Chapter 3
ELT: The Second Phase
(Structural Approach and Situational Approach)

Since the learning of a language is most commonly identified with acquiring mastery of its grammatical system, most of the language courses have a grammatical organisation which can also be called structural pedagogic organisation. Language has various constituent aspects which go to make it complete. It has sound system, vocabulary system, grammatical system, writing system, semantic system and so on. One cannot begin to teach all these simultaneously. The choice of the aspect with which the teaching should start, the emphasis to be given to each aspect and the order in which the several procedures available should be taken up have given us various approaches and methods. The different parts of a language are taught separately and step by step so that acquisition becomes a process of gradual accumulation of the parts until the whole structure of the language has been built up. At any one time the learner is exposed to a deliberately limited sample of knowledge. The language that is mastered in one unit of learning is added to that which has been acquired in the preceding units. Significant linguistic forms can be isolated from the structurally heterogeneous
contexts in which they occur-, so that learning can be focussed on important aspects of the language structure. The learner's task is to reorganise and resynthesise the language that has been broken down into a large number of smaller units. In the final stages of learning, the entire language is reestablished in all its structural diversity.

The Structural Approach is not a method of teaching. It is an approach to language teaching. The modern trend of having a systematic and scientific attitude towards language teaching has evolved the Structural Approach to language teaching. This approach can be used with any method. It is an approach which aims at teaching the pupils the essential tools of the language in the early stages of language learning. The Structural Approach was the result of a good deal of work done in the selection of vocabulary and the gradation of essential structures on the basis of their frequency, by experts like Edward L. Thorndike in the U.S.A., West in India and Palmer in Japan. Mary Finocchiaro and Christopher Brumfit, in The Functional Notional Approach; From Theory to Practice, say,

It was held that the patterns of the language, as defined by the structural linguistics needed to be "over-learned" by students so
that they would be produced correctly as a matter of unconscious habit. Consequently, meaningless repetition of correct forms was considered valuable. At the same time, it was maintained the contrasts between the structure of the native language and the target language (the second or foreign language being studied) caused conflict, because the patterns of the target language would fight against the established patterns of the native language. Teaching procedures should attack this conflict or interference by intensive exposure to the correct patterns of the target language through drills and pattern practice. (6-7)

In India, this approach has been described as the syllabus of graded structure and controlled vocabulary taught through the oral approach and, in the seventies, this was believed to be the most effective method of teaching English.

Basically any language has the two constituents, vocabulary and the arrangement of words in particular order. Though words have individual meanings of their own, the order or manner of the arrangement of
words determines the sense conveyed. This has been effectively expressed by French in *The Teaching of English Abroad* thus:

> When we are talking about the kinds of materials that go to make up language we are talking about the way the materials are put together, arranged and used to build up sentences which as statements, questions, commands and exclamations form the living language and are the means of expressing what we feel, do, talk about, ask about and so forth. Though words form the basis of a language the effective unit of language is not individual words but word-groups which form the structure of a language. So, in teaching English the 'phrase pattern' and the sentence pattern have to be presented to the pupils to listen to, to imitate and to memorise. (1^3)

This theory is exemplified in a structural syllabus. We start with the alphabet and go on to the words and the sentences in that order. After teaching the learners the alphabets of English language, words with their meanings are taught. Then, the
classification of parts of speech is introduced in which the distinction between noun, pronoun, verb etc., is taught. Intensive drilling is given to enable the students to identify a word as belonging to a particular part of speech. Even the sub-divisions (common noun, proper noun, collective noun, abstract noun etc., in the case of noun and finite verb, auxiliary verb etc., in the case of verb, etc.) are introduced and through repetitive exercises and practice the student is equipped with enough knowledge to identify the words in their particular group.

