Centre for Research into Language Teaching Methodologies

**PRIMARY LOTE TEACHERS' UNDERSTANDINGS AND BELIEFS
ABOUT COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING:
REPORT ON THE FIRST PHASE OF THE PROJECT**

**Francis Mangubhai
Ann Dashwood
Michael Berthold
Marta Flores
Julie Dale**

**Toowoomba
28 February, 1998.**

PRIMARY LOTE TEACHERS' UNDERSTANDINGS AND BELIEFS ABOUT COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING: REPORT ON THE FIRST PHASE OF THE PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

Communicative language teaching (CLT) has become a buzzword in the field of second language teaching and the sub-field of LOTE teaching is no exception. However, discussions about this approach to teaching with teachers invariably produces a number of beliefs and understandings about it that seem at variance with what researchers have been saying. To state that there is variance between teachers and researchers' conceptions of CLT is not to deny that within each group there is variance also. Nor should this variance be taken to mean that one group has a lien on "truth" while the other group is still groping towards it. It may be that there are two sets of realities that have some common features.

This project sets out to investigate teachers' understandings and beliefs about CLT and determine the similarities and differences between this set of understandings and those expressed in research literature. The project itself is in three phases: The first phase seeks teachers' views about CLT through a questionnaire. It is this phase that is being reported here.

BRIEF LITERATURE REVIEW

A number of influences in the nineteen sixties came together to push the field of second language teaching into examining more closely their teaching the goals. Amongst these influences were those that arose out of the displacement of people by World War II and their language needs in the new country of residence, and the generally greater movement of people through both migration as well as tourism that followed the War, as for, example, occurred in Australia (see Lo Bianco, 1987). It is this movement and the projected greater movement of peoples as a result of the proposed European Economic Community (EEC) that led to the establishment of The Council of Europe's Modern Languages Project in 1963. It was an ambitious initiative to try to promote second language teaching and learning in Europe, both at school level and at adult level in the form of continuing education. And it was learner-centred in its approach (Tudor, 1996).

The Council of Europe Project on curriculum development in early seventies (The Threshold Level Project) looked at the needs of people within the new political reality that was being created. Situations in which learners would be required to use the second language (SL) were analysed in terms of functions that would be required to be fulfilled through the use of the language. This resulted in a functional/notional orientation to curriculum development (Wilkins, 1976). He argued that utterances carry both functional meaning as well as a propositional/conceptual meaning which allows people to express and recognise concepts of time, place and quantity and so on. The syllabus that was advocated would be organised on the basis of functions and notions that learners at various levels of need and proficiency would need in order to perform in the second language. Wilkins (1976) argued that what people want to do with language is more important than the mastery of the language as an unapplied system. The Council of Europe document also specified situations in terms of leaner roles, settings, and topics, and listed language activities, functions and notions - van Ek (1975).

The Council of Europe project focussed on language use. This was echoed by a number of writers who advocated that a shift was needed from teaching a SL as a formal system to teaching a SL as communication (Widdowson, 1978; Allwright, 1979).

On the other side of the Atlantic, Chomsky's distinction between competence and performance was being questioned in the context of language learning. Hymes (1972) claimed that learning a language was more than just learning its grammar. Children learned also how to use it appropriately. As he put it:

> We have then to account for the fact that a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences, not only as grammatical, but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner. In short a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others (Hymes, 1972, p.277).

The debate generated by communicative competence and teaching language for use led increasingly to the view that learners needed to be competent in language use and not just language usage and the type of teaching that would produce learners who were "communicatively competent" increasingly began to be termed *communicative language teaching (CLT)*. From the very beginning it was not envisaged as a unitary method, a method that invariably led to a more-or-less the same list of functions/notions/structures to be learned as in the structural or audiolingual method. In fact, Widdowson (1978) warned that even the list of functions and notions advocated in the Threshold Level Syllabus in Europe could be taught in such a way as to nullify any effects that might lead to communicative competence.

In a comprehensive survey of the theoretical bases for communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing, Canale and Swain (1980) advocated that communicative competence minimally consisted of (1) grammatical competence, (2) sociolinguistic competence which accounted for appropriateness of language used, as well as the knowledge of the rules of discourse, and (3) strategic competence which refers to the verbal and non-verbal communication strategies used to keep communication going.

