Similarities and differences in teachers' and researchers' conceptions of communicative language teaching: Does the use of an educational model cast a better light?

Francis Mangubhai
Perc Marland
Ann Dashwood
Jeong-Bae Son

University of Southern Queensland
Toowoomba, Queensland 4350
Australia
Email contact: mangubha@usq.edu.au

Similarities and differences in teachers' and researchers' conceptions of communicative language teaching: Does the use of an educational model cast a better light? [1]

Abstract

This study seeks to document teachers' conceptions of communicative language teaching (CLT) and to compare their conceptions with a composite view of CLT assembled, in part, from researchers' accounts of the distinctive features of CLT. The research was prompted by a review of the relevant research literature showing that, though previous studies in this area have pointed to some significant differences between teachers' and researchers' conceptions of CLT, the results are still inconclusive. In this study, usual methods for accessing teachers' understandings of CLT, such as observation and questionnaire, have been replaced by one that examines teachers' practical theories that guide their use of CLT approaches in classrooms. Semi-structured interviews and video-stimulated recall interviews were used to gain access to teachers' practical theories of CLT. The interview data show that while these teachers collectively have internalized most of the elements of communicative approaches, there are many individual variations. The data also show that these teachers have integrated aspects of communicative approaches into an overall view of teaching that incorporates many features not normally mentioned in the second language literature.

I. Introduction

For quite some time now, as in other countries, teachers of foreign languages in Australian schools have been urged to use an approach referred to as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)[2], also known as the Communication and Language approach. This approach, which places a greater emphasis on the use of the foreign language in the classroom, both between teacher and students, and between students, has been incorporated into the Australian Language Level (ALL) guidelines (Vale et al., 1991), thereby endorsing the use of this approach by Australian teachers of Languages Other Than English (LOTE).[3]

As a result of this commitment to a more communicative approach, all state education authorities and teacher educators at both pre-service and in-service levels have made strenuous efforts to induct practising and prospective teachers in the use of this approach. Inevitably, questions have

been asked about the dividends from these efforts to get teachers to use this approach. Providers want to know, for example, whether teachers have developed a clear and comprehensive understanding of CLT and whether they are successfully integrating a CLT approach into their teaching of LOTE subjects. The review of literature below examines the current state of research into such questions.

II. Review of Literature

The literature on what teachers understand by a CLT approach, the extent to which they have incorporated it into their teaching and whether their conceptions of CLT have much in common with those of researchers is quite limited. A well-known earlier study (Fröhlich et al., 1985; see also Spada and Frölich, 1995) looked at the differences between teachers in their orientation to communicative instruction using a scheme, Communication Orientation to Language Teaching (COLT), designed to capture those differences. Using this classification scheme Fröhlich and her colleagues were able to classify language classes as more or less communicative in their orientation. Studies designed to explore teachers' understanding of a CLT approach, however, appear to be few. The first of these was a study by Mitchell (1988) which used in-depth interviews to investigate what 59 foreign language teachers in Scotland understood by 'communicative competence'. Mitchell reported that teachers in her study held a variety of understandings of this term. They ranged from a view of communicative competence as a survival language for travellers to foreign countries to an understanding described in terms of grammatical, strategic, sociolinguistic and discourse competences. Many of the teachers, according to Mitchell, held beliefs about the acquisition of a second language that were not consistent with those underpinning a CLT approach.

Some ten years later in Australia, Mangubhai, Dashwood, Berthold, Flores and Dale (1998) used an adaptation of a questionnaire developed by Karavas-Doukas (1996) to find out the understandings and beliefs about CLT held by 39 LOTE teachers. Data from this source were complemented by data from interviews with six of the respondents to the questionnaire. These researchers concluded that teachers had understandings and beliefs about CLT that differed from those of CLT researchers and theorists.

In another Queensland study (Sato and Kleinsasser, 1999), ten teachers of Japanese, who were native Japanese speakers themselves, were found to hold one of four conceptions of CLT. Some viewed CLT as about learning to communicate in the second language, others saw it as involving mainly speaking and listening to Japanese while yet others viewed CLT as an approach that involved little instruction in grammar. A fourth group saw CLT as involving the use of activities that were time-consuming. Use of observational techniques in this study indicated that the teachers used a didactic approach in which grammar instruction played a central role, features not consistent with theoretical conceptions of CLT, nor, it would seem, with views expressed in the interviews and on their questionnaires.

Overall, these studies suggest that teachers' conceptions of CLT differ in some critical ways from those held by researchers, a finding supported by a number of researchers and writers (Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Nunan, 1987; Rollmann, 1994; Savignon, 2002; Thompson, 1996; Whitley, 1993; Williams, 1995). Many of the studies on communicative approaches to second language teaching have tended to investigate those aspects of teachers' behaviours that are, or are not, congruent with conceptions of communicative approaches either through classroom observation (e.g. Nunan, 1987) or through questionnaires (e.g., Karavas-Doukas, 1996). These

studies have not investigated a CLT approach as part of the overall approaches of teachers to teaching in the language classrooms and thus locating this approach within an overall architecture of teacher beliefs and thinking. Moreover, because most studies have tended to be small scale and involved non-representative samples of teachers, the evidence in relation to the two questions identified earlier appears somewhat inconclusive.

The use of questionnaires inviting teachers to respond to a limited set of statements, devised by researchers in order to document teachers' understandings of CLT, also imposes a number of undesirable constraints. It does not allow teachers to provide personal interpretations of CLT approaches, to extend the descriptors of CLT approaches beyond those in the set of statements in the questionnaire or to use their own language and constructs for communicating their understandings of CLT in a manner suggested by, for example Brumfit (2001). What this review indicates is that there is no definitive answer to the question as to whether teachers have a full and accurate understanding of CLT and whether their classroom practice reflects such an understanding. Clearly, further research into teachers' conceptions of CLT and how these differ, if at all, from conceptions of CLT held by researchers, is necessary.

III. Outline of Project

A two-phase project was designed seeking answers to two questions: What do teachers understand by CLT? How similar are teachers' practical conceptions of CLT to those held by advocates of this approach? As the project was to involve adoption of a novel framework for investigating teachers' understandings of CLT, novel at least in the field of second language teaching, the project was conceived as a small-scale study involving only six teachers. The

decision to restrict the scope of the project was made to allow for thorough trialling of data-collection methods.

Participants

Teachers sought for involvement in this project were those claiming to be using CLT in their classrooms. Approaches to seven local primary and secondary schools yielded six volunteers (5 female, 1 male) who were full-time teachers of LOTE subjects at either Year 7 or Year 10 (amongst other year levels) and who claimed to be using CLT approaches. All but one, who was born in Holland and came to Australia in her youth, were Anglo-Australians and all had spent time as residents in foreign countries whose languages they were teaching. The group comprised one secondary teacher of each of German and Chinese, two secondary teachers of Japanese and two primary teachers, one of Indonesian and the other of Japanese. Hence languages taught included both scripted and non-scripted languages.

Teaching experience of the six participants ranged from 3 to 40 years, with a mean of 23.7 years. Experience as a LOTE teacher ranged from 3 to 33 years (mean: 13.8 years). All had participated in at least two in-service courses in LOTE (range: 2 to 5; mean 3.2) with 4 reporting that LOTE teaching studies had also featured in their pre-service courses. Given the emphasis on the use of CLT in LOTE classes in Queensland schools, teacher participation in LOTE courses was seen as a proxy for at least some exposure to CLT. Further details of their pre- and in-service LOTE courses were not sought because such data were unrelated to the focus of this study.

