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Emergence of Communicative Language Teaching in Turkey

Since 1980, with the beginning of teacher training courses in foreign language teaching sponsored in Turkey by Britain and the United States, there has been a movement from structural to functional methodologies. A clear example of this transition can be seen in the secondary school language education. With changes in the secondary school English curriculum, the first step has been made. According to this system, English courses are optional in the first class of the secondary schools, and students' overall proficiency has not only been tested by term and final exams, but also by their participation and productivity in the class environment. In addition, in this system, "Communicative Language Teaching" has been accepted as a methodology and its implementation has begun from the first year of all the state secondary schools.

To understand the necessity of aiming toward functional methodologies in language teaching in Turkey, the English language background should be analyzed in the overall Turkish education.
In the bygone eras of Turkish education, the philosophy of language teaching and learning was associated with the mastery of one's linguistic competence and performance. As Chomsky states (1986), "competence" refers to one's representation of linguistic rules, and "performance" symbolizes comprehension and production of the language. Since the English language is not the medium of communication in Turkish society in which the language of mass communication is Turkish, the aims of the structural language methods used in the education system have not focused on the mastery of communicative skills, but they have focused on the mastery of linguistic patterns. As a matter of fact, there has not been a great demand for gaining communicative skills in English for actual communication with English speaking people in a social context. English has been necessary for translation, reading literature, and writing for commercial purposes. So when we look at the issue of structural methods from this point of view, they have served those needs to some extent.

At this point one may ask the question, "Do Turkish students need to gain communication skills in English?" If this question had been asked thirty years ago, probably the answer would be "not necessarily" because the communication needs among English learners/students or, in a broader sense in the Turkish society, was not as high as it is today. Now things are changing. The Turkish society may join the European Economic Community within the coming years. Then what will happen if we cannot provide communication skills in English to our students?
The answer to this question is very simple. We will not be able to develop. If the aim of Turkish society is to develop, to take place among the level of the contemporary or developed countries, to adapt ourselves to the requirements of the changing world, it is time to accept and acknowledge the communication needs among English learners.

The fact that it is English which has become the international language and with respect to international interaction, it is fair to say that communicative knowledge of English is imperative (Wolfson, 1983). Because English has become the most important language of wider communication, it is very clear that only knowledge of the linguistic features of a language does not make communication efficient and effective. To compensate for this deficiency, learners and teachers of English should be aware of the fact that knowing a foreign language does not necessarily mean knowing its vocabulary, syntax, and structure; unless these prerequisites of a language can be used for the sake of communication, they are useless.

In this research, "Communicative Language Methodology" has been examined mostly from the point of communication needs and the researcher would like to mention here that, with respect to all methodologies, it is not intended to put down one way of teaching in favor of another. Since there is not any single methodology to meet the needs of certain learners, eclecticism may cover the expectations of students.
Purpose

In this project, the main purposes are to review selected library materials and the subject of communicative language teaching in order to gain a better understanding of what communicative language teaching is and to examine the proportion of a selected group of English teachers who are aware of the issue of the Communicative Language Methodology (C.L.M.).

Method

In this project, the data obtained by a questionnaire were collected from the Ministry of Education, YADEM, TOWER, Bilkent University TELF MA, Yildiz University and two private language schools. The questions and the questionnaire were designed to measure the knowledge of "Communicative Language Methodology" among some English teachers in Istanbul and Ankara. This sampling does not represent the current overall situation of the "Communicative Language Methodology" in Turkey and that is why this research is limited to the outcomes of the survey obtained from the teachers of the institutions in Istanbul and Ankara. The reason behind giving a questionnaire is to collect concrete, that is written, data which enable the researcher to interpret and present the subject teachers' responses in percentages objectively while doing the data analysis.

Except for the Ministry of Education, the institutions represent a variety of language education in Istanbul and Ankara. For example, YADEM is a co-organization of the Ministry of Education which deals with foreign languages improvement in
Turkish secondary schools. TOMER is a language institution run under the directives of Ankara University and provides English service to the general public. Bilkent University TEFL MA program is chosen with respect to being the only one MA program in "Teaching English as a Foreign Language" in Turkey and this program embraces sixteen teachers from different universities. Yildiz University represents one of the 29 universities in Turkey. Finally two commercial schools, Active English in Ankara and Dilfen in Istanbul, represent the private enterprise.

The frequencies of teacher responses to the each item in the questionnaire are shown in the data presentation. Then the outcomes of the questionnaire have been analyzed in the data analysis part by taking the EFL (English as a Foreign Language) scholars' ideas into consideration and by comparing these experts' views with the Turkish subject teachers' commands.

Organization

The first section of this research mainly deals with the general considerations of English language from the points of expectations of Turkish society. The next section focuses primarily on pedagogical considerations. Structural methodologies such as grammar translation, direct, and audio-lingual are re-examined. Then there is a review of the communicative language methodology, the rationale behind its popularity and its application. The third section presents the data that were collected by administrating a questionnaire among the English teachers. Finally, the fourth section is the data
SECTION 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This section is divided into three major parts. First, under the title of "Language Teaching and Needs Analysis" the importance of students' needs in language learning is presented. Then, two research studies are discussed to give an idea about the needs of civil servants and university students in Turkey from the viewpoint of English language. At the end of this part, in the foreign language teaching the importance of goals and objectives is reviewed. In the second part, grammar-translation, direct, and audio-lingual methodologies are re-examined to inform the reader of the differences between structural and communicative language methodologies.

