CHAPTER - IV

APPROACHES TO TEACHING ENGLISH
Before we dwell on characteristics, merits and
demerits of different approaches to teaching English,
we should digress a little to define what precisely is meant
by the term 'approach' and what is the difference between
the terms 'approach' and 'method', to look into the ambi-
valences and ambiguities associated with them. There is
a big controversy about terms 'approach' and 'method'.
Often people use these terms interchangeably. As E.M.
Anthony observes, "As one who has been concerned with
the teaching of English as a foreign language for almost
twenty years, I have sometimes found it taxing to beat
my way through the undergrowth of overlapping terminology
that surrounds this field. We talk and write of the aural
approach and the audio-lingual method, the translation
approach and the translation method; the direct method and the mimic-and-memorize method; pattern practice techniques; grammar method; and even the natural or 'nature' method of language pedagogy." ¹

But there is a difference between approach and method. Approach is a more extensive term than method. An approach is "a set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language and the nature of language teaching and learning. An approach is axiomatic. It describes the nature of the subject-matter to be taught. It stakes a point of view, a philosophy, an article of faith—something which one believes but cannot necessarily prove. It is often unarguable except in terms of the effectiveness of the methods which grow out of it." ²

Thus, an approach is merely a philosophical point of view, a standpoint of looking at the entire problem, a matter of faith. On the other hand, method is a well thought out plan for the presentation of the subject-matter based upon the selected approach. So within one approach the teacher can use various methods. After understanding the difference between the two terms, now we are in a

¹ Allen & Campbell (Eds.), op.cit., P.4. The quotation is from "Approach, Method, And Technique".
² ibid, P.5.
position to describe different approaches to teaching English as a second language generally used in India.

The Structural Approach

English as a second language is taught not only in India but also in Africa, Myanmar, Malaya, Japan, China etc. In no nation were the old methods and approaches found entirely satisfactory. Everywhere, it was realized that an innovative approach to the teaching of English was required. Consequently, comprehensive researches were made in the sphere of English as an alien language at the university of London Institute of Education. These researches enabled educationists to devise the structural approach also known as the aural-oral approach.

The structural approach has taken two distinct forms on the two sides of the Atlantic Ocean. These two forms are unlike in origin, value and essentials. The first movement called vocabulary approach, germinated from inside the classroom and was improved upon by distinguished language experts of English like Faucett, Hornby, M.P. West, and Palmer. Amendments, in this sphere, started during the First World War when a large number of foreigners began to learn English. Some difficulties were very common in all the countries. Research on sentence
structure began in Japan where in 1923 the Institute for Research in English Teaching was established and H.E. Palmer was appointed Director of the Institute and editor, of its Bulletin, issued ten times in a year. Palmer made a sincere contribution to the frustrating difficulty of the romanisation of Japanese. He returned to England after his retirement and focussed his full attention on the numerous problems of language teaching. He was an expert in phonetics, intonation and grammar. Research in languages benefited much from the progress made in descriptive linguistics, Educational Psychology and the study of literature. Improvement in English teaching began with vocabulary by searching the best words for definite purposes. It was realized that the actual intrinsic problem in learning a second language abides in mastering its vocabulary, so educationists started directing attention to vocabulary. They regarded vocabulary more significant in learning English than its grammatical pattern. A peculiar aspect of this approach was its stress on meaning. For the sake of imparting correct meaning of the words taught, graded and simplified structures were presented with proper situations.

The second movement was a growth in linguistics. The underlying assumption was that all languages were
systematic and structural. It was directed to objective studies of different languages. Thus, it was not a pedagogic approach like the first one. It did not offer the 'why', and 'how' of teaching English. It stressed 'what to teach'. This approach was called 'oral approach' in America. They first compared the native languages with English and then tried to find out areas of interference in learning English. As such they prepared the teaching material to face this problem.

In India, the structural approach is the product of imperative need. It has been introduced in India at a recent date. Educationists have adopted the principles of both the oral approach and the vocabulary approach. They have popularized it as a linguistic discovery appreciated by linguists all over the world. The two approaches have also become methods in passing from West to East. In India, the structural approach is generally understood as 'the direct method with a little changes and additions here and there, plus the play-way method'. But an approach is not a method. An approach is related to 'how', therefore, it may vary from teacher to teacher and from circumstance to circumstance. It does not alter like methods.

In India, Tamil Nadu was the first state to adopt the structural approach. Later, during the seventies,
this approach was made popular by the Central Institute of English, Hyderabad all over the country. This approach has been adopted by a number of schools in Uttar Pradesh under the direction of English Language Teaching Institute, Allahabad.