Overview of Phase 1

The first phase, already completed (see Mangubhai et al., In Press), sought insights into what the six teachers understood by a CLT approach by assisting them, during interviews, to make explicit their practical theories of CLT. Practical theories are viewed as "… notions about how to teach which have been crafted by individual teachers from their own experiences of teaching to suit their own particular work settings. [They are] … the valued residue of countless hours of practice, trial and error and reflection (Marland, 1998: 16). The rationale for this decision was that, because teachers' classroom behaviours are largely shaped by their practical theories (Marland, 1998; Sanders and McCutcheon, 1987), documenting teachers' practical theories should reveal what teachers understand by CLT approaches.

Data on teachers' practical theories were gathered during two, hour-long in-depth interviews and two stimulated-recall interviews in which lesson videos were used to prompt teacher recall of aspects of their practical theories. Both sources of data were audiotaped. In-depth interviews were semi-structured and required the interviewer to be empathetic, supportive and non-evaluative, to ask open-ended questions, to seek clarification and extension of teachers' self-report data where necessary and to use the language of interviewees as much as possible. Stimulated-recall interviews involved the use of video-tapes of two CLT lessons taught by the teachers to prompt recall of aspects of their practical theories that may not have been disclosed during in-depth interviews. Teachers were asked to stop the video-tape where aspects of their CLT approaches were in evidence and to explain the thinking that underpinned their use. In this context, the interviewer took the roles of facilitator and client-centred counsellor in order to assist teachers to disclose all aspects of their practical theories about the use of CLT approaches.

(Full details of the approaches adopted in both types of interviews are provided in the earlier paper, Mangubhai et al., In Press)

An account of each teacher's practical theory, in respect of one particular Grade 7 or Grade 10 class, was prepared from transcriptions of interview data. Once prepared, these accounts, usually about 12 to 15 type-written pages and reporting words used by the teachers as much as possible, were then given to the relevant teachers with the request that they modify them, where necessary, to ensure that they provided accurate and comprehensive accounts of their practical theories of CLT.

Overview of Phase 2

The second phase of the study, the focus of this paper, was designed to compare teachers' understandings of CLT with those of researchers. This phase involved:

- Preparation of a list of key attributes of CLT approaches (referred to in the study as 'criterial attributes'). Most of these attributes were located in the CLT literature while others were added by members of the research team with high-level expertise in CLT and its use in classrooms. This was done in order to provide a more complete list that would cover teachers' practical concerns.

- Analysis of teacher interview data to identify those features considered by teachers to be features of CLT. Comparisons of these features with criterial attributes nominated by researchers were then to be made; and

- Administration to participating teachers of a questionnaire based on the list of criterial attributes of CLT. This was done to provide another perspective on teachers' conceptions of CLT and as a means of cross-checking data in practical theories.

IV. Methods

1. Step 1: Preparation of a list of Criterial Attributes

Criterial attributes of a CLT approach were identified in literature dealing with conceptions of CLT (e.g. Canale and Swain, 1980; Finnochiaro and Brumfit, 1983; Johnson, 1982; Littlewood, 1981; Nunan, 1987; Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Savignon, 1983, 1991; Thompson, 1996; Whitley, 1993). Where authors had made lists of such features there was much that was common amongst the lists. Thus, attributes consistent with a widely shared view about distinctive features of CLT were included, while those at odds with this view or that represented a singularly idiosyncratic view of CLT were usually omitted. The search for criterial attributes of CLT was also shaped by the set of constructs embodied in Joyce and Weil's (1992) framework for providing comprehensive accounts of approaches to, or models of, teaching. This framework uses the following constructs: *goal focus*, *theoretical assumptions*, *social system* (described in terms of *teacher role*, *student role*, *teacher-student relationships*, and *normal student behaviors*), *support system* (described in terms of *teacher skills*, *teacher attributes* and *special resources*), *principles of teacher reaction*, and *instructional and nurturant effects*. Brief descriptions of these constructs are given in Appendix 1. The Joyce and Weil framework was chosen because it is widely used, and with some success in teacher education programs, for familiarizing teachers with new approaches to teaching and assisting them to implement them in their classrooms (see for example Joyce et al., 1981; Joyce and Showers, 1982; Joyce & Weil with Showers, 1992).

Moreover, many of the constructs in the Joyce and Weil framework have close parallels with those used to document the practical theories of teachers (Marland, 1998).

In some construct areas, for example, *Teacher-Student Relationships* and *Normal Student Behaviours*, the attributes located in the literature were quite limited. When this situation arose, attributes were proposed by research team members with CLT expertise in order to provide a more comprehensive account of CLT and one that would cover the practical concerns of teachers. Such proposals were carefully evaluated by the research team and adopted only if they met with the unanimous approval of all team members. In identifying characteristics of a communicative approach, no attempt has been made to evaluate whether there is universal agreement about them; they have been taken at face value as they appear in the literature.

The search for criterial attributes was further restricted by a decision to identify only those attributes aligned with the interactive phase of teaching, that is, the phase when a lesson is implemented. Thus, attributes related to both the pre-active or planning phase of teaching, and the post-active or evaluation phase of teaching, were not included. In retrospect, as will be discussed later, the decision to ignore the post-active phase of teaching, the phase usually devoted to evaluation of the lesson, was ill-advised.

Criterial attributes of CLT were then placed in categories corresponding very closely to the constructs in Joyce and Weil's (1992) framework.

It should be noted that the only construct from Joyce and Weil's framework not used to categorize criterial attributes was 'syntax' or 'phasing', a reference to the sequence of activities

within an approach or model of teaching. This construct was replaced by 'strategies' for two main reasons. The first reason is that a CLT approach is not limited to one central strategy, as is commonly the case in models described by Joyce and Weil, but may include several, such as role play, games and group methods, each with its own particular phasing. The second reason is that, to serve the purposes of this research project, it was necessary to have teachers identify only the strategies they believed consistent with a CLT approach and not have them describe the sequence of activities specific to each strategy.

Using this framework, a list of 62 criterial attributes was distributed among the construct categories and subcategories provided by the Joyce and Weil framework (see Appendix 1 for the complete list). Though the CLT literature provides a degree of validation of this set of criterial attributes, the list was also sent out for validation purposes to a number of researchers with national and international reputations as CLT experts. Feedback from this group, while resulting in a number of adjustments, mainly to wording, indicated general endorsement of the list.

2. Step 2: Identification of features of CLT as presented in teacher in-depth interviews

All interview data were transcribed and entered into files using Nvivo software to facilitate analysis of textual data. These data were then analyzed using a two-phase system of textual analysis. The first phase, unitization, involved the reduction of all text spoken by interviewees into ideational units. An ideational unit was defined as all the words uttered by an interviewee at a particular point in the discourse that dealt with a single idea. Units ranged in length from just a few words to several lines of text as the following examples show:

1. And I expect them to be tolerant of errors (Guy, Interview 2) (Coded: TAS7, Classroom culture should be characterized by teacher/student tolerance of learner error.)

2. I'll be there to guide (Adele, Interview 1) (Coded: TR2, Guide rather than transmitter of knowledge.)

3. I use German television programs a lot, especially the ones with advertisements on it. They're very very good. I tape "Inspector Rex" and they love it (Doreen, Interview 1) (Coded: SPR1, Authentic L2 materials.)

4. So I have to really hold back and allow them to make those mistakes. And hopefully that encourages them to take more risks. Because I am not going to say "oh, that's wrong" (Bess, Interview 1) (Coded: TAS8, Risk-taking by students should be overtly encouraged.).

Under a process referred to as classification, units were then sorted into categories corresponding to the constructs, with the one exception noted earlier, for describing models of teaching (see Joyce and Weil, 1992). Another category of unit, 'teacher affect', was added to the original 13 to accommodate all teacher references to their affective states (hopes, feelings, etc.) while a category called 'grand other' was used for all left-over or miscellaneous units. In all, then, 15 categories were used to classify the thought units in teachers' interview data.

