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2.1 Introduction

In the academic scenario, English language teaching is very important and gains more crucial status because of its role in the globalization and fast developing Information Technology Industry (IT). This fact is clearly revealed in the integral part of the higher secondary education syllabus in High Schools. The significance of ELT is so highly emphasized that teachers, parents and citizens including the government in every country are concerned with ELT.

As far as ELT is concerned, it is necessary to know the history of ELT as it indicates the respective development of English language teaching from the very beginnings to the present time. History of English language teaching can be traced back to the 17th century. Modern English is believed to have evolved from the parent language, Indo-European which was spoken about 3000-3500 B.C. by nomadic tribes who wandered in the lands around the Black Sea (Sarojakumari, 2004). English language teaching began in England after a long dominance of French language. In the time of King Henry V, English language became the language of all royal correspondence, the language of the nation and spoken by all from the King himself to common people. From the beginnings of 17th century towards the end of the 17th century, the teaching of English language took a systematic form. Grammar texts like the work of Joseph Priestly, ‘Rudiments of English Grammar’ appeared in 1761. This continued from the 18th century to the 19th century. By the 19th century, Latin grammar was playing a vital role as a model for every foreign language teaching. The main feature was that all the
grammatical rules were taught and explained in the mother tongue of learners in very a simple way. This approach paved the way to an emergence of the language teaching which came to be known as the Grammar-Translation Method or GT-Method later.

The variety of learning and teaching methods which is used in a Course is an important ingredient in creating a Course that is interesting for students. Over the past few years, a wide range of different teaching and learning methods have been introduced and tested, often with the aim of developing skills which more didactic methods are poorly adapted to do. There is substantial literature available on these methods and on how to use them best.

If one takes a historical perspective, one will discover that the interest in learning a foreign language started long ago. When the Romans studied Greek as a second language, they employed Greek tutors and Greek speaking servants in their houses. As soon as the Roman Empire expanded, many people started learning Latin because it was the medium of communication. Mackey, W.F. says,

“The teaching methods at that time were confined
to Latin grammar which were based on oral practice,
reading and writing in the second language.”

Both Latin and Greek had become important languages because they were considered as the key to the thought and literature of a great ancient civilization. In order to write Latin, one should know that it is different from its spoken forms. Therefore, textbooks were full of grammatical rules as they were regarded as the corrected forms.
Later, when Montaigne was a student in the school, he started learning rules of grammar and was able to speak Latin fluently. He knew the spoken Latin more than its standard forms. Luther and Melanchton are opposed to much formal grammar and teaching of rules. However, others, like Comenius, had emphasis on repetition, imitation and practice in reading and speaking instead of using rules.

Instead of having the idea of memorizing the complicated rules and paradigms, it will be beneficial if we come to know how to apply the communicative approach for grammar and it should be learnt indirectly through induction. Rivers (1970) is with the people who learn a language by using and not by committing to memory the conjugation of verbs and inflection of nouns, but by applying the forms of language in whatever way we intend to use them.

Some new methods had been introduced in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century so as to overcome the contradictory trends that emerged in teaching Modern Languages. Methodologists tried to give logical analysis of learning a language in general and English language in particular. The language educators had tried to solve the problem of English language teaching by focusing their attention on the teaching method and their evolution or development. Jacobovitz (1974) has summed up briefly the case by saying that

\begin{quote}
“If we now glance back at the development of language methods, we see that it first swing from the active oral use of Latin in ancient and Medieval times to the learning by rules of the
\end{quote}
Renaissance grammar, back to oral activity with Comenius, back to grammar rules with Poltz, and back again to the primacy of speech in the Direct Method.”

Being a foreign language, the teaching of English appeared in the past century as an autonomous profession. Therefore, teaching and learning English by using mother tongue was thought of as a paradox. However, mother tongue was both helpful and resourceful in the process. The learners’ knowledge of the first language, mother tongue, may make them learn their second language without much difficulty because according to Palmer (1964),

“This their mother tongue gives them confidence, free them from anxiety and repression and make the process of learning pleasant”.

Two basic streams of ideas or thoughts can be distinguished so as to analyze the theoretical position to various approaches. Every stream was developed into an integrated system of techniques. These techniques or approaches were called ‘formal’ and ‘functional’ by Titone. Rivers (1974), on the other hand, called these two terms as “‘formalist’ and ‘activist’ approaches.” Thus, the pendulum was swinging between these two terms till the seventies. Teachers have found themselves involved in these approaches alternatively. The ‘formal approach’ has been applied at some stages whereas the ‘functional approach’ has been applied at others. Rivers (1970) explained the ‘formalist’ and ‘activist’ approaches as follows:

“Formalists have mostly relied on a deductive form of teaching, moving from the statement of
the rule to its application in the example, activists have advocated the apprehension of a generalization by the student himself after he has heard and used certain forms in a number of ways…a process of inductive learning. Formalists sometimes become preoccupied with the pedantic elaboration of fine details of grammar, whereas activists have consistently argued a functional approach to structure whereby the student is first generally applicable, being left to discover at later stages the rare and the exceptional. As a result, formalist teaching has often been based on artificial exercises and led to titles use of language, emphasizing the features of written language used in literary works, whereas activist teaching has sought to familiarize the student first with the forms of language used for general communication in speech and in less formal writing, teaching the more literary forms of the language at an advanced level only."

It has been said that in order to learn a foreign language, different attitudes in understanding the main four skills should be analyzed. The productive skills, writing and speaking, and the receptive skills, listening and reading, should be acquired in the learning process in order to develop a comprehensive language skill. A good teacher should consider the process of teaching/learning as a comprehensive interaction which might help prepare a
student who can read, write, translate, master the rules of grammar, understand and speak the language fluently and accurately as well. In other words, he can get himself engaged in both a typical formalist class and a typical activist class as well.

Scholars have different views in presenting the four language skills, for example, Jacobovitz (1974) supports the idea of separating the various communicative skills of a second language. He states that in the field of second language teaching, very few people, in fact, believe that it is either possible or useful to develop specialized skills in the use of a second language. Conversely, Belyayev (1972) asserts that there is a definite relationship between the language skills; he also insists that to be able to express thoughts orally in the foreign language, pupils must master actively the reading and understanding of foreign texts followed by their translation into the native language. Palmer believes that teaching a foreign language depends on the idea of needful translation and says that when the foreign word to be demonstrated is known to be the equivalent of a native word for all practical purposes, translation is a better method.

In these quotations, the researcher agrees with all three of the above-mentioned academics and puts the onus on the ability of teachers to recognize the learning capabilities of their students and adapt his or her teaching styles to suit the requirements of individual students or groups. This may be fine when dealing with small classes of students, where a teacher can frequently change his or her teaching style during a single lesson, i.e. putting across a desired point using different approaches, then going on to the next point. However, this is not practical for teachers faced with larger classes,
especially of younger students, where the students’ capabilities are bound to cover a wider range; a teacher can easily lose control of the class, as students get bored and/or confused, whilst the teacher is attending to the requirements of another group of students.

Is there really a right or wrong way of teaching a second language? When renowned scholars give such diverse approaches, apparently not. However, it is most important that teachers are made aware that there are different methods of teaching second languages and that, with practice and experience, they will become able to compromise, i.e. find the most suitable method(s) for their students, and adapt their teaching styles to suit the requirements, according to the students’ age, intelligence levels and attention spans etc.

The history of English language teaching unfolds authoritative precedents for the ideas mentioned. The different teaching methods of foreign languages are actually aimed to teach certain language skills. Each method depends on a theory of language teaching and learning. At the same time, it concentrates on aspects of language that have been neglected or rejected by its predecessors. Fari Dabwan (1999) says,

“The direct method is selected by those who focus on listening and speaking; so is the audio-lingual method, the grammar translation method is for those who think highly of reading and translation, the cognitive-code method is for those who emphasize on four language skills, the eclectic method is for
those who select the best techniques from every method and so forth.”

In summary, an approach is like a set of correlative assumptions, dealing with the nature of language and the nature of language teaching and learning. Method is an overall plan for the orderly presentation of language material, no part of which contradicts, and all of which is based upon the selected approach. An approach is axiomatic, A method is procedures or techniques that actually take place in a classroom. Techniques must be consistent with method, and therefore in harmony with an approach as well.

2.2 Methods and Approaches used for foreign language acquisition
In fact, there are many teaching methodologies in the field of English language teaching. Some are still active in some parts of the world. There are two types of Methods and Approaches that have been used for foreign language acquisition (FLA) throughout history. Each theory and approach of foreign language teaching (FLT) has its supporters and its critics, mainly because each method and approach is derived from different perspectives of foreign language learning (FLL). However, methods and approaches have received wide recognition due to the historical roles they have played in the views encompassed in this subject.

Regarding the methods and approaches, methods are more related to the theory aspect of teaching. A method contains a particular view about teaching in which there are no contradictions. On the other hand, an approach is more related to practical teaching.

The various methods and approaches used in the field of English language learning and teaching are as follows:
(1) The Direct Method (DM)

The basic premise of the Direct Method (DM) was that second language learning should be more like first language learning. The method would include lots of oral interaction, spontaneous use of language, no translation between first and second languages, and little or no analysis of grammar rules.

