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Any serious study, which aims at contributing new ideas to English Language Teaching Methods have to analyze, thoroughly the strength and weakness of the various language teaching methods erstwhile tried. In this chapter an attempt is made to interpret and evaluate the methods that have been in vogue from time to time in different parts of the world. While discussing each of these methods, the prime objective, that is, the context of the ELT in India with particular reference to the ELT solution in Kerala, is borne in mind. The analysis of the methods includes the background in which the methods evolved the basic principles and characteristic features of the methods, the strength and weakness of each method and lastly the relevance of the method. Such an analysis of ELT methods is rendered here with the main objective of establishing the feasibility of following a bilingual approach for the teaching of English as a second language in the State of Kerala especially in higher secondary and under graduate classes.
Some of the important methods and approaches discussed in this chapter are:

1) The Grammar-Translation method.
2) The Direct Method
3) The Reading Method
4) The Army Method
5) The Audio-lingual Method
6) The Structural Approach
7) The Student Activated Multi Skill Approach advocated by the CIEFL, Hyderabad.
8) Communicative Language Teaching
9) Bilingual Method

**The Grammar-Translation Method**

Grammar Translation method, also known as the Classical Method or the Traditional Method, is clearly rooted in the formal teaching of Latin and Greek which prevailed in Europe for many centuries. Mackey says, “This is simply a combination of the activities of Grammar and Translation” (153).
As its name suggests, "this method emphasizes the teaching of the second language grammar; its principal practice, technique in translation from and into the target language" (Stern 453).

The Grammar Translation Method is based on three assumptions:

1. Translation interprets the words and phrases of the foreign language and ensures comprehension of the vocabulary items, collocations and sentences.

2. In the Process of interpretation the foreign phraseology is assimilated.

3. The structure of the target language is best learnt when compared and contrasted with that of the mother tongue.

This method became very popular in the late 18th century and in the early 19th century.

It advocates the learning of the rules of grammar and hence fails to produce fluency of expression in students. Lack of theoretical basis has not abated the applicability of the method even today when several linguistically sound methods are available. This method is most suited in teaching large classes with limited resources, since students can be made to
listen, copy rules, write out exercises and correct them from the black board. For this method the teacher need not be very competent in the target language. All that he needs to do is to follow the text carefully and discuss it using the mother tongue wherever necessary.

However, this method was not without weaknesses. There was a reaction against GMT in Europe around the year 1900. Stern, Sweet and Jesperson, to mention a few, realized that the use of translation as the only means of instructions would be ruinous. Palmer, who has no objection to using translation in certain specific contexts, attacks what he calls, 'The classical method', vehemently and says “It is one which treats all languages as if they were dead, as if each consisted essentially of a collection of ancient documents to be deciphered and analyzed... It is the one which categorically ignores all considerations of phonetics, pronunciation and acoustic image, and boldly places language on a foundation of alphabets, spelling and writing systems” (57). Wilga Rivers who succinctly sums up the limitations of the Grammar Translation Method says

Little Stress is laid on accurate pronunciation and intonation; communication skills are neglected; there is a
great deal of stress on knowing rules and exceptions, but little training in using the language activity to express one's own meaning, even in writing... The language learned is mostly of a literary type, and the vocabulary is detailed and sometimes esoteric. The average student has to work hard at what he considers laborious and monotonous chores - vocabulary learning, translation and endless written exercises... His role in the classroom is, for the greater part of the time, a passive one - he absorbs and then reconstitutes what he has absorbed to satisfy his teacher (17-18).

Although as a teaching method it is imperfect, certain elements in it may be found useful in a teaching situation. Where rules facilitate the learning process there is no reason why they need not be incorporated in teaching. Similarly stalwarts of language teaching like Stern, Sweet, Palmer, Passy, Jesperson, while realizing translation as an inadequate means of instruction, felt that it could not and should not be totally banned from language teaching activities. "When the foreign word to be demonstrated is
known to be for all practical purposes the equivalent of a native word, translation is a better mode than definition” (Palmer 58).

In India Grammar Translation method has been the most widely practiced method of teaching in Schools and Colleges. However in the past few decades a lot of changes have taken place in English Language Teaching Methodology. These changes and the introduction of new techniques have relegated the grammar translation method to the background. In theory this is what happened. But in the actual classroom situation, in spite of changes and new techniques, in most of the cases, what happens is adherence to the grammar translation method; the only difference is that it is being incorporated into other methods.

In Kerala, the situation is not different from that of other states of India. New innovations in the field of English language teaching could not bring much change in the attitude of the teachers of Schools and Colleges, especially of the rural areas, mainly because of the poor standard of the students, unwieldy size of the classes, incompetence of the teachers and the vast syllabuses imposed for the study.
The Direct Method

The language teaching reforms from 1850 to 1900 particularly in Europe attempted to make language teaching more effective by a radical change from grammar-translation. Various methods were developed during this period attesting to the general discontent with the prevailing theory and practice. The dissatisfaction is strikingly shown by the way in which new methods are run after.

"But none of these methods retain their popularity long - the interest in them soon dies out. There is a constant succession of them; Ollendorff, Ahn, Prendergast, Goniss to mention only a few - have all had their day. They have all failed to keep a permanent hold on the public mind because they have all failed to perform what they promised. After promising the impossibilities they have all turned out to be on the whole no better than the older methods" (Sweet 2-3).

The proposed reforms went under a variety of names: 'reform method', 'natural method', 'psychological method', 'phonetic method', but
the most persistent term to describe the various features of new approaches in language teaching was the term ‘direct method’ (Stern 457).

The Direct Method is characterized above all by the use of the target language as a means of instruction and communication in the language classroom, and by the avoidance of the use of the first language and of translation as a technique (Stern 456).