With regard to teaching methodology, Canale and Swain (1980), amongst other things, emphasised that communication activities in classroom should to be realistic, needing to reflect characteristics of normal conversations in everyday life such as social interactivity, unpredictability and creativity. Closely associated with the concept of realism of activities in classrooms was the notion that the choice of such activities should be driven by the needs of the learners (e.g. Munby, 1978).

The eighties saw refinements in what was understood by communicative language teaching. The need for genuine communicative activities, albeit within the confines of the classroom, led to the development of a number of activities like information-gap activities, jigsaw activities and the like. In each case, the task could only be completed if the information between two or more learners was pooled together. It was hoped that such pooling together of information would occur through the interactive use of language with negotiations of meanings, meaning checks, clarification requests and so on. These types of activities were regarded as coming closest to the ways in which language is used in normal interactions.The principles underpinning activities such as information gap and jigsaw activities relate to the nature of normal communication in which transaction takes place in terms of information transfer from the knower to the non-knower. As a corollary to this, researchers began to talk about these activities promoting learning. A number of principles that related learning to CLT

began to be discussed in literature (Long, 1983; Savignon, 1983). It was claimed that activities involving communication promote learning (Richards and Rodgers, 1986), or activities in which learners are required to carry out meaningful tasks promote learning (Johnson, 1982; Prabhu, 1987).

Since the focus was on communication and the assumption was that communication promoted language learning, classroom focus on teacher looked at how teachers made their language comprehensible. Prabhu (1987, p. 26) put it thus:

> When there was an indication of incomprehension, the teacher adopted such strategies as repeating or rephrasing the statement, breaking it down into smaller propositions, employing non-verbal form of communication, or providing a gloss in the learners' mother tongue, for the purpose of getting the meaning across adequately for the class to make a relevant response.

Communicative language teaching invariably led to the discussion of the respective roles of teachers and students in a CLT classroom. The roles tended to vary somewhat depending upon the particular contexts that writers had in mind when discussing them. Writers like Nunan (1988) talked of a greater role for learners in deciding the type of tasks they might engage in, reflecting the adult migrant context he had worked in previously. By contrast Littlewood (1981) talked about the roles of teachers and students within the context of foreign language learning. Table 1 shows the number of characteristics of CLT that have been discussed in literature as having some impact on learning.

So far the discussion has tended to focussed on what researchers have had to say about CLT. To what extent are the characteristics enumerated in Table 1 to be seen in practice in second language teaching classrooms. One such investigation was carried out in the early 80s and reported by Mitchell (1988). In this project 59 foreign language teachers from 20 schools in Scotland were interviewed in depth concerning their understanding of the nature of "communicative competence". This was followed by 14 teachers of French from 4 schools being observed in their classrooms. In the first phase, the interview phase, Mitchell reports that there was a wide range of understandings about communicative competence held by teachers, for some it being no more than survival language useful in travel to similar understandings as discussed by Canale and Swain (1980). With regards to the centrality of communicative competence among the objectives of FL teaching, there were once again widely differing viewpoints. With regards to teachers' understandings of, and beliefs about, the psycholinguistic processes of language learning, Mitchell says that many teachers still adhered to the many traditional beliefs about ways in which language learning takes place in classroom: "for example, the provision of grammar explanations, and the correction of pupils' formal errors, were justified by many on the ground that they make a direct and significant contribution to the pupils' internalisation of the target language system" (p. 45). The Scottish project took at its point for research the work of Canale and Swain on communicative competence, although in the interviews it dealt with a large variety of topics pertinent to CLT.

Table 1: Characteristics of Communicative Language Teaching

- Emphasis on language use rather than language knowledge.
- More attention is given to fluency and appropriacy than to structural correctness.
- Classroom exercises depend upon spontaneity and trial and error by learners.
- Promotes interpersonal rather than intrapersonal interactions.
- Group and pair work are effective learning modes. These modes are most effectively rendered in small classes.
- It uses authentic materials.
- For the development of communicative ability there needs to be an integration of form-focused exercises with meaning-focused experience.
- Emphasis on tasks that encourage the negotiation of meaning between students and between students and teachers with the goal of making input comprehensible to participants.
- The teacher oscillates between the roles of facilitator and director transmitter.
- The teacher sets an environment that is interactive and not excessive formal.
- A commitment to using the target language as a medium of classroom communication.
- It is learner centred.
- Methodology is geared not only to competence but also to the expectations of those participating in the learning process.
- Learners seem to focus best on grammar when it relates to their communicative needs and experiences.
- Emphasis on successful communication, especially that which involves risk taking.
- Emphasis on learner autonomy and choice of language, topic and so on.
- A communicative classroom seeks to promote interpretation, expression and negotiation of meaning - implying learners are active.
- Context is important in interpreting the meaning of a text (oral or written).