The appearance of the “Direct Method” thus coincided with a new school of thinking that dictated that all foreign language teaching should occur in the target language only, with no translation and an emphasis on linking meaning to the language being learned. The method became very popular during the first quarter of the 20th century, especially in private language schools in Europe where highly motivated students could study new languages and did not need to travel far in order to try them out and apply them communicatively. One of the most famous advocates of the Direct Method was a German person, Charles Berlitz, whose schools and “Berlitz Method” are now world-renowned. Still, the Direct Method was not without its problems. As Brown (1994) points out,

“(it) did not take well in public education where the constraints of budget, classroom size, time, and teacher background made such a method difficult to use.”

The Direct Method is based on the idea that people can learn an L2 easier if it were taught without any use of the L1. This way is supposed to simulate the way in which a child learns the L1 because, when a child acquires the L1, he or she has no prior language to refer back to. In this method, the
learner was to communicate in the FL in realistic conditions. One criticism of this method is that it is not easy to achieve in the classroom, which is obviously not a realistic situation. However, it does continue to draw a lot of support.

The method believes that adult L2 learners can learn a second language in essentially the same manner as a child. Therefore, if possible, the teacher should try to create a natural learning environment within the classroom. Instead of explicit grammar instruction, the major emphasis is on communicating. Classes are carried out totally in the second language with absolutely no reliance on the first language or on any form of translation. The expectation is that through question and answer dialogues, the second language will gradually be acquired. Problems have arisen with such an approach because adults do not in fact learn exactly like children, and they express the need for explicit instruction in grammar and other aspects of the second language.

Teaching of receptive skills (listening and reading) rather than teaching of productive skills (speaking and writing) was encouraged as the first step. Contrastive analysis of the native language of the learner along with the target language was done. Teachers were required to have good knowledge of the phonetics of the language they teach, but they would use it to teach pronunciation and not phonetics. This method was indeed an extension of the Natural Method, with greater emphasis on knowledge of linguistics. The movement resulted in various individual methods with various names, such as new method, reform method, natural method, and even oral method, but they can all be referred to as direct method or the direct methods.
In other words, whatever a method is called it may be referred to as the Direct Method because it teaches English directly. Thus, it establishes an immediate association between experience and expression so that the learner, perhaps, can use the word, phrase, idiom and a sentence as it happens in the use of mother tongue. It excludes translation as well as grammar because of the shift of emphasis from literary language to the spoken one. It is seen that the Direct Method is not like the oral method in a number of ways. Fries (1964) has made further distinction by saying

“In the direct method reading in the foreign language may form an important part of the early work whereas in the oral method, it is deliberately postponed until the structure of the new language is firmly grasped.”

Mackey (1965) summarizes the prominent features of the Direct Method in the following manner:

1. It emphasizes the use of everyday vocabulary and structure.
2. It uses many new items in the same lesson to make the language sound natural, and encourages normal conversation.
3. It uses oral teaching of grammar and vocabulary.
4. It teaches grammar by situation.
5. It illustrates grammar through visual presentation.
6. It extends listening and imitation until forms becomes automatic.

The Objectives of the Direct Method

The Direct Method has some of its own aims and objectives which make it unique among the other methods. For instance, it helps the students think in English so that he becomes able to express his thoughts and feelings directly
without the intervention of the mother tongue. Moreover, the language acquisition ability of the student helps him grasp the sense of what he is having or reading as if he were grasping his mother tongue. The principles of this method are clearly stated and paraphrased by Childers (1964) when he says:

1. Language is made up of sounds, not letters; therefore, speaking should be the first aim, the training of the ear and tongue should precede that of the eye.
2. Connected discourse and not isolated sentences should be used, because the expressions given should be full of meaning.
3. Language should be learnt in a natural way as a child learns its native language. The grammar translation method should be discarded.
4. Students should learn grammar inductively.

It can be expressed in another way - there is a direct link between the experience and its corresponding expression where vernacular is not interrupting heavily because the learner has gained a bit of thinking in a foreign language. In another sense, the learner has formed a direct bond between thought and expression. The learner’s mother tongue is reduced to a minimum due to the lot of time spent in speaking and hearing English. The more English is introduced in a period, the better result the student acquires. The learner’s resort to translation is not that much necessary because he translates full connected pieces of reading sparingly. The mother tongue must be avoided as soon as the student apprehends what task he is being involved in.
Merits of the Direct Method

On the basis of the preceding discussion, the merits of Direct Method may be summarized as follows:

1. Fluency in speech.
2. Command over language.
3. Easy understanding of English.

It may be noted that a variety of speech skills are acquired by the learners such as the use of proper pronunciation, stress and intonation. In addition to that, accuracy in writing is noticeable because the learner can express his thoughts and ideas in speech and writing as well. Champion (1965) highlights additional characteristics by saying that in both learning English and mother tongue the power house language is not the outcome but the condition of all fruitful observation and classification of its phenomena…The particular must precede the general; the concrete, the abstract; practice must precede theory.

The student’s command over language prepares him to make some basic development of skills in speaking, reading and writing. The learner gets rid of errors sooner or later as if he were mastering his mother tongue. It is difficult for him to get himself engaged in other thinking because all his body is located in the environment of learning situation of English. What comes into the learner’s brain or mind is fully poured in the language he learns.

The student’s taste for English in general and literature in particular is positive because of spending all his time in speaking and hearing English.
The atmosphere he is surrounded with is foreign. He can hear, read, speak and write in English because he learns a great deal of English authors and their work. The difficulties are sooner or later overcome due to the zeal for higher studies. The incessant intervention of the mother tongue is eliminated. Grammar is learnt without much help of rules due to practice of repetition. It has been said that the pupil who tries to learn the language with accuracy and order will learn at the same time how to think with accuracy and order.

Key Features of Direct Method
Richards and Rodgers (1988) summarize the key features of the Direct Method as follows:

1. Classroom instruction is conducted exclusively in the target language.
2. Only everyday vocabulary and sentences are taught.
3. Oral communication skills are built up in a carefully traded progression organized around question-and-answer exchanges between teachers and students in small, intensive classes.
4. Grammar is taught inductively.
5. New teaching points are taught through modeling and practice.
6. Concrete vocabulary is taught through demonstration, objects, and pictures; abstract vocabulary is taught by association of ideas.
7. Both speech and listening comprehension are taught.
8. Correct pronunciation and grammar are emphasized.

(2) Grammar Translation Method (GTM)
The Grammar Translation Method (GTM) of foreign language teaching is one of the most traditional methods, dating back to the late nineteenth and
early twentieth centuries. It was originally used to teach ‘dead’ languages (and literatures) such as Latin and Greek.

Mackey (1965) insists that the Grammar Translation Method is the oldest method that has been used in teaching foreign languages. Thus, completed documented historical hints of it are difficult to be found because the teaching of both translation and grammar has occurred in language instruction through ages. Although it was used in teaching Latin and Greek languages over the centuries, its origin is difficult to be traced back. Chastain tells us that through its name, one can conclude,

“It is a mixture of grammar and translation activities. So, learners are required to learn and memorize the rules of grammar deductively and in detail. Along with these rules, learners must memorize lists of vocabulary. Translation is used as a test of learners’ understanding of the rules of grammar and vocabulary. Learners must translate reading passages into and from the native language. It is also a common practice to ask learners to state the rules.”

The Grammar Translation Method, however, is a method in which grammar and translation equally dominate. Its aim is to teach students the translation as well as the grammar of English language. The student’s native language has a great influence in practicing the target language to enable him to write the language accurately.

It is so because the students value and appreciate what they have been reading. The first step, in learning a language, is to get the meaning of new phrases, words and sentences to be learnt. So, this Grammar Translation
Method uses translation of words into the mother tongue because they are translated orally and in writing. It seems that this method is clearly noted in the ‘formal’ and ‘traditional’ approaches which were dominant in Europe. It is said that it began in Prussia in Germany in the second half of the 18th century. Regular combination of grammatical rules with some translation became approximately well-known. Later, Poltz’s method ‘rule of paradigm’ and sentence for translation into ‘L1’ was adopted in Germany. Some linguists like Maccup also used the term ‘formal technique’ as another name for the Grammar Translation Method. The use of this method had become widespread in the late nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century.