In the structural approach the foundation and common ground of teaching is patterns or structures of English. It is necessary to understand what are structures or patterns that English uses in order to communicate meaning. Structures may be defined as the instruments of language. Just as a blacksmith, a carpenter or a goldsmith works with his instruments much in the same manner, the learning and teaching process of a language is worked upon by its instruments. The instruments of a language are its sounds, rhythm, stress and intonations, its vocabulary or words and structures. Using these instruments a teacher tries to develop the fourfold skills of a language. We express our views in sentences and not in words. Words used in sentences are the result of the social context in which we use them. Since this context changes, so also the structure of our sentences changes. So is the case with English. Meaningful words are used in a particular series to convey their meanings. Thus, these structures are the essential instruments of English. Words are much less significant than the order in which they are set with
each other. This is why the structural approach is based on the assumption that in the learning of an alien language, command of structures is more necessary than the mastery of vocabulary.

Structures can be categorized in the following four ways:

(i) **Sentence Structures**

There are nearly 280 basic sentence structures or language patterns that a learner is expected to learn at the early stage. They are divided into seven parts as follows:

(a) Patterns having two parts, as: They eat.

(b) Patterns having three parts, as: John takes a pen.

(c) Patterns having four parts, as: He gives you a car.

(d) Patterns beginning with a question verb, as: Are you going to London?

(e) Patterns beginning with a question word, as: Why are you creating problems?

(f) Patterns beginning with 'There', as: There was a king.

(g) Patterns of command or requests, as: Please shut the door. Get out etc.
(ii) **Phrase Structures** :-

Phrase is a word or group of words that conveys an idea without its being a clause or sentence. For example, a handful of, across the table, on the table, wish to do it etc.

(iii) **Formulae** :-

Formulae are those words which are employed on definite occasions, e.g. How do you do?: Excuse me; Best of luck! etc.

(iv) **Idioms** :-

Idioms are the product of every culture. Idioms are the group of words which must be presented as a whole while teaching English as a second language. If the teacher fails to do so, pupils will not be able to comprehend their meanings. Idioms like 'at the eleventh hour', 'mind one's P's and Q's, 'make no bones about' etc. come in this category.

In choosing patterns we should estimate the ability of learning of the average pupils in average school conditions. We should also keep in mind their average age, mental condition, the ability of teachers teaching it,
time allotted for the English period and the availability of the teaching material. It is commonly observed that several structures have more than one meaning. This implies that a structure can be used in more than one distinct situation. These distinct meanings should also be graded.

J.B. Bruton, in a working paper presented at the Nagpur Seminar in 1958, emphasizes that the success of a structural syllabus depends upon the gradation of structures and, therefore, he "states which items are to be taught at each stage and goes a step further by indicating the order in which the items should be presented." 3 He lays down the following criteria for the gradation of structures: "(i) area of difference: between the learner's language and English — a factor which has to be given due weight in determining the difficulty of various items; (ii) usefulness and teachability: the needs and interests of the pupils at different stages and certain practical difficulties which may be experienced in creating a proper situation in which a particular structure can be presented; (iii) surrender value: the items can not be viewed in isolation but as parts of an interrelated course which will ensure a certain mastery over the English language." 4


4. ibid., p. 43.
In the structural approach each structure is presented separately. Usually these six steps are followed to teach a structure or item:

(i) Presentation of item in proper situations by the teacher.

(ii) Oral drill by the pupils of those situations presented in first step.

(iii) Presentation of the item in some other situations.

(iv) Oral drill by the pupils of those situations that were presented in third step.

(v) Overall drill.

The exponents of this approach believe that efficiency in speech helps in developing, reading and writing skills. Moreover, there is no language in the world that has script but no spoken form. But there are a number of languages which endure merely on the tongue and do not have any written script. For this reason, much oral work is stressed in the early stage. Besides, use of the native language of the learner occupies a place in this approach. While teaching, English structures are compared with those of the learner's native language.
A structural syllabus is usually a list of linguistic items presented in teaching order, and is accompanied by exemplifying sentences. Command of signalling system of English is more useful than the detailed knowledge of the forms. This command is best gained by drill or repetition. The motif of teaching one item at a time is literally followed in order that the students may have full command of a presented pattern and may employ it confidently. Every text book is accompanied by a teacher's Hand Book that gives practical suggestions for the teaching of structures and words. The student is supposed to learn nearly 3000 basic words and their derivations at the end of a five year course. He is also supposed to have a mastery over nearly 280 root structures in five years.