Interview data also contained numerous references by teachers to contextual features relating to community, school, class and individual students. Provision of such details was actively sought so that teachers' practical theories could be contextualized. These details were coded but were used only in the preparation of accounts of teachers' perceptions of the contexts to which their

practical theories of CLT applied. This sorting of units into broad categories completed the first of two classification stages.

In the second stage of classification, units in each of the above categories, excluding 'grand other' and 'teacher affect', were then further broken down into sub-categories corresponding to the 62 criterial attributes of CLT approaches. Those within each of the 13 categories which could not be thus categorized were placed in miscellaneous categories referred to as 'other'. For example, all units coded as belonging to the 'teacher role' category were assigned, where possible, to one of the six sub-categories of teacher role regarded as an essential feature of CLT approaches. These included teacher as 'facilitator', 'guide rather than transmitter of knowledge', 'organizer of resources', 'analyst of student needs', 'counselor/corrector', and 'group process manager'. All other 'teacher role' units that could not be placed in one of the six sub-categories above were placed in the miscellaneous category 'teacher role other'. With the exception of contextual details, frequencies of units in the other 15 categories and sub-categories were then aggregated on a per-teacher basis.

All interview data were coded by the same member of the research team who had had extensive experience in this type of textual analysis. Initially, during development of the classification system, analysis proceeded slowly with coding of small chunks of text by all research team members being subjected to careful scrutiny until a comprehensive system of coding was stabilized. Eventually, after details of the classification system had been stabilized, checks on the reliability of coding were conducted on random selections of text comprising 10% of all textual material. The formula used (Brophy and Evertson, 1973) is regarded as a stringent one, yielding a conservative measure of reliability. Use of this formula provided reliability figures of 93% or

better for phase 1 coding (unitization) and 78% for phase 2 coding (classification), figures regarded as indicating a very satisfactory level of reliability. Once textual analysis had been completed, all instances of each type of unit were collated. Print-outs of these data were prepared for use in the preparation of accounts of practical theories and for calculating frequencies of each type of unit.

3. Step 3: Design and Administration of Questionnaire

To provide an alternative and complementary database on teachers' conceptions of CLT, a questionnaire was designed. The questionnaire data were to be used to provide another perspective for comparing teachers' and researchers' conceptions of CLT and to check the extent to which teachers' conceptions of CLT approaches, as revealed in their practical theories, matched those revealed in their questionnaire responses.

Items in the questionnaire took the form of statements about CLT approaches to which teachers were invited to respond. In all, the questionnaire comprised 80 statements, 62 of which were based on criterial attributes of CLT (see Appendix 1). A further 18 statements were included covering aspects of LOTE teaching that were elements of general teaching either not associated with CLT approaches or at odds with them. These 18 additional items were included to further gauge the clarity and precision of teachers' conceptions of CLT approaches and the extent to which their responses to questionnaire items received thoughtful consideration.

Teachers were invited to respond to each statement in two ways, first by indicating, on a four point scale ('strongly agree' [SA], 'agree' [A], 'disagree' [D] and 'strongly disagree' [SD]), the degree to which they considered each statement represented a feature of CLT approaches. Teachers were also asked to indicate on a five-point scale ('very frequently' [VF], 'often' [O],

'sometimes' [S], 'rarely' [R] and 'never' [N]), the extent to which they believed the aspect of teaching outlined in each statement surfaced in their teaching. Given the focus of this paper, however, data relating to the second type of response are not provided in this paper and are therefore not discussed.

Questionnaires were sent out to teachers for completion some six months after interviews were conducted and classroom lessons videotaped. This time delay was used to reduce the possibility that questionnaire responses were not contaminated by interview discussions that occurred during the earlier data collection phase. Responses from all six teachers were obtained and collated.

V. Results

1. Frequencies per teacher of units across categories of teaching framework

The first phase in the classification of units involved the broad categorization of units into the 15 features, as described above, of the framework for describing teaching approaches adapted from Joyce and Weil (1992). This phase yielded the results shown in Table 1 below. These data show that:

- All of the constructs for describing approaches to teaching within the Joyce and Weil framework are represented in the interview data of the group of teachers as a whole. However, one construct was not represented in the data of two teachers, namely 'teacher-student relationships' in the case of one teacher and 'teacher attributes' in the other. It should also be noted that, during the interviews, teachers were offered

opportunities to add other features of their practical theories not covered in interviews, including metaphors and images. All teachers indicated that they had nothing further to add to what they had revealed in the interviews.

- Units corresponding to criterial attributes of CLT approaches in teachers' interview data represent overall only about one-third of the total units coded, varying for individual teachers from 20% to 36%. In other words, almost two-thirds of the coded units dealt with matters other than attributes identified as criterial in this study, suggesting that teachers' thinking about their use of a CLT approach is not limited to attributes identified in this study as criterial.

- Constructs in the Joyce and Weil framework with relatively high numbers of units are 'theoretical assumptions' (23%), 'strategies' (14%), 'special resources' (7%), 'goal foci' (6%), 'teacher roles' (6%) and 'normal student behaviours' (5%). Those constructs with relatively low numbers of units are 'teaching skills' (2%), 'instructional effects' (2%) and 'teacher-student relationships' (1%). One explanation for these results is that, in teachers' minds, features of CLT approaches represented by the high incidence units are more critical or more problematical than those represented by the low incidence units. As a result, high incidence units feature more prominently in their thinking and revelations about their practical theories of CLT. At the same time, low incidence units could also be related to those aspects of teaching that have become routinized and so are rarely the foci of teacher thinking, the type of tacit knowledge that Shavelson and Stern (1981) discussed and that Berliner (1987)

Table 1 about here

15

says results from the formation of scripts that make teacher action appear automatized.

2. Distribution of units across criterial attributes

Classification of units appearing in teachers' in-depth interviews into the various unit sub-categories resulted in the frequencies shown in Table 2. These data show that:

- Sixty of the 62 criterial attributes were located in the interview data of one or more of the teachers. The two 'missing' criterial attributes were both 'teacher attributes', namely 'outgoingness' and 'proficiency in English for native speakers of LOTEs'. In other words, no teacher considered either of these teacher attributes as essential for teachers using CLT approaches. This is understandable in the case of the second attribute because all the teachers in this study were native or near-native speakers of English. It is much more likely to be a concern of non-native English speakers teaching a foreign language in a predominantly English-speaking environment. Overall, the high level of similarity between the six teachers' (collectively) thinking about CLT features and those of the researchers in literature suggests that the features frequently discussed in literature have some resonance with teachers.

- The number of criterial attributes cited by individual teachers ranged from 28 to 42 with a mean of 36 (58% of the total list of 62). (Individual percentages ranged from 45% to 68%.) This evidence suggests that only a very moderate level of agreement exists between these teachers and experts on essential features of CLT approaches.

- Only 12 of the 62 criterial attributes were located in the interview data of all six teachers. However, 30 of the 62 criterial attributes were located in the interview data of at least four of the six teachers. In other words, there was a high measure of agreement between experts and teachers in respect of 30 of the 62 criterial attributes. Three of the six teachers agreed with the experts on a further 10 criterial attributes. Areas in which criterial attributes identified by 50% or more of teachers tended to cluster included goal foci (2 of 2), theoretical assumptions (10 of 14), strategies (4 of 6), teacher roles (5 of 6), student roles (4 of 4), normal student behaviours (4 of 5), special resources (3 of 3) and instructional and nurturant effects (2 of 3).

- Of the remaining 22 of the 62 criterial attributes, two were not mentioned by any one teacher, while the 20 attributes were located in the interview data of only one or two teachers. That is, there was a low measure of expert/teacher agreement in respect of these 22 criterial attributes. Criterial attributes with this low level of agreement tended to cluster in the following areas: teacher-student relationships (2 of 3), teaching skills (2 of 3), teacher attributes (4 of 6) and principles of teacher reaction (5 of 7).