Then the sentence is introduced. The parts of a sentence (subject, predicate, object, adjunct etc.) are distinctly separated and taught. Next the types of sentences (assertive, interrogative, imperative and exclamatory) are taught and subsequently transformation of sentences (from negative to positive, from interrogative to assertive, from exclamatory to assertive etc.) is taught. Tenses and their different patterns are practised repeatedly. Once they are mastered, active voice and passive voice are introduced. Thereafter the learners are taught the degrees of comparison. Direct and indirect speech is taught next with the varieties of sentences. After these seemingly
unrelated sequences of language learning, clauses, phrases and full sentences are taught as components of simple, compound and complex sentences. By now the learner is expected to have become familiar with the different kinds of structural patterns and, by constant practice and drill, he is expected to have attained mastery over these. When he is introduced to the written lesson in the form of essays, he identifies the already learnt structures in these prose passages.

Thus, the basic or fundamental patterns are graded and arranged. French, in *Teaching of English as an International Language*, says,

> A sentence pattern is a model for sentence which will be of the same shape and construction although made up of different words and hence the pupil should not find it too difficult to identify a particular pattern when it occurs in a prose lesson. These structures are used in oral language too as they are the device we use to make signals, to convey meanings and indicate relationships. (8)

Any variation from the pattern the pupil has learnt is explained to him as and when it occurs in the lessons and further drill takes place until he
masters the new pattern. Thus, in about four or five
yearn he becomes familiar with the basic structures
of the target language. The more he learns the more
familiar he becomes with the heterogeneous structural
pattern of the target language. Over a period of time,
he himself should be able to shape his thought in the
form of those structural patterns he has mastered
earlier and to express himself well without mistakes
in the written form. The main difference of this
approach from the traditional grammar approach is that
the grammatical jargon is omitted and structures are
introduced without grammatical labels. It does not
require the pupil to know or learn the definitions of
the parts of speech or of clause and sentence but the
structures cover the whole of grammar and repeated
practice of these structures leads to the formation
of habits which will enable the learners to arrange
words meaningfully and convey ideas.

French, in International Language, calls the three
basic principles which are used in sentence construction
in English the "Bones of English." The three are:
(a) word order, (b) use of structural words, and
(c) inflections.

According to A. W. Frisby's Teaching English:
Notes and Comments on Teaching English Overseas, the
word-order points to sentence construction. The distinction between the main patterns of sentences such as statements and questions depends on the order of words. The change in the position of the words changes the pattern itself as shown below:

She will write.
Will she write? (59)

The structural words are the words that bind together other words to make phrases, clauses and sentences. Though all languages have such structural words, English depends more on their usage in sentence construction than other languages. All the prepositions, all the pronouns, all the relatives, all the auxiliary verbs, some adjectives and some adverbs fall under this category. If these words' are removed, the sentences fall apart.

The third important principle in English structure is the use of inflections. English is not a highly inflectional language. Modern English uses inflections only to a limited extent and mastery of these
inflections is a necessity for the correct usage of the language.

The Structural Approach lays emphasis on

i) the importance of forming language habits, particularly the habit of arranging words in standard English sentence-pattern,

ii) the importance of speech as the necessary means of fixing firmly all ground-work for language learning and

iii) the importance of pupils' activity rather than the teacher's activity.

In the Structural Approach, there is more emphasis on the learning of structures than on acquiring vocabulary. It lays emphasis on the aural-oral approach. The foundation of a sound language habit is laid by drill and repetition of the nuclear structure. Along with this, there is a mastery of the essential vocabulary.

With these principles behind it, for decades the structural syllabus influenced the thoughts of decision makers and teachers in India. When they prescribed a structural syllabus consisting of a collection of prose pieces and poems for detailed study and a play and novel or a collection of short stories for non-detailed study, they expected the learner to be exposed
to different styles and structures. They firmly believed that the students would be able to develop their own style of language based on the knowledge of the structural patterns they had already learnt. In the initial stages this worked quite well and those who were exposed to foreign culture and manners through these books read further books on their own and became fluent in the use of the foreign target language, namely English.