The structural approach has some strong merits. It intensifies the learning of the English language by giving a knowledge of its patterns. The language material, that is, structures and vocabulary are very cautiously chosen and graded. Text-book writers set the structures in the order, in which they come in the syllabus. Vocabulary items and structures are repeated to help the pupil make them instinctive habits. It pays more attention to speech habits, providing more opportunities for pupils to practise the use of English, for a language can not be separated from sound. The structural approach can be fruitfully
followed at every stage with a well-selected and well-graded programme. The pupil spontaneously learns some word-order, use of words and grammar by learning the pattern of sentences. In this way, he avoids general mistakes in grammar and composition. Language learning is a process of habit formation. The students develop the habit of speaking English through effective drills. This approach encourages the use of everyday English. As such, it promotes the interest and activity of the learners. Therefore, it is called 'English through play way'.

This approach can assist in teaching prose, poetry etc. as viewed by R.K. Jain, "If we have a programme of teaching language alongwith literature just as we have from class IX and upwards, even at the University stage where pupils offer English, there too, structural approach can be of much help to the teachers." 5

The structural approach originates an appropriate atmosphere in the classroom for teaching and learning a second language. Due to a lot of oral work, whatever is learnt in the class remains firmly fixed in pupils' memory. It is an extensive approach and it creates a consistent progress of the skill implied in language learning. It

results in 'economy of efforts', for the task of the teacher is completely streamlined that causes a minimum of wastage. It makes a perfect use of the learner's experience and knowledge in his mother-tongue that has a significant role to play in learning an alien language. The special worth of this approach lies in the fact that the aim of teaching or learning are very clearly defined at each stage and are attainable creating a pleasing sense of command and confidence. The approach is based on scientific principles of language teaching and is further justified by linguistic research work. It has demonstrated its success all over the world where English is not the native language of the learners.

Problems and Probable Solutions:

Some language experts charge some serious allegations against the structural approach. The approach seems to contain some demerits which make people doubt its efficacy. The selection and grading of structures does not remove the difficulties of teaching English. It merely assists the teacher to recognize what he has taught and what he should teach next. It neglects the linguistic habits already acquired by the pupil while learning his mother-tongue. It has been experienced that strict sequencing of structures amounts to the production of tedious and boring reading
materials. It overlooks the fact that the student is a learner. Similarly, it expects too much from the teacher. A great deal of mechanical drilling is thrust upon the pupils. It makes the class dreary and monotonous.

Text-books prescribed in courses can not be taught through the structural approach. It needs highly planned text-books which should have a systematic frequency of the language material used therein. Till such text-books are available, this approach will have to be at the mercy of defective devices. With its over-concentration on speech and oral activities, this approach has not paid enough attention to writing, reading of each kind and vocabulary acquisition. The grading of structures seems to be very useful in theory, but it does not work in practice. There are certain situations when the teacher has to alter the order of grading. It does not indicate how a new item should be presented or drill should be done. The teacher himself has to consider these points. The structural approach approves monolingual presentation, as a result of which students' experience and knowledge of the mother-tongue is not satisfactorily used, though the approach claims to do so. It is very difficult for them to comprehend meanings in English with the result that most of them do not know exact meanings at all or know them incorrectly. It requires a good deal of material
assistance for the sake of presenting a real life situation. In this approach, the centre of interest is the material and not the learner. In this way, the approach neglects him.

One of the causes for the non-performance of this approach is that properly trained teachers are not available in our country. Though the text-books are produced in accordance with the structural syllabus, yet teachers fail to understand how to introduce structures. The reason behind this is that these teachers had no proper training in teaching according to the structural approach. Teachers trained in traditional methods find it hard to handle.

This approach is not fit for teaching prose, poetry, grammar, pronunciation, rhythm, intonation etc. The approach is suitable for junior classes only. The structure-practice drills and cramming may be of some use for students of junior classes, but students of higher classes require a more creative and freer use of English. This approach does not impart a suitable solution to this difficulty.