In the third part, communicative language methodology is presented under the following sub-headings:

Communicative Competence
Communicative Methodology
Learner-directed Activity
Teacher's Role in Communicative Activities
A Model: From Controlled to Free Practice
   Controlled Practice
   Free Practice
The Transitional Stage
Principles of Communicative Language Methodology
Communication and Language in the Classroom
LANGUAGE TEACHING AND NEEDS ANALYSIS

Most teachers are trying to be practical, busy working professionals but either presenting activities or exercises written in a textbook or producing their own material is not enough for the needs of their classes. Every English teacher should understand the needs of students by taking the importance of the following questions (paraphrased and adapted from Principles of Language Learning and Teaching written by H. Brown, 1980) into consideration before implementing instructions:

WHO? Who are the learners? What are their levels of education? What are their socioeconomic levels? What are their intellectual capacities? What sort of personalities do they have? These crucial variables affect both the learners' success in mastering the English language and the teachers' capacity to help the students achieve that mastery. In the case of the teacher, another set of questions emerges. What is the teacher's experience or training? What is the knowledge of English and the culture of the English society?

WHAT? What must students learn? How can English be described adequately? What are the linguistic differences between Turkish and English?

HOW? How does learning take place? How can students realize success while learning English? What cognitive strategies are utilized in learning English? What kinds of style or study skills do the students use? What is the optimal interrelationship of cognitive, affective, and physical domains for successful English learning?

WHEN? How much time should be spent in learning/teaching
What are the curriculum boundaries? Is the learner exposed to three, five, ten, or twenty hours of instruction in a week?

WHERE? Are the learners limited to only school facilities? Do the learners have the opportunity to practice their English with native speakers? Do the learners have the chance of maintaining their English within the learning continuum?

WHY? Finally, to cover all of these questions: Why are the students attempting to learn English? What are the learners' purposes? Are they instrumentally motivated, seeking a successful career or carrying out a foreign language requirement?

Beyond these categories, what other affective, emotional, personal or intellectual reasons do the learners have while learning English?

Information concerning the needs of students can be obtained through observation, class discussions, individual talk with students, assigned essays, and by administering questionnaire/s among students (Peck, 1979). Here are the results of two questionnaires which were administrated among some Turkish civil servants and university students.

According to the research conducted by C. Cem, (1978) (taken from Yuksekogretim Kurumlarimizda Yabanci Dil Izlenceleri, Sebuktekin, 1981) among 472 university graduate civil servants the dispersion of needs were as follows:
35.6% Reading and understanding in English in order to follow literature
27.1% Being able to communicate in English in the English speaking countries
20.1% Participating in discussions in the English medium meetings
12.3% Welcoming foreign guests, making business contractions
4.9% Managing meetings in English, being able to speak English in the meetings, being able to respond the questions in English

As it is seen, the needs of subjects were mostly involved with reading, speaking, and listening skills which are accepted as crucial elements of communication.

The following outcomes developed from a recent research study conducted at Marmara University in 1988 at the Preparatory School among 230 students are based on the needs of students:

**Conversation**
92.30% very important (Upper intermediates)
80% very important (Intermediates)
71.80% very important (Beginners)
90% rather important (All students)
Reading Comprehension
92.30% very important (Upper intermediates)
49.30% very important (Intermediates)
51.40% very important (Beginners)
6% not important (All students)

Listening Comprehension
94% rather important (All students)

Note-taking
92.30% very important (Upper intermediates)
50.70% very important (Intermediates)
43% very important (Beginners)

Grammar
38.50% very important (Upper intermediates)
25.30% very important (Intermediates)
52.80% very important (Beginners)

For most of the students conversation was considered very important. Reading Comprehension and Listening Comprehension were also of primary importance. Upper intermediate students were more conscious of the importance of Note-taking and Writing subjects than were the others. Grammar was perceived as the most important subject for the beginners.
Goals and Objectives in Language Teaching

In addition to six important considerations—who, what, how, when, where, why—if objectives are not in correlation with goals, teaching becomes unsuccessful. According to Bellon and Handler (1982) in simplified terms "Goals are desired outcomes" which give a direction to the teachers to know what things their students should get at the end of a course. On the other hand, "objectives are the things that the students will be able to do" at the end of the course. In any given classroom teachers should have as clear an idea as possible of what they want to accomplish and should choose their techniques and materials accordingly (Celce-Murcia, 1979). Language teachers have argued endlessly about objectives. Shall we aim at speaking, reading, or both? Shall we work towards native-like pronunciation? Is it enough to develop linguistic competence or must we also teach practical language skills? To supply even a moderate degree of acceptance, objectives should be general in order to cover the needs of our students.

STRUCTURAL LANGUAGE METHODOLOGIES

This part is the review of certain methodologies which have influenced language teaching in the past and present. Especially grammar-translation, direct, and audio-lingual methods have been examined since these methods have been widely used in Turkey.

Grammar-Translation Method

Although the roots of grammar-translation are clearly seen in the eighteenth century, this method did not emerge fullblown
until the early decades of the nineteenth century. In the eighteenth century it was accepted that basic understanding of a foreign language grammar should be gained by analytical mastery of the vernacular grammar. Also the widespread use of textbooks and increasing enrollment in language classes contributed to the acceptance of grammar translation.

