

# **Communicative Language Teaching for Classical Languages**

by

Joshua Ferraro

## **Introduction**

For teachers of classical languages such as Greek and Latin and for teachers of modern languages such as Russian and French, the quality of the language pedagogy employed directly affects the outcome of language instruction. Both groups have shown concern for language pedagogy. There is even a joke among classicists that the ratio of Classical Greek grammars to professors is 10:9 (Mounce, 1993, p. x).

However, the findings of the field which is concerned with the scientific study of second and foreign language teaching and learning (Applied Linguistics) are not well known to many language teachers. That is, language teachers (of modern or classical languages) are not always aware of what second language acquisition research has indicated about how best to teach language. However, the gap between research and pedagogy is even greater with classical language teachers than with modern language teachers. This book bridges that gap by presenting the findings of applied linguistics--second language acquisition researchers, pysco-linguists, education specialists, psychologists, and theoretical linguists--and explaining what indications these findings have for the pedagogy currently employed by most classical language teachers.

My organization is as follows: In Chapter One I briefly review the history of language teaching, both ancient and modern, to show how each teaching tradition--modern language teaching and classical language teaching--has arrived at its current pedagogy. I conclude that section by enumerating the general characteristics as well as the underlying assumptions of the currently accepted pedagogy for each field--the Grammar Translation Method for classical language teaching and Communicative Language Teaching for modern language teaching. Chapter Two is a full evaluation of the disparate pedagogies in light of the stated goal of classical language teachers: to

equip learners with the tools necessary to begin reading very sophisticated and grammatically complex texts in multiple dialects and time periods and to enable development of this ability very quickly--within about one academic year. This chapter illuminates the details of the findings of second language acquisition studies in a number of areas relevant to classical language teaching environments. However, while Chapter Two presents a case for using Communicative Language Teaching, it does not deal with the perceptual challenges (whether real or imagined) that teachers and learners of classical and other "dead" languages face that impede implementation of Communicative Language Teaching. Therefore, Chapter Three addresses the question: is Communicative Language Teaching practical for teaching classical languages? This chapter is largely an evaluation of and response to common perceptions about the nature of classical and other "dead" languages that impede use of Communicative Language Teaching. While some of these perceptions merit consideration in design of a curriculum, many perceptions are based on incorrect assumptions. In Chapter Four, an empirical study supports the theoretical conclusions in the previous chapters. Chapter Five gets down to the practical level of how to go about incorporating communicative models into the classroom. Not all communicative tasks are useful for classical languages (e.g., making hotel reservations), so this chapter details several that are useful. It also includes some of the latest data on how grammar instruction can best be incorporated into a curriculum (Hinkel and Fotos, 2002). Finally, the conclusion summarizes the main concepts covered using non-technical language.

## **Chapter 1: Language teaching: a historical perspective**

In this chapter, major trends in language teaching pedagogy are traced in order to discover how the two disparate pedagogical approaches under consideration-- Communicative Language Teaching and the Grammar Translation Method--have developed. Additionally, this chapter enumerates the general underlying assumptions and characteristics of the two approaches. Both of these these topics need consideration in a comparison of modern language pedagogy and classical language pedagogy: the historical perspective enables one to grasp the underlying reasons that each approach was adopted; and understanding the basic characteristics and assumptions of each approach imparts a fuller picture of the approaches themselves. Since the tradition of language teaching for the western world has its roots with the Greeks and Romans, and since classical language teaching pedagogy is the main topic of this book, it is practical to proceed, covering major historical trends in the teaching of Classical Greek and Latin.

Some of the most notable contributions of the Greeks and Romans in linguistics were their innovations in grammar. Both Greek and Roman philosophers had written authoritative books on grammar, and as Robins, in his book on the history of linguistics, states, "grammatical descriptions provided in them [ancient grammar books] were maintained by a continuous tradition through the Middle Ages and the modern world to become the basis of the standard grammars of these languages today" (1969, p. 24). In fact, the grammatical theories, descriptions, and much of the terminology developed by these ancient scholars were the general tools used even by early modern descriptive linguists (*ibid*, p. 25).