It is quite interesting to note that two divergent opinions existed in the early years of the Introduction of structuralism in India. S. M. Patel, in his article "The Structural Syllabus at Work in India," says,

Structural syllabuses have met with a favourable reception at the hands of English teachers all over India.... Experience In India has revealed that in the hands of a teacher appropriately trained, a structural syllabus can be an effective tool for teaching English. Implying an activity method, it demands initiative, resourcefulness, and imagination on the part of the teacher. It keeps the young learner keen and active. It appeals to his innate interests and helps him to learn English as a skill subject
through an oral-aural approach. He is no longer the passive recipient of doses of language but an active participant in the co-operative enterprise of language-learning. Experienced and undogmatic teachers have discovered that a structural approach gives the best results and that pupils can be led a surprisingly long way into the heart of a language without ever opening a book or a single note. (146)

In his article Patel also mentions the improvements to be made in the Structural Approach and the structural syllabus. One of the shortcomings of the syllabus is that there is no provision for the teaching of English pronunciation. It is imperative that a good pronunciation should be inculcated from the beginning itself. Indian children have difficulty in pronouncing such English sounds as /«/ , /M/ , /ʃ/ , /+/, /v/, /A/, /i/, /θ/, /θ/, /t/ , etc. and the consonant clusters in initial, medial and final positions. Stress, rhythm and intonation, which are integral parts of English language system, should find an important place in any English course, but the structural syllabus has sadly neglected these vital aspects (Patel 147).
Secondly, there is no uniformity in the structural syllabi prescribed in various States in India. In Maharashtra and Gujai'at the structural syllabus exists side by side with the traditional Grammar-Translation Method. Since under the Structural Approach the essential points of grammar should be woven into the texture of the reading lessons in such a way that the pupil may arrive at his own generalisation about the language, it does not require the students to know the definitions. Moreover word-order is far more important than inflected forms of words under the Structural Approach. Hence uniformity in structural syllabus could have been easily achieved throughout the country.

Lastly, some of the structures included in the syllabus have a very low frequency of occurrence in spoken English and can be dropped. For example, the following structures merely help comprehension and their inclusion in the syllabus for drill and active use does not serve any learning purpose.

1. I will speak to his brother, since he is not here.
2. The base has been filling up since 7 0' clock.
3* See to it that he gets the book.
4. Tell me the reason why you did it.

5. I shall have been reading that book for ten days.

Added to this, Patel feels that a comparative linguistic analysis of the pupils' mother tongue and English from the phonological, non-phonological and syntactical points of view will yield fruitful results which will be of great value to the teaching of English in India (146).

As against Patel's observations, M. L. Tickoo, in his article "The Structural Fallacy," says,

The Structural Approach in India is the child of necessity. Teachers of English in India face a uniquely difficult task. The range of the functions of English is ever increasing, whereas the opportunities for learning it have been gradually reduced. Methods and materials successful in the past have been inadequate. Necessity has often mothered invention but at Limes it has also led to futile dodges.

The Structural Approach in India is a dodge. (177)

Tickoo agrees that the Structural Approach is a useful instrument and has much to offer, but asserts
Teaching English in the classroom is a complex task. It is riddled with numerous problems at every stage. Some of these are linguistic and many are pedagogic. The Structural Approach can never solve them all, nor even prescribe answers valid for every classroom. Enthusiasts who attempt to do everything "structurally" may be rudely disillusioned in actual practice.

In these controversial circumstances, one would naturally be skeptical about the outcome of the use of the Structural Approach in India. The defects of this approach mentioned were noted by several linguists and they set about searching for better and more effective methods.

Noam Chomsky already in 1957 attempted to prove the futility of the Structural Approach through his famous example in *Syntactic Structures*:

- John is eager to please. ...... 1
- John is easy to please. ...... 2

with the comment that these two sentences have the same structure but the difference in meaning between the two is quite obvious. Chomsky, further points out that if
"Penniless Peter plays happily" represents a valid structural pattern, "Colourless green ideas sleep furiously" also has the same structural pattern, but, while the former is accepted as a logical sentence, the latter is not (37). The latter is considered illogical semantically, though, structurally, it follows the same pattern as the former. How will the structuralists meet such criticism since the Structural Approach focuses on learning only the core and not on the distribution of that core in particular uses? Though the learner knows the core, he may not be able to communicate adequately when he finds himself in a situation requiring a different use of language.