LANGUAGE AUSTRALIA- CRLTM COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT) PROJECT

The main objective of the CLT Project that is being carried out by the Language Australia Centre for Research into Language Teaching Methodologies at the University of Southern Queensland is to identify teachers' understandings and beliefs about CLT (Phase I), to delve into these beliefs using a semi-structured interview format with a selected sub-sample of those who responded in Phase I (Phase II), and to determine how these understandings and beliefs are actually translated in classroom through videotaped lessons (Phase III). The Project itself is in two parts: Part A deals with primary LOTE teachers; Part B deals with secondary LOTE teachers. Results derived from this project will provide another source of information for the content (and processes) of in-service training of LOTE teachers.

In this report, data from only Phase I (Part A) will be presented.

Methodology (Part A)

For Phase I, a questionnaire was used in order to gather information about primary LOTE teachers' understandings and beliefs about aspects of CLT. In Phase II, a semi-structured interview was carried out with 6 primary LOTE teachers teaching French, German, Chinese,

Indonesian, Japanese and Italian. The same teachers were videotaped teaching their best communicative lesson. Only information about the Phase I of the study will be discussed below.

Subjects

The subjects were primary LOTE teachers in the Darling Downs region. Questionnaires were sent to all primary schools in the Darling Downs Region: State, Catholic and Independent. In all 134 questionnaires were sent out. However, many teachers in the State system taught at a number of schools, so when actual teachers were taken into account, there were 50 LOTE teachers involved in teaching at the primary level. Of these 39 returned their questionnaires, giving a very high response rate of 78%.

The first part of the questionnaire sought some background information about the teachers. The modal as well as the median age of the respondents was 40-44 years. There were 28 females and 9 males, with two not supplying the information. The languages covered with number of teachers responding in brackets were: Chinese (2), Italian (2), French (5), Indonesian (6), German (11) and Japanese (13). Of the 39 teachers 16 said that they had not had not any training in methodology. Eight of the teachers were native speakers of the LOTE they were teaching. Of the schools, 21 were rural, 15 urban and 3 were not indicated, while the school type was as follows: State (26), Independent (8) and Catholic (5).

Instrument

The questionnaire was an adaptation of the one used by Karavas-Doukas (1996) with Greek teachers of English as Foreign Language and its aim was to determine the teachers' attitudes towards communicative language teaching. There were 26 questions in the survey, 24 that were originally in the Karavas-Doukas questionnaire, and two that were added (see Appendix 1 for the questionnaire itself). The original instrument used a 5 point Likert scale, with a category "Uncertain". In the adaptation, it was decided to drop this category and insert two other categories "Slightly Agree" and "Slightly Disagree". This adaptation, in fact, did not make much difference to the data, as will discussed below in the next section. The data was grouped so that there were 5 scales: *Groupwork/Pairwork, Error Correction, Role of Grammar, Teacher Role, and Learner Role*. One of Karavas-Doukas's orginal question (#18) and a question that was added (#25) have been dropped from the analysis as they imply immersion type of teaching and this aspect of CLT is not being addressed in this project.

Analysis of the Data

The questionnaires were analysed using frequency counts and percentages. Grouped data, that is, the scales themselves did not provide much information because each of the item in each scale was answered in ways such that aggregation removed the variability (a feature also present in Karavas-Doukas (1996) and acknowledged by her). The data were therefore analysed using each item as a point of interest to see how teachers responded to them. The categories "Slightly Agree" and "Slightly Disagree" presented some problems of interpretation. However, each item was interpreted in light of what literature advocated was the understanding that ought to be with regards to CLT. So, for example, when one looks at Item #13 about Groupwork/Pairwork wasting time, 16 disagreed and 3 strongly disagreed with this statement. The responses of those who chose "Slightly Agree" or "Slightly Disagree" were aggregated with "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" and presented in the table under the heading "Rest" (see Table 3). This gave a total of just over 51% who agreed with this statement. Another way of putting this would be that just over 51% of the respondents

did not clearly disagree with this statement. The reason for this decision was that those who slightly disagreed with this statements were not strong in their belief that groupwork and pairwork are important forms of activity in order develop communicative skills. In other words, as groupwork and pairwork features fairly prominently in the literature on CLT, those who chose a weak response have been deemed not to be strongly committed to this feature of teaching. The tables that are presented in the section are therefore to be read so that the "Rest" represents an aggregate and it also represents an attitude that is not consistent with the espousal of a CLT approach in the classroom.