Kelly, in his book on the history of language teaching, explains that these detailed grammatical descriptions were developed by the ancient grammarians "to

teach Greek and Latin speakers the formal skeleton of their own languages" (p. 44). Schools had been established to teach the aristocratic youth the art of rhetoric, and deductive<sup>1</sup> grammar instruction was a feature of those schools. According to Kelly, exercises such as the "chria," an exercise in varying the inflections of nouns and verbs, "became a method of teaching students how to achieve a rhetorical balance in spite of having to handle cumbersome case forms" (p. 116). These formal deductive grammar exercises reinforced knowledge of the structure of the language, making youths more sensitive and aware of subtle differences not immediately apparent to an untrained native speaker.

In addition to teaching the art of rhetoric, these grammarians apparently played some role in teaching their languages to nonnative speakers. As Kelly states, "the first schemes for teaching Greek as a foreign language were developed by grammarians of classical Greece" (p. 327). Kelly, gives one example of an interlinear teaching text used in a third century Alexandrian school:

Dies; sol ortus est; solis ortus; lux; lumen iam licet; aurora; ante lucem mane  
surgo;

Greek text goes here, Greek text goes here, Greek text goes here, Greek text  
goes here,

surrexit de lecto lectum; vigilavit heri diu; vesti me; da mihi calcimenta et  
udones et

Greek text goes here, Greek text goes here, Greek text goes here, Greek text  
goes here,

bracas; i am calciatus sum.

Greek text goes here.

(Day; the sun is up; sunrise; the sun is shining; dawn; I get up in the morning

---

<sup>1</sup> explain the differences between deductive and inductive, etc.

before sunrise; he got out of bed; bed; he went to bed late last night; dress me; give me my shoes, my slippers and trousers; now I have something on my feet;...)

A.D. 250 (Pseudo-Dositheus), quoted in Kelly, p. 115

This type of language learning strategy is not unlike some methods that were used in the nineteenth century, particularly the "series" or "action chain" developed by Gouin, which is considered below.

Although the Greeks and Romans developed detailed descriptions of the grammars of Greek and Latin, these descriptions were not used for deductive grammar instruction to nonnative speakers. In fact, according to Kelly, grammar instruction during the classical era was largely inductive: "during the classical period [. . .] languages were usually drilled so that, even if one could not repeat a grammar rule, one could use the language" (p. 91). Deductive grammar instruction, as already mentioned, was reserved for more advanced or native speakers to enhance their rhetorical skill.

However, in the Middle Ages, as Greek and Latin were increasingly taught for literary purposes, deductive grammar instruction "became part of the process of introducing these languages to nonnative speakers" (Kelly, p. 44). "It was expected that skill in using languages would follow from an intellectual knowledge of their formal analyses [sic]" (Kelly, p. 7). But Latin (if not Greek) was still used as a spoken language as late as the eighteenth century, and in addition to formal grammar analysis, students were exposed to the Latin spoken language community in a way not unlike some modern immersion programs: there was plenty of opportunity for spoken communication. Additionally, the long history of prose and poetry composition in classical Greek and Latin further ensured active learner use of the languages.

Meanwhile, other, modern, languages were increasingly being included in school curricula. But the foreign language teaching techniques designed were largely based on the educational models of other disciplines. As Brown comments in his chapter on the history of language teaching methodology, "since there was little if any theoretical research on second language acquisition in general or on the acquisition of reading proficiency, foreign languages were taught as any other skill was taught" (1994, p. 52). Viewing language as a skill greatly affected the types of methods that were designed. Languages were viewed as structures that could be defined in a way not unlike mathematical formulas. With the advent of the discipline of general grammar, traditional Latin grammatical framework was used to analyze modern languages such as French, and these descriptions were then used to teach Latin to students. As Kelly, states, one school, Port-Royal, began emphasizing the importance of knowing the grammar of one's native language and "taught languages in such a way that there was a transfer of grammatical training between the classical languages and French" (p. 52). Practices like these, which emphasized the grammatical similarity of modern and classical languages, encouraged the merger of deductive grammar instruction and translation exercises as a means of teaching and evaluating the language. In their grammars, which appeared at the end of the eighteenth century, Meidinger and Seidenstucker, systematically combined deductive grammar instruction with translation exercises similar to supplemental translation exercises used in the Renaissance for improving style and grammar in learners of classical languages (*vulgaria*) and promoted these two activities as the primary teaching and evaluation methods. Other grammars soon appeared, using the general principles contained in Meidiner and Seidenstucker as the basis for their approach. Ollendorf's grammar, developed in the 1840s, was widely imitated, and "the order he used in his lessons

became standard: a statement of the rule, followed by a vocabulary list and translation exercises. At the end of the course translation of connected prose passages was attempted" (Kelly, p. 52). Thus, the Grammar Translation Method was born.