The structural approach has been facing some peculiar problems in India. In this country, the approach is the child of necessity. Teachers have borrowed features from both the approaches on the two sides of the Atlantic.
In taking up the structural syllabus they have modified it in many ways. So the structural approach is a misnomer here. The specialists use the term to mean anything they choose it to mean. They want to answer every problem of teaching English with the help of this innovative device. On the other hand, the teaching of English in our country is becoming more and more perplexing. Opportunities of learning English in the college or school atmosphere and inside the classroom have been exceedingly weakened. All the methods and devices, old and new, are not meeting the requirement. English, though reduced to the position of second language, has a broad range of functions. The Indian structural approach is a troublesome adjustment. There are not deep researches involving bilingual comparisons - comparing the pupil's first language with English. Without such researches handy text-books and syllabi can not be produced. There is no self-contained English course for Indian pupils. However, the English language Teaching Institute, Allahabad, has taken an initiative in this direction. Union Ministry of Education through the National Council of Education, New Delhi must work as an agency, in co-operation with the state governments, to co-ordinate the teaching of English all over India and to prepare inexpensive text-books meeting the requirements of rural and urban schools in our country.
If some precautions are taken, the structural approach can be more productive. The structures should be selected, graded and presented on the basis of findings of linguistic studies. Specialists in the field should be invited to prepare syllabi, to make comparative study of languages, and to discover more serviceable methods and materials for teaching through this approach. The comparison of English and the child's native language should involve linguistic analysis from the standpoints of phonetics, phonology, phonotactics, morphology, morphophonemics, syntax and semantics. Such efforts will give productive outcomes of extreme importance to the teaching of English in India.

Merely oral drills for weeks altogether is too much and this type of 'single root device' seems to be erroneous as far as teaching is concerned. It will result in feeding immoderately in one kind of nutriment. The structuralists in place of giving inflexible directives, should tell what this approach can not do for the sake of making the approach more effective. The teacher also should not think that the approach is 'philosopher's stone' changing everything into gold.

The first and legitimate place for the structural approach is behind the classroom, in the possession of
the policy makers, the text-book writers, and the syllabus designers. In order to escape undernutrition or overfeeding the language diet should be carefully managed. The order of preferences in providing language material and its settlement should be based on the findings of linguistic studies. The second but equally significant place for this approach is inside the classroom. It helps the teacher generate more life in the classroom. He can make language teaching more interesting and energetic by introducing his teaching items in the background of real-life situations. Students will be capable of associating new sentence structures with the field of experience pertaining to that situation. The English teacher's task is to remain always a teacher and not to become a structuralist. He can better utilize a situation as a teacher and not as a structuralist. We must bear in mind that most of the problems of a teacher are pedagogic and only a few of them are linguistic.

For teaching English through this approach a sound structural syllabus should be designed. It would definitely be beneficial for the teacher to have before him the most necessary structural items arranged in a rational and practicable kind of teaching order. A structural syllabus is a graded list of language items to be presented
in the classroom. A text is also prescribed that goes with it. There should be some difference between the syllabus for first three or four years and for senior classes. The syllabus for junior classes should comprise the basic patterns of the language and a specially designated vocabulary. From the second year of English onwards interesting supplementary books should be offered. This approach requires a proper and solid background at the earlier stage by reading, writing and exercises. The syllabus in English, for the last two or three years, depending on the duration of the courses need not be arranged in terms of graded structures. Essentials of elementary grammar should be presented in the last two years of the English course. By the end of secondary level, about 2500 words should be in the active and about 500 words should be in the passive vocabularies of the students. But the existing syllabi are unyielding and need mechanical drilling of separate language items. There is no cohesion between syllabi of junior and senior classes. The syllabi for the first three or four years of English are generally designed on the structural patterns but those of the later years are still conventional and have no connection with the former.

Nevertheless, the structural syllabus, in the hands of a properly trained teacher, can turn out to be an excessively
useful device for teaching English under the changed conditions. Each and every trained teacher must be retrained in the mechanical skills of this approach. Only properly trained teachers can employ this approach and its techniques in a successful manner. In every way the problem is of great bulk. The Government should support the agencies serving in this field with generous grants. Special task forces should be formed to provide short term deep training at district centres. Special courses should be introduced in teaching institutions. This approach calls for imagination, initiative and resourcefulness on the part of the teacher. It makes students active and interested in learning an alien language. It imparts pleasing experiences to the pupil who successfully learns by doing and speaking. The pupils are no longer passive recipients of half cooked language meals, rather they have an active share in the task of English learning. But there is another serious shortcoming in the syllabi used in India. There is no arrangement for the teaching of correct English pronunciation. This should be accomplished right from the initial stages. The teacher should sort out the problems of the pronunciation by comparing the sound system of the student's native language with that of English. In every language course reasonable emphasis must be laid on intonation, rhythm, and stress. The standard of judgement should be British pronunciation.
It will be difficult to adjust the new structural syllabus with the old examination system. Such oral and written tests will have to be produced that can assist in evaluating students' actual progress in English—that is, their achievement, development and more significantly their behavioural changes because of the learning experiences.