Grammar translation was an easy method for the teacher to use. Classes could be taught in the students' native language with little teaching skill or foreign-language speaking skill needed by the instructor (Brown, 1985). According to Celce-Murcia (1979), grammar-translation method consists of the following principles:

a. Classes are taught in the mother tongue, with little active use of the target language.

b. Much vocabulary is taught or memorized in the form of lists of isolated words with their meanings in the students' native language.

c. Long elaborate explanations of the detailed parts of grammar are given.

d. Grammar provides the rules for putting words together, and instruction often focuses on the form and inflection of words.

e. Reading of difficult classical texts is begun early no matter how stylistically or grammatically complex or archaic.

f. Little attention is paid to the content of texts, which are treated as exercises in
grammatical analysis.

g. Often the only drills are exercises in translating disconnected sentences from the target language into the mother tongue.

h. Little or no attention is given to pronunciation.

McArthur (1983) claims that the grammar translation method has generally taken the body of received knowledge as primary and the teacher as secondary. In essence it is the teacher's task, almost privilege, to pass on something that is already established and to do it in an established way, using the right kind of books with the right kind of paradigms and rules, list of regularities and exceptions, texts for guided reading and fixed exercises in two-way translation. Rote learning and the application of the rules are the basic procedure, along with examples and exercises encouraging a deductive, analytical approach to language.

Haskell (1978) implies that foreign language teachers, using this method did not generally intend to produce "speakers" of the language. The purpose was only to provide the broad liberal arts education necessary to produce a "well educated person" who could read a foreign language.

Direct Method

In the second half of the nineteenth century supporters of the direct method such as Gouin, Vietor, Jesperson and Berlitz tended to favor instruction on listening rather than reading, writing, and translation. Direct method enthusiasts in Britain,
including Palmer and West, tended to favor an incubation period of listening prior to teaching students how to speak, and quite generally the teaching of receptive skills prior to productive skills. Speech, not writing, was viewed as the basis of language (Bowen, 1985). In the direct method, the focus of foreign language teaching moves away from rules and literary texts towards the colloquial language. It was supposed that language could be taught "directly" and naturally much the same way that the students had learned their mother tongues. It was assumed that the student would slowly begin to live the language simply because there was no escape from it (McArthur, 1983). Celce-Murcia (1979) enumerates the basic elements of the direct method:

a. Lessons begin with a brief anecdote or dialogue in the target language, and in modern conversational style with the exclusive use of the target language in the classroom.

b. The material is first presented orally with actions or pictures.

c. The mother tongue is never used.

d. The preferred type of exercise is a series of questions in the target language based on the anecdote or dialogue, and answered in the target language within meaningful usage.

e. Grammar is taught inductively; rule generalization comes only after experience.

f. Verbs are used first, and systematically conjugated much later.
g. Advanced students read literature for comprehension and pleasure; literary texts are not analyzed grammatically.

h. The culture associated with the target language is also taught inductively.

Haskell (1978) says that most methodologies to language teaching that have developed in the twentieth century reflect the basic principles of the direct method.

Audio-Lingual Method

This method was dominant in the United States during World War II. The audio-lingual method refers to a combination of teaching materials constructed according to a well-known specification, a fairly standard syllabus, and a rationale based on Bloomfield's structural linguistics and Skinner's behaviorist psychology (Strevens, 1985).

According to Strevens (1985), structural linguists claim that natural language learning occurs first through listening, then speaking, and then reading and writing. Language is made up of three systems: phonology (sounds), morphology (word formation), and syntax (the arrangement of words in sentences), and these systems work exclusive of meaning.

Behavioral-psychology learning theory advanced by Skinner said that language was habit-formation and that language learning was a mechanical process of stimulus-response, strengthened by reinforcement of correct responses (behavior modification) (Haskell, 1978).

According to Celce-Murcia (1979) audio-lingual methodology
is characterized by the following:

a. New material is presented in dialogue form.
b. There is dependence on mimicry, memorization of set phrases, and overlearning.
c. Structures are sequenced, and taught one at a time.
d. Structural patterns are taught using repetitive drills.
e. There is little or no grammatical explanation: grammar is taught by inductive analogy rather than deductive explanation.
f. Skills are sequenced-listen, speak, read, write.
g. Vocabulary is strictly limited and learned in context.
h. Teaching points are determined by contrastive analysis.
i. There is much use of tapes, language labs, and visual aids.
j. There is an extended pre-reading period at the beginning of the course.
k. Great importance is attached to pronunciation, with special intention being paid to intonation.
l. The cultural background of the target society and its language is stressed.
m. Some use of the mother tongue by teachers is permitted.
n. Successful responses are immediately reinforced.

o. There is a great effort to prevent student errors.

p. There is a tendency to manipulate language and disregard content.

Looking at audiolingualism in an historical perspective, we can see that one reason for its success was its prestige, and support from research scholars in a variety of disciplines as well as from teachers and the public at large. Secondly it was accompanied by carefully prepared materials, an advantage not enjoyed by those who had used the older methods. And finally, it employed a variety of historically proven teaching practices: it was skill-oriented, with a practical oral emphasis as practiced by Quintilian, Erasmus, and many others (Bowen, 1985).

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE METHODOLOGY

Anyone who is familiar with recent books and articles on foreign language teaching will quickly recognize the words communication or communicative competence. Since this notion is essential to the subject matter of this project it is necessary to clarify them here.
Communicative Competence

According to Widowson (1979), the difficulty in learning a foreign language is that ability to compose sentences is not the only ability we need to communicate. Communication only takes place when people make use of sentences to perform a variety of different acts of an essential social nature. Thus, people do not communicate by composing sentences, but by using sentences to make statements of different kinds to describe, to record, to classify, to make requests, to give orders or to ask questions. Knowing what is involved in putting sentences together correctly is only one part of what people mean by knowing a language, and it has very little value on its own; it has to be supplemented by a knowledge of what sentences count as in their normal use as a means of communication. Communicative competence thus includes not only mastery of grammar and lexicon, but also the rules of speaking; for example, knowing when it is appropriate to open a conversation and how, what topics are appropriate to particular speech events, which forms of address are to be used to whom, and in which situations, and how such speech acts as greetings, compliments, apologies, invitations and complaints are to be given and responded to.

