogy, one of the key foundation stones of successful instruction is enabling students to "learn how to learn." That is, learners become **autonomous** through becoming aware of their own strengths and weaknesses and taking action in the form of strategic involvement in learning. (In the Chapter 4, we will expand on the principles of autonomy and investment.)

Implied in all the CLT-inspired approaches described so far in this chapter is the centrality of the learner. One of the most powerful ways that learners can "seize the day" in their journey to success is through what come to be called **strategic investment**. The learning of any skill involves a certain degree of investment of one's time and effort. Every complex set of skills—like learning to play a musical instrument or a sport—is acquired through a combination of observing, focusing, practicing, monitoring, correcting, and redirecting.

Learning an L2 is no different. A language is probably the most complex set of skills one could ever seek to acquire; therefore, an investment is necessary

in the form of developing multiple layers of strategies for getting that language into one's brain. Building into your pedagogy ways for students to achieve this kind of strategic autonomy has come to be known as **strategies-based instruction** (SBI), also called *learning strategy training* (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2013) as well as *learner development/training* (Wenden, 1998, 2002).

Several decades ago research began to show that successful learners engaged in certain practices that distinguished them from unsuccessful learners (Rubin & Thompson, 1982; Oxford, 1990). Among other characteristics, good language learners take charge of their own learning, seeking out opportunities to use the language, experiment with the L2, make guesses, use production tricks, allow errors to work for them, and learn from their mistakes.

In order for learners to become self-driven independent learners beyond the classroom, they must be fully *aware* of their own strengths, weaknesses, preferences, and styles, and be able to capitalize on that metacognition through the use of appropriate action in the form of strategic options. The importance of *awareness-raising* in language learning is well documented (Chamot, 2005; Cohen, 2011; Oxford, 2011). When learners are aware of their own capacities and limitations, they can efficiently adopt pathways to success that capitalize on strengths and compensate for weaknesses.

The effective implementation of SBI in language classrooms involves several steps and considerations (see Brown, 2014 for details):

1. stimulating awareness within learners of preferred styles
2. linking style to strategy with "strategic" techniques
3. providing extra-class assistance for learners

Stimulating Awareness

Most L2 learners are unaware of their own styles, preferences, and ways of addressing various problems. If they are aware, certainly very few have ever made the connection between these styles and learning an L2. So, what are some practical steps you can take toward awareness raising? Consider the following possibilities as a start.

STIMULATING AWARENESS OF LEARNERS' STYLES

- ask students to fill out informal self-checklists
- administer formal personality and cognitive style tests
- involve students in readings (e.g., Brown, 2002b) about styles
- introduce (define) and discuss various styles
- encourage "good" learning styles among learners

🌐 **CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS**

Have you ever been in an L2 course in which the teacher has talked about or encouraged you to become aware of your styles (strengths, weaknesses, preferences)? As a teacher, how would you use a style awareness checklist? How might you introduce your students to various styles?

Among awareness-raising possibilities is attention to **multiple intelligences** in L2 learning. As summarized in *PLLT*, Chapter 4 (Brown, 2014), Gardner's (1983, 1999, 2004) model of intelligence includes at least eight types of intelligence, which has led educators to view a number of forms of "smartness" that learners can manifest. A learner who is strong, for example, in interpersonal intelligence may thrive in the context of group work and interaction, while a student who has high spatial intelligence will perform well with plenty of charts, diagrams, and other visuals. Most educators who follow an MI approach advocate the use of a multiplicity of types of activities and techniques in order to appeal to as wide a swath of learners as possible (Armstrong, 1994). Christison (2005) offered a compilation of 150 different activities for language learners, each emphasizing a specific intelligence, coded for age and proficiency level.

Linking Style and Strategy in the Classroom

Recent research has linked styles and strategies and discussed classroom implications of such connections (Cohen, 2011; Oxford, 2011; Wong & Nunan, 2011; Brown, 2014). Among the various suggestions in these sources for engaging in SBI is the concept of taking into account a student's style that may be working *against* him or her and gauging classroom techniques that will address those needs. Consider some ways to accomplish this in the Tips box (from Brown, 2014) on the next page.