Later on, the Grammar Translation Method had been used widely among individual scholars because of their desire to acquire the reading knowledge of a foreign language by studying both its grammar and application to the new knowledge. The unit of speech or reading in this method is letters, then words and then sentences. Therefore, students are expected to know the rules for writing a correct sentence so as to show themselves off. In order to do that, they should be hard working in learning and understanding the logic of grammar, rules and exceptions. To be an extraordinary intelligent student is to be exceptional in knowledge of the roles of grammar and translation. The aim of this method was to inculcate understanding of the grammar of a language and train students to write the new language perfectly and accurately as well as through translation of native language (L1 or MT). In addition to the above activities, reading and writing are the only skills that have the priority in teaching and learning. An opportunity to listen or to speak the target language in a class is seldom offered.
Some Characteristics of Grammar Translation Method

The Grammar Translation Method has its own positive and negative characteristic features. Shroff (1990) has indicated some characteristics of this method. He has given the features as follows:

1. It stresses the use of formal grammar.
2. The vocabulary depends on the text used.
3. The teaching includes rules of grammar, isolated vocabulary, paradigms and translation.
4. It involves practice in translating the text from mother tongue into English.
5. It stresses reading.
6. It gives an opportunity to the teacher who feels tired of assigning students with written exercise.
7. It is a good chance for some lazy teachers because of making students busy writing some exercises which may not be important.
8. Vocabulary is divided into lists of words to be memorized.
9. Grammar rules are memorized as units which often include illustrative sentences.
10. Students hardly use foreign language in the classroom.
11. Pronunciation is either not taught or is limited to a few introductory notes.
12. This method motivates the students to extract the meaning of the text with the help of broad literary words and detailed grammatical explanations.
13. Grammar is taught analytically and deductively, in an abstract manner.
14. It emphasizes teaching L2, grammar and translation from and into the target language.
15. It can be used in large classes.
16. It is popular amongst English teachers who lack good spoken English.
17. Every new lesson has no more than two new grammatical rules, very few words and some practical rehearsal for translation.
18. It is a valuable aid in teaching English.
19. It is widely used because of its useful proof to use translation, reading and knowledge of grammar.
20. Translation is, however, a powerful aid in the interpretation of a foreign language provided it is not used excessively in all explanations.

Some Basic Principles of Grammar Translation Method
Thompson and Wyatt (1964) describe the Grammar Translation Method by giving the following basic principles:

1. Translation interprets foreign phraseology best.
2. In the process of interpretation, the foreign phraseology is assimilated.
3. The structure of the foreign language is best learnt when compared and contrasted with that of the mother tongue.
The more words and phrases are translated, the better understanding is acquired by the student. It helps the learners acquire clarity. The exact equivalence in translation gives much exactness and definiteness. Students can associate the foreign words which gain them a better comprehension of English by bringing out difference of structures and sentences in English and that in vernacular. This process is both effective and economical.

**Drawbacks or Defects of Grammar Translation Method**

Drawbacks of Grammar Translation Method have been pointed out by Finocchiaro et al (1983) as they say

“The ‘Grammar’ part of ‘Grammar Translation’ was attacked, partly because the grammar used was actually inappropriate to English, and partly it was felt that too much emphasis on grammar led to learning about the language rather than learning to use the language. However, while the basic patterns of the language were often learnt in a very formal way, together with lists of words, the translation procedure was supposed to help students to use the language successfully.”

Furthermore, Champion (1965) and others give additional defects of this method like:

1. It stresses reading more than training in speech.
2. Translation as a means of teaching meanings is not much useful because the thoughts, feelings, surroundings and customs of one
nation differ from those of others. Those differences are reflected in the language and colour the connotations of the simple words. Consequently, it is very difficult to find meaning equivalent in any two languages.

3. It fails to create direct contact between thought and expression. That is to say, there is always the ‘Gravitational Pull’ of the mother tongue.

4. Courses and lessons are burdensome to the interest of the learners.

5. Ignorance of phonetics, pronunciation and fluency in speech is noticeable.

6. Other aspects of English teaching such as reading, speaking and listening are ignored.

7. There is always a habit of translation from and into speaking or writing English and vice versa.

8. Chances of developing oral expression are reduced.

9. It is a one sided achievement rather than two sided.

10. It is almost always very difficult to find exact equivalent of a word in one language in another language.

11. Skills of communicating are neglected.

12. It is not successful with less intelligent learners because they find the language tedious.

13. Making many mistakes over and over again will build up cumulative habits of inaccuracy.

14. It perpetuates traditional fallacies and presents numerous pitfalls.

15. It does not teach the language itself, but about the language.
16. It does not differentiate between the various structures of L1 and the target language.

17. The study of grammar should not begin until the students have acquired a working knowledge of the language. It will be better not to make grammar the sole subject of the whole time.

Sharma (1973) further adds more drawbacks and weaknesses of the Grammar Translation Method by stating that if this method is overrated, it will not help students to learn good conversation and it may not last through their life. Moreover, speech, which is a part of student’s target in learning a language, is not developed. Teaching in the traditional manner is a waste of time and energy, since the values of this method are related to examination targets but the knowledge acquired is never used in life.

This method emphasizes reading, writing, translation, and the conscious learning of grammatical rules. Its primary goal is to develop literary mastery of the target language. Memorization is the main learning strategy and students spend their class time talking about the language instead of talking in the language. The curriculum requires the memorization of paradigms, patterns, and vocabulary, with translation being used to test the acquired knowledge. Consequently, the role of mother tongue or native language is quite prominent.

In summary, the Grammar Translation Method appears to be strictly theoretical rather than practical. It does not teach the language itself so it is criticized by some educators and linguists for neglecting the speaking skill, over-usage of the native language and over-emphasis on the so called rules of correctness.
(3) Audio-Lingual Method (ALM)

The next “revolution” in terms of language teaching methodology coincided with World War II, when America became aware that it needed people to learn foreign languages very quickly as part of its overall military operations. The “Army Method” was suddenly developed to build communicative competence among translators through very intensive language courses focusing on aural/oral skills. This in combination with some new ideas about language learning coming from the disciplines of descriptive linguistics and behavioral psychology went on to become what is known as the Audio-lingual Method (ALM).

Another factor that accounted for the popularity of the method was the ‘quick success’ it achieved in leading learners towards communicative competence. Through extensive mimicry, memorization and ‘over-learning’ of language patterns and forms, students and teachers were often able to see immediate results. This was both its strength and its failure in the long run, as critics began to point out that the method did not deliver in terms of producing long-term communicative ability.

The study of linguistics itself was to change, and the area of second language learning became a discipline in its own right. Cognitive psychologists developed new views on learning in general, arguing that mimicry and rote learning could not account for the fact that language learning involved affective and interpersonal factors, which learners were able to produce language forms and patterns that they had never heard before. The idea that thinking processes themselves led to the discovery of independent language ‘rule formation’ rather than ‘habit formation’ and that affective factors
influenced their application paved the way toward the new methods that were to follow the Audio-lingual Method.

The audio-lingual method was developed in the 1950s, based on behaviorist psychology with the idea that language is a habit-forming process. The focus is mainly on oral discussion and very little on grammar rules. The idea was that phrases would be repeated orally until a kind of pattern is established, and then systematic changes would be implemented to broaden the learners' skills. This method provides very little room for creativity in comparison to what most language learners would hope to get out of FLL.

The audio-lingual method in some sense represents a return to the direct method, as its main goal is to develop native-like speaking ability in its learners. It is an extension as well as a refinement of the Direct Method. Translation and reference to L1 are not permitted. Underlying this approach, however, is the notion that L2 learning should be regarded as a mechanistic process of habit formation. Audio-lingual learning comprises dialogue memorization and pattern drills, thus ensuring careful control of responses. None of the drills or patterns is to be explained, since knowledge of grammatical rules would only obstruct the mechanical formation of habits.

Just as the Direct Method was an extension of the Natural Method, so Audio-lingualism had its theoretical roots in the Direct Method. The Audio-lingual method exhaustively used the linguistic structures identified in the descriptive analysis of the target language. It resulted in carefully prepared materials. It was skill oriented, with a practical emphasis on oral practice. It provided contextualized language practice in true-to-life situations including dialogue. It provided a wide variety of activities to help maintain
interest, and it made extensive use of visuals. It arranged for abundant practice, although the grammar-based Audio-lingual approach moved cautiously from supposedly simple to more and more linguistically complex features, often without adequate consideration for what might be needed in everyday situations.

Some of the things which led to the spread and success of this method in this century include: Greater allotment of time, smaller classes, greater emphasis on oral-aural practice which led to automatic production of sentences repeated or in the internalization of sentence structures through repetition and inductive generalization, the structural description and gradation of sentence and other linguistic utterances presented to the students for drill, contrastive analysis between the structures of the native and target languages, and careful preparation and presentation of learning materials based on all these.

**Objectives of Audio-Lingual Method**

Just as with the Direct Method that preceded it, the overall goal of the Audio-lingual Method was to create communicative competence in learners. However, it was thought that the most effective way to do this was for students to ‘over-learn’ the language being studied through extensive repetition and a variety of elaborate drills. The idea was to project the linguistic patterns of the language based on the studies of structural linguists into the minds of the learners in a way that made responses automatic and ‘habitual’. To this end it was held that the language ‘habits’ of the first language would constantly interfere, and the only way to overcome this
problem was to facilitate the learning of a new set of ‘habits’ which is appropriate linguistically to the language being studied.

**Key Features of Audio-Lingual Method**

Here is a summary of the key features of the Audio-lingual Method, taken from Brown (1994) and adapted from Prator and Celce-Murcia.