Wolfson (1983) implies that how people speak is part of what they say, language learners may be unable to interpret the meaning of an utterance even though they know all the words. Worse, they may interpret what they hear according to the rules of speaking of their native language, thus frequently misunderstanding the speaker's intention and perhaps perceiving insincerity or offense where none was meant.
For the reasons mentioned above, language instruction must not be limited to the teaching of the traditional written and oral skills but rather the aim of such instruction must be what Hymes identifies as "Communicative Competence" (1979).

According to Hymes, a linguistic theory should develop to provide a more constitutive role for sociocultural factors. If this is so, he says that the notions of "competence" and "performance" which were first highlighted by Chomsky need redefinition. According to Chomsky, the term performance represents the actual use of a language or at least using a language, and competence means knowledge of the language, grammatical knowledge in other words. But once competence is viewed as the overall underlying knowledge ability for language use which the speaker-listener possesses, then it must be accepted that competence involves much more than knowledge of grammar. At this point Hymes summarizes "rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless" (1979). But, if speakers were to produce grammatical sentences without regard to the situations in which they were being used, speakers would certainly be considered deranged. There are then, several sectors of "Communicative Competence". Hymes (1979) lists the following four:
1. Whether and to what degree something is formally possible
2. Whether and to what degree something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available
3. Whether and to what degree something is appropriate in relation to a context in which it issued and evaluated
4. Whether and to what degree something is in fact done, actually performed

Hymes considers "competence" the most general term for capabilities of a person. Competence is dependent upon both knowledge and use. Knowledge is distinct, both from competence and from systematic possibility. Knowledge also is to be understood as substanding all four parameters of communication (Brumfit, 1979).

According to Savignon (1983), communication or, getting ourselves understood is the matter of not only foreign language teachers but all of us in our daily lives in whatever language we use. Learning how to be better communicators is important to all human beings either in private or public. Better communication means better understanding of messages between a speaker and interlocutor; then better communication can only be realized when expression of ideas, interpretation, and negotiation processes between speaker and listener are maintained appropriately. The opportunities for communication are infinite and include systems of signs and symbols beyond a language such as body language, gestures, and voice choices. Meanings or messages people convey depend on others who share an understanding of these signs and symbols and who may or may not interpret them as people intend.
From the preceding considerations, Savignon (1983) lists the characteristics of communicative competence as follows:

1. Communicative competence is a dynamic rather than a static concept. It depends on the negotiation of meaning between or more people, who share to some degree the same language.

2. Communicative competence applies to both written and spoken language as well as many other non-verbal systems such as body language, gestures, and voice of tone.

3. Communicative competence is context specific. Communication takes place in an infinite variety of situations, and success in a particular role depends on one's understanding of the context and schemata or in other words background knowledge of a similar kind. It requires choices of register and style in terms of the situation and the other participants.

4. There is a difference between competence and performance. Only performance is observable, however, it is only through performance that competence can be developed, maintained, and evaluated.

5. Communicative competence is relative not absolute, and depends on the cooperation of all participants involved. It makes sense then to speak of degrees of communicative competence.
Communicative Methodology

Methods and approaches used to develop language proficiency have varied with the passing years, but recent practice in the language classroom seems to be divided among three major types of processing required by language learning tasks: structural, meaningful, and communicative. A structural task is one that does not require attention to meaning, a meaningful task is one in which students must understand what is being said or written in order to complete a task, the third category, communicative or personalized practice, requires the transmission of new information based on the students' experience, opinions and thoughts (Birckbichler, 1987).

Learner-directed Activities

McLean (1980) claims that learning is most effective when the learner is the initiator of the learning process. With regard to language, syntactic complexity and sentence length both increase when the learner has been actively involved. Dubin and Olshtain (1986) summarize in concrete terms that communicative learning puts high value on people accepting responsibility for their own learning, making decisions for themselves, choosing and initiating activities, expressing feelings and opinions about needs, abilities, and preferences. In this framework, the teacher acts as a facilitator of others' learning rather than as an implantar of knowledge. In this role-relationship between teachers and learners their endeavors take place in a cooperative, open, and caring manner.
For many groups of learners, the responsibility of being involved directly in the activities may be unfamiliar at the beginning; therefore, their confidence can be undermined. The teachers need to take this assumption into account and be prepared to increase the students' alertness. Littlewood (1981) suggests the following precautions to decrease the students' anxieties:

-- The teachers can test a group's initial response to undirected activity by introducing it initially in small doses, which they can increase gradually as the learners develop more confidence and independence.

-- At first, the teachers must be especially sure that learners understand what they are required to do in an activity. Teachers can demonstrate the activity themselves with members of the class. Also, some activities can be performed not only in pairs or groups, but also as a class under the teacher's direction.

-- The teacher may begin by selecting activities which make comparatively light demands on the learners' linguistic and creative abilities. The teacher can equip the learners specifically with the language forms that they need for these activities, which can serve as a "bridge" between controlled and uncontrolled language use.
The Teacher's Role in Communicative Activities

Littlewood (1981) proposes that in the more creative types of activity, unnecessary interruption of the teacher may prevent learners from becoming genuinely involved in the activity and thus retard the development of their communicative skills.