There were other language teaching methodologies of the time, including those developed by C. Marcel, and T. Prendergast. Perhaps the best known by the Frenchman, Gouin (1831-1896), who, "developed an approach to teaching a foreign language based on his observations of children's use of language" (Kelly, p. 8). His famous Gouin "series" or "action chain" is reminiscent of the third century Alexandrian teaching texts described earlier. Gouin's first lesson included the following series:

I walk toward the door.	I walk.
I draw near to the door.	I draw near.
I draw nearer to the door.	I draw nearer.
I get to the door.	I get to.
I stop at the door.	I stop.
I stretch out my arm.	I stretch out.
I take hold of the handle.	I take hold.
I turn the handle.	I turn.
I open the door.	I open.
etc..	

(Richards & Rodgers, p. 8)

Gouin's techniques, although theoretically and practically sound, never received the level of support necessary to sustain their use--but they were popular for a short time.

As class sizes increased and textbooks became more readily available and affordable, the Grammar Translation Method was an attractive solution to the



problems faced by many educational institutions. Brown comments, "tests of grammar rules and of translations are easy to construct and can be objectively scored" (p. 53). Additionally, teachers who employed the Grammar Translation Method needed very little skill or training in education. As Kelly states, "Those with no teaching skill found their way eased by the control the [Grammar Translation] method exercised over pupil activity: it required little ingenuity to devise assignments, as they were laid down syllable by syllable in the book" (p. 278). In contrast, competing language teaching strategies such as the Direct and Natural Methods, two methods which sought to teach language using child first language acquisition as a model, "tested to the full extent the skills of their practitioners, and proved to be beyond the capacities of the unskilled" (Kelly, p. 278). In a short time, the Grammar Translation Method began to be viewed as the preferred, and even the 'traditional' method of modern language teaching.

However, classical language teachers were not quick to adopt Grammar Translation--largely because "the long tradition of composition methods in classical languages [...] acted for a time as a block" to relying on translation as a primary teaching and evaluation method. But several developments in the field of classics made this transition inevitable. As both the spoken element, and the literary necessity of classical languages declined, in part due to the increasing importance of modern languages, and in part due to a desire by educators to improve student's handling of the native tongue, classicists sought new justifications for teaching Latin and Greek. As Mallison (quoted in in Richards & Rodgers, p. 4) states:

"When once the Latin tongue had ceased to be a normal vehicle for communication, and was replaced as such by the vernacular languages, then it most speedily became a 'mental gymnastic', the supremely 'dead' language, a

disciplined and systematic study of which was held to be indispensable as a basis for all forms of higher education."

These new educational aims, when combined with increasing class sizes and a need for more objective standards of evaluation, made it difficult to continue with the tradition of composition exercises--or with any active use of Latin or Greek. Thus, the transition from composition to translation was made all the easier. After the Prussian school system adopted a variant on the Grammar Translation Method, an American classicist, B. Sears, published a method based on the 'Prussian System', which received some notice and "with the appearance of the Ollendorf Grammars for Latin and Greek the victory of Grammar Translation was complete" (Kelly, p. 53). It is rather ironic that this adaptation that may very well have saved the discipline from near extinction so drastically altered the curriculum as to render it nearly unrecognizable when compared with its former days.

The comments of one language teacher are of particular historical interest. Rouse, a classicist and advocate of the Direct Method made the following statement which illustrates well the sediments of some minority classical language teachers on the merger of deductive grammar instruction and translation exercises:

I will only add finally, that the current method [Grammar Translation] is not older than the nineteenth century. It is the offspring of German scholarship, which seeks to know everything about something rather than the thing itself: the traditional English method which lasted into the nineteenth century was to use the Latin language in speech.