Table 2 here

VI. Questionnaire Data

To effect some economy of space, only questionnaire results indicating a level of disagreement between teachers and researchers are provided (see Table 3). (Copies of the questionnaire, a five-page document, together with the full set of results, are available from the authors.) Data in Table 3 show that there were disagreements between one or more of the group of teachers and researchers on 20 questionnaire items. These 20 items correspond to only 18 of the criterial

attributes because four questionnaire items (two sets of two), namely items 4 (f) and 4 (g) and 11 (d) and 11(e), were derived from two criterial attributes, TR 5 and PTR 3 respectively (see Appendix 1). In other words, all six teachers agreed with 44 of the 62 attributes of CLT approaches regarded as criterial (cf 12 in the case of in-depth interview data).

As the data in Table 3 show, the degree of disagreement between the group of teachers and researchers on the 20 questionnaire items varied from minor to major. A majority of teachers (i.e. four or five) agreed with the experts on all but three of these items. Those items on which there was substantial disagreement (three or more teachers disagreeing) were items 2m (With CLT approaches, emphasis is placed on meaning-focussed self-expression rather than language structure) (five teachers disagreeing), 2e (With CLT approaches, communication among classroom participants is authentic, i.e. communication is spontaneous, not previously planned) , 10b (Special resources required in CLT approaches include people with the LOTE facility in the community) (three teachers disagreeing on each) and 12 (c) (The outcomes of CLT approaches should include greater understanding of one's own culture and mother tongue (3 teachers disagreeing). Of the 33 separate instances of disagreement by individual teachers, on only four occasions was the scale of disagreement extreme. That is, there were only four statements to which a response of 'strongly disagree' was recorded, one teacher responding thus to items 10b (see above) and 2p (With CLT approaches, more attention is given, initially, to fluency and appropriate usage than to structural correctness) and two teachers to item 2m (see above).

Scrutiny of the responses of individual teachers to statements in the questionnaire showed that of the 33 occasions when teachers responded with 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' to questionnaire items, 10 were made by one teacher, nine by a second and seven by a third. Thus three teachers,

interestingly the lesser experienced of the LOTE teachers, accounted for 26 of the 33 disagreements.

Insert Table 3 here

VII. Discussion

Three matters will be dealt with in this section of the paper: The adequacy of the Joyce and Weil framework; comparisons of teacher and researcher conceptualizations of CLT approaches, as revealed by analysis of interview data; and comparisons of teachers' and researchers' conceptualizations of CLT approaches, as revealed in questionnaire data.

1. Adequacy of the Joyce and Weil Framework

There is some evidence to suggest that the framework used by Joyce and Weil (1992) for describing approaches to teaching was an adequate one for capturing the principal features of teachers' practical theories of CLT and hence their understandings of CLT. This opinion is grounded in two sets of data. First, there were negative responses from all teachers to the invitation to add any other aspects of their CLT approaches not covered in interviews. Second, analysis of interview data revealed only two categories of units falling outside the Joyce and Weil framework, the 'teacher affect' and 'grand other' categories. The first of these categories contained a small number of units in which teachers recorded a range of feelings. These included references to the fulfillment they derived from teaching LOTEs and from the subsequent successes of their students in language studies at the tertiary level and in careers. On the negative side, reference was made to the frustrations, disappointments and anger they felt at negative and non-supportive school and community attitudes to LOTEs and their host cultures. The 'grand other' category, though quite numerous, contained nothing related to CLT approaches or

teaching LOTEs per se. Many of the entries under this category had to do with school organization and education generally, personal experiences in the country of the foreign language, observations on the culture associated with native speakers of the foreign language, general remarks about the curriculum, and other asides.

While the Joyce and Weil framework captured many aspects of teachers' practical theories, it lacked two categories that would have allowed quite distinct and important features of these teachers' theories to be identified separately. Without the two separate categories, these features were coded as belonging to miscellaneous or 'other' categories and were thus denied the prominence they deserved. The first of these features relates to assessment and evaluation of students, the second to general principles of teaching. Accordingly, it would seem beneficial to add categories to the framework to accommodate references to these two distinct features of practical theories. Reasons for this suggestion are two-fold. One is that units related to these aspects of teaching were quite numerous. A second reason is the significance attached to them by teachers. Evaluation/assessment of students was seen as important because it provided a basis for checking on and guiding student learning, designing and adjusting lessons and reporting to parents and education and employment agencies. One of the teachers, Doreen, explains one of the ways she evaluates:

> … (s)ometimes, the kids'll say, 'Miss, you haven't tested us for speaking this term.' And I'll say 'but I have.' They'll look at me, and they'll say, 'When?' I'll say, 'Well over the last couple of weeks I've talked to you a little bit. I've listened to you talk to others. That's good enough for me'; and they'll say, 'That's cheeky, that's sneaky'; and I'll say, 'It doesn't matter, it doesn't have to be done [formally]. (Doreen, Interview 2)

Another teacher, Adele, evaluates students and stores that information for future use.

> And I try and pick out the key things, and if there's a common error that's coming up, not
>
> in everyone's work but in a fair amount of the work, well then I'll make sure that comes
>
> into the next activity or piece of work … [in that way] we can reinforce the correctness of
>
> that particular one, with lots of examples, and things like that. (Adele, Interview 2)

Herein, then, lie the reasons for the earlier comment about the inappropriateness of the decision
to omit criterial attributes related to the post-active or evaluation phase from the list. The list of
criterial attributes could then have been extended to cover teacher evaluation. Clearly, the
interactive phase is one in which teachers engage in considerable evaluation of such matters as
student progress, aspects of the lesson and their own role in classroom proceedings.

General principles of teaching were also a focus of considerable comment in teacher interviews.
These provided guidelines used during lessons by teachers in, for example, the distribution of
resources, formation of groups, allocation of time for activities, singling out students for one-on-
one teacher assistance and seeking student inputs. Though units of this type could be
accommodated under the 'principles of teacher reaction other' sub-category, these guidelines
appeared to play such a key role in shaping lesson events that, having a category for 'general
principles of teaching' in addition to one for 'principles of teacher reaction', would seem
appropriate. The addition of this category would also give due recognition to a finding of
research into teacher thinking (Clark and Peterson, 1986; Elbaz, 1983) , which points to the
prominence of this construct in teachers' practical knowledge and theories. Finally, while Joyce
and Weil assumed that the use of their model would take into account contextual factors, it

seems that teacher thinking and teacher action would be better understood if the contextual factors were made explicit as a category within this framework.

2. Teacher conceptualizations of CLT approaches as revealed in interview data and comparisons with researcher conceptualizations

Data set out in Tables 2 and 3 above indicate that the six teachers have a different conceptualization of CLT approaches from that represented by the experts' list of 62 criterial attributes. Accounts of their practical theories of CLT contained, on average, numerous references to features regarded by experts as criterial attributes of CLT but three times as many references to features not included in the list of criterial attributes. A close examination of a range of units in 'other' categories suggests that teachers have integrated many features of general teaching into their practical conceptualizations of CLT approaches. Their theories for teaching CLT seem to incorporate factors outside those listed as criterial attributes by researchers.