1. New material is presented in dialogue form.
2. There is dependence on mimicry, memorization of set phrases, and over learning.
3. Structures are sequenced by means of contrastive analysis and taught one at a time.
4. Structural patterns are taught using repetitive drills.
5. There is little or no grammatical explanation. Grammar is taught by inductive analogy rather than deductive explanation.
6. Vocabulary is strictly limited and learned in context.
7. There is much use of tapes, language labs, and visual aids.
8. Great importance is attached to pronunciation.
9. Very little use of the mother tongue by teachers is permitted.
10. Successful responses are immediately reinforced.
11. There is great effort to get a student to produce error-free utterance.
12. There is a tendency to manipulate language and disregard content.

To sum up, this method was one of the first to have its roots firmly grounded in linguistic and psychological theory which apparently added to its credibility and probably had some influence in the popularity it enjoyed over a long period of time. It also had a major influence on the language teaching
methods that were to follow and can be seen even today in major or minor manifestations of language teaching methodology.

(4) Silent Way Method (SW)
The title of this teaching method indicates its practical aspect. This method of teaching was developed in 1960 by Caleb Gattegno, a Mathematics teacher. He proposed his method based on the tenet ‘teaching must be subordinate to learning’. In this method, the teacher plays fewer roles in talking. Students do all speaking in the class. As Tickoo (2004) points out, SW is an approach to language learning in which learners are encouraged, as silently as possible by the teacher, to do most of the talking. What the teacher has to do is not to intervene and thus, to facilitate learners’ own efforts at building autonomy and self-reliance, and to help them derive the rule and full satisfaction of their inner criteria. (p.364-365)

The objectives of this method are that students should be able to use the target language to express their thoughts, feelings, and perceptions. They have to develop English independently from their teacher and their inner criteria of correctness, and the process of teaching is that students begin to study the target language through its basic building blocks and its sounds.

(5) Suggestopedia Method
Dr. Georgi Lozanov, a Bulgarian doctor of medicine, psychiatrist and parapsychologist, originated the teaching methodology based on the principle of joy and easiness and with a belief that language learning can occur at a much faster rate than it ordinarily transpires. According to Lozanov and others (1978), a human uses only five to ten percent of his
mental capacity. To make use of the preserved human mental capacity, the limitations are needed to be ‘desuggested’. With this idea, the Desuggestopedia had come to be known.

Suggestopedia was originally applied mainly in foreign language teaching, and it is often claimed that it can teach languages with approximately three main principles which are mostly related to psychological terms. They are:

1. Joy and psycho-relaxation: Learners will use their hidden potential only if they feel relaxed and happy. It is in such conditions that learners will be interested and involved in meaningful activities using the new language.

2. Gaining access to the reserve powers of the mind.

3. Harmonious collaboration of the conscious and the subunconscious.

The application of this method has been developed with the purpose of assisting learners to eliminate the feeling of fear in unsuccessful or negative association. In brief, it helps learners to overcome the barriers to learn. One of the ways that can stimulate learners’ mental capacity is through fine art.

The objective of this method is to have students feel comfortable while they are learning the target language. There is a relaxing environment like easy chair, soft light, and music. Posters and other teaching aids are hung in order to get students’ learning peripherally. There are a lot of games, demonstration, songs and so on. (Larsen – Freeman 1996: p.72-86)

(6) Total Physical Response Method (TPR)

With basic concept obtained from the research hypothesis in the 1960s and 1970s that language learning should start first with understanding and later
proceed to production (Winitz, 1981) paved the way to development of TPR. Asher (1996), an experimental psychologist was the originator of this method. He proposed the method after closely observing the way a child learns the first language. In this aspect, Diane-Freeman (2004, p.108) conclude that on the basis of Asher’s research, he has reasoned that the fastest, and least stressful way to achieve understanding of any target language is to follow directions uttered by the instructor (without native translation). The process starts from listening to languages and tries to speak, following what is said. Thus, this method focuses mainly on listening comprehension.

With regard to practical aspects in accordance with actual situation, the teacher gives a command and learners perform the action. The way of action performed by both the teacher and learners is said to be a meaningful way of language learning. In the class, the learners are asked to follow a simple command such as ‘Stand up!’ ‘Sit down’. A demonstration may be done if the learners do not follow the command. New commands can be given to the learners after each command is followed. ‘Copy Down sentences’ from the blackboard can be performed after sentences are written by the teacher. At this level the learners are not required to speak. Later, the learners are given a chance to demonstrate commands and the rest of the class is to do the action.

The principles employed in the pedagogy can be summarized as given below:

1. Action can be the best transmission of meaning of the target language.
2. Learning can be done well via doing things.
3. Listening comprehension should come first, prior to other skills.

4. With a feeling of success, TPR allows learners to achieve a higher degree of success. (Nagaraj, 2000, p.67)

Regarding approaches, the approaches are theoretical positions and beliefs about the native speaker, the native of language learning, and the applicability of both to pedagogical settings. The various approaches used in the field of English language learning and teaching are as follows:

(1) The Communicative Approach (CA)

The origin of Communicative Approach (CA) goes back to the changes in the British language teaching tradition which took place in the late 1960s. It has flourished in foreign language teaching since early 1970s. These changes required a closer study of the language itself and a return to the traditional concept that utterances carried meaning in themselves and expressed the meanings and intentions of the speakers and writers who created them.

Some scholars like Widdowson and Candlin have seen the need to focus on both language teaching and communicative proficiency rather than mastering some structures of the language. This method has become global rather than national.

Owing to the changes in the educational situation of Europe, new approach to foreign language teaching was attempted. The Europeans considered the need to adopt a new method of language teaching as a high priority. Thus, investigations were carried out so as to develop language courses on a unit-credit system. That is to say, a system in which learning tasks are broken into
“Portions or units, each of which corresponds to a component of a learner’s needs and is systematically related to all the other portions.”

according to Richards and Rodgers. (1988).

According to Littlewood (1981), this Communicative Approach rejects the notion that

“The language competence can be achieved by simply memorizing grammar rules, sentence patterns and vocabulary. Language is considered a complex system and language learning involves an understanding of how it is actually used”

He further describes this approach as having a great number of characteristic features by stating

“It pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language, combining these into a more fully communicative view”

In case of the above-mentioned quotations, the researcher points out that the Communicative Approach to language teaching includes several distinct aspects. Applying these aspects means that language teaching and learning become far more than a series of grammar lessons and vocabulary lists. For language teaching and learning to be truly communicative, it must not
only be in context, but be used to convey ideas, preferences, thoughts, feelings and information in a way that is addressed to reach others.

In this Communicative Approach there are two roles which are assumed by teachers of English, Richards and Rodgers (1988). They state -

“The teacher has two main roles: the first role is to facilitate the communication process between all participants in the classroom, and between these participants and the various activities and texts. The second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group. The latter role is closely related to the objectives of the first role and arises from it. These roles imply a set of secondary roles for the teachers; first as an organizer of resources and as a resource himself, second as a guide within the classroom procedures and activities…. A third role for the teacher is that of researcher and learner, with much to contribute in terms of appropriate knowledge and abilities, actual and observed experience of the nature of learning and organizational capacities”13

However, teaching should be involved in either grammar or communication in the learning process. If learners work in partnership, more results will be achieved. Grammar always helps the learner understand the basic tools for using and practicing the language. While communication generally offers the student an opportunity to use the rules he has learnt. Both grammar and
communication need to be used in real contexts. It appears as if the most important thing was to know how to communicate rather than to master the language forms. Thus, students in this approach are found to be aware of what teaching and learning should be like. In addition to that, the learners’ role is expected to be co-operative in their interaction with each other rather than with the teacher and in making the tools of communication multiple. The students are encouraged to feel self-confident and responsible as well. Thus, Richards and Rodgers further state (1988) the learner’s role

“As negotiator – between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning – emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an interdependent way.”

The Framework of Communicative Approach

Littlewood (1981) determines the framework of this approach as follows:

1. **Through pre-communicative activities**, the teacher isolates specific elements of knowledge or skills which compose communicative ability, and provides the learners with opportunities to practice them separately. The learners are thus being trained in the partial skills of communication rather than practicing the total skills to be acquired.... This aims above all to provide learners with fluency and command of the linguistic system without actually requiring them to use. This system is for communicative purpose. Accordingly, the learner’s main purpose
is to produce language which is acceptable i.e. (sufficiently accurate or appropriate) rather than to communicate meanings effectively.

2. In **Communicative activities**, the learner has to activate and integrate his pre-communicative knowledge and skills in order to use them for the communication of meanings. He is, therefore, now engaged in practicing the total skill of communication…. In ‘functional communicative activities’ the learner is placed in a situation where he must perform a task by communicating as best as he can with whatever resources that are available for him. The criterion for success is practical: how effectively the task is performed. On the other hand, in ‘social interaction activities’, the learner is also encouraged to take account of the social context in which communication takes place. He is required to go beyond what is necessary for simply ‘getting meaning across’ in order to develop greater social acceptability in the language he uses.

Therefore, an activity should always focus on achieving the skills of that purpose. Speech, aural-oral practice, is to help the learner prove what he has understood without taking into consideration accurate language production.

**The Principles of Communicative Approach**

Diane (1896) has summarized the salient principles of the Communicative Approach as follows:

1. Whenever possible, authentic language, as it is used in a real context, should be introduced.

2. Being able to figure out the speaker’s is or writer’s intention is a part of being communicatively competent.
3. The target language is the object of the study.