However, this does not mean that once an activity is in progress, the teacher should become a passive observer. The teacher's function becomes less dominant than before, but not less important. Therefore:

-- If learners cannot cope with the demands of situation, the teacher can offer advice or supply necessary language items. If student cannot agree on any point, teacher is there as a source of guidance and help. Teacher’s presence may be an important psychological support for many learners.

-- While students are performing, the teacher can monitor their strengths and weaknesses. Although the teacher may not interrupt at the time they can use weaknesses as signs of learning needs which can be handled later.

-- There may be occasions when the teacher decides to reinforce a more immediate influence over the language used. Most obviously, the teacher may need to take away the learners from referring to their mother tongue in moments of difficulty.
-- The teacher may also decide that a particular error is so important that must be corrected at once, to prevent it from becoming fixed in the students' speech.

Stevick (1980) points out that if teachers aim to provide communication opportunities to their students in a student-centered situation, teachers must not undermine students' security. In a communicative oriented group like a language class, the student's place is at the center of a space which the teacher has structured, with room left for him or her to grow into. Dubin and Olshtain (1988) state that the teacher's role in a communicative classroom is essentially a creative one in which the primary function is getting other people to do things with language by establishing short-term objectives which suit the interests of the majority in the group. By following this view, Wilkins (1979) warns teachers that since there is no single set of objectives that will coincide with all kinds of learners, teachers should well understand their students' common needs to find reasonable solutions. Wilkins (1979) says "It is a mistake that communicative language teaching is exclusively concerned with the use of spoken language; however, it is equally valid for other language skills."

In Figure 1, Munby (1985) shows a category of foreign language learner's communicative objectives which are achieved by controlling particular communicative behaviors.
Communicative Workouts

Workouts are language learning and language using activities which improve students' overall learning processes. Dubin and Olshtain (1986) propose the communicative workouts under ten different categories:
1. Operations/transformations enable learners to focus on semantico-grammatical features which are necessary when aiming at accuracy in language use.

2. Warm ups/relaxers are motivated workouts which add an element of enjoyment and personal involvement.

3. Information-centered tasks enable learners to use the language naturally while being fully involved in fact-gathering activities.

4. Theatre games encompass all activity types which simulate reality within the classroom situation. These workouts are especially important since they enable the language session to broaden its context beyond the classroom.

5. Mediations/interventions are workouts which enable learners to experience bridging information gaps while using the target language.

6.7. Group dynamics and experiential tasks are group activities which create opportunities for sharing personal feelings and emotions among learners.

8. Problem-solving tasks involve learners in making decisions about issues while using the target language, enabling them to focus on the features of the activity rather than on language usage. In this type of activity learners are involved in a "whole task" process.
9. While similarly "whole task" focused, workouts which involve transferring and reconstituting information emphasize cognitive uses of language.

10. Skill-getting strategies are activities which enable learners to develop specific skill areas in the target language.

While realizing these workouts students need situations where they are on their own (i.e. not supported by teacher or structured exercise) trying to use the English language to exchange with others messages of real interest to them. Yet students cannot be sent off in groups or pairs and told to interact. Motivation to communicate must be aroused in some way such as explaining the reason or the purpose of the activity. According to needs of students, teachers must propose or encourage students to develop activities which are highly interesting for them. Rivers and Temperly (1978) suggest the following interactional activities:
1. Establishing and maintaining social relations: Formal and informal greetings, introductions, wishes for special occasions, making arrangements, giving directions, apologies, refusals, excuses, agreements and disagreements (formal or informal), persuasions.

2. Expressing one's reactions: In simulated situations reactions to a T.V. show, an exhibition of pictures or photographs, etc.

3. Hiding one's intentions:

4. Talking one's way out of trouble: Giving non-answers to a curious neighbor who want to know the origin of a loud noise heard in the middle of the night, redirecting an embarrassing conversation, answering a complaint.

5. Seeking and giving information: About oneself, one's family background, the area where one used to live, one's career expectations, vacation preferences, pet peeves.

6. Learning and teaching how to do or make something: Simulation games, hobbies, crafts, physical exercises, dances, hand-made products.


9. Discussing ideas: Mystery stories, controversial subjects, using microtexts such as; menus, concert programs, a paragraph from an English newspaper.

11. Acting out social roles: Dramatic improvisations such as; job interviews, visa application, situations based on proverbs, mimicry of well-known political figures or movie characters.

12. Entertaining others: Singing, making music, talent shows, dance figures.

13. Displaying one's achievement: Public presentations, presentation and explanation of social projects (e.g., art, music, architecture or history).

14. Sharing leisure activities: Verbal competitions, visiting the exhibitions of American or British paintings, watching English movies, listening to English music, reading English books or magazines.
A Model: From Controlled to Free Practice

This model was promoted by Hubbard (1986) for teachers of English as a foreign language who especially teach in the unnatural environment (i.e. English is not the means for wider communication).

Controlled Practice

This is the stage at which learners are given intensive practice in the structure, but their production of the language is very carefully guided and controlled by the teacher, so that correct form and meaning are consolidated. So, the possibility of error is reduced to a minimum. Teacher control can be analyzed as follows:

1. The teacher initiates and manages the activity.
   The teacher makes clear to the students what they have to do and then ensures that they are doing correctly.