(Rouse, 1925; quoted in Kelly, p. 53)

But the majority of the classical and modern language teaching community paid little attention to such minority reports. As Richards & Rodgers point out,

alternatives to the Grammar Translation Method "did not manage to achieve any lasting impact" (p. 7). Thus, although "Grammar Translation did not enter classical language classes until the first decade of the nineteenth century" (p. 53), it quickly became the prevailing method of teaching classical (and modern) languages.

### **The Grammar Translation Method**

Before proceeding to explain modern developments in second language acquisition it is useful to enumerate the major features of the Grammar Translation Method. They have been described by Richards & Rodgers:

1. The goal of foreign language study is to learn a language in order to read its literature or in order to benefit from the mental discipline and intellectual development that result from foreign language study. Grammar Translation is a way of studying a language that approaches the language first through detailed analysis of its grammar rules, followed by application of this knowledge to the task of translating sentences and texts into and out of the target language. It hence views language learning as consisting of little more than memorizing rules and facts in order to understand and manipulate the morphology and syntax of the foreign language. "The first language is maintained as the reference system in the acquisition of the second language." (Stern, 1983, p. 455)
2. Reading and writing are the major focus; little or no systematic attention is paid to speaking or listening.
3. Vocabulary selection is based solely on the reading texts used, and words are taught through bilingual word lists, dictionary study, and memorization. In a typical Grammar-Translation text, the grammar rules are presented and illustrated, a list of vocabulary items is presented with their translation

equivalents, and translation exercises are prescribed.

4. The sentence is the basic unit of teaching and language practice. Much of the lesson is devoted to translating sentences into and out of the target language, and it is this focus on the sentence that is a distinctive feature of the method. Earlier approaches to foreign language study used grammar as an aid to the study of texts in a foreign language. But this was thought to be too difficult for students in secondary schools, and the focus on the sentence was an attempt to make language learning easier (see Howatt 1984, p. 131).

5. Accuracy is emphasized. Students are expected to attain high standards in translation, because of "the high priority attached to meticulous standards of accuracy which, as well as having an intrinsic moral value, was a prerequisite for passing the increasing number of formal written examinations that grew up during the century" (Howatt 1984: 132).

6. Grammar is taught deductively--that is, by presentation and study of grammar rules, which are then practiced through translation exercises. In most Grammar Translation texts, a syllabus was followed for the sequencing of grammar points throughout a text, and there was an attempt to teach grammar in an organized and systematic way.

7. The Student's native language is the medium of instruction. It is used to explain new items and to enable comparisons to be made between the foreign language and the student's native language.

(Richards & Rodgers, pp. 5, 6)

While the above enumeration makes some generalizations that may not be true in every instance where the Grammar Translation Method is employed, it is remarkably accurate in its description of the general characteristics of the method still

prevalent in the majority of classical language teaching environments. The Grammar Translation Method has survived largely unaltered in the classical language classroom since its adoption in the nineteenth century. Why it did not survive as the prevailing method in the modern language classroom, and what has replaced it are the topics of the the next section.

### **The Reform Movement**

Grammar Translation was practical from an administrative point of view (e.g., objective tests), but it was hardly effective as a method for encouraging active use of the language being studied. As educators recognized that inadequacy, there was increasing interest in developing new methods based on principles of linguistics, psychology, and education; "this effort became known as the Reform Movement in language teaching" (Richards & Rodgers, p. 9).

Although the Reform Movement included most of the language teaching profession, not everyone incorporated its principles into pedagogy design. As Richards & Rodgers further point out, "Grammar Translation dominated European and foreign language teaching from the 1840s to the 1940s, and in modified form it continues to be widely used in some parts of the world today [ . . . ] it is still used in situations where understanding literary texts is the primary focus of foreign language study and there is little need for a speaking knowledge of the language" (p. 6). As Kelly states, "the persistence of Grammar-Translation methods among orthodox teachers maintained a running polemic [ . . . ] But the armor of most teachers has remained unscratched, protected as they are by the circumstances of their profession against any fortuitous awareness of a side opposed to their own" (p. 139). In fact, many contemporary college level foreign and classical language teaching texts continue to use Grammar Translation principles. Further, "these texts are frequently

the products of people trained in literature rather than in language teaching or applied linguistics" (Richards & Rodgers, p. 7).