Purpura (2014) adds a further dimension to strategy training by considering the various *stages* of processing that learners go through. For example, processing new input involves a comprehending process that consists of attending, decoding, noticing, and clarifying. The same strategies to be applied at this stage are far different from those at, say, response preparation and generation (output), which come only after intake, storage, and retrieval have taken place. Others (Brown, 2002b; Oxford, 2011) have built on this observation by distinguishing among strategies for comprehension and production, remembering, monitoring, and sociocultural awareness, among many other subcategories.

✎ COMPENSATING FOR STYLES THAT MAY BE WORKING *AGAINST* LEARNERS

To lower inhibitions

Guessing games and communication games
Role plays, skits, and songs
Group and pair work
Humor, fun, laughter, enjoyment
Students share their fears in small groups

To encourage risk taking

Praise students for making sincere efforts to try out language
Use fluency exercises where errors are not corrected at that time
Extra-class collaborative projects

To build students' self-confidence

Tell and show students that you believe in them
Students make lists of their strengths
Students enumerate goals accomplished

An increasing number of L2 textbooks are offering guidelines and exercises for strategy awareness and practice within the stream of a chapter. Brown's (2000) *New Vistas* series for ESL learners offered examples of embedding strategy work within the exercises of a textbook. In another series of textbooks (Sarosy & Sherak, 2006), for academic listening, students' attention is drawn to cues for listening accurately to a lecture, for example, by attending to language that signals sequences of points, the "big picture," and a new idea or topic. Similarly, Chamot, O'Malley, and Kupper (1992) included strategy training modules in each unit.

Providing Extra Class Assistance

A third step toward building students' strategic awareness and awareness can be implemented beyond the classroom. Teachers can issue challenges to students to implement certain strategies that have been practiced in the classroom, and bring reports of their successes back to share with classmates. Self-help study guides (Marshall, 1989; Rubin & Thompson, 1994; Brown, 2002) tend to have short, easy-to-understand chapters with information, anecdotes, tips, and exercises that will help learners to use strategies successfully beyond the language classroom. Excellent opportunities for authentic communication are available in the social media, and even though texting, tweeting, blogging, and Facebook posts are replete with nonstandard language, strategic investment may still reap benefits.

We will be spiraling TLT, SBI, and other CLT-inspired approaches into numerous examples in the rest of this book, as we look at more specific pedagogical basics

in the chapters to come. We have so far just provided a sketch of the variety of outgrowth in the last few decades of the CLT "era."

Other Collaborative Approaches

Several other pedagogical approaches in the latter part of the twentieth century featured collaboration, interaction, and cooperation among learners in the classroom. We'll take a brief look at three such models, all within the principles of CLT, variations of which are present in many L2 classrooms today.

Cooperative learning, as opposed to viewing learners as individuals on a solitary quest for success, incorporated principles of learner-centered instruction. As students work together in pairs and groups, they share information and come to each other's aid. They are a "team" whose players must work together in order to achieve goals successfully. According to the research (Oxford, 1997; McCafferty, Jacobs, & DaSilva, 2006), in such a milieu, learners typical show heightened self-efficacy and identity, lowered anxiety, and in their communities of practice are able to nurture relationships among classmates.

Included among some of the challenges of cooperative learning are accounting for individual learning styles, personality differences, and possible over-reliance on the first language (Crandall, 1999). Further, virtually any models that feature *collaboration*—in which students and teachers work together to pursue goals— promote communities of learners that cut across the usual hierarchies of students and teachers, necessitating a cautious approach in cultures with strong power distance norms between teachers and students (Oxford, 1997, p. 443).