To eliminate these weaknesses, Situational and Functional-Notional approaches based on modified behaviouristic theories were introduced in other countries. However, the several approaches, old as well as new, were not mutually exclusive. They adopted the proven successful practices from the former approaches and tried to remedy the weaknesses.

When the Structural Approach could not guarantee complete success in acquiring the required mastery over the English language, linguists tried to evolve new approaches. The behaviouristic principles which formed the basis of the Structural Approach were
reanalysed. The behaviouristic theory is based on the following assumptions:

1. Language is learnt only through habits and, therefore, through practice. The more the learner is exposed to the language, the better and quicker is his learning of it.

2« The production of language depends on the situation which makes its use necessary. Language cannot be taught in isolation from situation. The teacher has to introduce each new pattern of language along with a meaningful situation.

3. Producing the correct linguistic response to a stimulus requires effort. If the learner is not called upon to make this effort, there is no learning.

4. Attention which is necessary to produce the correct response is bound to slacken after a time and hence prolonged practice is less useful than spaced practice.

5« The spoken language comes earlier than the written one and is the direct result of listening to the language. The receptive or passive experience of language is necessary before any productive or active use can begin.

6. Learning takes place quicker if the correct response to a stimulus is immediately confirmed.
7* If the situations in which the learner is placed are apt and are such as would ensure only the correct response, learning is still quicker. Each incorrect response builds up a faulty behaviour pattern which interferes with the process of conditioning.

8. Every new item learnt must be reinforced by repeated practice before further learning begins. The behaviourists insist that the scientific study of psychology cannot rely upon assumptions about unknown and unknowable interior processes but must consist of observations of overt observable reaction (R) to observable stimuli (s). In short, learning is the product of the association between stimulus and response and the association is progressively strengthened by a process of reinforcement.

That is why drills have an important place in the Structural Approach. One form of drill is provided through substitution. Constructing new sentences in a language can be done in three ways. Sentences can be constructed as grammatical constructions. They can be formed by conversion of one sentence into another. The third way of constructing new sentences is by organic
substitution, that is, the construction of new sentences based on the analogy of the model sentence, by replacing its organs or working units with other organs already learnt. Palmer describes substitution as a process by which any authentic sentence may be multiplied indefinitely by substituting for any of its words or word groups others of the same grammatical family and within certain semantic limits.

A model sentence is provided by the teacher and the students first learn the pattern and then substitute each unit of the sentence with another word from the same grammatical unit. Through repeated practice, the pattern is learnt. Though this method ensures correct usage, it has its limitations. As the pupils learn isolated sentences, sequence is absent. All aspects of English cannot be taught through this method. When the model sentences and the drill are repeated, the exercise tends to become monotonous for the pupil and artificiality creeps in.

With all these points in mind, it was argued that reinforcement is produced by rewarding or encouraging the desired response and discouraging the unwanted response. This suggests that the reinforcement depends even more on the consequences of learning than
on the quantum of repetition. The rewards provide the motivation in inducing, accelerating and reinforcing learning. Motivating the learner adequately is even more important than providing practice. The most powerful kind of motivation can be obtained by linking the learning experience in a direct and obvious way to the satisfaction of the learner's need. Learning must above all be relevant to felt needs. The more challenging the learning task the more rewarding is the learner's success in it.