However, the Reform Movement gained momentum with the help of linguists, teachers, and psychologists, who began developing practical (from a language skill point of view) alternatives to the Grammar Translation Method that received widespread recognition. Professional associations, such as the International Phonetic Association, as well as journals, conferences and various media were established to focus specifically on language teaching. Although it was a time of much debate as to which language teaching techniques should be employed, there were many fundamental beliefs that these reformers shared that shaped the outcome of the branch of language study which focuses on the science of second and foreign language teaching and learning--Applied Linguistics. These basic beliefs are outlined by Richards & Rodgers:

1. the spoken language is primary and that this should be reflected in an oral-based methodology
2. the findings of phonetics should be applied to teaching and to teacher training
3. learners should hear the language first, before seeing it in written format
4. words should be presented in sentences, and sentences should be presented in meaningful contexts and not taught as isolated, disconnected elements
5. the rules of grammar should be taught only after the students have practiced the grammar points in context--that is, grammar should be taught inductively
6. translation should be avoided, although the native language could be used in order to explain new words or to check comprehension

(Richards & Rodgers, p. 10)

Using these intuitions, educators, linguists, and language teachers, began to develop language teaching methods from scientific principles based on the nature of language and language learning, as well as educational psychology.

Over the next fifty years, methods based on a wide variety of theories from an equally wide variety of disciplines were advanced. The earlier of these theories (such as the Audio-Lingual Method) were dominated by the behaviorist model of psychology. Behaviorism was seminal in the development of structural linguistics, which, in harmony with the cognitive models of the time, recommended focusing on mastery of "phonological and grammatical structures" (Richards & Rodgers). However, in 1955, a doctoral student from the University of Pennsylvania, delivered his doctoral dissertation, *Transformational Analysis*, which reversed many of the precepts of the popular linguistics theories. In 1957, Noam Chomsky presented his major theoretical viewpoints of his thesis in a monograph: *Syntactic Structures*. In time, the field of linguistics was stood on its head as Chomsky's ideas systematically reversed most of the popular linguistic theories of the time. Chomsky firmly uprooted the behaviorist model of language and convincingly explained language in terms of mentalist theories.

By the 1960s, in response to Chomsky's criticisms of standard structural theories of language, the British modern language teaching tradition began to reevaluate the then popular Behaviorist derived, Situational Language Teaching Method. In addition to Chomsky's fundamental demonstration--that structural models of language could not account for the creativity and uniqueness of language--British "applied linguists emphasized another fundamental dimension of language that was inadequately addressed in approaches to language teaching at that time--the functional and communicative potential of language. They saw the need to focus in language

teaching on communicative proficiency rather than on mere mastery of structures" (Richards & Rodgers, p. 153). This marked the beginning of the now favored Communicative Language Teaching Approach.

### **Linguistic terminology**

Until this point, method, approach and other similar terms, have largely been used interchangeably. However, before advancing to a technical discussion of the features of Communicative Language Teaching, it is useful to draw attention to certain distinctions between these terms when they are used in a technical sense. Therefore, this section focuses on defining and explaining the technical terms that are used in applied linguistics to discuss language teaching. The following content is condensed largely from the excellent discussion in Richards & Rodgers (2001), in which they "clarify the relationship between approach and method and present a model for the description, analysis, and comparison of methods" (p. 18), and the clarifications made by Brown (1994) as regards the popular use of the model. In the remaining sections of this chapter, and chapters of this book, this model will serve as a means of describing, and comparing the two pedagogical traditions under consideration.

### **Method, approach, design, and task**

The term method, or methodology, as it relates to language teaching has been used since the 1980s to refer to a 'prepackaged' plan for teaching language. A method is composed of three basic elements: approach, design, and task. Approach refers to a set of assumptions, beliefs [classicists will object to this word], and theories about the nature of language and language learning. Design (also referred to in the literature as curriculum or syllabus), specifies the relationship of those theories to classroom materials and activities. Task (also referred to in the literature as technique,



procedure, activity or exercise) refers to the individual techniques or practices that are derived from one's approach and design (Richards & Rodgers, pp. 18-34; Brown, p. 48).