In a broad sense any method, which does not use the learner’s mother tongue, may be said to be a direct method. Its main features as stated by Mackey are as follows:

(1) The use of everyday vocabulary and structure. (2) Grammar taught by situation. (3) Use of many new items in the same lesson to make the language look sound and natural and to encourage normal conversation. (4) Oral teaching of grammar and vocabulary. (5) Concrete meanings through object lessons: abstract ones through the association of ideas. (6) Grammar illustrated through visual presentation. (7) Extensive listening and imitation until forms become automatic. (8) Most of the work is done in the class;
more class hours needed for the method. (9) The first few weeks devoted to
pronunciation. (10) All reading matter first presented orally. (152)

Wilga Rivers comments on the Direct Method as follows:

A Direct Method Class provided a clear contrast with the
prevailing grammar translation classes. The course began
with the learning of the foreign words and phrases for
objects and actions in the classroom... where the meaning
of words could not be made clear by concrete
representation, the teacher resorted to miming, sketches or
explanations in the foreign language but never supplied
native language translations. Grammar was not taught
explicitly and deductively as in the grammar translation
class but was learned largely through practice. Students
were encouraged to draw their own structural
generalizations from what they had been learning by an
inductive process. When grammar was taught more
systematically, at a later stage, it was taught in the foreign
language with the use of foreign language terminology...
Texts were read aloud by teacher and students were encouraged to seek direct comprehension by inferring meanings of unknown elements from the context rather than seeking equivalents in a bilingual vocabulary list where the meaning could not be discovered. In this way the teacher gave explanations in the foreign language. Students were never asked to translate passages into their native language; instead their apprehension of the meaning was tested by questioning and discussion in the foreign language... The classroom was continuously filled with the sound of the foreign language and all activity was closely linked with its use in speech and writing. (19-20)

The approach initially precluded any resort to the mother tongue either for exercises or translation or for elucidation of vocabulary and grammar. "It was sanguinely expected that by banishing the vernacular from the classroom the pupils would be compelled to do their thinking in the new medium." (Morris 10)
Perhaps as a reaction to the Grammar Translation Method, the Direct Method did succeed in making an immediate appeal. This is one of the most widely known methods and one that has caused the most controversy. The method gave birth to more problems than it could solve. In the beginning it enjoyed a great popularity because it overcame two major defects of GMT. It substituted language contact in grammar recitation and language use for translation. Its focus on innovations of drill, vocabulary selection and systematic presentation went a long way to fetch laurels for it. In the hands of competent teachers this method succeeded with the whole class in contrast to the grammar translation method, which at best helped the exceptional students.

The important advantage of the direct method is that the student gets a lot of opportunities to listen to the spoken language. Listening is one of the important skills in language learning. The method lays emphasis on oral work and helps the student improve his speech habit. He can think in the target language without the help of the mother tongue. Ability to think in the target language and ability to speak will induce confidence in the minds of the learners.
However the method has some inherent weaknesses. The exponents of the direct method do not think that the learning of the first language and the second language are not alike. The circumstances necessitate the child to imbibe his first language because he has to express his wants. A first language learner also gets ample exposure to the language. A second language learner has neither such compulsion nor is he exposed to the language so intensely. The method is, no doubt, very useful for young learners in the beginning classes, but it does not work well specially in higher classes. It lays greater emphasis on speech training but ignores other skills of language learning namely, reading and writing.

The main defect of the method was that the students plunged into ‘a language bath’ tended to use native language structures in foreign vocabulary, thus developing inaccurate fluency.

Since students were required at all times to make a direct association between foreign phrase and situation, it was the highly intelligent student with well developed powers of induction who profited most from the method, which could be very discouraging and be widening for the less
talented. As a result, the members of an average class soon diverged considerably from each other in degree of foreign language acquisition. (Rivers 21)

Further, its efficient handling required competent teachers with good command of spoken language. It required teachers who had native like fluency in the foreign language. It was largely dependent on the teacher’s skill rather than on a text book and not all teachers were proficient enough in the foreign language to adhere to the principles of the method. Moreover strict adherence to the principles of the method was often counter productive since teachers were required to go to great lengths to avoid using the native tongue when sometimes a simple brief explanation in the student’s native tongue would have been more efficient route to comprehension. The psychologist of the Harvard University, Roger Brown (1973) described his frustration in observing a teacher performing verbal gymnastics in an attempt to convey the meaning of Japanese words, when translation would have been a more efficient technique to use.

The British linguist Henry Sweet also recognized its limitations. He argued that the direct method offered innovations at the level of teaching
procedures, but lacked a thorough methodology basis (Sweet 4). The direct method, Stern observes, "was a first attempt to make the language learning situation one of language use and to train the learner to abandon the first language as the frame of reference" (Stern 459).

In spite of all its drawbacks the direct method enjoyed immense popularity in many countries like Germany, France, Switzerland, Belgium, England and the United States. In India also during the twenties and thirties of the 20th century the Direct Method was introduced. The first book advocating the use of the method in India was P.C. Wrenn's 'The Direct Teaching of English in Indian Schools'. But the method did not fetch the desired result. The study group appointed by the Ministry of Education, Govt. of India in 1964 describes the chaotic situation created by the practice of the direct method in our country as follows:

In the large majority of schools in which it could not be implemented, it was practiced with ruinous consequences. The Direct Method drills would themselves have ensured correct expression on the part of pupils. But the teachers, uncertain of their own command over Spoken English did
not venture for it in that direction. The rules of grammar had in the meanwhile been exited from the classroom, since they were regarded as the accompaniment of a dead language. The result was that children at school developed a kind of English that was as primitive and grammarless as a war cry... The teacher's diffidence with reference to spoken English and his almost subconscious belief that a second language can only be taught through the grammar and translation method made him use even a direct method or structural course book as he would have used a grammar and translation course book... This is why we teach English for six years or more in schools and find that children have hardly learned to frame a correct sentence in English. (270)

Though the method was accepted and implemented throughout India for teaching English, there were limitations that led to its ineffectiveness. The large classes of unmotivated students, as a result of our mass education programme, the ever growing demand for the rationalization of the medium
of instruction at the school and college level and the impact of the three language formula on our school time table complicated the issue still further. Hence the time was ripe for the appearance of an effective and practicable method for ELT.

3.3 The Reading Method

"The Reading Method was devised for schools whose only objective was a reading knowledge of the language. The method deliberately restricts the goal of language teaching to train in reading comprehension" (Stern 460).

As the initial step of the method the text to be taught is divided into short sections each preceded by a list of words to be taught through context, translation or pictures. After a certain vocabulary level is reached, supplementary readers in the form of stories or simplified novels are introduced in order to enable the learner to consolidate his vocabulary. In the first quarter of the 20th century the reading method was advocated by some British and American educators. Thus the writings of West (1926a), Bond (1953) and Coleman’s volume in The Modern Foreign Language Study (1929) provided contemporary arguments for this approach.
As early as 1921 Michael West realized the futility of a total adoption of the direct method in Indian conditions. West, who was teaching English in India, argued that learning to read fluently was more important for Indians learning English than speaking. He realized the importance of ‘Reading’ in second language learning and regarded it as the most useful and easiest skill to acquire in a foreign language. He believed that ‘the initial stage of learning a foreign language should be to learn to read it... even in the case of a student who aims at complete mastery of reading, writing and speech’ (5). This inspired him to create his *New Method Readers*. These readers advocated a method based primarily on reading. Later it came to be known as the Reading Method.