It almost goes without saying that communicative classrooms by definition are interactive. The extent to which *intended* messages are received is a factor of both one's production and the listener's/reader's reception. Most meaning, in a semantic sense, is a product of negotiation, of give and take, as interlocutors attempt to communicate. Thus, the communicative purpose of language compels us to create opportunities for genuine *interaction* in the classroom. An interactive course exhibits the following features, to name a few:

Characteristics of Interactive Language Teaching

- doing a significant amount of pair work and group work
- receiving authentic language input in real-world contexts
- producing language for genuine, meaningful communication
- performing classroom tasks that prepare Ss for actual language use beyond the classroom
- practicing oral communication through the give and take and spontaneity of actual conversations
- writing to and for real audiences, not contrived ones

The theoretical foundations of interactive learning lie in what Long (1985, 1996) described as the **interaction hypothesis** of second language acquisition (see *PLLT*, Chapter 10). Long and others have pointed out the importance of input *and* output in the development of language. As learners interact with each other through oral and written discourse, their communicative abilities are enhanced.

Another example of a collaborative approach was found in **whole language education,** which emphasized the interconnections between oral and written language. Interpretations and variations of this model were so divergent, however, that its impact soon waned (Rigg, 1991; Edelsky, 1993). Nevertheless the model offered three important insights that are worthy of mention.

- Language is not the sum of its many dissectible and discrete parts.
- Integrate the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing).
- Language is a system of social practices that both constrain and liberate.

These insights underscore some key principles of L2 pedagogy. First, L1 acquisition research shows us that children begin perceiving "wholes" (sentences, emotions, intonation patterns) well before "parts." Teachers might therefore help their students attend to such wholes, resisting the temptation to build language only from the bottom up. Second, because the four skills are interrelated, beware of assuming that the skills are easily separable. And finally, in the words of Edelsky (1993, p. 548), whole language education is a perspective "anchored in a vision of an equitable, democratic, diverse society." Part of our job as teachers is to empower our learners to seize their *agency*, and to master whatever social, political, or economic forces might otherwise constrain them.

🌐 CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

Edelsky (1993) made quite a jump from *whole language* to the *social* nature of language and language learning. In your learning of an L2, to what extent do you feel that you learned a "system of social practices"? If so, were you aware of such learning at the time? What are some examples of *social practices* that you as a teacher might include in your curriculum? How can you as a teacher help your students to be *empowered* through learning an L2?

SPECIFIC APPROACHES

All the above general approaches may to a great extent be implemented in any language course regardless of context. In the next few descriptions of CLT-based approaches in this chapter, we will focus on models that are more limited

in their applicability and feasibility. Certain conditions must apply in order to render them relevant and viable. Some contextual constraints are age-related or institutionally determined, others vary by course goals or proficiency, and still others are embedded in sociopolitical and sociocultural constraints. Let's look at some of these options.

Content-Based Language Teaching

> Yaling is a Chinese child of eight who completed second grade in China and now, as her parents have just moved to Japan, she finds herself in a new country learning a new language. There is no special Japanese language class in Yaling's new elementary school in Osaka, so her parents place her in a regular third grade class, hoping that her intelligence, determination, and outgoing personality will pay off. Ultimately, Yaling manages, with a fair amount of difficulty in the first few months, to learn third grade subject matter as she simultaneously acquires Japanese.

Yaling was lucky. Parental support and better than average intelligence propelled her along. Others might have benefitted from some form of **content-based language teaching** (CBLT) to assist in the process of concurrently learning subject matter and a new language. CBLT can come in many forms and interpretations, and sometimes the definitions and boundaries among CBLT and its "cousins" are blurred by "competing claims in the literature" (Brinton, 2013, p. 1). So, it may be easier to think of CBLT as "an umbrella term for a multifaceted approach to second or foreign language teaching that...shares a common point of departure—the integration of language teaching aims with content instruction" Snow (2014, p. 439).

More specifically, according to Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989, p. vii), CBLT refers to "the concurrent study of language and subject matter, with the form and sequence of language presentation dictated by content material." Such an approach contrasts sharply with many practices in which language skills are taught virtually in isolation from substantive content. When language becomes the medium to convey informational content of interest and relevance to the learner, then learners are pointed toward matters of meaningful concern. Language takes on its appropriate role as a vehicle for accomplishing a set of content goals.

A surge of interest in CBLT in the late twentieth century resulted in widespread adoption of content-based curricula around the world, as chronicled by Brinton (2003), Stoller (2004), Schleppegrell et al. (2004), and others. Content-based classrooms have the potential of yielding an increase in intrinsic motivation and empowerment, because students are focused on subject matter that is important to their lives. And as they center their interest on mastery of subject matter, they are concurrently acquiring linguistic ability.