The structural approach is still in an experimental stage even after thirty-odd years and many institutes of English teaching are striving to reform it. The approach is, undoubtedly, superior to old approaches to teaching. It has brought about something of great importance in the sphere of teaching English as a second language. But its proper employment in Indian schools and colleges seems to be well nigh impossible. Reasons for this are not difficult to find. First of all, Indian classrooms are overcrowded and teachers have to teach according to an inflexible curriculum. In addition, they are not properly trained to utilize the approach efficiently. They are not even given the material that can assist them in teaching English through this approach. Besides,
there is that traditional examination system, that evaluates the ability of a teacher by the number of students passing in his subject. Due to these conditions, it is expedient, though unfortunately, not to use the structural approach.

The Situational Approach:

The situational approach virtually seeks to give the knowledge of English as a second language in the same way as the child learns his own native language. As we all understand that each unit of the native language is learnt in a real situation. Whatever the child comes to know and expresses in words is linked with his own life and the situations in which the child learns the mother-tongue occur again and again. It can be resolved from discussed points that a foreign language should also be taught by creating links between new words and real situations. But the difficulty is how to produce real situations in the classroom that provides rather unnatural situations. It is a practical difficulty requiring practical solution and not the theoretical one. The situational approach seeks to overcome this practical difficulty. It, for that reason, indicates how a teacher should produce a real situation in the classroom.

The chief characteristics of this approach are:-
(i) The teacher presents new words incidentally in the classroom.

(ii) Proper materials are employed to form appropriate situations.

(iii) Several opportunities are provided for students to connect the meanings of new words with suiting situations.

(iv) Constant repetition is emphasized.

(v) The teacher asks numerous questions regarding created situation and himself answers them.

(vi) The teacher's chain of actions is unbroken.

(vii) A number of examples are presented in a short period.

(viii) Teacher's actions are not silent but he constantly talks about his activities, asks questions and answers himself.

Here the procedures of teaching have been outlined to indicate how the teacher might go forward with the approach in the class. What is discussed below should be spread over many weeks or even months, in agreement with the number of periods given to English each week.
The teacher should begin with actions that need affirmative, negative and interrogative forms of speech to be explained. "What is that? It's the book. I'm pointing to the book. What's that? It's the chair. I'm pointing to the chair." In the same way, the teacher may continue to teach the new vocabulary and syntax with other material things in the classroom—blackboard, pen, table, door, window etc.

"Am I pointing to the door? Yes, I am. What am I pointing to now? I'm pointing to the window now. I'm not pointing to the door." This task is to go on till the class has had enough opportunities of identifying the affirmative, negative and interrogative forms of speech.

The teacher, while doing these actions in the class, will reiterate these statements often. Then he may proceed to the imperative—"Stand up! Open the book! What's Rahul doing? He's opening the book. Maneesha, go to the door! What's Maneesha doing now? She's going to the door." The teacher will present enough examples, reiterating his statements in accordance with the situation produced and action performed. The students will hear these statements presented by the teacher several times, in affirmative, negative, interrogative and imperative
Having done this the teacher may put questions to the class. "Is Maneesha going to the door? Am I taking the pen? Are you reading the book? etc."

When this has been adequately understood by the class, the teacher may step in the next stage. "I'm touching the book. I'm going to shut the door. I'm shutting the door. Is the door shut or open?" These statements and other sentences of the same sort will be repeated with minor alterations. "What's Rahul doing now? He's moving. He's sitting on the chair. What am I doing now? I'm writing on the blackboard. I'm going to write the word 'paper'. I'm writing the word 'paper'. Now I'm going to write the word 'pen' etc. In this way, the teacher will display the new item and will repeat the use of this imperative again and again. "Go to the blackboard! Write on it! Come back! Prabha, come here and take the chair! What's Prabha going to do? She's going to take the chair, etc."

In the initial stages the teacher may give all instructions in the mother-tongue of pupils but gradually pupils will pick up a classroom vocabulary, understanding the orders and performing actions according to them. In the next stage the teacher will dilate the same situation as presented below:
"What am I pointing to? Yes, I'm pointing to the door. Now I'm going to the door. I'm going to open it. Where am I standing now? Yes, I'm standing at the door. I'm going to open it. Javed, what am I going to do next?"