West realized that in general the Indian learner of English needed to improve his receptive skills only. He also demonstrated that Reading Method makes it easy to learn and teach and the size of the class is immaterial. The method is based on the psychological principle that listening and understanding precede speaking and writing. The aim of this method is to create a desire in the readers to read more and more by supplying interesting reading materials.
Basing himself on Thorndike's *Teacher's Word Book* (1921) West constructed readers with a controlled vocabulary and regular repetition of new words. On similar grounds Coleman (1929) drew the conclusion from the Modern Foreign Language Study that the only practical form of language teaching in American high schools would be to concentrate on reading skills. Bond developed a reading method approach to college language courses at Chicago University between 1920 and 1940. The course of study that was developed over a period of decades provided graded reading materials and a systematic approach to learning to read. The spoken language was not entirely neglected, but it was the reading objective that received the main emphasis.

Regarding the techniques employed for reading method Stern writes:

*The techniques* were not radically deficient from those developed under previous methods. As under grammar translation, the use of the first language was not banned in language instruction. The introduction of the second language was oral as in the direct method because facility in pronunciation and 'inner speech' were regarded as an important aid in reading comprehension... Above all, vocabulary control in reading text was
regarded as of prime importance and so was the distinction between intensive reading for detailed study and extensive rapid reading of graded ‘readers’ for general comprehension (461).

The reading method introduced into language teaching some important new elements; (a) the possibility of devising techniques of language learning geared to specific purposes; (b) the application of vocabulary control to second language texts, as a means of better grading of texts; (c) the creation of graded ‘readers’; and (d) thanks to vocabulary control, the introduction of techniques of rapid reading to the foreign language classroom. (462)

The new method failed because the exponents of this method believed that plenty of exercises in reading comprehension would enable the learner to improve in speech and writing. But the passive work could not generate active work. Further, West considered that the silent reading is a key to speech and writing. But modern researchers and investigators in the field of language learning do not support this view. On the other hand they feel that the best way of learning a language is through speech. Another main reason for its failure was the lack of adequately trained competent teachers to teach.
Though Michael West, who tried the reading method in Bengal, could achieve success, the method did not fetch the desired result after his departure from the country. Perhaps the main reason was the lack of competent teacher in our country.

3.4 The Army Method

The Army method is, to a great extent, the outcome of the exigencies of the second world war. During the war time American authorities realized the need for interpreters of various languages for communication purposes. To fulfil their need the Army Specialized Training Programme (ASTP) was set up in 1942. Its sole aim was to train fluent speakers in as many languages as they needed in the shortest time possible. To achieve the goal abundant contact with the spoken language was provided with minimum reading and writing.

The Army Method was a great success because it involved small groups of the trainees who were highly motivated and who were given long hours of drilling with specially prepared materials. However the army method could not expect to be successful in an ordinary teaching learning
situation where ordinary students are taught by average teachers. Hence this method did not have much relevance on the language-teaching programme in India. Since the method evolved and developed to meet specific needs of the army for a short time during the Second World War, it could not stay after it. Hence it lost its relevance soon after the war was over.

3.5 The Audio-Lingual method

While grammar translation and direct method had largely developed in the European School Systems, audio-lingualism had its origin mainly in America. But it considerably influenced language education in many parts of the world. It appeared under various names. In the 1950's it was most frequently referred to as the aural-oral method. It was Brooks(1964) who proposed the term audio lingual. Brooks himself popularized another term that referred to the same method as ‘New Key’. Carroll (1966) called the method the ‘audio lingual habit theory’. While Smith (1970) referred to it as the ‘functional skills strategy’.

Whatever it was called, the origin of audio lingualism is to be found in the ‘Army Method’ of American wartime language programmes in World
War II. After the war foreign language teachers and educational authorities became interested in techniques used in the Army Method. Many factors like growth of the theory and practice of the Army Method, the writings and teachings of C.C. Fries and R. Lado, the development of Contrastive Linguistics, the new technology of language laboratory and the theories of conditioning of behaviorist psychology contributed for the development of audio-lingualism.

The distinctive characteristics of the audio-lingual method listed by Stern are as follows:

(1) separation of the skills - listening, speaking, reading and writing - and the primacy of the audio lingual over the graphic skills;

(2) the use of dialogues as the chief means of presenting the language;

(3) emphasis on certain practice techniques, mimicry, memorization and pattern drills;

(4) the use of language laboratory;

(5) establishing a linguistic and psychological theory as a basis for the teaching method.
The growth of the theory was expressed in the five slogans listed by Moulton (1963)

(1) Language is speech, not writing

(2) A language is what its native speakers say, not what someone thinks they ought to say.

(3) Languages are different.

(4) A language is a set of habits.

(5) Teach the language, not about the language. (21)

The fifth slogan expresses more a pedagogical than a linguistic principle. It emphasizes the need for practice rather than for explanation. All five principles became the tenets of language teaching doctrines during the two post war decades until they were questioned by the linguists under the influence of Transformational Generative Grammar.

The advocates of the Audio Lingual Method emphasize teaching through oral presentation prior to written presentation. They give the greatest importance to speech. At the same time reading and writing are not
neglected. "The student is not however, left to pick up these skills as best as he can, using his native language as the basis of all his thinking. Instead he is trained to build up skills in these areas step by step, capitalizing on his growing knowledge of the structure of the language until both reading and writing become for him not exercises in transposition from one language to another but activities to be conducted entirely in the foreign language.” (Rivers 45)

Student motivation in audio-lingual classes is, on the whole high. Students enjoy learning to use a language from the very first day of their introduction to it. Like the direct method, audio lingualism tries to develop target language skills without reference to the mother tongue. Brooks (1960) for example regards a co-ordinate command of the second language as the ideal outcome of language learning (64).