The challenges of CBLT range from a demand for a whole new genre of textbooks and other materials to the training of language teachers to teach the concepts and skills of various disciplines, professions, and occupations. Allowing the subject matter to control the selection and sequencing of language

items means that you have to view your teaching from an entirely different perspective. You are first and foremost teaching science or math, for example, and secondarily teaching language. So you may have to become a double expert! Some team-teaching models of content-based teaching alleviate this potential drawback by linking subject-matter teachers and language teachers. Such an undertaking is what Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) describe as an **adjunct model** of content-based instruction.

Can content-based teaching take place at all levels of proficiency, even beginning levels? While it is possible to argue, for example, that certain basic survival skills are themselves content-based and that a beginning level class could therefore be content-based, such an argument extends the content-based notion beyond its normal bounds. CBLT usually pertains to academic or occupational instruction over an *extended* period of time at intermediate-to-advanced proficiency levels. Talking about renting an apartment one day, shopping the next, getting a driver's license the next, and so on, is certainly useful and meaningful for beginners, but would more appropriately fall into the category of a *task-based* or *theme-based* curriculum, as discussed above.

🌐 CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

At the beginning of this section, Yaling's adjustment at the age of 8 into a Japanese elementary school system was described. If you were her third-grade teacher, what kinds of assistance could you give to Yaling in her first few weeks of the school year? How might you involve parents, technology, or other students in your quest to help her to master the *content* of the curriculum?

Immersion and Sheltered Models

Over the years CBLT has been linked with several related models of education that, because of their uniqueness, deserve separate mention here.

Immersion models of language teaching began half a century ago in Canada and the United States with programs that sought more intensive instruction in French and Spanish, respectively, for native-English-speaking children in elementary school. Immersion models typically provide the majority of subject-matter content through the medium of the L2, thus the name "immersion." According to years of documentation (Tedick, Christian, & Fortune, 2011), immersion programs have been highly successful, with children performing on a par with their monolingual counterparts and becoming functional bilinguals by the end of elementary school. Immersion models have since sprung up in other countries: China, Hong Kong, Hungary, Finland, and Spain, among others (Snow, 2014).

Sheltered models of education involve "the deliberate separation of L2 students from native speakers of the target language for the purpose of content instruction" (Snow, 2014, p. 441). For L2 students whose language proficiency is not quite able to handle subject-matter content in the L1 of the educational system, they provide opportunities for them to master content standards with added language assistance. In such cases, the teacher of a school subject (say, science or history) modifies the presentation of material to help L2 learners process the content. Pre-teaching difficult vocabulary, suggesting reading comprehension strategies, explaining certain grammatical structures, and offering form-focused feedback are among techniques that have shown to be helpful (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2012).

Bilingual Education

Among the multiplicity of communicative approaches to L2 instruction that have appeared over the last several decades is a cluster of models all of which may be classified as bilingual approaches. However, that "cluster" contains so many variations that some caution is in order, lest bilingual education be thought of as a single approach.

McGroarty and Fitzsimmons-Doolan (2014) define **bilingual education** as an approach in which "two languages are used as media of classroom instruction for the same group of students so that students receive some of their instruction in one language and some in the other, with the proportion of each language varying according to program type, instructional goals, and various contextual influences" (p. 503).

Researchers and practitioners alike are careful to explain the many forms that bilingual education has taken in elementary school, secondary school, and higher education, as well as in the context of language-majority and language-minority students (Kroon & Vallen, 2010; Garcia, 2013). Options at the elementary level, for example, can range from *early-exit*, or *transitional* programs (students are placed for a limited number of years in a bilingual classroom, until they are *mainstreamed*), to *developmental*, or *maintenance* programs (the child's L1 is maintained throughout the duration of the program). At the higher education level, language for specific purposes (see below) and content-based immersion programs may also fall into the category of bilingual education.