With this new shift in emphasis, language learning and teaching became learner-centred* A need-based syllabus was evolved for the first time to fulfil the anticipated needs of the learners. This inevitably-paved the way for the Situational Approach. This change in emphasis does not mean that the structural facts of language are not made use of in making decisions. The Situational Approach is organised in terms of the purposes for which people are learning language and the kind of language performance that is necessary to meet those purposes. Situational needs are taken as the starting point and a Situational syllabus is constructed to replace the purely Grammatical or Structural syllabus.
An effective means of learning depends mainly on the initiative and interest of the learner. It is a known fact that motivated pupils learn better and quicker. Educationists and psychologists have proved that motivation in learning depends on the desire or need to learn. In learning a language the innate or natural desire to communicate plays a vital role. Hence, the material of the language lesson is not language, but life itself: the language we use is an instrument to share slices of experience with. We find that, in spite of the quantum of language teaching that goes on in the English classes, the pupils are not able to use English in their conversation. As Gurrey has rightly pointed out, in Foreign Languages, the main reason for this inability to use the language is that the words and most of the sentences the pupils pore over so laboriously and which are drilled into them so conscientiously are book-words and book-sentences and they do not arise from real-life situations (93). This book-language has no roots in a human desire to communicate. So, if, instead of the book-language, the language of real-life is used habitually in the teaching of a foreign language, pupils learn quicker and better. The Situational Approach follows the principle that a word or structure
becomes meaningful for the pupil only when it is used in a real-life situation. F. L. Billows, in his book, *The Techniques of Language Teaching*, aptly says,

Effective use of language, economical and telling language teaching in which no time is wasted in explanation, translation or reflection on pattern of usage not yet learnt must be situational. The need for expression in language must arise from the need to realise and deal with the situation we are in; the fascination of bringing new language tools to bear on the familiar circumstances we live among must be exploited to the full. The mind must be passed to and fro over the well-known landscape dressed in the disguise of a new language. (6-7)

In these words, Billows has very effectively brought out the essence of the Situational Approach to language teaching. The four driving forces in real life, namely usefulness, purpose, need and emotion, make expression through language necessary. In teaching English, if the Situational Approach is used, these driving forces are provided and the pupils
realise the need for the language. This, in turn, helps in the better assimilation and easy understanding of language usage.

There are two kinds of situations that could be effectively used in language teaching—real and artificial situations. It is inevitable that the situations created by the teacher in the classroom while teaching a foreign language become artificial. None the less, for the pupil, the relation between the word and situation becomes clear and can be assimilated. Thus, a strong link between the expression and the experience is established. The selection of the situation to be presented to the learner involves careful preparation. Situations, real and artificial, occur at different places and levels. Some situations can be seen and felt and some can be heard and thought about.

Billows has divided situations into four concentric spheres with the learner at the centre. The first or inner sphere consists of what the pupil can see, hear and touch directly. In practice, this is the classroom situation, including all that can be seen and heard through the classroom window. Billows narrates one of his own experiences while he was
teaching the use of the verb 'to have' to Indian children. After making marks of several colours on 'their foreheads he generated these sentences:

- You have a black mark on your forehead.
- She has a red mark on her forehead.
- This girl has a black exclamation mark on her forehead.

It was immaterial that the children did not know the words 'forehead' or 'mark' or 'exclamation mark'. They soon learnt them from the situation and from the author's use of them and their attention was agreeably distracted from the verb 'to have' which the author was subtly insinuating into their understanding.

A word may often be introduced and made familiar without its being noticed until it has been nearly learnt.

The second sphere, which should always be approached through the first one, consists of what the pupil knows from his own experience, his daily life, his family circle, what he has seen and heard directly but cannot see or hear at the moment. It is imperative for the teacher to keep in mind the fact that though the situations deal with familiar things, at the particular moment of learning, the
mind requires a slight effort to recall them. For example, according to Billows, the general past tense could be introduced as follows:

T: I have a pen and you have a pen. All of us have\(^1\) pens. Today I have a green pen with me, yesterday I had a grey one.

TJ Do you have the same pen everyday?

Thus, when we begin to speak of what is generally true, or of the past, we enter the second sphere.

The third sphere consists of what the pupil has not yet experienced directly, but can call to mind through an effort of the imagination with the help of pictures, dramatisation, charts and plans and other visual aids. All work in this sphere must be based on the work in the first and second spheres, because grasping the unknown through the imagination is possible only in terms of the known.