Figure 1.1, Method, approach, design and task

[scanned picture from Richards and Rodgers]

Until the 1980s, applied linguists and educators focused on developing and improving methods. Some of the popular 'prepackaged' methods that come with prescribed approaches, designs and tasks include: Audiolingualism, Counseling-Learning, Situational language Teaching, The Silent Way, Suggestopedia, and Total Physical Response. However, placing so much emphasis on method design is problematic. As Richards & Rodgers, state, "[...] methods tend to have a relatively short shelf life. Because they are often linked to very specific claims and to prescribed practices, they tend to fall out of favor as these practices become unfashionable or discredited" (p. 245). So since the 1980s, rather than focusing on developing one 'all-powerful' method for teaching languages, applied linguists and educators have turned their attention to designing and collecting tasks that are informed by empirically supported approaches to language teaching and learning. In this way, individual teachers are given the freedom to choose from a wide variety of tasks based on their particular needs. In recent years, 'Communicative Language Teaching' has become the blanket term used to refer to most or all of the common interpretations of time tested and empirically supported approaches to language teaching. Some of these include: Competency-Based Language Learning, Content-Based Instruction, Cooperative Learning, Lexical Approaches, Multiple Intelligences, Neurolinguistic Programming, Task-Based Learning, and Whole Language. Each of

these interpretations has a place in further clarifying aspects of the core set of theories and beliefs about the nature of language and language learning and the "derived set of principles for teaching a language" (Richards & Rodgers, p. 245) that underlie the Communicative Language Teaching Approach. Rather than prescribing a fixed set of tasks to be used in teaching a language, these interpretations expand on the effect that selected tasks have on language classrooms. In this way, Communicative Language Teaching allows selection of tasks based on the needs of the individual circumstances of each language teaching environment (Richards & Rodgers, p. 245).

So to summarize, in Communicative Language Teaching, the methodology is designed by the language teacher, who selects a set of tasks based on the the approaches that best meet the needs of the classroom. In this way, Communicative Language Teaching allows for flexibility in design and application of language teaching.

Having clarified the necessary terminology, the rest of this book focuses on determining whether the set of approaches that make up Communicative Language Teaching meet the needs and circumstances of classical language teaching environments. Therefore, in Chapters 2 and 3, the fundamental characteristics of this approach are compared to the Grammar Translation Method and other common classical language teaching practices in light of both the stated goals of classical language teachers and the perceptual challenges that make adoption of the approach difficult. In Chapter 4, empirical evidence is presented that supports the use of communicative tasks in classical language teaching and thus supports the theories of the previous chapters. Finally, Chapter 5 is devoted to the topics of design and task; that is, how can classical language teachers apply the fundamental principles of Communicative Language Teaching in their classrooms? However, before these

topics can be considered, the general characteristics of the set of approaches that make up Communicative Language Teaching need to be enumerated in more detail.

### **Communicative Language Teaching**

Richards & Rodgers explain that proponents of the Communicative Language Teaching, "see it as an approach (and not a method) that aims to (a) make communicative competence the goal of language teaching and (b) develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication" (p. 155). Starting from these two fundamental principles, Communicative Language Teaching has expanded to incorporate a wide variety of theories and practices all of which can be incorporated into development of one's methodology. Using the terminology previously defined, this section enumerates the main characteristics of some approaches that are common in Communicative Language Teaching classrooms. The design and task aspects of Communicative Language Teaching are more closely examined in Chapter 5.

#### **Approach**

##### *Theory of language*

The fundamental theory of language that Communicative Language Teaching is based on defines language as communication. Therefore "the goal of language teaching is to develop what Hymes (1972) referred to as 'communicative competence'." Further defining what communicative competence entails is the function of language theories. Several of these language theories have been briefly characterized by Richards & Rodgers:

1. language is a system for the expression of meaning.
2. The primary function of language is to allow interaction and communication,.
3. The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses.

4. The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse.

(Richards & Rodgers, p. 161)

*Theory of language learning*

Richards & Rodgers list three prevailing elements of a theory of language learning that have been consistently selected in Communicative Language Teaching environments based on "how well they engage the learner in meaningful and authentic language use (rather than merely mechanical practice of language patterns)" (p. 161).

These are:

1. "[. . .] the communicative principle: Activities that involve real communication promote learning" (Richard & Rodgers, p. 161).
2. "[. . .] the task principle: activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote leaning" (Richard & Rodgers, p. 161).
3. "[. . .] the meaningfulness principle: Language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process" (Richard & Rodgers, p. 161).