2. The teacher corrects errors.

3. The teacher talks most of the time.

4. The teacher controls the subject matter of the talk, either by suggesting the words to be used, or by writing up words on the blackboard; or by choosing a particular set of language teaching materials-textbook, wall-chart, etc.
Free Practice

Free practice is the opposite of controlled practice. The teacher may initiate the activity, but will not interrupt or manage it, unless it breaks down totally. The teacher does not correct errors: the students have to cope by themselves. The teacher does not talk at all: the students do all talking. Finally the teacher does not control the subject matter apart from setting up the beginning of an activity.

The Transitional Stage

The transition from controlled to free practice can be illustrated in Figure 2 which was taken from Hubbard, (1986).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.T.T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error correction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. supplied subject matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.T.T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. self-management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self, peer-correction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. chosen subject matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: The Transition from Controlled to Free Practice

The transition from controlled to free work results from two changes of attitude on the part of the teacher. The first is to upset the teacher-student control pattern in the classroom by reorganizing the system of classroom management; the traditional class management is called lockstep. Here the teacher is
completely in control of every classroom interaction. The second is to change the type of activity from one which allows little or no choice on the part of the student to one which allows great freedom of choice. In groupwork, students work simultaneously in groups of three or more, while the teacher circulates, provides assistance or encouragement where necessary, and checks that the task is carried out satisfactorily. Also in pair work students work freely in pairs. The teacher is available to help or sort out problems, but to do this type of activity the students must be well prepared in order to work entirely by themselves.

In reality there is no sudden shift from one stage to another. There may be a change of the the context for practice when shifting from the controlled to the free practice stage, although a good teacher may smooth this transition by providing some thematic coherence in the form of a link in subject matter between the two stages. At what stage, then can communicative language practice be fitted into the teaching process? The most obvious suggestion would be to add it after the free practice stage. Once students have been encouraged to produce the new pattern freely and meaningfully, it would be reasonable to introduce a practice activity which gives students a motive and provides them with an opportunity to use their newly learned language for a purpose. The whole teaching process described so far can be summarized by means of the following figure from Hubbard, (1986).
If communicative teaching is teaching language for a purpose, then the sense of purpose plays a notable part in the process of presentation and practice. Instead of teaching forms with their meaning and then going on to practice their uses, teachers might begin with the use and proceed to teach examples of the forms students require. This type of procedure might be termed communicative presentation and practice. This procedure is summarized by Hubbard, (1986) in Figure 4.
**Principles of the Communicative Language Methodology**


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

2. Being able to figure out the speaker's or writer's intentions is part of being communicatively competent.

3. The target language is a vehicle for classroom communication, not just the object of study.

4. One function can have many different linguistic forms. Since the focus of the course is on real language use, a variety of linguistic forms are presented together.
5. Students should work with language at the discourse or suprasentential level. They must learn about cohesion and coherence, those properties of language which bind the sentences together.

6. Games are important because they have certain features in common with real communicative events—there is a purpose to exchange. Also the speaker receives immediate feedback from the listener on whether or not the speaker has successfully communicated. Having students work in small groups maximizes the amount of communicative practice they receive.

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

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

9. One of the teacher's major responsibilities is to establish situations likely to promote communication.

10. Communicative interaction encourages cooperative relationships among students. Communicative interaction gives students an opportunity to work on negotiating meaning.
11. The social context of the communicative event is essential in giving meaning to the utterances.

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

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

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

15. The grammar and vocabulary that the students learn follow from the function, situational context, and the roles of the interlocutors.

16. Students should be given opportunities to develop strategies for interpreting language as it is actually used by native speakers.
Communication and Language in the Classroom

Language as a means of communication consists of linguistic principles and paralinguistic principles. Knowing only one of these principles does not allow one to maintain communication appropriately. Communicating in a foreign language requires the use of linguistic patterns in a social context. Since communication is a social, two-sided process, it requires at least two people. There is always a communication environment between teacher and students in the language classroom. Then how can teachers effectively make use of this environment in English classes? As a suggestion, instead of presenting exercises, drills or reading texts that students are not familiar with, teachers should encourage students to talk about themselves, ask and answer questions about their friends and their teacher. These early activities not only break the ice but also motivate students toward the principles of human communication by means of language. When students primarily understand the prerequisites of human communication, secondarily the foundation of foreign language can be set and when students come across different situations they will not get into difficulties while they communicate with the native speakers of English. Although teaching the usage of a foreign language naturally in the class is a desired wish of an innovative teacher it is not easy, however, to realize in practice. Therefore, students, teachers, administrators, curriculum writers/planners and language institutions should be determined, enthusiastic toward excellence in the teaching of the English language (Sebuktekin, 1981).
SECTION 3: DATA PRESENTATION

In this research the data were collected by administrating a questionnaire which consisted of eight questions. Thirty copies of the questionnaire were sent to the English teachers and twenty copies were returned. The questionnaire contains (see Appendix 1) the following items:

1. Definition of the C.L.M. (Communicative Language Methodology)
2. Instructional activities used in the C.L.M. by the teachers.
3. Role of the teacher in the C.L.M.
4. Goals and objectives of the teacher using the C.L.M.
5. Examination of the C.L.M. from the point of student motivation.
7. Whether or not the teachers receive any training in the C.L.M.
8. Comparison and contrast of the C.L.M with the structural methods.

Teachers' responses to each item in the questionnaire were shown by percentages.

Item 1

In the first item, teachers were required to define the communicative language methodology. The responses given to this item indicated that 40 percent of the teachers perceived communicative language methodology as teaching students how to communicate by using English language and 60 percent as teaching the use of language and not the usage.
Item 2

The second item which was aimed at getting information about the activities done by teachers at communicative language (C.L) courses showed that half of the teachers (fifty percent) preferred role plays and dialogue-building exercises. Thirty percent of the teachers implemented games, group work, pair work, problem solving tasks during their lessons. Finally, 20 percent of the teachers mentioned discussions, simulations, and dramatizations that were held as communicative activities in class.