4. One function can have many different linguistic forms. Since the focus of the course is on real language use, a variety of linguistic forms are presented together.

5. Students should work with language at the discourse or suprasentential level. They must learn about cohesion and coherence.

6. Students should be given an opportunity to express their ideas and opinions.

7. Errors are tolerated and seen as a natural outcome of the development of communication skills. Students’ success is determined as much by their fluency as by their accuracy.

8. One of the teacher’s major responsibilities is to establish situations likely to promote communication.

9. Communicative interaction encourages co-operative relationships among students. It gives students an opportunity for negotiating meaning.

10. The social context of the communicative event is essential in giving meaning to the utterances.

11. Learning to use language forms appropriately is an important part of communicative competence.

12. The teacher acts as an advisor during communicative activities.

13. In communicating, a speaker has a choice not only of what to say, but also how to say it.

14. The grammar and vocabulary that the students learn follow from the function, suitable context and roles of the interlocutors.
15. Students should be given opportunities to develop strategies for interpreting language as it is actually used by native speakers.

In summary, communicative principles can be applied to the teaching of any skill at any level. The method has a wide variety of classroom activities which leads to the use of ‘authentic’ materials ‘from-life’ as well as from the classroom. Different audio-visual aids can be found and used like signs, magazines, advertisements, newspapers, pictures, symbols, charts etc…. Pair and group work is suggested to encourage students to use and practice functions and forms. Communicative language learning is an engaging development in the field of ancient language acquisition. It opens numerous opportunities for creative instruction, and may serve to captivate students and teachers alike for years to come.

(2) The Natural Approach (NA)
Krasheen Stephen and Tracy Terrell (1983) developed the Natural Approach in the early eighties, based on Krashen’s theories about second language acquisition. The approach shared a lot in common with Asher’s (1977) Total Physical Response method in terms of advocating the need for a ‘silent phase’, waiting for spoken production to ‘emerge’ of its own accord, and emphasizing the need to make learners as relaxed as possible during the learning process. Some important underlying principles are that there should be a lot of language ‘acquisition’ as opposed to language ‘processing’, and there needs to be a considerable amount of ‘comprehensible input’ from the teacher. Meaning is considered as the essence of language and vocabulary (not grammar) is the heart of language.
As part of the Natural Approach, students listen to the teacher using the target language communicatively from the very beginning. It has certain similarities with the much earlier Direct Method, with the important exception that students are allowed to use their native language alongside the target language as part of the language learning process. In early stages, students are not corrected during oral production, as the teacher is focusing on meaning rather than on the form, unless the error is so drastic that it actually hinders meaning.

Communicative activities prevail throughout a language course employing the Natural Approach, focusing on a wide range of activities including games, role-plays, dialogues, group work and discussions. There are three generic stages identified in the approach: (1) Preproduction - developing listening skills; (2) Early Production - students struggle with the language and make many errors which are corrected on the basis of content and not structure; (3) Extending Production - promoting fluency through a variety of more challenging activities.

Krashen's (1983) theories and the Natural approach have received plenty of criticism, particularly orientated around the recommendation of a ‘silent period’ that is terminated when students feel ready to ‘emerge’ into oral production, and the idea of ‘comprehensible input’. Critics point out that those students will ‘emerge’ at different times (or perhaps not at all!) and it is hard to determine which forms of language input will be ‘comprehensible’ to the students. These factors can create a classroom that is essentially very difficult to manage unless the teacher is highly skilled. Still, this was the first attempt at creating an expansive and overall ‘approach’ rather than a specific
‘method’, and the Natural Approach led naturally into the generally accepted norm for effective language teaching: Communicative Language Teaching.

Since children learn naturally to speak before they read, oral practice should precede literacy and that receptive skills precede productive ones. Proponents of the method tended to avoid the use of books in the class . . . like the child in his home, the student was to be immersed in the language and allowed to formulate his own generalizations . . . it consists of a series of monologues by the teacher, interspersed with exchanges of question and answer between instructor and learner; all in the foreign language . . . a great deal of pantomime accompanies the talk. With the aid of gesticulation, by attentive listening, and by dint of repetition, the beginner comes to associate certain acts and objects with certain combinations of sound, and finally reaches the point of reproducing the foreign words or phrases.

It can be concluded that in the Natural Approach the teacher speaks only the target language and the class time is committed to providing input for acquisition. Students may use either the language being taught or their first language. Errors in speech are not corrected; however homework may include grammar exercises that will be corrected. Goals for the class emphasize the students being able use the language "to talk about ideas, perform tasks, and solve problems." This approach aims to fulfill the requirements for learning and acquisition, and does a great job in doing it. Its main weakness is that all classroom teaching is to some degree limited in its ability to be interesting and relevant to all students.
(3) Notional-Functional Approach (NF)

To cope with language communication occurring in Europe where industries and establishments were facing the problem of language barriers among workforces in 60s and 70s, the Council of Europe and the Council of Cultural Cooperation had designed courses to solve the said problem. The Notional-Functional syllabus came into being and has been used in the school. Actually the name notional-functional is given after two kinds of syllabuses, national and functional were designed at the same time. But later the functional one is used as singular in terms of ideas and outcomes.

The functional syllabus is organized according to language functions and the language items which are necessary for them. As Nagaraj (2004, p.38) cited, a table from The Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistic (1985) can be the best clear explanation for the functional syllabus.

Table No. 1: Language functional in functional syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of discourse</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Exponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spoken</td>
<td>speaking, listening</td>
<td>Bank, harbour, museum</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notions, according to the definition given by Tickoo (2004, p.249), are concepts expressed through language (e.g. time, space, causality, duration, frequency). D.A. Wilkins was the main proponent of this syllabus. The concepts and meanings are provided to the learners for communication purpose. In brief, concepts and means are called Notions. In Nagaraj’s (2008) work, some examples of notions from Wilkins (1976) are given.
The samples are as follows:

1. Semantico-grammatical categories
   a. Time:  Point of time, duration, time relations, frequency and sequence
   b. Quantity
   c. Space
   d. Sentential relation ‘cases’, for example:
      
      *John drank the milk.*
      
      *The milk was drunk by John.*
      
      *It was John who drank the milk.*

2. Categories of communicative function
   a. Judgment and evaluation
   b. Situation
   c. Argument
      i. Information asserted
      ii. Information sought:
         - question, request
            - interrogatives
            - declaratives and question intonation
      iii. Information denied
      iv. Agreement
      v. Disagreement
      vi. Concession (pp.41-42)
Based on the notional syllabus, Nagaraj provides the sample of contents in the book containing meaning, language and situation as shown in the Table No. 2.

In conclusion, notional-functional syllabus, according to Markee (1997), was one of the first syllabuses to be theoretically based on a Learner-Centered, communication-oriented approach to language instruction (P.16).

**Table No.2: Contents of the book designed on the basis of notional syllabus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Key Expression</th>
<th>Notion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Where do you come from?</td>
<td>Personal Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I need a..................</td>
<td>Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Do you like..............?</td>
<td>Likes and Dislikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What’s it like?</td>
<td>Describing objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Where is it?</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Would you like one?</td>
<td>Offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>What do you usually do?</td>
<td>Habit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>May I.................?</td>
<td>Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Will you.................?</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Let’s.....................?</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(4) Content-Based, Task-Based, and Participatory Approaches

Content-Based Language teaching (CBLT) is not new in English language teaching. It is 40 years old. General features of this method are the language teaching method which integrates contents from other disciplines to the teaching. As Larsen-Freeman (2004) pointed out, the special contribution of content-based instruction is that it integrates the learning of language with the learning of some other content, often academic subject matters.

In the 1970s there was a movement of native English speakers in England to integrate the teaching of reading and writing into all other subject areas. It was successful in English speaking countries to follow such movement. But in non-native language classrooms, students are in a difficult situation to comprehend subject matter in the texts. With the help of clear language objectives and content learning objectives, students are at ease in the study. The reason behind this is that language objectives are dictated by the texts, content-based can work.

In Asian countries like India, there are some textual materials which are built on language used in different subject areas. As Tickoo (2004) mentions, CIEFL Hyderabad has brought out text books that become models for similar courses produced at other Indian universities and by individual ELT practitioners. The texts are:

a) Language through Literature, Book 1, 2 and 3 (1967-1973)

b) A Preparatory General English Course for Colleges: Physical Sciences (1963) and

(5) Community Language Learning Approach (CLL)

This teaching method was developed by taking its principles from the more general Counseling-Learning approach developed by Charles A. Curran, Professor of Psychology in Chicago. Its main area involves the application of psychological techniques of counselling to language learning. Its focus is on the learners as ‘whole persons’. In this teaching method, a teacher gives attention to students’ intellect, understanding of relationship among students, their feelings, physical reactions, instinctive protective reactions, and desire to learn. The main principle of this teaching method is influenced by Carl Roger’s Humanistic Psychology. On the basis of Human Psychology, Curan (1977) found that adults often feel threatened by a new learning situation. They are threatened by the change inherent in learning and by the fear that they will appear foolish. The appropriate duty of a class teacher to get rid of adult learners’ fear is to act as the counsellor. Saraswathi (2004) points out six elements which are necessary for learning proposed by Curan: security, aggression, attention, reflection, retention and discrimination (SARD) (p.72). Curan regards this as the central idea of his humanistic approach. The following is his original statement:

As whole person, we seem to learn best in an atmosphere of personal security. Feeling secure, we are freed to approach the learning situation with the attitude of willing openness. Both the learner’s and the knower’s level of security determine the psychological tone of entire learning experience (Curan 1977, p. 6)."
The main focus of CLL Method lies on the principle of humanistic psychology. In practical aspect, ‘CLL practice lies in the attempts that are made to reduce the students’ anxiety by developing their own inner criteria to judge the value of what is being learnt and activating the inner emotional resources’ (Tickoo, 2004, p.361).