The fourth sphere of the situation consists of what is brought into his mind through the spoken, written or printed word alone, without audio-visual aids (119-55). This method obviously proceeds from the familiar) immediate and concrete situations to unfamiliar, remote and abstract situations. While learning the language, the pupil must hear and use in the earlier spheres the language which he would
need to understand what he is to read or hear in the fourth one. The classroom learning of the fourth sphere should enable him to communicate with society, since as Billows points out,

Language depends on society and society is built up on relationship supported and realised through language; no learner can be expected to take seriously a language which fails to do what his own language does for him; namely set up and carry genuine contacts with others, even if the contacts are different from those carried by his own language. (15)

The Situational syllabus is formed taking these factors into account. D.A. V/wilkins, in Notional gyllabuses, says:

The argument for the situational syllabus is fairly straightforward. Although languages are usefully described as general systems, language is always used in a social context and cannot be fully understood without reference to the context. . . . Therefore, rather than orientate learning to the subject and its content, we should take account of the learner and his needs. We should predict situations in which the
learner is likely to meet the language and then teach the language that is necessary, to perform linguistically in those situations. It will be a more efficient process because it will include only what is relevant to the learner. . . . The distinction between language for learning and language for use will disappear. Units in the syllabus will have situational—instead of grammatical—labels (16).

Situational courses did and do exist. They consist of learning units with labels like 'At the Post Office', 'Asking the Way', 'Going to Market' and so on. In several instances they have been successful in what they set out to do. The limited aims of a tourist, a telephone operator, or a prospective consumer can be adequately provided for in this way. But, if language is to be generally applicable, it must be applied in class to more circumstances than those in the learning unit. Otherwise, the pupil may be inhibited all his life from applying it to other circumstances because the words are too closely linked with particular experiences. It would be naive to think that the speaker, somehow, is linguistically at the mercy of a physical situation in which he finds himself. What the individual says
is determined by his intentions and purposes. Even in the sample situations cited earlier, language does not, have to be related to the situation. One need not go to the post office merely to buy stamps or postal stationery; one may also go there to lodge a complaint, though this need not be a typical situation. Making requests, seeking information and expressing agreement or disagreement can take place in almost any situation. There are probably no situations where one typically expresses possibility, probability, certainty, doubt or conviction and yet the need to make these expressions is demonstrated by the frequency with which they are expressed in one's speech.

The impact of these ideas on English language teaching in India can also be traced. The Structural Approach has had many a metamorphosis in the Indian classrooms. But all these changes have worked on the superstructure of the approach leaving its theoretical underpinnings untouched. The energised Structural Approach is now called STRUCTURAL, ORAL, SITUATIONAL APPROACH, popularly known as SOS Approach. In this approach, in addition to structural patterns, the motivational factors, such as Interesting situations etc., have also been taken care of in the classrooms.
The teachers mime, act and use sketches and pictures to make the classes lively. The teachers walk to the door, climb on to the table and jump down, run round the class or make children perform all these gimmicks in order to present the structure. Yet, the most important part of motivation—the act of communication—is lacking. The teacher has to adhere to the pre-selected language items to be taught in the class and also to their rigid gradation. This factor acts as a check against any innovative method and the use of new materials in the classroom. This constraint subsequently widens the gap between the classroom language and the language outside the classroom which is more real and natural. If conversation is one of the aims of teaching, as it is claimed by the structural syllabus, the rigid structural pre-selection and the grading defeat the very purpose of developing this skill in the learners. So, the changes wrought in the structural syllabus to make it more situational proved to be futile in English language teaching in India.

The Situational syllabus is valuable in so far as the learner's need is the ability to handle language situations of a particular sort. But he would be ill-equipped to meet any deviations from the routine. A Structural Approach may be useful in certain
circumstances but it does not offer a 'general solution to the problem of language teaching and learning. The Structural Approach seeks to teach language by taking the learner progressively through the forms of the target language. The Situational Approach does so by recreating the situations in which native speakers use the language. Both leave the learner short of adequate communicative capacity, though neither approach would deny that languages are learnt for purposes of communication.