Item 3

When the role of an English teacher in the communicative methodology was asked, 70 percent of the teacher responses to this item indicated that communicative language teacher was a facilitator, guide, and organizer. Thirty percent evaluated the teacher's role as an advisor and observer.

Item 4

The fourth item was designed to learn teachers' goals and objectives while implementing the communicative language methodology in class. It was understood that 40 percent of the teachers focused on teaching communication skills in speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Twenty percent of the subjects aimed their goals toward teaching the use of the language. Finally, 40 percent of the teachers did not give any answer to this question.
Item 5

In this item, all of the teachers (100%) agreed that communicative language methodology increased students' motivation toward language learning.

Item 6

In this item, teachers were supposed to evaluate the limitations and strengths of the communicative language methodology in Turkey. According to the majority of the informants (90%), limitations of the communicative language methodology were 1) Lack of real environment for students to use English, 2) Material limitations, 3) Fixed classroom setting, 4) Large classes, 5) Teachers' limited competency in English, 6) Teacher-student relationships in the classroom. And 10 percent of the teachers did not give any comment to this question.

When the strengths were mentioned, 70 percent of the teachers preferred not to give an answer and 30 percent remarked that communicative language methodology increased students' motivation.

Item 7

The responses to this question signified that 90 percent of the subjects had received special training in the communicative language methodology and 10 percent had not received any training.
Finally, when teachers compared and contrasted the communicative language methodology with structural ones, 50 percent of the subjects mentioned that communicative language methodology was student-centered. And for the structural methodologies, 20 percent of the teachers stated that structural methodologies were teacher-centered. Second, 30 percent of the teachers viewed communicative methodology which dealt with communication, meaning, speaking and listening. However, 50 percent of the teachers remarked that structural methodologies focused on repetitive drills. Thirty percent of the teachers referred to structural methodologies which focused on imitation, forms of language, habit-formation, error correction, and finally language accuracy. Tertiary distinctions of the communicative language methodology were indicated with thought-effort relationship, less error correction, and language fluency which were favored by 20 percent of the teachers.
SECTION 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Data Analysis

According to the results of the data analysis, the definition of communicative methodology is perceived as teaching the use of the language to the students through communication.

The activities used by teachers in the communicative methodology show a variety of instruction types. Role plays and dialogue-building exercises are the most preferred type of activities. Since communication is important in learning a language, most of the teachers are mindful that roleplays prepare learners to utilize the language appropriately.

Dialogues are also in the category of the most preferred activities. Dialogues, if performed simultaneously, are mainly involved with speaking and listening skills--skills that should be improved for the learner in order to be competent in oral communication. The intensity in this activity indicates that most teachers perceive communicative methodology as a builder of speaking and listening skills. However, as it was mentioned in the literature review, communicative language methodology not only deals with speaking and listening but also with reading and writing. The preferences of the other activities such as games, pair work, group work, and problem solving tasks demonstrate that teachers recognize the co-operation of the students in the class activities. Finally discussions, simulations and dramatizations are favored less by the teachers. The reason for this might be that the teachers' skills do not allow them to use these
activities in the classroom since the implementation of these activities mostly require special knowledge.

The responses to the third item indicate that the teacher who uses communicative methodology is a facilitator, guide, and organizer rather than a "doer" which is the significant role of a teacher in the structural methodologies. Being an advisor and observer is the secondary role of a teacher in the communicative methodology according to the subject teachers. These data show that teachers who use communicative methodology do not deal with everything in the classroom; in contrast, teachers give room to students to use the language they learn.

The responses given to the fourth item spread out into three parts. Approximately half of the teachers directed their goals and objectives toward the communication skills in speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Twenty percent of the teachers mentioned their goals and objectives in a broad sense that are not clear and specific, i.e. teachers know communicative methodology but as far as the researcher understands some teachers are not totally aware of what the goals of communicative methodology are in teaching a foreign language. If this had not been the case, forty percent of the teachers would not have avoided giving responses to this question. According to this information, half of the teachers cannot clarify their goals and objectives concisely toward the communicative methodology. This implication shows that teachers are not completely aware of their students' needs. As it was touched upon in the literature review, if teachers do not know what skills are needed to be learned by
their students, then how can these students benefit from their teachers’ instruction? Stating goals and objectives before any instruction is an essential responsibility of any teacher. Without recognizing these prerequisites it is probable to receive unexpected outcomes at the end of the course.

All of the teachers gave positive responses to the item concerning the communicative methodology and students’ motivation. Students have fun with the class environment and their affective filters are lowered by the learning atmosphere in the classroom. Thus, students’ attitudes toward teacher, friends, learning environment and the activities done in the classroom affect their overall success. Then, according to the Turkish teachers’ understanding, communicative methodology decreases the affective filter.

The limitations of communicative methodology have been reflected by stating lack of opportunities for the students to use the target language out of the classroom, inefficient physical conditions and materials, teachers’ limited proficiency in English, and finally traditional teacher-student relationship in the Turkish classroom. These limitations were stated by 90 percent of the subject teachers. Although these limitations are the common problems of every language teacher, these limitations can be minimized by strong efforts made by the teachers. Beyond the external limitations, if teachers determine to overcome problems in their classrooms through using an active methodology, in some extent they may contribute to the minimization of the limitations at least in their classrooms.
Seventy percent of the teachers did not respond to the item related to the strengths of the implementation of communicative methodology in Turkey. The reason for not giving any responses to this item might indicate that teachers do not support communicative methodology for the EFL situation in Turkey. Thirty percent of the teachers repeat that communicative methodology increases students' motivation.