According to Tickoo (2004), there are two other outstanding features which should be of value to the language teacher interested in using this approach in the classroom: a) the teacher’s and learner’s roles in it and b) the techniques that are used.

CLL techniques are useful in a bilingual classroom as it allows the classroom to have translation at the earlier stage, recoding and transcription, reflection and observation and free conversation.

With regard to methodological strengths, Tickoo (2004) states that strengths include a judicious use of the learner’s language, the well-thought-out attempts to build a healthy and secure learning environment, the focus on learner autonomy and the use of appropriate aids and techniques.

In conclusion, in actual use in the world, ‘CLL has been used mainly in countries and classrooms where society’s expectations about teacher and learner roles are not the same as those in a majority of Asian FL classroom’ (P.364).

(6) The Structural Approach (SA)

English has been taught by using different techniques from time to time. Translation method has been quite popular. It is still abundantly used in the classrooms for teaching English. At some places, direct method is applied
for teaching this language. Improving the situations still further, structural approach has come up to stand and last for a long time. It is to benefit all concerned with the teaching and learning of English.

The structural approach was introduced in 1950s. That way it is a new approach. A number of researchers have used it in the field of teaching English and they have shown commendable results. The structural approach is the outcome of extensive researches made in the field of English as a foreign language. It is not the latest approach. The functional and the communicative approach are the latest. Sachdeva M.S. (2001) points out that

“The structural approach is based on the belief that in the learning of a foreign language, mastery of structure is more important than the acquisition of vocabulary.”

In this present set up of education, too much of emphasis is laid on the Structural Approach of teaching English. It is also known as the Aural-oral approach. The Structural Approach is the new technique of teaching English. This technique is based on the principle that in the early stage of language learning the students should be told about the essential tools of languages. These tools can be mastered only by practicing their use. It believes in providing opportunities to the students to hear and speak the language. This opportunity is provided by a carefully planned reading material provided to them. It is properly graded and enables the students to use the language in a given situation. Students are given an opportunity to state facts, answer questions, respond to certain situations, people and so on and so forth.
Roi B.C. (2001) states that

“The new technique of teaching English as a second language is based on sound linguistic principles, linguistic science considers language learning to be analogous to learning a trade. The method described here (Structural Approach) aims at teaching the pupils the essential tools of the language in the early stages of language learning. The tools can be mastered only by practicing their use.”

The Objectives of Structural Approach

According to Memon and Patel (1964) the objectives of structural approach are as follows:

1. To lay the foundation of English by establishing through drill and repetition about 275 graded structures.
2. To enable the children to attain mastery over an essential vocabulary of about 3,000 root words for active use.
3. To correlate the teaching of grammar and composition with the reading lessons.
4. To teach the four fundamental skills namely understanding, speaking, reading and writing in the order named.
5. To lay proper emphasis on the aural oral approach, active methods and the condemnation of formal grammar for its own sake.
The Basic Principles of the Structural Approach

The structural approach is based on some principles which are explained hereunder:

1. **Importance of Speech:** In the learning of a language, speech is more important than reading and writing, the reason being that language is learnt orally first. Then speech becomes the basis for acquiring other skills like reading and writing. In structural approach, speech is given more importance; it is the sheet anchor of this new approach.

2. **Formation of Language Habits:** Structural approach takes care of the fact that learning of a language is a habit formation process. Here a lot of drill work is given to the learners. The students are given a lot of practice in listening, speaking, reading and writing. Thus the structures are well fixed up in the minds of the learners.

3. **Students’ Activity:** For learning a language, the students are expected to be very active. In structural approach, pupils’ activity is given more importance as compared to teacher’s activity. Moreover, the best teaching takes place if both the teachers and the students are actively involved in it. The structural approach takes care of it.

4. **Mastery of Structures:** Emphasis is laid on the mastery of structures as compared to the acquisition of vocabulary. One structure is taken up as the teaching point. Its listening, speaking, reading and writing practice is given to the learners step by step. The more the aural-oral practice is given to the learners, the better would be the result. It will ensure mastery of structures. And mastery of structures results in effective learning of the language.
5. Meaningful Situations: The teacher is expected to create meaningful situations. That makes the teacher’s work interesting. Moreover, the students are able to learn the structures very well. The different types of meaningful situations can be created by facial expressions, by dramatization and by actions. In fact, the resourceful teacher faces no difficulty in creating meaningful situations.

6. Teaching one item of language at a time: In structural approach, only one item is taken up at a time and taught to the students. In this way, the students are able to grasp it well. A new structure is taught by using the vocabulary already learnt by the students. The second structure is introduced when the learner acquires mastery over the first structure.

Advantages of Structural Approach

This approach trains the students through the process of hearing and speaking in the use of the language. Structural Approach has the following advantages:

1. The students remain active throughout the teaching-learning process.
2. This approach helps the students to acquire fluency in their spoken English.
3. It makes the students creative learners. They are able to think of a large number of sentences of similar types.
4. The students are able to understand the subject matter fully because teaching is conducted by creating meaningful situations.
5. The learners are able to retain the subject matter in their minds for a longer time because they learn through situations.

6. Learning of the language takes place in a natural way because the students first have listening and speaking followed by reading and writing.

7. It enables the students to have good command over the language.

8. It helps the learners to have good pronunciation. Wherever a student mispronounces a word, there is an immediate check of the teacher himself.

9. Language learning becomes a habit with the students. So the learner is able to speak or write without any stress or strain.

10. The different skills of teaching-learning of the language are equally emphasized. So the students are good in all the skills i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing.

11. Structural approach helps all the students in the class to learn the language well. Even the slow learners and backward children are benefitted.

**Limitation of Structural Approach**

However, structural approach undoubtedly is of great utility in teaching English at all levels. It has worked wonders in the field of English teaching. It has a few shortcomings which are given as follows:

1. In structural approach, the learners have to be given a lot of practice. This type of teaching might make the process of teaching-learning dull and mechanical for a few learners.
2. Teaching by structural approach requires the services of really competent and hard working teachers.

3. Teaching by structural approach will be successful only if we have structurally graded syllabus.

4. Now when the emphasis is on communicative approach, structural approach cannot be given more importance and weight.

In summary, it is found that the principles of structural approach are very sound. They are directly helpful in the teaching-learning of a language. But the structures are many and English being a foreign language, it is not an easy job to gain mastery over all the structures. In fact, it needs competent and hard working teachers. The structural approach makes the young learners keen and active.

(7) Eclectic Approach (EA)

English is an instrument of living communication and a form of social behavior as some linguists and methodologists have said it. It is not a simple tool that any person can acquire without making efforts. It seems to be as complex as life itself. That is why a great variety of methods have been invented and tried. Thus, the methods found are expected to solve the trouble a learner encounters in learning a language.

Neither the explicit language learning (the Grammar Translation Method) nor the implicit language learning (the Direct Method) could satisfy the linguists or the methodologists because of their failure in fulfilling the learner’s and the teacher’s needs and interests. The first concentrated on the translation in the process of learning whereas the second one concentrated on the aural-oral skills. Rejection of other skills can be noticed. As a result of
this fact, the Eclectic Method came as a compromise between the explicit language learning (the Grammar Translation Method) and the implicit language learning (the Direct Method). Yardi (1994) states

“It allows for the use of mother tongue in explaining difficult points in grammar and recognizes the use of translation to some followers of the Eclectic Method as witnessed by Fries.”

Childers (1964) has offered some explanation for the adoption of the Eclectic Method

“The direct method required direct contact with the target language without using the native language of grammar deductively.”

The weak teachers cannot manipulate their teaching messages in various ways. Consequently, they effected some modifications by borrowing some techniques from here and there and resorted to the native language or made some grammatical explanations. However, Childers (1964) has given a fairly comprehensive summary conclusion of the major steps when the teacher uses the Eclectic Method by saying:

1. Oral practice of sounds, phonetics and reading aloud were included in the initial stage of the language course.
2. Questions in the language and answers in the same were used to test comprehension of the spoken language.
3. The students were trained in the use of vocabulary and learning to give information.
4. Grammar was explained deductively in order to save time in the classroom.

5. The method visualized tests to determine if the student has really understood what he has learnt.

However, the Eclectic Method is not a homogeneous method due to its combinations of other methods. Thus, Yardi (1994) states

“This method makes use of the learner’s mother tongue when necessary, accommodates teaching of formal grammar, makes use of situations for presenting teaching materials and freely uses audio-visual aids.”