Rather than viewing language learning as derived from practicing skills, these elements support a theory that views language learning as a result of participation in meaningful communicative exchanges.

**Conclusion**

This Chapter has discussed the historical origin of both the Grammar Translation Method and Communicative Language Teaching, as well as given the general characteristics of each. Additionally, it has covered briefly each pedagogical tradition--classical language teaching, and (more recently) modern language teaching.

Greek and Latin were taught inductively until the Middle Ages when educators began using techniques designed by ancient grammarians to improve rhetorical skill

(deductive grammar exercises), to introduce the languages to nonnative speakers. However, speech and composition formed a major part of classical language teaching tradition, and this ensured that learners continued using the language actively, until the latter nineteenth century when the Grammar Translation Method was widely adopted.

Grammar Translation had its origin in the eighteenth century during a period when educators and grammarians developed foreign language teaching programs (not for classical languages) based on the educational precedents of other disciplines: language was viewed as just another skill. Its adoption by classical language teachers was a result of demands placed on the discipline that forced a change in established traditional pedagogical practice. Contributing factors included: shifts in educational aims; need for objective evaluation methods; lack of skilled teachers due to the number of classes; and class size and control.

The Communicative Language Teaching Approach is the evolving culmination of efforts by applied linguists and educators to respond to the need for language teaching techniques that match what is known about language teaching: the approach primarily stems from a theory of language as communication. It is comprised of a variety of other theories and practices any of which can be used by language teachers based on the individual needs of teaching environments.

## References

- Brown, H. Douglas. (1994). *Teaching by Principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Howat, T. (1983). Talking shop: Transformation and change in ETL. *ETL Journal* 5(3):263-268.
- Kelly, L. C. (1969). *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- Mounce, William D. (1993). *Basics of Biblical Greek Grammar*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Richards, Jack C. and Rodgers, Theodore S. (2001) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robins, R.H. (1967). *A Short History of Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Stern, H.H (1983). *The Practical Study of Languages*. Reprinted London: Oxford University Press.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Which is an approach to the teaching of second and foreign languages ,emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of learning a language. It is also referred to as "Communicative Approach". As the language theories underlying the Audiolingual method and the Situational Language Teaching method were questioned by prominent linguists like Chomsky (1957) during the 1960s, a new trend of language teaching paved its way into classrooms. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which is an approach to the teaching of second and foreign languages, emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of learning a language. It is also referred to as the "Communicative Approach". Communicative language teaching is an effective way of engaging learners and helping them to develop their language skills in a natural context. It encourages learners to improve their language in a personalised way and helps them to interact in English in real life situations rather than just learning English grammar rules and word lists. Students develop their skills by "doing". It can be compared to riding a bicycle "you can't learn how to ride a bicycle without practising". Activities in Communicative Language Teaching are focused on students in realistic communication. The more practice and success students have using English, the better their motivation to learn.

1. Classroom management. 2014. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Teaching Listening to the Eight Grade Students of Bilingual Program at SMP N 2 Ponorogo in Academic Year 2013/2014. Thesis, English Education Department, Tarbiyah Faculty, State Islamic College of Ponorogo (STAIN Ponorogo), Advisor 1 Dr. Hj. Siti Maryam Yusuf, M.Ag, Advisor 2 Winantu K. S. A., M. Hum. Keywords: Teaching, Listening, Teaching Listening, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Basically, teaching is very important in educational system. It plays important role in which an interaction between teacher and the students in the classroom. Communicative language teaching (CLT), or the communicative approach, is an approach to language teaching that emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of study. Language learners in environments utilizing CLT techniques, learn and practice the target language through the interaction with one another and the instructor, the study of "authentic texts" (those written in the target language for purposes other than language learning), and through the use of the language both in class

Communicative language teaching (CLT), or the communicative approach, is an approach to language teaching that emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of study. Language learners in environments utilizing CLT techniques learn An effective knowledge of a language is more than merely knowing vocabulary and rules of grammar and pronunciation. Learners need to be able to use the language appropriately in any social context. Theorists agree that meaningful communication supports language learning and that classroom activities must focus on the learner's authentic needs to communicate information and ideas. Grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary are, of course, necessary parts of effective communication.