In order to rectify the defects found in the Structural Approach and the Situational Approach, further researches were carried out in the field of linguistics and the result was the Functional-Notional Approach. The Functional-Notional Approach, in contrast to the other two approaches, takes communicative capacity as the starting point. This approach, instead of asking how speakers of the language express themselves, or when and where they use the language, asks what it is they communicate through language. This approach organises language teaching in terms of the content rather than the form of the language. One advantage of the Functional-Notional Approach is that it constantly keeps the communicative facts of
language in sight, without losing sight of the situational and grammatical factors. It is potentially superior to the structural Approach because it aims at producing communicative competence, sustaining, at the same time, the interest and motivation of the learners. It is superior to the Situational Approach because it ensures that most important grammatical factors and structures are included in it and because it can cover all kinds of language functions, not merely those that typically occur in certain situations.

The Functional-Notional Approach to language teaching mainly concentrates on deciding what to teach, based on a consideration of what the learner should most usefully be able to communicate in the foreign language. When this is established one can decide what are the most appropriate forms for each type of communication. The labelling for the learning units is now primarily semantic. The linguistic content is planned according to the semantic demands of the learner. While several other methodologies seem to ignore the fact that the ability to use the real, appropriate language to communicate and interact with others is—and should be—the primary goal of foreign language learning, the Functional-Notional Approach emphasises this aspect. Finocchiaro and Brumfit summarise the
objectives of the Functional-Notional Approach thus:

The Functional-Notional Approach springs from an attempt to classify exactly what aspects of a language have been mastered by a particular student. Thus, the early work in this area was concerned with suitable bases for such a classification. It was suggested, particularly, that language was much more appropriately classified in terms of what people wanted to do with the language (functions) or in terms of what meaning people wanted to convey (-wotions) than in terms of the grammatical items as in traditional language teaching models. It was argued, particularly, that we all understand that we use language to apologize, greet, persuade, recommend, or praise, and we all understand that we use language to express certain meanings, time or spatial relations for example, but we do not all agree that we use language to exemplify grammatical categories invented by linguists! Thus, a Functional-Notional organization of language teaching will incorporate a
classification of language which closely matches ordinary people's perception of what language is for. (12)

The special advantage of the Functional-Notional Approach is that it lays emphasis on the fact that the students and their communicative purpose are at the very core of the teaching programme. The learner's actual and foreseeable academic, social and vocational needs, underlie all aspects of the linguistic and cultural content of the programme. While due attention is given to certain aspects of selection and grading of linguistic and cultural content, the primary consideration will be those functions that persons of a particular age level in a particular situation would wish or need to express.

Whereas the Functional-Notional Approach was widespread in foreign countries in the late seventies, India was, at that time, still struggling to come out of the stranglehold of structuralism. It was only in the beginning of the eighties that the innovative methods and materials of this approach were experimented with in India. Significant work has been done on these methods in recent times and it has led linguists to another method popularly known as the Communicative Method of teaching and learning. Vilkins, in Second Language Learning and Teaching, says,
Though language is a means of communication, it is not the only form of communication. Human language differs from animal language not only in the unique way in which it exploits sound, the substance of expression, but also in the enormous subtlety of variation in content that its formal structure permits. . . . Language is central to human experience and if we are to understand the process by which men communicate with one another, we must look closely at the human capacity for language and at the particular qualities of language which enable it to play so powerful a role within us and between us. . . . Our faculty of language is a faculty of linguistic creativity. . . . The ultimate aim in learning a second language must generally be to achieve the same flexibility, the same linguistic creativity that the native speaker possesses. (3-^)

The Communicative Approach to language teaching is the result of the desire to develop the skill to communicate through a mastery of variables in a foreign language.
NOTES

This explains why, though out of the 500 teachers of English Interviewed by this researcher 110 favoured the Structural Approach, only ninety of them practised it predominantly. See Appendix 1.