In the audio-lingual method the learning process is viewed as one of habituation and conditioning without the intervention of any intellectual analysis. Followers and supports of Audio-lingual method were influenced by B.F. Skinners 'Operant Conditioning' theories. For them the linguistic behavior of the child can change, as does its social behavior through the
process of habit forming. The kind of thinking introduced mimicry, memorization and pattern drill into foreign language teaching. Audio-lingual techniques, therefore, appeared to offer the possibility of language learning without requiring a strong academic background and inclination. Thus language learning seemed to be within the scope of the ordinary learner.

Major contributions of audio-lingualism to language teaching are:

(1) It was among the first theories to recommend the development of a language teaching theory derived from linguistic and psychological principles. (2) It tries to make language learning accessible to large groups of ordinary learners. (3) It led to the development of simple techniques, without translation of varied, graded and intensive practice of the specific features of the language. (4) It developed the separation of the language skills into a pedagogical device. (Stern 465-66)
Still the method failed. In the early 1960's audio lingualism had raised hopes of ushering in a golden age of language learning. But by the end of the decade it became the whipping boy for all that was wrong with language teaching. In the first place the importance given to achieve oral accuracy has only prompted many linguists to question the very necessity of a teacher. Albert Valdman has criticized the exaggerated emphasis on oral drilling in Audio-Lingual Method (Valdman 30). The second objection to Audio Lingual Method is that the techniques of memorization and drilling can be tedious and boring. Only an imaginative teacher can minimize this.

Thus the teacher should be inventive and resourceful if the audio-lingual method is to be successful. The teacher should be able enough to prepare the teaching materials, which will interest the students and motivate them. He should be able to innovate new ways of presenting the materials to keep aloof boredom. This implies that the service of well-trained and well-equipped teachers is very essential for the successful implementation of audio-lingual method.

In our part of the country, in the absence of well-trained teachers and other facilities needed for implementation of audio-lingual method,
successful practice of the method in our schools and colleges is not still within our reach.

The audio-lingual method gives stress to oral accuracy and lays emphasis on oral drilling. For the success of this method the service of well-trained resourceful teachers is very essential. In Kerala up to high schools those who have not got any training in the phonetics and phonology of English are forced to handle English Language. Further language laboratories are not established in schools; even the condition of the colleges is also not different. In such a situation one cannot expect the successful implementation of the audio-lingual method in our part of the country.

The Structural Approach

In the latter half of the 20th century extensive research was conducted on English Language Teaching as a foreign language at the University of London, Institute of Education. This caused the emergence of the structural approach, which is in many ways, an improvement upon the direct method. However the basic principles and techniques of the structural approach and the direct method are essentially the same.
The exponents of the structural approach consider that language consists of 'structures' and that the mastery of these structures is more important than the acquisition of vocabulary. In this approach structures are carefully graded in terms of both meaning and form. They are so graded that each structure follows naturally from the one immediately proceeding or can be built upon structures already learnt. The structures are learnt through drill based on substitution table technique or oral work.

The strength of this approach lies in (a) the selection and grading of most important items (structures and vocabulary), (b) arranging the teaching items in the order of teaching, (c) emphasizing the pupils' activity rather than the activity of the teacher. Thus the structural approach combines within the important features of oral method, the direct method and the structural approach.

Basic features of the structural approach are:

(1) The sentence is taken as a teaching unit.

(2) The structures are selected and graded

(3) The selected material is presented through aural-oral technique
Intensive drilling and pattern practice

The structures are taught through situation.

The selection of structures depends on the capacity of the teacher and availability of equipment. However, the age of the learner, his ability and the time available for teaching are the important factors, which guide the selection and grading of the structures. Selection of structure is done on four principles - usefulness, productivity, simplicity and teachability. The principle of usefulness suggests teaching of those structures, which occur more frequently in real life situations. Structural approach distinguishes two types of structures: productive and non-productive structures. Productive structures are those with which other structures can be built. Naturally productive structures are given more importance since the mastery of such structures enable students to construct other structures on similar lines by themselves. The form and meaning of the structure decide its simplicity and some structures can be taught easily through demonstration.

In India the structural approach made its appearance in 1952 along with the Madras Syllabus of that year which was based on the ideas
developed at the London Institute of Education. It was popularized by the wide publicity given by the English teaching specialists of the British Council and the English language teaching institutes in India.

In 1957 the All India Seminar held at Nagpur very strongly supported the structural approach and recommended it for use in schools. The approach had been widely used in many states of India for more than two decades. Experts in the field produced classroom material and syllabus designing was based on this approach. Most of the teaching learning programmes were being carried out and are still carried on through the structural situational method. Secondary school teachers are still being trained through short term courses conducted by State Institution of Education Research and Training to teach English as a second language on the assumption of this approach. But the result have been far from satisfactory, the main reason being the lack of competent and well equipped teachers.
The Student Activated Multi-skilled Approach as Advocated by the CIEFL, Hyderabad

The traditional methodology backed the three important points, which a methodologist considers to be the most important. A method should have clear objective, should describe and analyse the means by which the objectives can be achieved and should involve an operational place. The traditional teachers taught in total disregard of the receptive capacity of the learner. Because of this the teachers did make any conscious and systematic effort to place and organise the lessons before entering the class. However, methodologists at the CIEFL, Hyderabad, realized the futility of the traditional methodology in teaching English to students of higher classes. Basically language is a form of activity and one learns a language through activity. One learns to speak by speaking and to write by writing; there is no short cut to language learning. The practice must be meaningful, interesting and useful to the students in real life situations. Therefore a teacher of English will have to be an initiator, sustainer, coordinator and guide for a student engaged in language learning activity.
Such thinking encouraged the CIEFL to propagate a method based on student activity.

Hence the CIEFL advocate a 'multi-skill' approach i.e., an approach to speaking, writing, reading and listening. In the changed situation Indian students should give high priority to developing their reading skills and the 'multi-skill' approach places high premium on reading. This priority is the result of the belief that in India English is needed primarily as a 'library language'. The report of the Second Study Group (1971) envisages that the widespread use of English in India will mainly be as a library language with the premium on reading than on expression. This shift in the status of English in India will affect the teaching materials. Courses in English will then serve to help the students achieve competence in areas of language relevant to their specialities (29). Therefore the 'multi-skill' approach of the CIEFL will help the students to cultivate the habit of independent reading.