Some illustrations may make this point clearer. A study of units in the 'goal focus other' category reveals that 5 of the 6 teachers nominated 'student enjoyment' as an important goal of their use of CLT approaches. Similarly, interviews contained numerous references to: the use of 'chalk and talk' as an important strategy; 'disciplinarian' as a teacher role, 'tolerance of foreigners and other cultures' as a nurturant effect and 'overhead projectors' as a special resource. Thus, as the data in Table 1 show, teachers' accounts of their practical theories of CLT appear to contain a mix of features of their general teaching (non-criterial units which encompassed beliefs, and assumptions and non-CLT knowledge) and CLT approaches (criterial units) in ways similar to that reported by Woods (1996) who found that beliefs, assumptions and knowledge permeate teacher action in the classroom, and Smith (1996) who found that teaching

language as communication and as product were seen by teachers as part of the continuum and less as a case of either/or. From the practical point of view of teachers, this makes very good sense. It seems unlikely that teachers would conceive of lessons as either 'pure CLT' or 'CLT-free'. Bennett (1997), in charting preservice teachers' (including some foreign language teachers) developing perspectives on teaching, found that there were few pure perspectives; rather, the data were characterized by the blurring of perspectives. Similar observations about second language teachers have been made by Kumaravadivelu (1994) and summarized in Borg (2003). Indeed, it would seem well nigh impossible, and even undesirable, for teachers to ignore any sound practices from general teaching while using CLT approaches as is evidenced in this teacher's data:

> You don't throw the baby out with the bathwater, do you? If something works you hang on to it! … (What) I've never thrown out, is when there's a little fun rhyme, even an oral way of practising something, I'll teach them. It's a bit like rote learning, but …sometimes it's just like learning tables. Remember, we used to chant them but we never forgot them. So I've never really given up on some of those things. In fact, when we're learning dates for example, my Grade 8's think it's so crazy because of the patterns that we get with our voices, saying the dates, and if they get into that pattern, it just helps them to learn them.
> [Adele, Interview 1]

Thus lessons may be based on approaches that are predominantly CLT-based but will inevitably include some elements that are not discussed in the literature on CLT. One may argue, however, that writers and researchers discussing CLT make the assumption that underpinning the CLT approach are sound pedagogical practices that apply in any teaching context regardless of the

subject matter. The fact of the omission, whether deliberate or accidental, has led to a somewhat distorted view of CLT and sometimes a call for an abandonment of the term and what it might represent (see, for example, Bax, 2003).

There is the possibility, of course, that some non-CLT elements may be at odds with, opposed to, or inimical to CLT approaches. Evidence of these 'rogue' elements was sought in interview and questionnaire data and lesson video-tapes. Little such evidence was found in five of the six teachers (see also below some differences suggested by the questionnaire data). However, in the case of one of the teachers, one with somewhat limited experience as a LOTE teacher, lesson features that were opposed to experts' views of what CLT approaches involve were clearly evident. For example, this teacher did little to encourage meaning-focused self-expression and took the view that structural correctness was not to be sacrificed in the interests of promoting fluency among those starting to learn a LOTE. She stressed the importance of translating the LOTE utterances into English as a way of checking the quality of comprehension in the LOTE. This teacher also favoured the use of didactic techniques and dominated interaction in the classroom, thus severely restricting student use and exploration of the second language. To a significant extent, the high degree of teacher-imposed structure evidenced in two lessons limited student exposure to the real, meaningful and personally relevant learning activities that exponents of CLT approaches recommend. These aspects of practice, which were anti-CLT, were also reflected to an extent in interview data and responses by this teacher to some questionnaire statements. Such consistency in data from different sources lends credibility to conclusions drawn from them.

The other significant outcome of the analysis of in-depth interview data is that individual teachers' and experts' conceptions of CLT appear to be moderately different. This is suggested by the low numbers of criterial attributes proposed by experts in teachers' interview data (Range: 28 to 42; average: 36) and also by the very numerous teacher references to aspects of general teaching. Hence, teachers as a group and as individuals, have a view of CLT that incorporates roughly half to two-thirds of the criterial attributes. It might be argued that, from the perspective of experts, teachers could be seen as holding a hybrid conception of CLT made up of 'authentic' CLT components – at least those regarded by the experts as authentic - and aspects of general teaching. With the one exception noted earlier, teachers in this study and experts are not in dispute about half to two-thirds of the criterial attributes appearing in the list proposed by experts.

These findings bear some similarities with those of other studies referred to earlier (e.g., Mitchell, 1988; Nunan, 1987; Whitley, 1993) but also some differences. The findings in this study indicate that the six teachers held conceptions of CLT that did differ from that represented by the list of criterial attributes, as reported by Nunan (1987), Mangubhai et al, (1998) and Sato and Kleinsasser (1999). However, these six teachers' conceptions of CLT consisted of many common elements from the list of criterial attributes and so did not appear as variable as those reported by Mitchell (1988) and Sato and Kleinsasser (1999). It is possible that the greater level of variability reported by Mitchell and Sato and Kleinsasser may have resulted from their use of much larger numbers of LOTE teachers than was used in this study.

It is also possible that if teachers had been asked to respond to interview questions with different teaching contexts in mind (that is, not just Year 7 for primary teachers and Year 10 for

secondary), they may have responded differently and covered more (or fewer) attributes of communicative approaches.

An analysis of questionnaire data creates grounds for another explanation that will be considered in the next section.

VIII. Teachers conceptions of CLT as revealed in questionnaire data and comparisons with researchers' conceptions

Though only about half of the list of criterial attributes of CLT were located in each teacher's interview data, teachers' responses to questionnaire items gave a very different result. All six teachers agreed with statements representing 44 of the the 62 criterial attributes. Of the remaining 18 criterial attributes, five teachers indicated agreement on 10 items, four teachers agreed on a further five items and three teachers agreed on another two items. Thus 50% or more of teachers were in agreement with 61 of the 62 attributes claimed to be criterial. On the remaining item (a theoretical assumption that emphasis should be placed on meaning-focused self-expression rather than language structure), five teachers indicated disagreement, two strongly disagreeing with it. Overall, questionnaire data show that these teachers and experts share a common view on key features of CLT approaches as propounded in literature, a finding which is clearly at odds with those of other studies (Mangubhai et al., 1998; Mitchell, 1988; Nunan, 1987; Rollmann, 1994; Sato and Kleinsasser, 1999; Thompson, 1996; Whitley, 1993; Williams, 1995).

The item that generated the most serious level of disagreement (5 teachers disagreeing) was the proposition that with CLT approaches the emphasis should be placed on meaning-focused self-expression rather than language structure. This has been a fundamental feature of CLT

approaches, especially in the earlier stages of the promotion of more communicative approaches (see, for example, Wilkins, 1976). However, this principle is often misunderstood to mean that there should be no emphasis on language, as Thompson (1996) points out. In the early 1980s it had become evident from the data on Canadian immersion studies that focusing on meaning solely and neglecting any reference to the form did not lead to a satisfactory grammatical competence. There was also a need to focus on form (Harley and Swain, 1984; Swain, 1985) Such focus was to be operationalized in classrooms quite differently as discussed by Long (1991), Ellis (2001), Harley (1989) and in the volume by Doughty and Williams (1998). It seems that Second Language (SL) teachers had never been convinced that a total focus on meaning to the neglect of form would somehow develop grammatical competence, notwithstanding Krashen (1985). The responses of these teachers on this item in the questionnaire seem to confirm this. The issue of whether focus on form or focus on forms was prevalent in teachers' thinking is not discussed in this article, as this information was not sought in the interviews or the questionnaires. Closer analyses of the videotaped data (yet to be carried out) may provide an answer.

Another two items found support of only three of the six teachers. The first of these related to the theoretical assumption or principle that communication among classroom participants should be authentic or spontaneous rather than previously prepared. A further interview after the completion of the questionnaire might have shed some light on this.

Second, three of the six teachers did not regard having people with a LOTE facility in the community as a special resource for a CLT approach. One would have expected that such a language resource would be most desirable, if not for language input then to convince the

learners that the language they were learning was actually used by people for daily interactions. Once again, a follow up interview would have provided some insight into this belief. However, these disagreements, though noteworthy and of interest, should, in no way, detract from the overwhelmingly clear message from these data which is that a considerable level of agreement between teachers and experts exists as to the meaning of CLT approaches.