In this way the teacher can present a good number of new words incidentally in the class, introducing them spontaneously. The pupils will have many opportunities to associate new words with the suiting situations.

The teacher will go forward to teach the use of present perfect with 'just' that is a crucial use but a bit perplexing to learn otherwise.

"Tahaseen is going to shut the door. She's just shut the door. She's opening the door again. She's going to shut it again. What has she just done? She's just shut the door." Here the use of the word 'just' suits the kind of situation genuinely. The situation is offered as an order of simple activities. The students by this time have become well acquainted with these situations and activities with which they associate the use of 'just' and retain it in their memory for future use.

It is obvious from the process discussed in detail upto this extent that there is no trouble in having appropriate material to create appropriate situations. But much reiteration is constantly required in the situational
approach. Numerous examples are to be presented in a short time. The teacher has to put a large number of questions regarding his activities and he has to answer them too. He then again puts questions in a bit different situation and again himself provides the answers of every question. The most essential part is frequent repetition. The action chain alters from situation to situation imparting ample of opportunities for revision. While doing the action the teacher is uninterruptedly giving instructions, asking questions and giving answers. The new teacher can learn how to handle a class in this manner, only through practice.

The situational approach honestly pursues the principle of interest. It also aims at the principle of simplicity and change. It lays a great deal of stress on learning by playing and action chains create a liveliness in the classroom. This approach emphasizes learning through listening that is the most important skill for learning a language.

Problems and Probable Solutions:

Inspite of having certain merits, the situational approach is also not free from several problems. Only well chosen words and sentence-structures can be taught by
this approach. The students are overburdened with the exercises of these sentences. This process of teaching becomes dreary and boring after sometime. This approach is fit for only junior classes. Teachers in senior classes can not completely depend upon this approach. The approach is useless for teaching prose, poetry and composition. Moreover, text-books generally prescribed in Indian schools can not be taught by this approach. This approach deadly needs trained teachers and a very few teachers, properly trained in this approach, are available in our country.

Moreover, teachers trained in the traditional methods will never wish to adopt this approach. Their standpoint is that the traditional methods are well tested and safe. Another contention is that in view of the inflexible curriculum and too much work-load, the situational approach will never work. Hence it is understandable that only 12.47% respondents prefer situational approach to other approaches (Table 25, Appendix II).

If, however, the situational approach is used, it should be used with some precautions and improvements. The quantity of new material in every period should be restricted to what can be digested by the class without any difficulty. Each new construction and word should be precisely introduced in the class in situations which
clarify their meaning. The teacher must remember that this type of work should take not more than one-third of the entire period. Diversity is required, and the remaining two-thirds of the period may well be given to pronunciation drills, the first stage of reading spelling and writing.

Action-chains, long sequences are more desirable than isolated actions. These action-chains are the indispensable procedures for making direct and immediate links between the situation, the intention, the relation, the activity, etc. and the words, phrases and constructions required to express them. In the beginning the classroom situation may seem to be new and pleasing to the learners but in a short time the novelty will wear off and the pupils' interest may decrease if the situations are not changed. Therefore, this process should not be accomplished in too great detail and for too long a time. The action-chains selected for the class should be practical. Their repetition is essential but there must be variety as well as simplicity. Classroom activities must be as gay and interesting as possible. But this does not mean that the classroom should be made a picture-hall or circus. It is ridiculous and the wastage of time to open and shut the door for forty minutes. Repetition should be there,
no doubt, but the changing situations should enable the students to see the meaning of new words in various actions. Simple action-chains in the classrooms can be extended and so designed that they become interesting diversions for the young pupils. The diversions adopted by the teacher must suit the age level and mental growth of his students.

In the situational approach, the English teacher is required to perform a lot of conversation. The principle implied is that the learner must hear, and hear again and again every word and pattern from the teacher before being asked to speak them. The students should also have a good deal of conversation about the actions carried out by them and by the teacher.

While handling this approach, the teacher should be prepared to use pictures as an aid to originate new situations. Every picture must exhibit a story in an amusing manner. But, pictures should be used to offer situations that are outside the classroom. These pictures should be appropriate for intensive oral work. For this objective the picture strip has tremendous potential value in teaching a second language. The picture may be designed in a series, each denoting a stage in the story or the event that the teacher intends to tell and use for question-answer work. Students at an advanced level wish to
know about the life of people whose language they are learning. They also like enterprising tales from history. However, the teacher should produce his own pictures for this kind of lesson. He can prepare a series of pictures with a little imagination, more appealing to the pupils and elucidating the situation for the objective of classroom treatment. The series should be so prepared that a different sort of questions may be asked and the subject of the story should enable the teacher to deal not only with the situation in the picture but also with the real situations in life.