It can be summarized that the Eclectic Method is not only a combination of the Grammar Translation Method and the Direct Method, but it is also a mixture of the best techniques of various methods in the teaching and learning. The advocates of this method believe that a good teacher should not follow any given method, either in spirit or in letter, because a particular method is perhaps not suitable to be applied in an educational situation. The eclectic approach is the label given to a teacher's use of techniques and activities from a range of language teaching approaches and methodologies. The teacher decides what methodology or approach to use depending on the aims of the lesson and the learners in the group. Almost all modern course books have a mixture of approaches and methodologies. Eclecticism in language teaching must be judiciously adopted and not just for the sake of it but it should also achieve the desired goals. Aslam (2004, p.70) states that in using eclectic approach, there has to be principled combination of different techniques to avoid frustration among students. In eclectic approach, there is no guarantee that learners might make a sense of what they are learning.
They may be exposed to a whole host of interesting materials and attractive tasks but might not learn anything through them. In such a situation a language teacher needs to manifest commitment to his profession and to his own teaching. Change is always good, but one must change only if one needs to. If a teacher feels that his method has been doing well, there is no need for him to change. However, if a change is necessary, he must tread the new path carefully.

In conclusion, the researcher suggests that the teachers of English should see teaching methodology as their own personal domain, certainly open to outside influences and examples, but theirs to experiment with and develop. They should decide what their language learning principles are and select techniques from various "methods" that appear to match them. They should try adapting/experimenting with those techniques before they prematurely discard them after one attempt. They should try using various techniques in a variety of combinations. They have to observe their learners closely, and invite them into the process by eliciting their feedback on the range of techniques they use. They should not misinterpret what the role of a language teacher is - they are not some authority with a mandate to tell learners how they should think. They are facilitators and a guides, and ongoing learners themselves.

2.3 English Language Teaching Methods in Thai Pedagogy

English language teaching in Thai history started when Thailand opened its threshold to the outside world. Officially in the Ratanakosin Period, King Rama IV and King Rama V had realized the significance of English as the medium of communication and knowledge. Since then English teaching
commenced in Thailand or Siam. With regard to teaching, English language teachers who were missionaries, introduced and employed teaching methodologies being used and flourished at that time in the Thai context.

In the history of English pedagogy, different teaching methodologies were proposed and applied. For instance, the Grammar – Translation or GTM, the Audio – lingual method (ALM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are among the prevalent teaching methodologies.

As mentioned earlier, from 1851 onwards, King Rama IV of Siam had hired American missionaries to teach English to his royal children in his palace six days a week. Later, King Rama V visited several countries and knew how significant English language was. Moreover, the King even initiated his royal support with scholarship for those who were fluent in using English to study abroad. From this event, Thailand or Siam had relations with the western countries, particularly Britain, France and Russia.

2.3.1 Grammar Translation and Direct Methods in the Thai context
With regard to teaching methodologies employed by English teachers in this period (1815), grammar translation, rote memorization and direct method were main teaching techniques. Since then Thai education, particularly English language teaching, has been influenced by these two teaching methodologies, grammar translation and rote memorization. Textbooks were not specified and were printed by missionaries. Lesson plans were designed in accordance with their perception of what should be taught to Thai students. Four main skills, listening, speaking, reading and writing were their main focus. Translation from mother language (Thai) into English was
included in it. In general, English teaching with grammar translation and rote memorization was satisfactorily successful.

In the period between 1893 – 1960 new official English curriculum was introduced to cope with an influence of foreign trading, religion and modern knowledge. Within this period, in 1909 the modern Educational Curriculum was brought which gave significance to English language as a compulsory subject and became both compulsory and elective subject when the 1909 Curriculum was revised in 1991. In 1960 English curriculum dealt with four macro skills including specific vocabulary items and grammar. Teachers were provided with manuals and guidelines. But the teaching of English in this period was not successful. Teachers still preferred using the translational method, grammar – translation and rote memorization.

2.3.2 Functional-Notional Approach and Communicative Approach

In 1961 – 1995, the status of English teaching was high but English teaching and learning in this period were not successful as they should be due to two main reasons. The first was teachers who were Thais with lack of experience and the second reason was students with low motivation. In this period Grammar – Translation method retained its influence in Thai education. In addition to this method, the functional-notional approach and communicative approach were introduced into Thai education. These two techniques were influenced by applied linguistics and psycho – sociolinguistics.

2.3.3 Learner – Centered Approach

Finally, the 1996 English curricula came into force aiming to provide Thai students with opportunity to continue their English study without interruption. Main goals were set to train students to have communication
skills. Besides, there were three main issues in the national Education Act (1999): learner – centered approach, teacher – conducted classroom research, and technology for education.

2.4 The method that works

From the above discussion, it is reasonable to raise a question-which method is the best for a language teacher to employ in the classroom? All methods have some characteristics in common, but there are also some fundamental differences among them. In teaching, a language teacher does need to choose at the end. In this regard, Stevick (1993) says, “if we intend to make choices that are informed and not just intuitive or ideological, then we need to expend no little effort first in identifying our own values, next in tying those values to an appropriate set of larger aims, and only then devising or rejecting, adopting or adapting techniques”. (P. 434)

In choosing one method, it is easy for some teachers to do something like this. “These teachers find that a particular method resonates with their own what they are trying to achieve and it is appropriate to their students and their context. We might call the position such teachers adopt, when confronted with the issue of methodological diversity, one of absolutism: One method is best. What makes it so is it is the one teacher knows, having been trained in it, and/or because it is consonant with the teacher’s thinking (values, beliefs, assumptions), and/or because there is research evidence supporting it. Such teachers may choose to become specialists in a particular method; they may even pursue advanced level training in it” (Larsen-Freeman 2004, p.181)
In reality, methods themselves are decontextualized. Each method contains a certain ideal based on certain beliefs. As Larsen-Freman (2004, p.181-182) points out, methods deal with what, how, and why. They deal with little or nothing about who/whom, when, and where. Each method put into practice will be shaped at least by the teacher, the students, the conditions of instruction, and the broader socio-cultural context. A particular method cannot, therefore, be a prescription for success for everyone. Moreover, some argue that there can be no right method for everyone due to diversity of age levels. Certain method is appropriate for certain level such as beginning level, intermediate and advanced levels. The relativists like Haliday (1994) warn that the method should not be exported from one situation to another.

According to relativists, each method has its strengths and weaknesses, but they are not equally suited for all students. Different methods are suitable for different teachers ad learners in different contexts. It is observed that one method works in a particular situation or context and it cannot work in a different context. As Palmer (1998) comments, ‘When a person A speaks, I realize that the method that works for him would not work for me, for it is not grounded in who I am’ (P.147).

Apart from the above idea, there is another belief which does not rely on the effectiveness of any teaching method, but gives an equal significance to all teaching methods with the basic belief that there is some value to teach methods. As Prabhu (1990) points out, instead of believing that different methods should be practiced in different contexts, different methods, or parts of methods, should be practiced in the same context. The above idea may be called pluralism and the way of picking and choosing from among methods
to create a teacher’s own blend and practice is called eclectic. In picking and choosing, teachers are advised to follow some principles called principled eclecticism.

2.5 Rationale Sampling

Sampling is an essential aspect of surveying; it is seldom possible to survey the complete population. A sample is a small proportion of a population selected for analysis. During the recent decades sampling technique has been increasingly used in the field of education to obtain information necessary in answering certain questions about a specific population. A sample is a group selected from the complete population to make the task of surveying…. more manageable. According to Best J.W. and Kahn J.V.

“A sample is a small proportion of a population selected for observation and analysis. By observing the characteristics of the sample, one can make certain inferences about the characteristics of the population from which it is drawn.”

Careful sampling was made only for teachers of English, though it cannot be claimed to be exhaustive, but it was adequate for its purpose of the study. According to Best J.W. and Kahn J.V.

“The ideal sample is large enough to serve as an adequate representation about which the researcher is to generalize and small enough to be selected economically…. There is no fixed number or percentage of subjects that determines the size of an adequate sample.”
Nick Moore emphasizes that

“The chance of a particular characteristic
or attribute occurring in the sample should
be the same as the chance of the same
characteristic appearing in the whole population.”

The study determined the samples by using Krecie and Morgan’s table. The subjects in the study were 61 English teachers in Higher Secondary Schools who were teaching in 10th, 11th and 12th standards in Muang district, Sisaket province of Thailand in the first semester in academic year 2010. The samples were randomly selected from the small, medium and large-sized schools. The researcher carried out a careful sampling for the teachers which were adequate for his purpose of the study. Regarding this way of selecting the samples Nick Moore says,

“Select a sample that will represent,
or have the same characteristic as the
overall population.”