What is perplexing, however, and has not been reported previously, is the apparent contradiction between the two sets of data – interview data and questionnaire data. Whereas the former reveal a more limited measure of agreement between teachers and experts as to conceptualizations of CLT, the latter show a close to identical understanding. Why is this so? Evidence was provided earlier to discount the view that teachers would have been able to add significantly to their explanations of their CLT approaches if the interviews had been extended. However, it is possible that teachers found some difficulty in articulating fully details of their practical theories. Moreover, it is quite likely that some of their pedagogical actions in the classroom have become so automated that the rationales underpinning them are no longer accessible for reflection, without some form of an outside intervention. Such a possibility is indirectly suggested by this segment of the interview:

> Interviewer: And that comes through in your use of group work, pairs and so on. Quite a few values there. Are there any other key ones?

> Guy: Not that I can think of. Think I've about covered it all.
>
> Interviewer: Um, again we're dealing with some deep-seated implicit things, here, …
> [moves onto another area].

While this may go some way towards explaining the difference, a more plausible explanation is that these teachers have two conceptions of CLT. First, they hold a theoretical or academic conceptualization which has been constructed from study, readings and in-service courses on CLT. The very form of the questionnaire, where they are responding to a set of statements that potentially reflect CLT approaches, would encourage them to draw substantially on their abstract or theoretical understandings of CLT. Second, they hold a practical conceptualization of CLT that is grounded in their classroom experience of this approach (as Johnson, 1996 has argued) and which they had to draw heavily on during interviews. This is the conceptualization that directs classroom practice and may represent cut-down or 'streamlined' versions of their theoretical understandings of CLT, 'no-frill' versions that have been refined through the exigencies of practice.

If these conjectures have any validity, then it suggests that five of the six teachers have internalized conceptualizations of CLT that, in large measure, conform closely to those of experts and that are idealized and academic in nature. The second implication is that the teachers' everyday classroom use of CLT approaches is guided, not by these conceptualizations in their entirety, but by relatively smaller-scale versions of these conceptualizations, as represented by their practical theories of CLT. These smaller scale versions are, by and large, consistent with the idealized versions and intensely practical but contain only those features that are prominent in the minds of the holders and of central importance to them. A subsequent conclusion is that questionnaires access teachers' theoretical knowledge of CLT approaches but that such knowledge may not, in its entirety, inform practice[4].

Thus, in summary, five of the six teachers do hold abstract understandings of CLT approaches that are quite similar to those of researchers. However their classroom practice of CLT draws on a smaller, practical version of this abstract understanding that, while consistent with the broader version, is attuned to their personal use of CLT approaches in their own unique work contexts. In terms of the original question asked in this study it is obvious that these six teachers individually have integrated many, but not all, aspects of CLT into their understandings of this concept. These aspects have become part of a much larger architecture of teaching that these teachers carry in their heads. Such an integration suggests that teachers' classroom actions may not be driven solely, or even mostly, by concerns related to a CLT approach in the classroom.

---

[1] This research was made possible by a grant PTRP 179596 from the University of Southern Queensland. We would like to thank the six teachers who were generous with their time and allowed us into their classrooms. Without their generosity this project would not have been possible. We would also like to thank Christopher Brumfit, Alister Cumming, Marilyn Lewis and Rosamond Mitchell for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this article. We would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers whose comments and suggestions have been valuable in improving this article.

[2] The authors acknowledge that CLT cannot be thought of as a method but rather as an approach which has a number of characteristics, many of which are accepted by researchers without contest.

[3] LOTE is a term that excludes indigenous Aboriginal languages and refers only to what is known elsewhere as 'foreign languages' or 'modern languages'.

[4] The question then arises that where there are substantial differences between teachers' responses on a questionnaire and the literature on which such a questionnaire is based, then even less of that knowledge will inform these teachers practice.

References

Bax, S. 2003: The end of CLT: a contextual approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal* 57, 278-287.

Bennett, C. I. 1997: How can teacher perspectives affect teacher decision making? In Byrd, D. M. and McIntyre, D. J., editors, *Research and education of our nation's teachers*, CA, Corwin Press, Inc, 75-91.

Berliner, D. C. 1987: Ways of thinking about students and classrooms by more and less experienced teachers. In Calderhead, J., editor, *Exploring Teachers' Thinking*, London, Cassell, 60-83.

Borg, S. 2003: Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do. *Language Teaching* w36, 81-109.

Brophy, J. & Evertson, C. (1973) Low-inference observational coding measures and teacher effectiveness. ERIC Microfiche, ED 077 879.

Brumfit, C. J. 2001: *Individual freedom in language teaching,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Clark, C. M. and Peterson, P. L. 1986: Teachers' thought processes. In Wittrock, M. C.,

    editor, *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, New York, Macmillan Publishing

    Co., 255-296.A

Elbaz, F. 1983: *Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge,* London: Croom Helm.

Doughty, C. and Williams, J. (eds.) 1998: *Focus on form,* New York, Cambridge

    University Press.

Ellis, R. 2001: *Form-focused instruction and second language learning,* Malden:

    Published at the University of Michigan by Blackwell Publishers.

Finnochiaro, M. and Brumfit, C. J. 1983: *The functional-notional approach: From theory

    to practice,* New York: Longman.

Fröhlich, M., Spada, N, and Allen, J.B.P. 1985: Differences in the communicative

    orientation of L2 classrooms, TESOL Quarterly, 19, 51-62.

Harley, B. 1989: Functional grammar in French immersion: A classroom experiment.

    Applied Linguistics 10, 331-59.

Harley, B. and Swain, M. 1984: The interlanguage of immersion students and its

    implications for second language learning. In Davies, A., Criper, C. and Howatt,

    A., editors, *Interlanguage*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 291-311.

Johnson, K. 1996: The role of theory in L2 teacher education, *TESOL Quarterly* 30, 765-771.

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

Joyce, B., Weil, M. W. with Showers, B. 1992: *Models of teaching,* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Joyce , B. and Showers, B. 1982: The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership* 40, 4-10.

Joyce , B., Weil, M. and Wald, R. 1981: Can teachers learn repertoires of models of teaching? In Brown, C., editor, *Flexibility in teaching*, New York, Longman, 141-156.A

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

Krashen, S. 1985: *The input hypothesis: issues and implications,* California: Laredo Publishing Co Inc.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 1994: The postmethod condition: (e)merging strategies for

second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 28, 27-48.

Littlewood, W. 1981: *Communicative language teaching,* Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Long, M. 1991: Focus on form: a design feature in language teaching methodology. In de

Bot, K., Ginsberg, R. B. and Kramsch, C., editors, *Foreign language research in*

cross-cultural perspective, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Co, 39-52.

Mangubhai, F., Dashwood, A., Berthold, M., Flores, M. and Dale, J. 1998: Centre for

Research into Language Teaching Methodologies/The National Languages and

Literacy Institute of Australia, Toowoomba.

Mangubhai, F., Marland, P., Dashwood, A. and Son, J-B. In Press: Teaching a foreign

language: one teacher's practical theory. *Teaching and Teacher Education.*

Marland, P. 1998: Teachers' practical theories: Implications for preservice teacher

education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Development* 1, 15-23.

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

Nunan, D. 1987: Communicative language teaching: making it work. *ELT Journal* 41,

    136-145.

Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. 1986: *Approaches and methods in language teaching,*

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rollmann, M. 1994: The communicative language teaching "revolution" tested: a

    comparison of two classroom studies: 1976 and 1993. *Foreign Language Annals*

    27, 221-239.

Sanders, D. and McCutcheon, G. 1987: The development of practical theories of

    teaching. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 2, 50-67.