The Communicative Approach:

The communicative approach to language teaching is based on the idea that mastering a language implies to communicate spontaneously and confidently in the language. The fundamental theory that communicative competence is the target of second language learning is not a new one. According to Robert Lado: "Learning a second language is ... acquiring the ability to use its structure within a general vocabulary under essentially the conditions of normal communication among native speakers at conversational speed." 6

Through such concepts as 'communicative' or 'functional' language teaching or 'communicative ability' as a target of language teaching, educationists have tried to include in language teaching concepts that they have traced from discourse analysis, speech act theory and the ethnography of communication. Communicative approach in teaching English has been adopted, developed and followed in the countries of the Far East, specially in Japan and China. It is also known as methodically based communicative language teaching in Japan.

At present, perhaps China has the largest English learning population in the world. Foreign Language Institute at Canton has been working on the project – Communicative English for Chinese Learners, and they have produced a great deal of material for English learners. While in Japan, the Communicative Teaching Society was established in 1977 to meet the objectives of the communicative teaching of English.

This approach introduces a broader prospect of language. It considers that language is a system for the expression of meaning. The basic components of language are not only its structural and grammatical features, but categories of communicative and functional meaning as exemplified in conversation. The chief function of
language rests upon communication and interaction. The structure of language reflects its communicative and functional uses.

The basic theory of communicative approach is to acquire the English language through 'use'. Use implies communication. Communication includes unpredictability and freedom. In so-called 'conversation drills', pupils speak pre-written sentences or utter a pre-written dialogue. There is no freedom, no selection and no unpredictability. Teachers never impart them a chance and deprive pupils of freedom by giving them the correct response or interpretation. They neglect all structural items or vocabulary not prescribed. They illustrate all new concepts and ideas in advance, leaving nothing unpredictable or irresolute. In this way, students do not have any opportunity to handle situations themselves. On the contrary, when a pupil learns a language through use, he instinctively comes into contact with a language that is real, original, proper, and global. Teaching the language as mere form, disconnected from use, role and situation, is another practice which definitely does not assist in sensitizing pupils to appropriacy.

The students should be given enough exposure to English. Learning a lesson in English does not imply
cramming each word and analysing every single sentence grammatically. After accomplishing some tasks in the lesson, the student has learnt something. He learns the skills that create overall communicative ability. Undoubtedly, they acquire vocabulary and grammar by assimilation and not by cramming. Memorization is not digestion of a lesson, enough exposure to English will also not result in indigestion to the student. In an English-speaking country the child is exposed to a great deal of English language without resulting in any indigestion.

The aim in the communicative approach is, of course, communicative ability that can be divided into communicative skills. The four primary skills are - listening, speaking, reading and writing. In the learning tasks they are firmly united and integrated in use. Hence, they are not four distinct skills but rather integrated skills, involving one, or two, or more at a time. We must sort out ways to deal with language skills integratively within their psycho-linguistic as well as socio-linguistic context.

There are two versions of communicative approach: weak and strong. The weak version that has become about standard exercise in the last twenty-five years or so, emphasizes the value of giving opportunities to students to use their English for communicative goals and tries
to integrate such activities into an extensive programme of language. On the other side, the strong version of communicative approach vigorously claims that language is learnt through communication, therefore, it is not only a question of activating an existing but sluggish knowledge of the language, but exciting the progress of the language system itself.

English is a subject that aims at encouraging the overall progress of students. This notion had directed experts to follow a 'growth model', rather than a 'skill model'. It implies that language activities performed in classrooms need not essentially be aimed at use which is real from the native speaker's point of view. Here the communicative competence of the pupil is more useful. It helps to bring about personal growth and self-expression. So, in this approach English teaching may be defined as a functional approach to the structure of English. This implies that the structure-oriented syllabus is prescribed to establish language activities which help students use the presented patterns in communicative situations that are meaningful to them. Meaningful situations signify language tasks that involve pupils not only mentally but also physically and emotionally.
The general classroom procedure is entire classwork. In this approach, the principal kinds of organisation are pair work, individual work, small group work and entire class-work. The teacher creates a non-threatening, warm and friendly atmosphere through interesting language activities. Friendly interaction in the classroom is the most necessary aspect in acquiring communicative ability in language. New grammatical items are introduced incidentally through conversation between the teacher and the taught. Then practice is given by encouraging self-expression activities and by rousing pupil's intellectual inquisitiveness. The language learnt so far is put to creative use, orally or in writing.