Finally, while comparing and contrasting communicative methodology with the structural methods, teachers emphasized communicative methodology as student-centered rather than teacher-centered. Even though communicative teaching is accepted as a student-centered methodology, only 20 percent of the teachers accept structural methods as teacher-centered. It seems there is a contradiction between two choices. Percentages of the teachers were expected to show the structural methods were much more teacher-centered, but the result did not turn out that way. According to informants, the repetitive exercises are the most outstanding characteristic of the structural methods. The other comments about communicative methodology are focused on meaning rather than form, and speaking and listening rather than reading and writing. The secondary characteristic of the structural methods are mentioned as imitations, forms of language, habit formation, error-correction, and accuracy of a language. Thought-effort relationships, and reduction of correction are less important, and fluency in a language are represented as secondary qualities of the communicative methodology by the teachers.
Conclusions

In the wake of their success or weakness, many of the structural methods were exported to a number of countries such as Turkey where English is taught or learned as a foreign language. These methods were introduced into the school systems of Turkey. Although a great effort was made by foreign language teachers using these methods, the success was much less than it was hoped for. The reason for not achieving desired outcomes in teaching/learning English is that learners have been loaded with the study of grammatical points as if they are language teachers. Learners of foreign languages have been taught the usage but not the use of language they need.

The first motive behind teaching grammar is that structural methods are easy for the teachers to use. Classes can be taught in the students' mother tongue with little teaching skill or foreign language communication skill needed by the teachers. In the structurally-oriented classroom, the teacher, as the center of the classroom, explains the grammatical points, makes students use the newly learned items through drills, gets students to read and interpret the texts which are finely-tuned for grammar reinforcement; then students translate literary texts and the lesson finishes. This type of learning does not differ from learning physics or chemistry. But according to communicative methodology enthusiasts, the target language is a vehicle for classroom communication, not just the object of the study. This feature of language learning has been ignored in the structural language methods.
The second reason for using structural methods in language classes in Turkey is because of the teacher's dominant role in the classroom. Many language teachers prefer to use grammar-based methodologies which require minimum participation of the learners. Thus, the teachers who use structural methodologies feel comfortable in the classroom because merely explaining grammatical points requires less effort than preparing and using communicative activities in the classroom. Whereas, the teachers who use communicative language methodology give more respect to learners to indicate their initiatives in learning the target language.

Third, the need for communicative methodology in Turkey is due to the learners' needs. Turkey, a developing country, may need more foreign language speakers in the near future in order to be one of the E.E.C. countries; therefore, learners of English may have to utilize their English with foreigners. This factor seems to be neglected by some of the language teachers and English language programs and unfortunately a certain amount of teachers have not recognized their students' needs yet. If teachers understand the students' needs they can clearly state their goals while teaching English. But this research proves that teachers' goals are neither toward the communicative language methodology nor toward structural ones. It is suggested that since the current needs are clear, English teachers in Turkey need to change their instructions by implementing a methodology which targets more global, i.e. integrative skills, rather than discrete ones. The researcher assumes that besides
thinking of overall considerations, if communicative language methodology is widely implemented in Turkish educational institutions:

1. Students coming from secondary education who do not want to study at the university can be channeled to a variety of labor markets such as tourism, marketing, and economics.

2. Students coming from secondary education who want to study at the university will improve the quality of English programs given at the university.

3. Since the secondary school graduates who do not want to study at the university can earn their living by utilizing their English in the labor market, the great demands of university entrance will be lowered.

4. Teachers' proficiency in English will increase.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


APPENDIXES
Appendix 1: Questionnaire

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE METHODOLOGY (C.L.M.)

Title of the institution:
Teacher's Name:
Faculty of Graduation:
Work experience:

1. Please define the C.L.M. briefly:

2. What instructional activities do you use in the C.L.M.:

3. What is the role of a C.L.M. teacher:

4. What are the goals and objectives of a C.L.M. teacher:

5. Does the C.L.M. increase or decrease the students' motivation:

6. What are the limitations and strengths of the C.L.M. in Turkey:

7. Have you ever received any special training in the C.L.M.:

8. Please compare and contrast the C.L.M. with the traditional language teaching methodologies:
July 28, 1989

Dear Mrs. Olut,

As I informed you before, we as TEFL MA students at Bilkent University have to write major projects. My project title is "Communicative Language Methodology". Attached to my letter, I am sending you the copies of a questionnaire related to my project. If you deliver the copies to my colleagues at Yildiz University, to be filled, I will be grateful. I am looking forward to receiving the results soon.

Sincerely

Murat Yalvac
Sayın Perrin Uner,


Saygılarımla

Murat Yalvac

Adresim: Carsi cad. Cengiz sk. 67/4
Yenimahalle/ANKARA
RESUME

I was born in Ankara in 1962. I completed my elementary and secondary education in Istanbul. In 1981, I began my higher education in Konya at Foreign Languages College. The following year, I transferred to Marmara University, Faculty of Education, English Language Department and I graduated in 1985.

Since 1985, I have been working at Yildiz University as an English Instructor. In the summer of 1988, I attended a six-week course on the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language, sponsored by USIS and the Fulbright Commission at Robert College in Istanbul.

Murat YALVAC
August, 1989