Sato, K. and Kleinsasser, R. C. 1999: Communicative language teaching (CLT): Practical

    understandings. *The Modern Language Journal* 83, 494-517.

Savignon, S. 1991: Communicative language teaching: state of the art. *TESOL Quarterly*

    25, 261-277.

Savignon, S. J. 1983: *Communicative competence: theory and classroom practice,*

    Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Savignon, S. J. 2002: Communicative language teaching: linguistic theory and classroom practice. In Savignon, S. J., editor, *Interpreting communicative language teaching*, New Haven & London, Yale University Press, 1-27.

Shavelson, R. J. and Stern, P. 1981: Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments and behaviors. *Review of Educational Research* 51, 455-498.

Smith, D. B. 1996: Teacher decision making in the adult ESL classroom. In Freeman, D. and Richards, J. C., editors, *Teacher learning in language teaching*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 197-216.

Spada, N. and Fröhlich, M. 1995: Colt observation scheme, Sydney: NCELTR, MacQuarie University.

Swain, M. 1985: Communication competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. and Madden, C., editors, *Input in second language acquisition*, Rowley, Mass., Newbury House.

Thompson, G. 1996: Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT Journal* 50, 9-15.

Vale, D., Scarino, A. and McKay, P. 1991: *Pocket ALL,* Carlton, VIC.: Curriculum Corporation.

Whitley, M. S. 1993: Communicative language teaching: An incomplete revolution. *Foreign Language Annals* 26, 137-54.

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, 12-16.

Woods, D. 1996: *Teacher cognition in language teaching: beliefs, decision making and classroom practice,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix 1
List of Criterial* and Non-Criterial Attributes of CLT (with codes)

- Non-criterial attributes are in bold type.

Goal Focus (Principal goals)

GF 1.   To develop students' communicative competence in L2, defined as including grammatical, socio-linguistic, discourse and strategic competencies.
GF 2   To have students use L2 productively and receptively in authentic exchanges.
GF 3   Other

Theoretical Assumptions (Beliefs, principles etc underlying approach)

TAS 1   Students should be actively involved in the construction of meaning.
TAS 2   Learning L2 involves students solving their own problems in interactive sessions with peers and teachers.
TAS 3   Communicative competence is best developed in the context of social interaction.
TAS 4   Communication among classroom participants should be authentic i.e. not staged or manipulated by a power figure.
TAS 5   Communication should be stimulated by genuine issues and tasks.
TAS 6   Communication should follow a natural pattern of discourse rather than be pre-determined or routine.
TAS 7   Classroom culture should be characterized by teacher/student tolerance of learner error.
TAS 8   Risk taking by students should be overtly encouraged.
TAS 9   Classroom culture should be characterized by student centeredness i.e., an emphasis on student needs and socio-cultural differences in students' styles of learning.
TAS 10 Emphasis should be placed on meaning-focused self-expression rather than language structure.
TAS 11 Grammar should be situated within activities directed at the development of communicative competence rather than being the singular focus of lessons.
TAS 12 Resources should be linguistically and culturally authentic.
TAS 13 More attention should be given, initially, to fluency and appropriate usage than structured correctness.
TAS 14 Use of L2 as a medium of classroom communication should be optimized.

TAS 15 Other

Strategies (Methods used with a CLT approach)

S 1   Role plays
S 2   Games
S 3   Small group and paired activities
S 4   Experiences with authentic resources involving speaking, listening, writing and reading in L2
S 5   Tasks requiring the negotiation of meaning
S 6   Asking questions of students that require the expression of opinions and the formulation of reasoned positions.
S 7   Other

Social System
Teacher Roles
TR 1   Facilitator of communication processes

TR 2   Guide rather than transmitter of knowledge
TR 3   Organizer of resources
TR 4   Analyst of student needs
TR 5   Counselor/corrector
TR 6   Group process manager
TR 7   Other

Student Roles
SR 1   Active participant, asking for information, seeking clarification, expressing opinions, debating
SR 2   Negotiator of meaning
SR 3   Proactive team member
SR 4   Monitor of own thought processes
SR 5   Other

Teacher-Student Relationships
TSR 1   Friendly
TSR 2   Cooperative
TSR 3   Informal where possible
TSR 4 Other

Normal Student Behaviors (behaviors that teacher wants students to display during lessons)
NSB 1   Engaging in autonomous action, defining and solving own problems
NSB 2   Risk taking
NSB 3   Activity-oriented behaviors
NSB 4   Cooperation with peers, teacher
NSB 5   Using L2 as much as possible
NSB 6 Other

Support System

Teaching Skills
TS 1   General teaching and management skills
TS 2   Skills in the use of technology
TS 3   Ability and Commitment to work with community
TS 4   Other

Teacher Attributes
TAT 1   Outgoingness
TAT 2   Proficiency in L2 (for non-native speakers)
TAT 3   Proficiency in English (for native speakers of L2)
TAT 4   Fascination with L2 and its culture (non-native speakers)
TAT 5   Teaching experience
TAT 6   Experience as a resident in the L2 culture
TAT 7 Other

Special Resources (resources needed over and above usual resources in classrooms)
SPR 1   Authentic l2 materials
SPR 2   Human resources with facility in L2 in community
SPR 3   Internet; CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning) resources
SPR 4 Other

Principles of Teacher Reaction (Guidelines used by the teacher in reacting to student questions, responses, initiations, etc)

PTR 1   Encourages learners to initiate and participate in meaningful interaction in L2
PTR 2   Supports learner risk taking (e.g. going beyond memorized patterns and routine expressions
PTR 3   Places minimal emphasis in error correction and explicit instruction on language rules
PTR 4   Emphasizes learner autonomy and choice of language, topic
PTR 5   Focuses on learners and their needs
PTR 6   Encourages student self-assessment of progress
PTR 7   Focuses on form as need arises
PTR 8   Other

Instructional and Nurturant Effects

Instructional
IE 1   Proficiency in L2
IE 2   Greater understanding of one's own culture and mother tongue
IE 3   Other

Nurturant
NE 1   Respect, fascination for L2 and its culture
NE 2   Other

Teacher Affect

Grand Other

TABLE 1
Unit Frequencies per teacher in Each Category

Type of Unit	Unit Frequencies							Unit Totals & %	
	Guy	Bess	Doreen	Gwen	Kate	Adele	Totals		
Goal Focus*	6	9	8	7	5	2	37		
Goal Focus Other[+]	13	33	20	10	19	18	113	150	6
Theor. Assumps*	15	11	30	37	20	34	147		
TAs Other[+]	55	94	59	91	67	58	424	571	23
Strategies*	15	14	13	15	22	11	90		
Strats Other[+]	39	38	25	65	36	58	261	351	14
Social System									
Teacher Roles*	1	12	7	9	17	8	54		
T/Roles Other[+]	4	19	18	12	16	13	82	136	6
Student Roles*	11	4	7	5	7	9	43		
S/Roles Other[+]	12	2	8	16	14	5	57	100	4
Teach-Stud R'ship*	1	2	2	1	0	2	8		
T/ES R'ships Other[+]	2	0	6	6	4	6	24	32	1
Norm Stud Behav*	12	3	11	8	6	8	48		
NSBs Others[+]	17	5	16	10	6	18	72	120	5
Support System									
Teaching Skills*	1	6	1	8	14	4	34		
T/Skills Other[+]	0	0	2	0	4	1	7	41	2
Teacher Attributes*	8	0	5	4	5	2	24		
T/Attributes Other[+]	2	6	8	12	5	13	46	70	3
Special Resources*	9	12	23	22	17	21	104		
S/R'ces Other[+]	9	11	6	29	4	12	71	175	7
Prin of T Reaction*	3	3	6	4	3	3	22		
Prin of TR Other[+]	8	4	18	7	1	11	49	71	3
Instruct. Effects*	2	2	2	2	2	4	14		
I/Effects Other[+]	5	15	2	3	3	11	39	53	2
Nurturant Effects*	2	1	4	3	2	2	14		
N/Effects Other[+]	7	13	7	1	11	15	54	68	3
Teacher Affect[+]	5	1	1	3	4	18	32	32	1
Grand Other	75	75	78	126	24	101	479	479	20
Total (a)*	86	79	119	125	120	110	639		
Total (b)[+]	253	316	274	391	218	358	1810		
(a) + (b) = (c)	339	395	393	516	339	468	2449	2449	
% (a) of (c)	25	20	30	24	36	24	35		

NOTE: (i)   Numbers in rows marked thus * represent totals of all units related to critierial attributes

       (ii)   Numbers in rows marked thus [+] represent totals of all units not related to criterial attributes.