In teaching through communicative approach, the teacher is required to embrace a number of roles. As a general observer of his pupils' performance, the teacher must seek to co-ordinate the activities in order to ensure their coherent development, leading towards better communicative competence. In several activities, he may perform the well-known role of a language instructor. He may give new language exercises, evaluate and correct them, and so on. He will sometimes desire to take part in an activity as co-communicator with the students. In this role, he can stimulate and present new language without
taking the chief initiative for learning away from the students themselves.

The communicative language teaching has provided something of immense importance in the sphere of teaching English as a second language. This approach is learner-centred and learner-friendly. The teacher does not hold the central position in the class as in the conventional text-analysis syllabus. Learning occurs according to the requirements of the student. In a communicative class the teacher is no more a director. The learners are free to perform what is required to fulfil the presented communicative task. The teacher's duty is merely to present situations. To learn the language the learner has to take part in the process, a judicious and conscious process that is patterned by the individual way a learner acquires the language. The learner is redressed from a passive role. He accomplishes a task full of life, creativity, interest and potentialities.

In this approach students gain more language practice. As much of the task is done in pairs and groups, they get better chances to converse in the target language. The time-honoured principle of proceeding from easy to complex is also adopted in this approach. However, easiness or difficulty is not decided on the basis of grammar.
and vocabulary. It depends upon how challenging the task is for the pupil. Performance requirements rely on cultural, conceptual and linguistic difficulty of the task and not on the difficulty of the structures. As learners pay a great deal of attention to speaking English, they become fluent speakers. They learn the proper use of language. It may be added here that as many as 44.94 per cent of the respondents (Table 25) comprising 51.39 per cent Degree College teachers, 34.03 per cent Inter College teachers, 55.22 per cent Jr. High School teachers and 50.82 per cent primary school teachers prefer communicative approach to structural and situational approaches.

Problems and Probable Solutions:

Even the best have their faults and the communicative approach is no exception in this respect. It is not sure whether an average teacher of English can utilize this approach effectively. Some teachers themselves can not speak English fluently. Whatever happens the teacher has to be reoriented to make a successful use of this new approach.

Indian classrooms are overcrowded with students. Thus, it is very difficult to seat them properly for pair work and small group work. Moreover, with its over-stress on oral work this approach avoids reading. This
shortcoming needs to be removed.

It is considered that the communicative approach can not be employed at all stages in a language programme. This approach is not equally fit for ESL (English as a second language) and EFL (English as a foreign language) conditions.

Even then, the value of the communicative approach can not be neglected. If the teacher wants to do away with these problems, he must keep in mind certain points. In context, there are some conditions which must be met before any task can be called 'communicative'. The situation must be real, and the role of the teacher as well as the learner must be real. Just to speak a few sentences is not communicative ability that involves the capability of reacting mentally as well as verbally in communication situation. The mental reaction is the basis of the verbal reaction. Keeping the learner out of the real situation is like keeping the plant out of soil, and expecting that it will flourish.

There is always a need and an objective for communication and something to be communicated, that gives rise to communication in real life. Putting questions like, "Who is Ram?" or "Is there a table?" is not actually
communicating anything. This type of empty talk is to divorce language from real communication. The need compels the child to invent the language.

Language learning is an active growth process, that needs a greater degree of initiative from students. Mechanically acquired habits are superficial, while on the other hand communicative ability is something which involves the creative functioning of the mind—giving enough credit to the student's mental ability. The conservative approaches aim at quantitative increase of knowledge of the foreign language. Whereas in the communicative approach learning a language is considered as a developmental process that must essentially go beyond quantitative increase to qualitative progress.

Having made a brief survey of the characteristics, qualities and drawbacks of various approaches to teaching English, one may ask, "Which of these approaches should be adopted?" It may be frankly asserted that none of the recognized approaches to teaching English is foolproof. No one teaching device can probably be suitable for all cases and climates. It can be resolved after discussion that for meeting the pedagogical aims the teacher should not be adamant in the application of approaches. However, the approach should necessarily be basically
oral. The greatest possible use of the foreign-tongue should be ensured in the classroom. The problems of the target language in the matter of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and intonation should be cautiously graded for presentation. The teaching of English should be considered more as the imparting of a skill than as the provision of information about the forms of the language. The teacher must be prepared to select a suitable approach in accordance with the aims and subject-matter.