Worldwide, bilingual education has been shown to be effective in many contexts (Baker, 2011), in spite of the many forms and models it has taken over the years. Unfortunately, in the United States bilingual education has been highly politicized, and with inaccurate data reported by self-interests, "often based on ignorance and misunderstanding" (McGroarty & Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2014, p. 513), it has faced strong opposition. Elsewhere there is better news. The Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), for example, representing 48 countries, supports multilingualism as a group

right, a means for political cohesion, and cross-cultural understanding (Baetens Beardsmore, 2009; Huhta, 2013). We'll return to this issue in Chapter 8.

Workplace and Vocational L2 Instruction

The last couple of decades of the twentieth century saw a surge of interest in language instruction within the context of the workplace: factories, restaurants, hotels, retail stores, and offices, to name a few examples. **Workplace L2 instruction** offers distinct advantages by tailoring language to the specific linguistic needs of carrying out one's duties "on the job." Workers engaged in housekeeping services in hotels, for example, can in an hour or two a week of classroom instruction learn to comprehend basic vocabulary (e.g., towel, sheet, pillow), useful phrases ("I need an extra towel"), produce appropriate responses ("I'll bring an extra pillow"), and even read simple messages left by hotel guests ("Please repair the air conditioning") (Holloway, 2013).

> ### 🌐 CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS
>
> You have no doubt experienced moments when a worker in a hotel you're staying in says something (maybe in a language you don't know, or maybe just in your L1, but with an accent that's hard to understand) you cannot decipher. Judging from those experiences, what are some words or phrases that you might teach those workers in order to communicate with customers?

Administrative challenges are sometimes an obstacle in that businesses are asked to provide instruction as part of the paid contract of a worker. Employees themselves may need to be convinced of the benefits of going to classes. And of course, instructors need to be paid and classroom space provided at the job site. Offsetting such potential obstacles are the ultimate "soft skills" (etiquette, customer relations) acquired by workers, which has been shown to raise the self-efficacy of employees as well as the company's reputation for service (Johns & Price, 2014).

Workplace programs intersect with what has come to be known as **vocational L2 instruction**, all of which may be subsumed under the category or languages for special purposes (see the next section). Many vocational programs differ in that they are part of an adult education program that provides pre-employment language training, and this typically includes basic academic language skills. Because students are anticipating entering the job market, interviewing and other skills for gaining employment are included in the curriculum. In English-speaking countries, **Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL)** courses typically combine basic literacy education with specialized occupational contexts, are

geared toward a single occupation or multiple occupations, and are gauged for several levels of language ability (Johns & Price, 2014).

Languages for Specific Purposes

Workplace and vocational approaches to L2 instruction are forms of what is generically referred to as **languages for specific purposes (LSP)**, or in the case of English, **English for specific purposes (ESP)** (Master, 2005). This genre of L2 instruction is commonly associated with higher education, and has offshoots in **English for academic purposes (EAP)** (Hamp-Lyons, 2011), as well as in specialized English courses in, for example, the fields of science and technology (EST), business and economics (EBE), and medicine (EMP), in the case of international students studying in English-speaking countries.

You have no doubt experienced differences in the use of language, especially in vocabulary choice and discourse conventions, depending on the subject matter involved. A laboratory report of a chemistry experiment carries with it certain expectations in form and function, and those often bear little resemblance to a marketing analysis for a manufacturing company. Once learners have progressed beyond intermediate stages in their L2, they are usually both prepared and motivated to accomplish tasks in a chosen vocation or profession.

In the words of Johns (2010, p. 318), "in LSP, the *authentic* world must be brought to the students, and they must learn to interact with the language as it is spoken or written in target situations." Those target situations are the specific disciplines being pursued by students. Some of the advantages of LSP may be obvious, notably, acquiring knowledge and skills of one's chosen field of study along with developing the linguistic ability needed for such an accomplishment. A less immediately obvious advantage lies in the concept of *identity* (to be discussed further in the next two chapters). "LSP students' identities are both negotiated and developed as they increase their participation in particular communities of practice" (Paltridge & Starfield, 2011, p. 107). Such a view provides a richer conceptualization of students as potential members of a larger community, learning to participate more significantly in shifting power relationships (Belcher & Lukkarila, 2011).