Discussion and language exercise should follow reading activity. In oral exercises phonetic accuracy could be neglected but comprehension, correctness and appropriateness should be emphasized. The details of the reading material will have to be explained by the teacher in simple English
beforehand. This will help the students to formulate the answer to the question put to them. It will be easy for the students to put in working what they already know. This will improve their comprehension.

'Language practice' and directed 'oral activity' is not possible in a typical English class where the number of the students sometimes is about 100. The CIEFL method suggests that the larger class need not be a hindrance to 'language practice' and 'oral activity'. One of the essentials of good methodology is the acceptance of actual conditions and adjustment of the method to these conditions.

The three significant aspects of ELT methodology, which the CIEFL advocates, are: (Das 1974)

1) The Organization of Teaching Materials:

The teaching material should be prepared. The language used should be well controlled in terms of the entry level and the terminal proficiency level of the students. The cultural content of the text should be familiar to the students so that they can understand and appreciate the matter they study. The teaching material should be lively and they should be lucidly presented.
2) The Teacher's Presentation:

The teacher should motivate the student to take up the reading activity. The teacher should find a way to encourage the students to read the texts voluntarily and find out what the text contains. A certain amount of curiosity has to be aroused and some sort of suspense has to be created. The teacher can, for instance, write up some 'motivating questions' on the blackboard. Such 'before questions' and suggestions by the teacher will draw the attention of the students to certain facts well in advance. This will make the reading activity more purposive. The teacher may ask a student to read a few lines, explain the difficult vocabulary and then ask them comprehension questions. These 'after questions' will enthuse the students to read again the lines they have just read to find out the answers to the questions. Before the commencement of the class the teacher should see that all the 'blocks' that hamper the student's understanding of the text be removed. These 'blocks' may be new words, difficult syntax, allusions, references and so on.
3) **Exercise by the Students:**

The ELT methodologists of CIEFL find that the initial presentation by the teacher is only the first phase. To get a better result, the students must be given adequate practice exercise. The exercises may be of different types, such as comprehension exercises, oral discussions after reading activity exercises or grammar and written work. In short the ELT methodology advocated by the CIEFL is 'learner centred' at all stages of teaching and therefore if properly handled the teaching techniques introduced in the method will certainly produce maximum desired results (24-34).

To conclude, the Student Activated Multi-Skilled Approach of the CIEFL lays a lot of stress on the reading skill. Experts at the CIEFL have realized that English will be needed only as a library language for most of the learners. The 'multi-skilled' activity of this method places too much importance on reading because attentive silent reading with comprehension is expected of a student now all over India. The recent development in the field of language teaching emphasizes the communicative ability of the learner. Hence, the latest approach, the 'Communicative Approach' needs to be analysed in detail.
Communicative Approach

In recent years, communicative language teaching has become popular as a method of teaching second/foreign language although it covers a variety of developments in the field, especially in respect of syllabus design and methodology of teaching. Moreover, as David Wilkins (1976) points out, “we do not know how to establish the communicative proficiency of the learner” (82). Wilkins however expresses the hope that “While some people are experimenting with the notional syllabus as such, others should be attempting to develop the new testing techniques that should accompany it” (82). An attempt has been made here to outline some of the basic postulates of the CA to language teaching.

The origin of Communicative Language Teaching relates to the changes in the British language teaching tradition from the late 1960s. The real impetus for the CA came from the changing educational reality in Europe. With the emergence of many independent European countries, there arose the need to teach people the major languages of the member countries of the European Common Market. Education became one of the major activities of the Council of Europe. It encouraged conferences on
language teaching and publications of books and monographs, which emphasized the need to develop alternative methods of language teaching-methods, which were different from the methods like the Audio-lingual and the Situational. The CA, to language teaching, has since then become popular or at least in vogue in many countries of the world.

The CA draws inspiration from current ideas about language, particularly about language as a social tool. Therefore CLT is organized on the basis of certain communicational functions like apologizing, describing, inviting, promising etc. An ESL learner should be familiar with these functions. Scholars like Halliday (1969, 1973, 1978) Austin (1962) Searle (1969) and others have also made major contributions to its theoretical underpinnings. It was Hymes (1971) whose work crystallized the approach. The CA is rooted in a theory of language as communication and the goal of language teaching is to develop what Hymes calls ‘Communicative Competence’. He suggests that linguistic theory should be seen as part of a more general theory incorporating communication and culture.

Communicative Language Teaching does not ignore the role of grammar in the process of language learning, but it insists that the
grammatical rules are useless unless they are applied to real life situations. Hymes maintains that grammatical competence is not a sufficient basis for communication. There must be a shift of emphasis from usage to that of use of the language. CLT lays emphasis on functional, communicative and social interactive activities. Communicative competence entails the knowledge of how to use language appropriately in given situations in given cultural contexts in order to achieve the desired objectives. To make language learning practical and realistic in the language classes it is essential to create social and real life like situations. Therefore creating and interpreting everyday situations in the language class should be the important strategy of teaching English as a second language. This is evident from what Little wood (1980) has to say “Foreign language learners need opportunities to develop the skills by being exposed to situations... the learners need to acquire not only repertoire of linguistic items, but repertoire of strategies for using them in concrete situations” (4) CLT also lays emphasis on the semantic aspects of the language.

Advocates of CLT over the years tried to educate communicative approach to teaching English in their own ways. Amongst scholars who
provided theoretical base to the CA, Halliday and Widdowson deserves special mention. Spelling out his functional accounts of language use Halliday (1947) remarks “linguistics is concerned with the description of speech acts or texts. Since only through the study of language in use are all the functions of language and therefore all components of meaning brought into focus”(145). Henry Widdwson’s book, _Teaching Language as Communication_ (1978) has dealt with the scholarship between linguistic systems and their communication values in text and discourse. Harris was, of course, amongst the first scholars to view at language in terms of the combination or interconnection of sentences. “Language”, he held, “does not occur in stray words or sentences but in connected discourse in purely formal terms as a series of connected sentences”(155). Scholars like Labov (1969) relate the use of language form to social actions.

Commands and refusals are actions; declarations, interrogations, and imperatives are linguistic categories-things that are said rather than things that are done. The rules we need will show how things are done with words and how one interprets these inferences as actions. In other
words relating what is done to what is said and what is said to what is done. One must take into account such sociological non-linguist categories as rules, rights and obligations (Labov 54-55).