To some the procedure discussed above will seem controversial. And it is important to understand the reasons for proceeding along those lines. Those who ticked the categories 'Slightly Agree' and 'Slightly Disagree' did not seem to espouse the views expressed in literature on CLT. Thus in the example used above, on the role of groupwork, CLT literature is strong in its claim that groupwork presents more opportunity for language interaction and negotiation and therefore is more likely to lead to the development of communicative abilities in learners.

All data that is discussed in this report has been interpreted in the manner described above and this needs to be kept in mind when reading the tables.

Results

Table 2 presents the grouped data for the five scales in the questionnaire. The five scales are the ones that Karavas-Doukas (1996) had used. Negatively-worded items have been recoded so that 6 is the positive end of the scale.

Table 2: Grouped Data for Various Factors
N=39
Range: 6-1

Factors	Mean	S.D
Groupwork/Pairwork	4.34	1.65
Error correction	3.83	1.41
Role of Grammar	4.40	1.12
Teacher Role	4.31	0.85
Learner Role	4.63	1.15

With 6 being "Strongly Agree" and 1 being "Strongly Disagree" the table would suggest that teachers are very moderately inclined towards the five factors that, amongst others, related to CLT. The highest mean is for the role and contribution of learners themselves suggesting that this is one area in which teachers' beliefs about the contribution that learners can make to their own learning are congruent with the views expressed in the literature. The next highest mean is for the 'Role of Grammar'. A close examination of the items that make up this construct, however, reveals quite marked variations in the understandings and beliefs about this construct.

Tables 3 to 7 present teachers' responses on individual items that make up the five used in the questionnaire. In the presentation of the data in Table 2, responses to negatively worded items were recoded. In the data that are presented in Tables 3 to 7, the negatively worded statements have not been recoded and are indicated by an asterisk. These tables are to be read in light of the discussion in previous section.

Table 3: Groupwork/Pairwork
N=39

Item/Choice	6	5	4	3	2	1	Rest	Rest %
#2 promotes interaction	10	20	7	2			9	23.1
#9 promotes autonomy	4	21	10	1	2		13	33.3
#13 wastes time*		2	7	11	16	3	20	51.3
#21 whole class better*		7	7	9	15	1	23	59.0
#22 difficult to monitor*		4	7	12	15	1	23	59.0

Teachers' understandings and beliefs about the importance of groupwork and pairwork in CLT ranges from an acknowledgment that these types of classroom organisation do indeed promote interaction but about a third of the teachers are not certain how far such activities contribute towards a greater learner autonomy. Just over 50% of the respondents believe or suspect that group work is a waste of time and an equal number seem to regard whole class teaching better. The reaon for these views might lie in #22 in which only 41% (i.e. 16 respondents) definitely disagreed that it was difficult to monitor students in a group or pair situation.

Overall it appears that teachers acknowledge that small groups and pairs promote greater interaction but difficulties of monitoring, and one suspects discipline problems in some cases, lead a number of LOTE teachers to prefer whole class teaching.

Table 4: Error Correction
N=39

Item/Choice	6	5	4	3	2	1	Rest	Rest %
#6 Feedback about appropriateness, not correcting form	4	15	13	5	2		20	51.3
#10 Correct all errors*		4	12	12	10	1	28	71.8
#14 Much correction wasteful of time	1	3	9	2	20	4	35	89.7
#26 Get it correct from the beginning*+	2	5	9	6	14	2	22	57.9

+ N=38

With regard to error correction the responses show an interesting pattern of understandings and beliefs. Just over 51% are not convinced that students are likely to become effective communicators if the feedback they receive from teachers is about appropriateness of their utterances rather than linguistic correctness. As a corollary to this, over 71% of the respondents would correct all mistakes their learners make and almost 90% do not think that since errors are a normal part of learning error correction is wasteful of time. Consistent with the above views is the view that students need to get it correct right from the beginning.