       (iii)   The percentages in the final column represent percentages of 2449, the total of all kinds of units.

TABLE 2

Frequencies of all units appearing in transcripts of teachers' in-depth interviews

Criterial Attribute/Other Code (see Appendix 1)	Frequencies							
	Guy	Bess	Doreen	Gwen	Kate	Adele	Totals	
Goal Focus:								
• GF1	4	1	6	5	2	2	20	
• GF2	2	8	2	2	3	0	17	
• Other	13	33	20	10	19	18	113	150
Theoretical Assumptions								
• TAS1	1	0	3	0	0	0	4	
• TAS2	0	1	1	1	0	1	4	
• TAS3	7	1	4	8	4	3	27	
• TAS4	0	0	1	3	1	0	5	
• TAS5	1	0	5	5	0	0	11	
• TAS6	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
• TAS7	1	0	5	1	1	5	13	
• TAS8	0	3	1	1	2	0	7	
• TAS9	2	4	6	6	7	14	39	
• TAS10	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
• TAS11	0	0	1	5	1	2	9	
• TAS12	0	0	1	2	2	0	5	
• TAS13	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	
• TAS14	3	1	0	4	2	7	17	
• Other	55	94	59	91	67	58	424	571
Strategies								
• S1	0	0	0	2	4	1	7	
• S2	5	2	2	1	4	3	17	
• S3	6	4	4	9	6	4	33	
• S4	4	8	6	3	5	3	29	
• S5	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	
• S6	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
• Other	39	38	25	65	36	58	261	351
Social System								
(a) Teacher Roles								
• TR1	0	1	1	7	1	1	11	
• TR2	0	4	2	0	2	2	10	
• TR3	0	0	3	2	8	0	13	
• TR4	0	3	0	0	2	2	7	
• TR5	1	4	1	0	4	0	10	
• TR6	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	
• Other	4	19	18	12	16	13	82	136
(b) Student Roles								
• SR1	7	3	5	0	3	7	25	
• SR2	2	0	0	3	0	1	6	
• SR3	2	0	2	1	3	1	9	
• SR4	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	
• Other	12	2	8	16	14	5	57	100

Table 2:   Frequencies of all units appearing in transcripts of teachers' in-depth interviews (contd)

Criterial Attribute/Other	Frequencies							
Code (see Appendix 1)	Guy	Bess	Doreen	Gwen	Kate	Adele	Totals	
(c)Teach-Stud R'ships								
• TSR1	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	
• TSR2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
• TSR3	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
• Other	2	0	6	6	4	6	24	32
(d)Normal Stud Behav								
• NSB1	0	0	4	2	4	0	10	
• NSB2	1	1	0	2	0	2	6	
• NSB3	5	0	1	1	0	2	9	
• NSB4	6	2	6	2	2	2	20	
• NSB5	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	
• Other	17	5	16	10	6	18	72	120
Support System								
(a) Teaching Skills								
• TS1	1	6	1	8	12	3	31	
• TS2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
• TS3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
• Other	0	0	2	0	4	1	7	41
(b) Teacher Attributes								
• TAT1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
• TAT2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
• TAT3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
• TAT4	3	0	1	1	2	0	7	
• TAT5	3	0	2	0	0	0	5	
• TAT6	2	0	0	3	3	2	10	
• Other	2	6	8	12	5	13	46	70
(c) Special Resources								
• SPR1	0	6	17	12	7	10	52	
• SPR2	7	2	4	6	3	7	29	
• SPR3	2	4	2	4	7	4	23	
• Other	9	11	6	29	4	12	71	175
Principles of T Reaction								
• PTR1	2	0	1	3	0	1	7	
• PTR2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
• PTR3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
• PTR4	0	0	3	0	2	0	5	
• PTR5	1	1	1	0	1	1	5	
• PTR6	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
• PTR7	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
• Other	8	4	18	7	1	11	49	71
Instruct. & Nurt. Effects								
(a) Instructional								
• IE1	1	2	2	2	2	3	12	
• IE2	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	
• Other	5	15	2	3	3	11	39	53
(b) Nurturant								
• NE1	2	1	4	3	2	2	14	
• Other	7	13	7	1	11	15	54	68

Table 2: Frequencies of all units appearing in transcripts of teachers' in-depth interviews (contd)

Criterial Attribute/Other Code (see Appendix 1)	Guy	Bess	Doreen	Gwen	Kate	Adele	Totals	
Teacher Affect	5	1	1	3	4	18	32	
Grand Other	75	75	78	126	24	101	479	
Total number of criterial features (a)	86	79	119	125	120	110	639	639
Total number of non-criterial features (b)	253	316	274	391	218	358	1810	1810
Total (a + b)	339	395	393	516	338	468	2449	2449

TABLE 3
Questionnaire items on which teacher responses indicated disagreement with experts

Item No.	Questionnaire Statement	Response Frequencies				
		SA	A	D	SD	M'g
2	**With CLT approaches**					
2c	communicative competence is best developed through social interaction	1	4	1	0	0
2e	communication among classroom participants is authentic, i.e. communication is spontaneous, not previously planned	2	1	3	0	0
2m	emphasis is placed on meaning-focused self-expression rather than language structure	0	1	3	2	0
2n	grammar is situated within activities directed at the development of communicative competence rather than being the singular focus of lesson activities	4	1	1	0	0
2p	more attention is given, initially, to fluency and appropriate usage than to structural correctness	3	1	1	1	0
3	**Strategies consistent with CLT approaches include:**					
3g	asking students questions that require expressions of opinions or formulating of reasoned positions	2	3	1	0	0
4	**The role of the teacher in CLT approaches includes being**					
4f	counselor	1	4	1	0	0
4g	corrector of errors when meaning is unclear	1	4	1	0	0
4h	group process manager	1	3	1	0	1
7	**Behaviors normally required of students in a CLT lesson include:**					
7d	being activity oriented	2	2	2	0	0
8	**Skills required by teachers in CLT lessons include:**					
8b	use of technology	0	5	1	0	0
9	**CLT approaches require teachers to:**					
9a	be outgoing	2	2	1	0	1
9f	have experience as resident in the LOTE culture	1	4	1	0	0
10	**Special resources required in CLT approaches include:**					
10b	people with the LOTE facility in the community	1	2	2	1	0
11	**In responding to students, principles to be observed by teachers in CLT lessons include:**					
11c	placing minimal emphasis on error correction	2	3	1	0	0

		SA	A	D	SD	M's
11d	placing minimal emphasis on explicit instruction of language rules	1	3	2	0	0
11e	emphasizing learner autonomy and choice of language topic	1	3	2	0	0
11h	encouraging student self-assessment of progress	1	4	1	0	0
12	**The outcomes of CLT approaches should include:**					
12a	proficiency in LOTE in all macroskills	2	3	1	0	0

SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree; M's=Missing