Experts in the area of philosophy of language like Austin have specified the conditions attended upon as act of promising, advising, warning, greeting, congratulating and so on. But probably the most important work in the field of communication as Widdowson has done is discourse. He has made a useful distinction between ‘signification’ and ‘value’, between ‘text & discourse’ and between usage and use.

Communicative competence thus rests in a set of composite skills. Emphasizing the communicative aspect of language learning CandE and Swain (1980) have observed. “Communicative competence is composed minimally of grammatical competence, socio-linguistic competence, communicative strategies or what we will refer to as strategic competence. There is no strong theoretical or empirical motivation for the view that grammatical competence is more or less crucial to successful communication than is socio-linguistic competence or strategic competence” (21). The
primary goal of a communicative approach must be to facilitate the integration of these types of knowledge for the learner, an outcome that is likely to result from overemphasis on one form of competence over the others throughout a second language programme. Cande and Swain (27).

Some great proponents of CLT viewed learning a second language as acquiring the linguistic means to perform different kinds of functions. From the existing literature of CLT Richards and Rodgers (1995) glean the following as the main characteristics of the communicative approach.

(i) Language is a system for the expression of meaning.

(ii) The primary function of language is for interaction and communication.

(iii) The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses.

(iv) The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as in discourse (Richards and Rodgers 71).
Communicative language teaching like any other kind of language teaching, should be geared to the objectives of the cause and the learner's needs. Piepho (1985) has discussed the following levels of objectives in a communicative approach:

1. Integration and content level (language as a means of expression)

2. Linguistic and instrument level (language as a semiotic system)

3. Affection level of interpersonal relationships (language as a means of expressing value judgements.

4. Level of individual learning needs (remedial learning)

5. Level of general extra linguistic needs.

However, these are general objectives applicable to any leading situation. Instructional objectives for a communicative language-teaching course should reflect specific aspects of communication competence according to the learner's proficiency level and communication needs. It is the teacher's responsibility to determine and respond to the learner's language needs. This may be done informally or through a formal
assessment of the learner's motivation for studying the language. D.A Wilkins (1972) was the first to analyse communication meanings that a learner needs to understand and express. He proposed a need: - based, functional or communication definition of language that could serve as a basis for developing communication syllabuses for language teaching. He described two types of meaning: notional categories (concepts such as sequence, quality, location, frequency) and categories of communicative function (request, demand, offers, complaint). Wilkins later developed these ideas into a book called Notional Syllabuses (1976), which had a significant impact on the development of what came to be popularly known as communicative language teaching.

There is, however, a considerable amount of fluidity and eclecticism in theorising about and practising the CA to language teaching. Within the parameters of its basic principles, it means different things to different people depending upon their predilection and experience. According to Littlewood, for example, one of the most important characteristic features of CLT is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language. What is essential in the various approaches is an
interaction or transaction of some kind. Where one person has an intention and the other reacts to it. Howatt distinguishes between a strong and weak version of CLT

There is in a sense a ‘strong’ version of the Communicative Approach and a ‘weak’ version. The weak version which has become more or less standard practice in the last ten years, stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and characteristically attempt to integrate such activities into a wider programme of language teaching ...

The strong version of communicative teaching, on the other hand, advances the claim that language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself. If the former could be described as ‘learning to use’ English, the latter entails using English to learn it. (279)
Interactive model of language teaching is one of the most significant parts of CA. It requires communicative teaching material and motivated language teaching. How interaction is achieved in a formal situation is a matter of classroom technique. The teacher is the initiator of the activities and he creates situations that prompt communication between and among the students. Therefore it requires imaginative planning on the part of the teacher. Through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen or read authentic linguistic material. Interaction takes place not only between the teacher and the students, between students and among students, but also between the learners and the linguistic environment.

Another characteristic of CA is the use of authentic materials. Authentic materials need not be difficult materials. These should be on topics the students come across in everyday life situation. Therefore selection of authentic materials should be done carefully so that they motivate the students. CA lays emphasis on the participation of students and on the significance of their need. It recognises the link between the language forms and functional meanings. In this approach the learner is placed in real life or life like situations. The strategies that the CA makes use
of for teaching are important and interesting. (Use of authentic materials, group work, language games, role-playing etc.) This approach seems interesting and it will be able to induce learning in the minds of the students. Therefore it has been selected as one of the methods for our developmental projects.

**Drawbacks of the Communicative Approach**

Like any other method CLT is also not without drawbacks. Some of them are as follows (1) CLT makes great demand on professional training. Previously the teacher needed expertise in translation, giving explanations, defining, exemplifying, assessing, and maintaining class discipline and so on. In CLT, over and above these pedagogic techniques, the teacher needs organisational abilities and managerial qualities. His role in the classroom range from that of a controller to an organiser, a manager, a supervisor, an assessor and sometimes a participant in language activities. Without professional training, it is very difficult to conduct a communicative class. (2) CLT also makes great demands on the teachers’ language proficiency. The teacher must be fluent speaker of the target language because language learning takes place not only from the text activities, but also from the wide
spectrum of language used by the teacher in the course of organising and managing those activities. Thus such teacher-performance like instructing, directing, explaining, describing, praising, encouraging, asking for information etc. provide extra language exposure outside the language of the textbook for many learners. (3) CLT does not offer the teacher the security of a textbook. In the more traditional approach it is sufficient for the teacher to follow the prescriptions laid down in the textbook. CLT, however, requires the teacher to be inventive and creative. (4) It is more difficult to evaluate students' performance in a communicative class than in the previous approaches. (5) Moreover CLT calls for changes in the attitude of the teacher. The teacher must be willing to participate in the activities, must be encouraging, must have a tolerant response to errors, must give a lot of freedom to the students to express themselves. In other words, the classroom environment must be more democratic than the previous classroom.

Yet more and more experts in the field of ELT are turning to CLT as an effective instrument of improving language proficiency all over the world. It has stimulated fresh thinking on current ELT strategies in India as
well. The language cell of the NCERT in collaboration with CIEFL is making earnest efforts to incorporate CLT into its teacher training programmes and material production. Recently in our country a lot of changes have been made and is still making in the syllabus of English language for higher classes keeping in mind the urgency to improve the communicative skill of the learners. CBSE syllabus for high school and higher secondary classes has already made enough changes in this direction. But in our teaching environment nobody can be sure of attaining any remarkable achievement through CA.