As LSP courses and models have evolved over the last five decades, several important offshoots of LSP have emerged. The growth of research on *genre* analysis (the study of linguistic and discourse variations in text types) has led to **genre-based pedagogy** (Paltridge, 2001; Johns, 2002, 2010; Hyland, 2004; Tardy, 2013). Such an approach could present students with common genres in a wide variety of professional or occupational communities: e-mails, memos, letters, minutes of meetings, research reports, abstracts, texting, and blogging, for example. More specifically, genre-based pedagogy focuses students on discipline-specific genres, such as laboratory reports, travel brochures, financial reports, drug dosage precautions, essays, or newspaper articles.

🌐 **CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS**

Let's say you have been asked to teach a unit to advanced L2 students in a marketing course on "writing travel advertisements." What are some of the words, phrases, and discourse styles that you would need to include, in order for your students to be able to construct such a genre?

Corpus-Based Teaching

Let's look at one more approach, which could easily be subsumed under LSP, but because of the widespread applications of corpus research, it deserves a special category.

Corpus analysis (also known as **corpus linguistics**) is a computerized approach to linguistic research that stores and analyzes written and/or spoken texts in electronic form (Conrad, 2005). Corpora can be looked at in terms of syntax, lexicon, discourse, along with varieties of language, genres, dialects, styles, and registers (Johns, 2002; Silberstein, 2011). In written form, corpora can be classified into academic, journalistic, or literary prose, among others, and spoken corpora have been classified into conversations of many kinds: everyday conversation among friends, theater/television scripts, speeches, and even classroom language (Biber & Conrad, 2001; Conrad, 2005; McEnery & Xiao, 2011).

Within the broad scope of LSP, **corpus-based teaching** has added many advantages for curriculum and textbook writers as well as teachers in their daily methodological routines. Among the many corpora available today, subcategories include genres such as academic presentations, lectures, interviews, and textbooks, along with study group discussions, office hour conversations, and academic word lists (Paltridge & Starfield, 2011; Keck, 2013). This kind of research has clear benefits as it provides at one's fingertips (literally!) hundreds of millions of instances of words, phrases, and collocations all classified within a linguistic context of co-occurring words before and after the target item. At times social or discourse *contexts* may be difficult to discern, but recent developments have even been able to add certain contextual features into corpus studies (Paltridge & Starfield, 2011).

The benefits of corpus analysis extend well beyond LSP. Curriculum designers and materials developers in all contexts have access to *naturally* occurring language subcategorized into specific varieties, styles, registers, and genres. In lieu of "inventing" possibly inauthentic phrases, collocations, and sentences to illustrate linguistic specifications, these materials can present "real" language (McEnery & Xiao, 2011). A case in point is Walker's (2012) textbook on academic English vocabulary, which is based on the standard corpus-based

Academic Word List in which lexical and grammatical factors are linked and vocabulary presented in *context*. Similarly, Chapelle and Jamieson (2008) have offered useful "tips" that teachers can use in incorporating corpus research into language classrooms. (See Chapter 12 in this book for further discussion of the use of technology in L2 classrooms, including the use of corpus data.)

🌐 CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

Log onto the *Longman Spoken and Written English Corpus* pearsonlongman.com/Dictionaries/corpus/index.html and look up some entries of your choice, but try some less common words to limit the number of instances. You could look up "genre" or "immersion," for example. Using the collocations you find there, design a few fill-in-the-blank exercises for intermediate to advanced students of English.

A methodological approach that has been considerably buoyed by the recent surge of corpus analysis is Michael Lewis's (1993, 1997, 2000) **Lexical Approach**. Building on the hypothesis that the essential building blocks of language are words and word combinations, Lewis maintained that one can do almost anything in a language with vocabulary, and therefore emphasized lexical phrases, or **collocations**, as central to a language course. Phrases like *not so good, how's it going,* and *I'll be in touch* are useful patterns for a learner to internalize along with predicable collocations like *do my homework, . . .the laundry, . . . a good job*, and *make. . . some coffee, . . . my bed, . . . a promise.*

A lexical emphasis has some obvious advantages. It remains somewhat unclear, however, how such an approach differs from other approaches (which certainly allow for a focus on lexical units). Nor is it clear how "an endless succession of phrase-book utterances, 'all chunks but no pine-apple,'. . . can be incorporated into the understanding of a language system" (Harmer, 2001, p. 92).