Overall, in the matter of error correction, many teachers like to deal with all errors and are not inclined to focus on fluency without at the same time focussing on accuracy. It seems in the issue of accuracy versus fluency, which incidentally are not mutually exclusive, greater focus on accuracy is likely to evident in many classrooms.

Table 5: Grammar
N=39

Item/Choice	6	5	4	3	2	1	Rest	Rest %
#1 Grammatical correctness most important criterion*	1	3	5	9	16	5	18	46.2
#3 Grammar taught as means not an end	7	25	5		2		7	17.9
#15 CLT leads to fluency but inaccuracy*		4	13	8	12	2	25	64.1
#17 Rules need to be mastered to communicate effectively*		2	6	4	22	5	12	30.8
#12 Knowledge of rules not guarantee about use	10	21	8				8	20.5
#23 Direct teaching of rules important*	1	5	12	12	8	1	30	76.9

With regards to grammar, the majority of teachers believe that it ought to be taught as a means not an end in itself and they acknowledge that knowledge of rules of grammar is not sufficient to ensure that students can use the language for communication. However, teachers also believe that direct teaching of rules and terminology of grammar are important, though the same proportion do not hold the view that rules have to be mastered in order to communicate with a native speaker effective. Finally, there is some suspicion about CLT that it might produce learners who might be fluent but ungrammatical.

With regards to teaching the grammar of the LOTE to learners, teachers seem to hold some views that prima facie appear to be contradictory.

Table 6 Teacher Role
N=39

Item/Choice	6	5	4	3	2	1	Rest	Rest %
#7 Authority figure gone	4	21	7	4	3		14	35.9
#11 Learner needs can't be met in a large class*		9	18	7	5		34	87.2
#16 Transmission only one of many teacher roles	2	16	14	6	1		23	59.0
#19 T's role to impart knowledge*	15	21	2			1	38	97.4
#20 Tasks need to be negotiated & adapted	5	15	16	3			19	48.7
#24 A textbook needs to be supplemented by Ts	26	13					0	0

The teachers see very much their role as imparting knowledge. It may be that at primary level teachers do see their roles in this way. It would be interesting to see whether secondary teachers have a somewhat less marked view of themselves as imparters of knowledge and information. However, many do not see themselves as an authority figure and this transition

from authority figure to another role, as yet not defined for many teachers, is also reflected in item #20 which asked for teachers' reaction to whether tasks should be negotiated and adapted to suit the learners' needs rather than imposed upon them. Only just over 50% clearly agreed with the statement; others either hedged with only slightly agree or disagreed with it.

Table 7: Role & Contribution of Learners
N=39

Item/Choice	6	5	5	4	2	1	Rest	Rest %
#4 Learners can't say what activities they want*		4	1	10	20	4	15	38.5
#5 Making learners autonomous is futile*	1	3	2	4	19	10	10	25.6
#8 Learner-centred teaching develops full potential	7	19	9	2	2		13	33.3

Regarding the role of learners and the contribution they can make to their own learning, the majority of teachers seem positive about learners contributing to their own learning and that a more learner-centred approach is likely to develop the full potential of students. These beliefs sit side by side with beliefs about their roles as transmitters of knowledge.

BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The data presented above reveal that teachers' understandings and beliefs regarding some of the key characteristics of communicative language teaching methodologies is not strong vis-a-vis the relative emphasis that is placed upon them in the literature and official documents. It is true that teachers are eclectic in their approach to teaching but such eclecticism can lead to a de-emphasis on those activities in classrooms which are necessary for the development of communicative abilities in students.

It should also be mentioned as Karavas-Doukas (1996) also does, that the holding of seemingly contradictory views about LOTE teaching might arise from teachers contextualising the statements in the questionnaire in two different teaching-learning situations so that they see themselves as transmitters of knowledge in one context and facilitators of learning in another.

With regard to pairwork and groupwork, the picture that emerges is that a number of LOTE teachers have reservations about the use of such an organisation in classroom because it wastes time and that they are not able to monitor all students. For these reasons many teachers believe that whole class teaching is better. Teachers do acknowledge that pairwork and groupwork is conducive to greater interaction and could promote autonomy in learners but at the same time their beliefs shaped by their classroom experience leads many to be cautious about these modes of classroom organisation. It seems also that such teachers may have difficulties with truly autonomous learners.