For those teachers who are willing to experiment, modify and make changes, CLT can be very challenging and rewarding. "If the teacher is able to see himself as a learner in the educational system, then he will develop along with the students because he will require expertise, both linguistic and professional, to develop communicative competence in the learners" (Mullick, Ghosh 51).
Bilingual Method

The initiation of Bilingual Method into the teaching of second language has opened new vistas of knowledge and possibilities in regard to the use of L₁ in foreign language teaching. (Mukalel 85) The history of second/foreign language teaching methodology has almost always seen extreme approaches either in the form of GTM or DM. The extremities lay in two aspects.

1) Emphasis of the language skills in the teaching of a foreign language, and

2) The role of the MT in the teaching a foreign language.

In the GTM L₁ is almost substituted in the classroom in the teaching of L₂, whereas in DM L₁ is completely discarded in the classroom in the teaching of L₂. "The initiation of BM is, thus, the answer to a far reaching cry to restore the dignity and potentiality of the learner's mother tongue which was totally ignored and neglected in the Direct Method and in the structural approach" (86).
The origin of BM goes back to Prof. Dodson of the North Wales University who made use of Welsh in the teaching of English and other foreign languages with a view to discovering the efficacy of systematically and judiciously using the L1 in the teaching of an L2. The assumption most fundamental to BM is that MT of the learner is the most potential resource at his disposal in the learning of a language and instead of shutting the door upon MT, the resource should be systematically employed in the teaching of a FL. Dodson has discovered certain basic requirements for the success of any method. They are as follows: (1) The method must be simple. (2) It must strike a balance between the spoken and the written word. (3) It must overcome the conflict between accuracy and fluency. (4) Some ways must be found for increasing the rate and amount of learning, which takes place in the classroom. (5) Testing and constant revision must be part of the method used. (6) A new method must give the teacher the assurance that the pupil will say exactly what he wants him to say. (7) It is essential to find out whether the linguistic habits, which the child has already acquired by learning his MT, have any positive influence on the pupil’s ability to assimilate a new language. (8) A new method must offer a new approach to
the application of translation work without destroying the pupil’s fluency.

(9) The method must give the teacher an opportunity to promote inter-
communication between himself and the individual pupil. (10) The method
must be sufficiently flexible to cope with various classroom conditions and
the pupil’s specific and general abilities. (11) The method must ensure that
the pupil is given the opportunity of having a large number of contacts with
the target language than he receives with the present method (10-11).

The main principle of BM which satisfy the above mentioned criteria
are: controlled use of the students’ MT, the introduction of reading and
writing easily in the course of language learning and integration of writing
and reading skills.

After experimenting with different kinds of stimuli, Dodson, on the
basis of his research concluded that the following conditions were the most
effective ones:

(1) FL spoken stimulus

(2) MT equivalent for the acquisition of sentence meaning

(3) Picture and other visual aid for the retention of sentence meaning
Dodson vehemently attacks DM, which not only ignores but also attempts to annihilate MT in teaching a foreign language. In this context he observes

It is one of the tragedies at present being enacted in some emergent countries where a major world language is being taught as a second language to young children by DM, that if this type of teaching were successful which by all account it is not, the vernacular would disappear within a few generations. It is only possible to teach a second language by direct method technique at the expense of the first language, and it is sheer hypocrisy to claim that the final aim of such teaching philosophies is bilingualism. Every aspect of direct method teaching is directed towards keeping the two languages as far apart as possible thus destroying the bridge which the learner must continuously cross to and fro, if he wishes to be truly bilingual (40)
Imitation, Interpretation, Substitution and Extension and Independent production of sentences are the four important steps involved in the BM. In the first step students learn a small range of basic structures through imitation. In the second step interpretation helps the students to identify the 'sound' and 'meaning.' This helps them to switch over from one language to another rapidly. In the third step students learn to construct their own sentences similar to the structures they have already learned and thus their field of activity widens. Step four puts the students into a creative process i.e. the students are encouraged to write their own sentences with new structures.

The Bilingual Method is not an independent new method with new concepts and models. It is in fact, a happy synthesis of the best principles and features present in other methods. It has modified the principles of other methods to overcome the objectives and criticisms and to suit the objectives of second language learning today. Carrol expresses this idea through the following words: "But then, in these highly advanced times it could hardly be expected that a new method would represent anything more than a new combination of procedures."(177).
The fundamental characteristic of BM is its attitude towards the learner's mother tongue. In it we find a legitimate revival of the nobility of MT and its role in foreign language teaching. The first language is the child's basic asset, for the child the first language is behaviour, communication, achievement and fulfilment. The child cannot be thought of or defined as a growing and maturing personality apart from the first language he has acquired. The first language is intimately connected with the child's biological, psychological and social fulfilment. Unlike a foreign language, which the child learns later, the development of the first language is linked directly to every phase of the child's psycho sociological developments. It is such a resource as part of the child's built in personality that almost all foreign language-teaching trends of the structuralist school have been keeping out of the classroom. In keeping out the first language, we have deprived the L2 learner of a large bulk of his dynamism and made him artificially silent when his very personality surges with enthusiasm to know and speak in a language, which is all part of him. Yet we cannot go so far as GTM is permitting the L2 employ the L1 with all the satisfaction that might be derived out of it. "Bilingual method with all the methodological
precautions permits the teacher bring the harnessed horse of the mother
tongue into the classroom with a view to utilize this powerful resource in
the teaching of the foreign language” (Mukalal 88).