✮   ✮   ✮   ✮   ✮

In this chapter we have presented most of the major communicative approaches being used worldwide today. As you read further in this book, and as we focus more specifically on classroom lessons and activities, we'll be illustrating many of these approaches in concrete examples.

Meanwhile, a word of warning: Virtually all of the approaches and models described here might appear to be "buzzwords" or even "designer" models, in the same way that methods were depicted in the previous chapter. We claim that is *not* the case, however, because the approaches described here are the

product of well-researched, time-tested, globally relevant methodological practices. In the next chapter, we invite you to discover why we think so, as we present basic *foundational principles* of language teaching on which each of the models can be evaluated and appraised. See for yourself!

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)** Ask your students for concrete examples of the dysfunction of dichotomizing *theory* and *practice*. What's wrong with trained, expert researchers carrying out studies on SLA even if they have never taught in an L2 classroom? How is a teacher supposed to carry out systematic research if he or she has never been trained to do so? How might researchers and teachers productively cooperate?

2. **(D)** Review the notion that one's overall *approach* to language teaching can directly lead to curriculum design and lesson techniques, without necessarily subscribing to a *method*, as the term was used in the previous chapter. Ask your class how they might now understand the term *methodology* to refer to pedagogical *practice* in general? Alternatively, ask them to verbalize the difference between *method* and *methodology*.

3. **(A)** Divide your class into groups of 3 or 4 each and ask them to share any "horror" stories they have experienced in L2 classes that were (like the example of "Gary" on page 45) so authoritarian, strict, scary, or intimidating that they stifled learner-centered spontaneity and creativity. Then ask them to suggest how they might have *changed* that climate if they were teaching that class today. Ask for brief group oral reports of a few of their stories.

4. **(A)** In pairs, have students write down a few phrases to describe each of the following *general* CLT approaches:
   - learner-centered instruction
   - task-based language teaching
   - theme-based instruction
   - experiential/project-based learning
   - strategies-based instruction

   Ask them to share with their partner some examples from personal experience (learning or teaching) of approaches they have just defined. Then solicit a few examples to be reported to the class as a whole.

5. **(A)** In the same pairs, assign to each pair one of the 6 different *specific approaches* discussed in the last part of this chapter. Then have them brainstorm a few phrases to describe their approach, write their findings on the board, and provide a brief oral explanation to the rest of the class. The purpose of this activity is simply to review the many approaches covered in the

chapter. If any students have learned or taught an L2 within any of the models, ask them to briefly describe and evaluate their experience.

6. **(A)** In anticipation of Chapter 4, in which readers will encounter eight principles of language learning and teaching, ask students to brainstorm, in small groups, some assertions about language learning that one might include in a description of an approach to language teaching. For example, what would they say about the issues of age and acquisition, inhibitions, how to best store something in memory, and the relationship of intelligence to second language success? Direct the groups to come up with axioms or principles that would be relatively stable across many acquisition contexts. Then, as a whole class, list these on the board.

FOR YOUR FURTHER READING

Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

A practical resource offering a comprehensive view of classrooms operating under the principles of CLT. Topics include teaching listening comprehension, grammar, spoken language, reading, and writing, all within a communicative framework.

Nunan, D. (2014). Task-based teaching and learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. Brinton, & A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed., pp. 455–470). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.

A concise summary of basic concepts of TBLT, its conceptual underpinnings, and a variety of practical classroom examples of TBLT in action.

Huhta, A. (2013). Common European framework of reference. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 740–746). London, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

A concise introduction to the widely used Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). This chapter is a synopsis of the history of CEFR, its functional, communicative basis, and recent research on its applications in numerous countries and contexts.

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., & Snow, A. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.

Most of the CLT approaches described in this chapter are explained in some detail across the chapters of this volume. A useful guide to research summaries, practical applications, and bibliographic references in each approach.