In this respect, it is interesting to note that international studies which have compared students and teaching in many countries of the world found that students who did well in Science and Mathematics, for example, came from countries where there was a much greater time spent on task in comparison with other countries which recorded lower time-on-task

figures because considerable amount of time was spent in organising classes into groups (TIMMS Study).

> **Comment [FM1]:** FIND REFERENCE FOR TIMMS STUDY

Regarding error correction, over 71% did not hold the view strongly that it was not necessary to correct all errors, this despite the recent emphasis on giving students opportunities for fluent verbal behaviour, and keeping disruptions from teacher correction to a minimum. There was consistency in teachers' viewpoint on error correction because almost 90% did not think that errors were a normal part of language learning and that error correction was a waste of time. The same consistent viewpoint about errors -- which is different from that advocated in literature (see, for example, Williams, 1995) -- is evident in the question that solicited teachers' views whether they thought language learning is about getting it correct right from the beginning. Over 57% would prefer grammatical correctness from the beginning. With regards to views on error correction, a large proportion of respondents would not subscribe to the view that errors were a natural product of language learning. This may relate to their conception of teacher roles.

Error correction is a complex area (Ellis, 1994) which involves both cognitive and affective domains of the learners and a number of different approaches to corrective feedback, including whether it is peer provided or teacher provided. In this questionnaire such niceties were not explored. At a more gross level, one could argue from these data that many teachers' classroom practices would favour accuracy over fluency, regardless of whether error correction (of certain types) would lead to future accuracy.

Regarding teachers' understanding and beliefs about the role of grammar in second language learning, a majority of the teachers would favour direct teaching of grammar. It seems that the notions of "consciousness-raising" (Sharwood Smith, 1981; Fotos and Ellis, 1991; Ellis, 1993) and the ways that can be achieved in classroom may not be very prevalent amongst teachers. The debate about the balance between accuracy and fluency in classroom activities needs to be worked through by teachers so that they reach a balanced view about these two aspects of language behaviour.

In CLT it is often argued that the teacher needs to be more of a facilitator of student learning than the dispenser of knowledge to the students. It is probable that this facet of teacher role has not been incorporated into teacher behaviours because of lack of concrete exemplars of how this can be done. About 95% of the respondents thought it was the teacher's role to impart knowledge. If we are agreed that language learning is primarily skill-acquisition rather than knowledge-acquisition, then there is a very serious divergence in understandings about the processes of acquiring a second language. This is, however, a question that might be better answered not through a questionnaire but through interviews.

Finally, while learner autonomy has been one of the goals that was outlined in the ALL Guidelines (Vale, Scarino and McKay, 1991), some teachers are not convinced that this is possible. It may be that their responses here reflect their circumstances, that is, the particular group of learners they are engaged with, and that with another set of learners, teachers may all agree that there is a strong role for learners in their own learning of the LOTE.

The first phase of this study has indicated some areas in which teachers' understanding and beliefs about aspects of CLT may differ from those who are writing about CLT and language acquisition from theoretical and research perspectives. In some cases research outcomes have not filtered down or if they have, they have not been incorporated into teachers' belief

systems. Some of this might occur because of teachers' scepticism about research findings and the frequent inability of researchers to speak to teachers in a language that they can relate to.

Survey data might present some indicators of what the situation is but to fully understand the issues a more in-depth study has to be made of ways that teachers operate in classrooms and the many constraints that surround them that may prevent them from carrying out all aspects of planned lessons according to principles that are enunciated in the second language literature.

REFERENCES

Allwright, R. (1979). Language learning through communication practice. In C. J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.). *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp.167-182.

Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis R. (1993). The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 91-113.

Fotos, S. & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(4), 605-628.

Hymes D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics: selected readings*. Harmondworth: Penguin.

Johnson, K. (1982). *Communicative syllabus design and methodology*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT Journal*, 50/3, 187-198.

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lo Bianco, J. (1987). *National policy on languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Long, M. (1983).Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-141.

Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative language teaching in practice*. London: CILTR.

Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum: A study in second language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prabhu, N.S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative competence: theory and classroom practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, 159-169.

Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centredness as language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Ek, J. (1975). *The threshold level in a European unit/credit system for modern language learning by adults*. Systems Development in Adult Language Learning. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Vale, D., Scarino, A. & McKay, P. (1991). *Pocket ALL*. Carlton, Vic.: Curriculum Corporation.