In summary, it can be said that using a sample in research saves mainly money and time, if a suitable sampling strategy is used. If appropriate sample size is selected and necessary precautions taken to reduce on sampling and measurement errors, a sample should yield valid and reliable information. Details on sampling can be obtained from the references and many other books on statistics or qualitative research which can be found in libraries. Rationale Sampling population can be seen as a learner variable, a contextual consideration that can be rated alongside knowing "who" exactly your students are, and "where" and "why" they are learning English
as a second or foreign language. While it would perhaps be rash to say that this or that specific method matches this or that specific sampling population of learners, there are definitely general considerations for various sampling population that ought to encourage teachers to be mindful/selective of the kinds of teaching techniques they use according to the sampling population of their students.

Since the present research is based on the real life situations in the field of teaching English language in Muang district, the advantages and disadvantages of survey of teaching methodology were used by the researcher for collecting views of the English teachers.

The survey results indicated that disadvantages of Grammar Translation Method are as follows,

(1) Wrong ideas of what language is.
(2) Less motivation of learners.
(3) Creating frustration for learners.

Whereas, advantages of GTM are as follows,

(1) An effective way for application of grammar and sentence structure
(2) Few demands on teachers.
(3) Least stressful for students.

Disadvantages of Direct Method are as follows,

(1) Difficult to implement in public secondary education.
(2) Waste of time,
(3) Not all teachers were proficient in the foreign language.
Whereas, advantages of DM are as follows,

(1) An effective way in creating learners to be competent in using the target communicatively.

Disadvantages of Audio-Lingual Method are as follows,

(1) Descriptive rules.
(2) Analogy (comparison and contrast).
(3) Teacher-based (as a model to mimic).
(4) Less interaction.
(5) Repetition of practice and drill.
(6) Paying less attention to comprehension, reading and writing,

whereas advantages of ALM are as follows,

(1) Based on a scientific method and approach.
(2) Paying attention to speaking and listening.

Disadvantages of Communicative Approach are as follows,

(1) No environment of ESL.
(2) Difficulty in evaluating students’ performance.
(3) Ignoring the training of reading and writing.

Advantages of CA are as follows,

(1) Students will be more motivated.
(2) Students have opportunities to express.
(3) Students’ security is enhanced.

Disadvantages of Natural Approach are as follows,

(1) The NA ignores many factors essential in second language course design.
(2) There is nothing novel about its procedures and techniques within the framework of a method.
(3) There are still many problems in the research method.

Advantages of NA are as follows,

(1) The classroom is practically a source of comprehensible input in the target language for students who are beginners.

(2) The teacher creates a speech which will enable students to interact using the target language.

(3) Students are not to respond in the target language immediately.

(4) Students interact in meaningful situations with other students at or near their own level of competence.

(5) The teacher is aware of the specific vocabulary needs of the students and can concentrate on appropriate and useful domains.

Disadvantages of Structural Approach are as follows,

(1) SA is most suitable only for lower classes.

(2) It overlooks the linguistic habits already formed while learning the mother-tongue.

(3) It is possible to teach only well-selected sentence patterns with the help of this approach.

(4) It is not possible to teach the prescribed text-books by this method.

(5) It cannot be used successfully for crowded classes.

Advantages of SA are as follows,

(1) It puts more emphasis on speech or oral aspect of learning.

(2) It creates appropriate environment for learning the language.

(3) It provides enough opportunities to the students to express their ideas and feeling.

Disadvantages of Silent Way are as follows,

(1) It would seem necessary for a teacher to gain a good deal of
training and skill in order to apply the Silent Way to the teaching of total grammar in all its complexity, if such a broad application is, in fact, possible.

(2) This method can be beneficial for the teacher only in small groups of students. The teacher can gain ability in this method with his efforts. The teacher is expected to enrich the materials on his/her own.

(3) For some teachers the rigidity of the system (no repetitions by the teacher, no answers by the teacher etc.) may be meaningless.

(4) How such a method would work in the average classroom situation, or how successfully it might be used at more advanced levels is a question mark left in our minds.

(5) Language is separated from its social context and taught through artificial situations.

Advantages of SW are as follows,

(1) This method fosters cooperative learning between individuals.

(2) It embodies a new approach to education in general, a respect for the individual and an awareness of the individual’s extraordinary cognitive powers.

(3) If it succeeds to teach the language by using the rods without repeating too much, it will really save time and energy for both teachers students. The advocates of the Silent Way claim that the short-term memory is used artificially but well. The self-esteem of the students will be increased and this will enhance learning. By this way students will say ‘I learned instead of I was taught well.’
Disadvantages of Suggestopedia Method are as follows,

(1) Environment limitation
Most schools in developing countries have large classes. Each class consists of 30 to 40 students. One of the problems faced in utilizing this method is the number of students in the class. There should be 12 students in the class (Adamson, 1997).

(2) The use of hypnosis
Some people say that suggestopedia uses a hypnosis, so it has bad deep effects on human beings.

(3) Infantization learning
Suggestopedia class is conditioned to be in a child-like situation. There are some students who do not like to be treated like this as they think that they are mature.

Advantages of SM are as follows,

(1) A comprehensible input based on dessugetion and suggestion
Principle -
By using this teaching method, young Language Learners can lower their affective filter. Suggestopedia classes, in addition, are held in ordinary rooms with comfortable chairs, a practice that may also help them to relax. Teachers can do numerous other things to lower the affective filter. According to Kharsen (1989) cited in Xue (2005), activities that allow students to get better acquainted with each other may help lower anxieties and make students to adopt new names for the duration of the language course may have a similar effect.
(2) Authority concept
Students remember best and are most influenced by information coming from an authoritative source, teachers.

(3) Double-plannedness theory
It refers to the learning from two aspects. They are the conscious aspect and the subconscious one. Young language learners can acquire the aim of teaching from both direct instruction and environment in which the teaching takes place.

(4) Peripheral learning
Suggestopedia encourages the students to apply language more independently, take more personal responsibility for their own learning and get more confidence. Peripheral information can also help encourage students to be more experimental, and look to sources other than the teacher for language input. For example, students can make some sentences using the grammatical structure placed on the classroom wall, describe a particular place in an English speaking country by looking at the poster on the wall etc. When students are successful in doing such self-activities, they will be more confident.

Disadvantages of Total Physical Response Method are as follows,

   (1) It is fun and easy. Students will enjoy getting out of their chairs and moving around.

   (2) Simple TPR activities do not require a great deal of preparation on the part of the teacher. However, some other more complex applications might require it.

   (3) It is good for learners who need to be active in the class.

   (4) It is a good tool for building vocabulary.
(5) It is memorable. Actions help strengthen the associations in the brain.

(6) Class size need not be a problem.

Advantages of TPR are as follows,

(1) While it can be used at higher levels, TPR is most useful for beginners. It is also useful at the higher levels where preparation becomes an issue for the teacher.

(2) Students are not generally given the opportunity to express their own thoughts in a creative way.

(3) It is easy to overuse TPR. "Any novelty, if carried on too long, will trigger adaptation." Asher writes, "No matter how exciting and productive the innovation, people will tire of it."

(4) The teacher may find that it is limited in terms of language scope. Certain target languages may not be suited to this method.

(5) It can be a challenge for shy students.

It can be concluded that teaching methodology and techniques used by the English teachers are a combination of approaches and methodologies. English teachers have started to think that one single method couldn’t satisfy students’ needs of learning a language. Sometimes the teachers make use of Non-verbal cues, Group discussion, Presentation, Role-playing, Bi-lingual materials, Repeat and rephrase. Most of the teachers use traditional method of teaching English at Higher Secondary Level. In traditional approach, the teachers tend to teach the rules governing the language. It is due to the traditional method of teaching English as a foreign language, that students and teachers face several problems in achieving the communicative goals. Therefore, the Communicative Approach along with technology based
audio-video aids will certainly help enrich the students as well as teachers in the use of English language. Moreover, Audio-lingual Method also can create communicative competence in learners. In addition, Self access learning centers (SALC) have been established in Higher Secondary School in Muang district, Sisaket province to facilitate learner independence. The Schools provide multi-media and learning facilities for the students to do further practice on language skills on their own. Students can integrate in the study of subject matter in the English language especially in listening and reading skills, and also to be used as a tool for learner training in strategies of learning, so that students can continue the development of their work and quality of life.

2.6 Hypothesis of the Research

The English language teaching is beset with a lot of problems all over the country. Some of the major problems are lack of fluency in spoken English and that of accuracy in written English. There is a great scope for improvement of standards of English. It is, therefore, important that a thorough study of the problems of teaching English is undertaken. The proposed study would be an attempt of that kind.

The proposed study attempts to investigate into the methods of teaching English in Sisaket province in relation to the objectives of teaching/learning English there. It is also proposed to evaluate the teaching methods as well as methods of evaluation and means of improving the effectiveness of teaching English in Muang district, Sisaket province in particular and all over the country in general.
The study aims to approach the English Language Teaching (ELT) from the point of view of teachers who are teaching English as a subject at Higher Secondary School level. The main objective, which has guided the study, is to obtain data related to independent variables such as the aims of ELT in Thailand and the process of teaching English that is operating to fulfill the goals of English language teaching.

It is due to the traditional methods of teaching English as a foreign language that the students and teachers are facing several problems in achieving communicative goals. Therefore, communicative approach along with technology-based audio-video aids will certainly help enrich the students as well as teachers in the use of English language.
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