Advantages of Bilingual Method

When the powerful resource of the mother tongue is systematically
employed in the teaching of English, unfailingly the following advantages
will be derived in the English language teaching class: (1) Much of the
laboursome activities of the teacher in introducing a language item will be
eliminated by systematically replacing the activities with the learner’s MT.
(2) The most complex and activity- oriented class in DM and the
linguistically indirect comprehension procedures for the learners are
simplified by BM by means of judicious use of MT. In GTM, the burden is on
the pupils by way of translation, memorising and written question-
answering; by contrast, in DM the burden is on the teacher by way of
initiating classroom activities and introducing language items through
situational factors. BM attempts to strike a medium in terms of distribution
of work between the teacher and pupils. (3) A class in GTM does not call for
much resourcefulness on the part of the teacher; a class in DM calls for great
initiative ness and resourcefulness on the part of the teacher. Between these
two extremes an average teacher (as is mostly the case in present day
classroom) can very well manage a class in BM, if he is conversant with the
aspects of the method. (4) The sounds of MT and the words with which the
learner is intimately conversant provide a congenial atmosphere in a
second/foreign language classroom; the very mention of an equivalent in
MT in an English class brightens up the young faces in contrast to the
labour, a helpless teacher undertakes to bring home the same idea through
activities and illustrations in English. (5) BM gives equal stress on all the
four skills unlike other methods of second/foreign language teaching. (6) It
strikes a balance between fluency and accuracy. GTM provides accuracy in
whatever work it does such as the knowledge of formal grammar, ability
and accuracy in written language, and DM is said to provide fluency in
spoken language at the cost of accuracy. BM is expected to achieve both
fluency and accuracy in language learning. (7) BM provides ample time for
practice because the time usually taken up in a DM class for presenting some
material is cut short to the minimum by the introduction of MT. (8) BM
leaves enough scope for the growth of the child’s imaginative and creative
aptitude by not spoon-feeding the child with everything. All these can be achieved through a systematic and controlled utilization of MT while learning a second/foreign language.

In spite of all these advantages, critics of BM put forward their arguments against it. The main argument against BM /BA is that a language should be taught in the target language itself. Their arguments holds good in the case of students who have gained a firm control of the basic structures in the earlier stages of language learning. They will follow quite easily discussions about the structures in the foreign language. Their accurate knowledge of the recurring features will help them in their study. But we are not concerned with such students; our area of interest is to students who actually need the help of MT in their SLA.

These are the very students who will have difficulty in following abstract explanations in the foreign language. A short elucidation of a grammatical point in the native language will help these students much more than a prolonged attempt to explain and re explain in the foreign language and will leave more time for practice of the
feature under discussion. Hence with a homogeneous group of gifted students who already have an understanding of fundamental structural relations, discussions of the structural system in the foreign language is an appropriate technique; for students who are finding the language study difficult, explanation in the native language which are brief, coherent, and to the point, followed by active practice of the features under discussion, are more effective. (Rivers 86)

Another point against BM is that one cannot expect the students' fluency in the target language, unless they are provided with enough exposure to the language. In our present educational system, chance to provide the learners with enough exposure to the target language is very delicate. Whatever is the shift in problems that we face or the shift in politics, the integrity of a modern language like English calls for an integrated approach to the language, in terms of fluency and accuracy as well as of the basic skills of the language. BM, by relating the L₁ to the teaching of L₂ as the principal aid, is aimed at saving considerable time and
thereby channelling the resources and using the time available for an integrated teaching of the language skills as well as for achieving fluency and accuracy in the use of FL.

Simplicity of Bilingual Method

Perhaps the most attractive characteristic of BM is its essential simplicity in terms of the teaching technique. GTM is too simple for the teacher at the risk of actual language learning; DM lays great burden on the teacher as the method has complex organisation of teaching techniques. But simplicity in teaching techniques is ever more recommended in the present day teaching practice. Simplicity of teaching method is required due to a variety of reasons like: (1) No language teaching method can take as the norm, the ideal teacher, as few ideal teachers are to be found in actual class rooms. The methodological recommendations made, should be within the ability range of the average teacher, as average teacher crowds the foreign language scene. In the Indian schools though quite recently the authorities have recommended the appointment of graduates and post-graduates in English language for teaching English at the school level. Still it remains only in paper. This situation in ELT in Kerala stresses the need to adhere to a
bilingual / integrated approach for teaching English as a second language. (2) Too complex language teaching methods will create learning problems, especially for the average and below average learner. The learner is to be kept in mind in developing foreign language teaching methods. Any method, which makes the learning process complex, cannot be recommended for the classroom. (3) Again simplicity of method is required so that the method will be applicable in a variety of language teaching backgrounds.

Simplicity of teaching method would yield the following benefits: A simple language teaching method avoids undue stress in any particular aspect of learning. Any such undue stress would result in neglect of several important aspects of learning. Method concentrating on speech would pay better or no attention on the development of the reading and writing skills. A simple language teaching method, again, would keep the learner fully at the centre and all work would revolve around him. Simplicity of method, therefore, consists in organising classroom experiences in such a way as to achieve maximum benefits by means of minimum techniques.
As a result, any simple method will be functionally feasible in the hands of any average teacher. The ultimate aim of Methodist is to lay down the most practical guidelines for the teacher to follow in order to make language teaching most effective. The fundamental simplicity of the BM is made possible by the judicious use of L1. Owing to the strictly controlled use of L1, so much time is saved and effort is so lessened that these precious resources can be channelled to the working of the four skills. The greatest simplicity of the method lies in the presentation of a structure or a set of vocabulary items, where instead of the most complex demonstrative and illustrative techniques, merely the equivalent of MT is flashed across with simple reactions on the faces of the pupils which makes sure that the meaning has gone home much faster than even the teachers’ expectation through a word which is already a part of the pupils’ language experience.

In the Indian context and against the background of the Indian languages, BM is gaining greater acceptability and relevance. The argument is that a strict adherence to English language alone in the classroom is no longer possible in the present day Indian context where the ideal English teacher is far from reality. Whether BM is the answer to the problem of
English teaching is highly controversial. The principal reason for this being the average teacher's high rate tendency to pull back fully and unscrupulously on to MT as is the case today. Perhaps, BM in such circumstances would only be a licence for the full-fledged use of $L_1$ and subsequently falling back again on to the grammar translation way of teaching English. If kept within the recommended guideline, Bilingual approach will certainly prove effective, provided the English atmosphere required in the classroom, is fully maintained.

Bilingual Approach was experimented by many researchers in our country. The main centre of experiments in India was the Central Institute of English, Hyderabad. H.N.L Sastri, Mr.R.V.S Murthi and Smt.Nalini Nagarguna in Kannada, Telugu, and Tamil medium schools conducted the experiments. All the three experiments concluded that BM is well suited for classroom teaching and learning in India. Till today no body has conducted any research on that line in Kerala. Though Kerala enjoys the highest literacy rate, (data in support of this have already been given in table 1, 2 & 3) the standard of English of the entrants to higher classes is very poor. Hence an Integrated Approach/ Bilingual Approach will be very effective to develop
the four basic skills in the learners. The following three chapters are set apart to deal in detail bilingual approach to ESL through an empirical analysis and to find out its favourable effects in the Kerala context. Considering the educational backwardness of the learners, such a study will be of great relevance in the present context.