Widdowson, H. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, J. (1995). Focus on form on communicative language teaching: Research findings and the classroom teacher. *TESOL Journal*, 4(4), 12-16.

APPENDIX 1
The University of Southern Queensland
Centre for Research into Language Teaching Methodologies

This questionnaire has been designed to give an indication of teachers' attitudes to certain aspects of LOTE teaching. Please respond to the questions in relation to your own teaching and beliefs. There are two parts to this questionnaire. Please respond to both the parts.

A. Background Information

Please tick the boxes where they are supplied.

1. School: state   ☐   rural   ☐
                        independent ☐   urban   ☐
                        catholic   ☐

2. Gender: female   ☐
                     male   ☐

3. Age: 20-24 ☐   30-34 ☐   40-44 ☐   50-54 ☐   60+   ☐
             25-29 ☐   35-39 ☐   45-49 ☐   55-59 ☐

4. Language: Chinese   ☐
                     French   ☐
                     German   ☐
                     Indonesian ☐
                     Italian   ☐
                     Japanese   ☐

5. Are you a native speaker or a non-native speaker of the LOTE you teach?
      native speaker   ☐   non-native speaker   ☐

6.(a) Have you undergone LOTE methodology training as part of your formal studies?
        yes   ☐   no   ☐

  (b) If the answer to 6(a) was yes, was it primary, secondary or K-12 training?
             primary ☐   secondary ☐   K-12 ☐

  (c) Where was the training done?   Australia ☐   other ☐

  (d) If the answer to 6(c) was *other*, in which country was it undertaken? _____

7. Length of time since LOTE training (years):

        < 5 ☐   6-10 ☐   11-15 ☐   16-20 ☐

        21-25 ☐   26-30 ☐   >30 ☐   n.a. ☐

8. How many LOTE inservice courses have you attended in the last five years (at least one day long)?

0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	>10
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Part B   *Please tick the box that represents your level of agreement with each of the statements*

	Strongly Agree 6	Agree 5	Slightly Agree 4	Slightly Disagree 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1
1. Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance (actual language used) should be judged.						
2. Group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students.						
3. Grammar should be taught only as a means to an end and not as an end in itself.						
4. Since the learner comes to the language classroom with little or no knowledge of the language, he/she is in no position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for him/her.						
5. Training learners to take responsibility for their own learning is futile since learners are not used to such an approach.						
6. For students to become effective communicators in the foreign language, the teachers' feedback must be focused on the appropriateness and not the linguistic form of the students' responses.						

	Strongly Agree 6	Agree 5	Slightly Agree 4	Slightly Disagree 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1
7. The teacher as 'authority' and 'instructor' is no longer adequate to describe the teacher's role in the language classroom.						
8. The learner-centred approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential.						
9. Group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning. It is therefore an invaluable means of organising classroom experiences.						
10. The teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make. If errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning.						
11. It is impossible in a large class of students to organise your teaching so as to suit the needs of all.						
12. Knowledge of the rules of language does not guarantee ability to use the language.						
13. Group work activities take too long to organise and waste a lot of valuable teaching time.						
14. Since errors are a normal part of learning, much correction is wasteful of time.						
15. The communicative approach to language teaching produces fluent but inaccurate learners.						
16. The teacher as transmitter of knowledge is only one of the many different roles he/she must perform during the course of a lesson.						

	Strongly Agree 6	Agree 5	Slightly Agree 4	Slightly Disagree 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1
17. By mastering the rules of grammar, students become fully capable of communicating with a native speaker.						
18. For most students language is acquired most effectively when it is used as a vehicle for doing something else and not when it is studied in a direct or explicit way.						
19. The role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing, and modelling.						
20. Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than imposed upon them.						
21. Students do their best when taught as a whole class by the teacher. Small group work may occasionally be useful to vary the routine, but it can never replace sound formal instruction by a competent teacher.						
22. Groupwork activities have little use since it is very difficult for the teacher to monitor the students' performance and prevent them from using their mother tongue.						
23. Direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.						
24. A textbook alone is not able to cater for all the needs and interests of the students. The teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students.						

	Strongly Agree 6	Agree 5	Slightly Agree 4	Slightly Disagree 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1
25. Language learning in the classroom is about students using the second language regularly in a natural way						
26. Language learning is about getting it right from the beginning.						

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE