

Factors in Development of Language Teaching Methods¹

Miyang Cha, Vaishna Narang

Namseoul University, Jawaharlal Nehru University

Cha, Miyang & Narang, Vaishna. (2008). Factors in development of language teaching methods. *Modern English Education*, 9(2), 1-20.

Beginning with the distinction between *Method*, *Methodology* and *Methodics*, the three integral components of any language teaching program, this paper presents a brief overview of the evolutionary process that language pedagogy has witnessed over the past 100 years. In particular, this paper explores the developmental changes in language teaching methods, focusing on the factors that cause such changes in order to gain insights for future directions for language teaching. Some of the important factors influencing the development of teaching methods are discussed under the five headings: Linguistic theories, social aspirations, learner-related factors, teachers' experiences, and physical contexts. A particular factor or a set of factors may have resulted in a particular change at a certain time, while other factors might have dominated the language pedagogy scene at another time. A shift from one kind of method to another which was congruent with the development in linguistic theory may also have been independent of the linguistic advancement. The advent of communicative function oriented approaches to language teaching, for instance, has been attributed primarily to the so-called 'teachers' experiences' which include teachers' frustrations with the structural syllabus and pattern practice methods of drilling structures isolated from their actual context of use. It is considered as teachers' eclecticism and innovations in language teaching in order to contextualize the structures learned in isolation.

[Language Teaching/method/model/pedagogical theory/
언어교육/교수법/교수모형/교수이론]

I. INTRODUCTION

Terms like 'methods' and 'methodology' have been in use in the area of language pedagogy over the centuries, but it is perhaps impossible to outline "a single undifferentiated methodological prescription" (Stern, 1983, p. 494) that could be applied

¹ This research was supported by the Namseoul University Research Grant of 2008.

consistently and comprehensively to any and every situation in which languages are taught. Ever since language pedagogy made its first appearance, with an ever-increasing variety of language teaching situations, language teaching methods have changed and developed due to and in response to a number of factors. A particular factor or a set of factors may have resulted in a particular change at a certain time, while other factors might have dominated the language pedagogy scene at another time. The purpose of this paper is to give a brief overview of the evolutionary process that language pedagogy has witnessed over the past 100 years. In particular, this paper is aimed to examine the developmental changes that language teaching methods have undergone, focusing on some of the important factors that cause these changes in order to gain insights for future directions for language teaching. Prior to the discussion on the evolutionary process of language teaching methods, it is perhaps obligatory to differentiate terms like *Method*, *Methodology* and *Methodics*.

In the name of pedagogical procedures, it is important to include the preparation of a syllabus and teaching materials and practice of such materials as it is an integral part of any language teaching exercise. This necessitates an explicit statement about the distinctions between methodology and method; selection and gradation of the language teaching materials on the one hand, and the presentation of these materials in classrooms on the other. In fact, a three-way distinction has been considered important. Allen and Davies (1977) recognizes three stages that are important for any language teaching program. The first stage is 'the evaluation of the linguistic grammars according to their own terms of reference and extract features relevant to language teaching.' This kind of a rewriting of the linguistic grammars to suit the specific needs and requirements of the specific language teaching situation has been referred to as *Methodics* by Halliday, McIntosh and Stevens (1964). The second and the third stages are 'the preparation of a structured syllabus' and based on the syllabus, 'writing a full array of texts, exercises explanations,' respectively. These two later stages correspond to what Halliday et al. (1964) refer to as *Methodology*.

Methodics and Methodology are therefore both prerequisite preparations prior to actual language teaching. It is *Method* that is in fact confined to the techniques of presentation of the materials prepared for the learners. The term 'method' has been used at all times to refer to the techniques of presentation, and sometimes highlighting some aspects of material preparation. Different labels designating different methods thus only indicate the thrust of that particular language teaching program. An effective language teaching program is the one that treats the *Methodics* of rewriting a linguistic grammar in the form of a pedagogical grammar, and the *Methodology* of syllabus and the text preparation, and the *Method* of presentation, all as equally important. These three Ms

that are integral components of any language teaching program are inseparable, interdependent and equally important and therefore must receive equal attention of the pedagogues. The success or failure of a language teaching program depends not only on the choice of a method but more on the right matching of these three Ms.

II. FACTORS AFFECTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF METHODS

Apart from the developments in disciplines like linguistics, psychology, education, etc. that influence the development of language teaching methods, the methods also change, develop and evolve in response to the changing demands on language education resulting from social aspirations of a society. Social, economic pressures like better job opportunities for those knowing a particular language, and socio-psychological factors like positive attitudes towards a particular speech community and its language and thus greater motivation to communicate in that language, all such factors influence learning and teaching of languages.

The factors influencing the developments in the area of language pedagogy and hence the development of methods are discussed under the following five headings: Linguistic theories, social aspirations, learner-related factors, teachers' experiences, and physical contexts. It is one of these or a combination of these factors that have been affecting the changes on the pedagogy scene at a particular time, while another set of factors became more effective in bringing about a change at another time. Yet another kind of hierarchy could be seen at work when teachers opted for another change in the overall language pedagogy scenario.

1. Linguistic Theories

Linguistic theory, linguistic grammar and the analytical techniques recommended by a theory for language analysis, all have had a direct/indirect influence on pedagogical theory and practice both. One can begin with the phase when there was no such a distinction as linguistic grammar vs. pedagogical grammar. Nor was there a distinction between a pedagogical theory and its actual practice in language teaching situations. There was a direct and a unidirectional relationship between linguistics and language pedagogy in which a theory gives a certain set of rules which could be applied straight away in language teaching. The grammar which described the correct language and served a normative purpose was used like a textbook in the language teaching classroom.

During that phase, grammar methods were the only methods for teaching a language no matter what the target language was, the mother tongue or the other tongue, in the learner's environment. Grammar methods for mother tongue teaching and grammar-translation methods for other tongue teaching were the only methods in use because of the underlying presumption that knowing the grammar of a language meant knowing about the language. A lot of research and discussion have gone into this and the related issues since then. The questions of relationships among linguistic theory, pedagogical theory, linguistic grammar and practical aspects of language teaching have been dealt with differently at different times. These relationships and the teaching techniques have followed a course of evolution.

There has been a gradual distancing between linguistics and language teaching practice in the last seven to eight decades. The relationship between linguistics and language pedagogy has become indirect and bidirectional. Spolsky (1969) insists that this relationship is indirect in the sense that one can only draw insights or implications from a linguistic theory which are of tremendous use to language teachers. A linguistic theory can also help to write descriptions of languages which are a necessary prerequisite to any language teaching program.

A similar bidirectional relationship holds between a pedagogical theory and a pedagogical grammar (Spolsky, 1969). A pedagogical grammar is a linguistic grammar rewritten in order to suit a specific language teaching situation, considering the specific socio-psychological, socioeconomic, political, educational and other factors pertaining to that specific language teaching situation. The experience of using such a pedagogical grammar helps a teacher review and revise the pedagogical theory, and also confirm or refute the pedagogical theory on which it is based.

A more bidirectional relationship can be envisaged between a linguistic grammar and a pedagogical grammar. A linguistic grammar that offers the explanation of linguistic structures can serve as a source and basis for writing a pedagogical grammar which is a complete plan for teaching the target language, presented in the form of a graded set of teaching units/modules, each one of which consists of the text, exercises, illustrations, and instructions on how to present it in the classroom. While using such a pedagogical grammar, the teacher may be able to review and reevaluate the linguistic grammar it is based on, and if not satisfied, may shift to another grammar based on another theory. The evolution of these relationships that indicates a gradual distancing between linguistics and actual language teaching is discussed in what follows.

1) Traditional Linguistics: Grammar-Translation Method (GTM)

Traditional linguistics is characterized by the admiration for the classical literary works and for the language of the classics. This admiration led people to believe that the language of the classics was 'pure', 'standard', 'high' and 'correct' as opposed to the spoken languages that were regarded as 'impure', 'nonstandard' 'low' and 'incorrect' varieties. All linguistic studies in those days therefore aimed at preserving the purity of the classical languages. Such a trend referred to as classical fallacy continued up to the 19th century, while languages changed, diversified and evolved into many new languages. At this juncture, a need was felt to study and describe the contemporary forms of languages and also to impose a norm on a constantly changing, highly fluid state of languages. Impact of traditional linguistics was so great that grammars were written with an aim to impose a norm. Only the standard and high literary variety was described in order to serve this prescriptive function. Grammar of one classical language served as a model for describing contemporary languages.

Languages were taught and learned during this period, but no distinction was made between mother tongue teaching and other tongue teaching. All language teaching was grammar oriented and sometimes amounted to grammar teaching alone, sorely focusing on form. Teaching of mother tongue in a formal educational setup was meant to impart the knowledge of the formal styles and their written forms, to expose the learners to literary style in its written form. Other tongue teaching was considered no different. Formal written styles was the target and the grammar rules were the only means to impart knowledge about it. For mother tongue teaching, the spoken variety that the learner was familiar with served as a medium of instruction, whereas for other tongue teaching, the mother tongue served as the medium of instruction and for translation practice.

This traditional linguistic era coincided with the Japanese colonial period (1910-1945) in Korea. Japanese annexation denying Koreans access to the outside world brought about a sharp decline in the development of English teaching in Korea. During this period, Japanese teachers of English taught English through GTM focussing on grammar explanation and translation exercises (Yongjae Paul Choe, 1996).

2) Structural Linguistics: Direct Methods and Discrete Point Approaches

Structural linguistics which emerged in reaction to traditional linguistics of the 19th century historicism was motivated by a need to describe contemporary varieties of language, both written and spoken forms independent of their historical lineage. Synchronic linguistics became independent and autonomous in parallel with diachronic linguistics which was regarded as a separate branch of linguistics. It was a change from

prescriptive grammars to descriptive grammars. As the descriptive function of grammar was primary, descriptive adequacy was the criteria by which grammar could be judged. Data-based empirical studies were conducted leaving no room for any subjectivity, and grammar was a set of rules and categories to be discovered from the data by a process of inductive generalization. Formal, distributional methods were employed to study the structure of language. Speech was considered primary and writing a secondary medium, and all forms of language in its various styles and varieties were recognized. Language was seen as a composite of four skills, and the language structure was analyzed at various levels- phonological, morphological, lexical, syntactic, semantic, etc. Thus an exhaustive linguistic description was expected to combine the two and describe each one of the resultant units in detail. Such discrete point charts were prepared more for pedagogical purposes than for merely descriptive purposes. One such division of language into various units combining units of structure with four skills can be seen in Mackey (1965) reference.

This phase of structural linguistics coincides with the well-known behaviorists' theories of learning in the area of psychology and psycholinguistics. Like all learning, language learning was also viewed as situation and environment oriented. Hull's Theory of habit formation and Pavlov's experiments on conditioning of reflexes cited as evidence were applied to language learning as well. Their implications for language learning were that verbal expressions, words, sentences, phonological units, etc. could be all acquired or learned by a process of mimicry and memorization. The rules were meant to be acquired inductively since no distinction was made between conditioned behavior and rule governed behavior.

The combined impact of structuralism and behaviorism on language pedagogy was distinct and clearly marked. Almost revolutionary changes that could be attributed to these two came about on the pedagogical scene: a shift from normative grammars to descriptive grammars and from grammar oriented language teaching to skill oriented language teaching. Some noticeable distinctions also emerged during this phase - distinctions between linguistic grammars and pedagogical grammars, between learning and teaching of mother tongue (L1) and other tongue (L2), between acquisition of knowledge and acquisition of skills, and between deductive methods and inductive methods of teaching. As a result, the teaching arena was dominated, for a number of years, by direct methods, inductive methods, audio-lingual methods giving primacy to oral skills over written skills, and structure/skill oriented discrete point arrangement of teaching units in the syllabus. Also, methods for conditioning of reflexes like habit forming drills of various kinds were devised, and the extensive use of language laboratories and audio-lingual/visual aids was meant to serve this very purpose.

English teaching in Korea experienced drastic changes and innovations during this phase. Influenced by these combined developments in the areas of linguistics and psychology, direct methods and audio-lingual methods dominated the English teaching scene in the 60s and 70s (Sang-ho Han, 1999).

3) Cognitive Linguistics: Natural Methods and Learner Centered Approaches

Chomsky revolutionized the linguistic/theoretical scene by his innate hypothesis of language and by his rationalistic, theory oriented universal grammar in place of data based, empirical descriptions of language structures. Chomsky (1965) asserts that there are highly abstract structures, and highly specific principles of organization which are characteristic of all human languages, which are intrinsic rather than acquired, which play a central role in the perception and production of sentences, and which provide the basis for the creative aspect of language use.

A grammar which aims at capturing these properties of languages in general is a universal grammar, and an innate grammar aims at capturing innate properties of language. Such a grammar is acquired by the native learner by applying the language acquisition device, an innate property of human mind, to the data received from the environment. It is this native speaker/hearer's competence to construct and to interpret grammatical sentences which should be reproduced as the grammar of the language. Some important distinctions were drawn between competence and performance, and between deep structure and surface structure. As regards to its application to language pedagogy, the cognitive theory aims at understanding the process of language learning that goes on in human mind. It is not a theory of first, second or any other language pedagogy as Chomsky (1965, p. 43) claims, "neither linguistic theory nor learning theory has achieved a level of understanding that it could provide us with a model for language teaching."

However, language teachers did try to apply this theoretical advancement in linguistics to language teaching. Use of T-rules and transformation drills, ordering of rules and subsequent practice patterns to follow the rule ordering given in transformational generative (TG) grammar was recommended in language teaching classes. Similarly, suggestions like 'writing a transformational teaching text' 'transformational competence model', 'surface structure teaching model,' etc. all reflect attempts to use the Chomskyan model of TG grammar in language teaching. This mentalistic and rationalistic theory of language and the TG grammar not only enhanced our understanding of language and the process of language learning, but also provided an operational framework to write specific descriptions of language. These descriptions are

better in that they are more precise, complete, and more generalized and highly formalized as compared to the discovery descriptions of the earlier kind, i.e. structural, formal, distributional descriptions of linguistic structures. This theory and the model of grammar therefore help in language pedagogy indirectly.

The innate hypothesis attributes an important role to human mind and says learning is not all environment or situation oriented. It directly discourages mechanical practice methods of mimicry-memorization kind. An important contribution lies in the fact that the shift from structure/text oriented language pedagogy to learner centered teaching came about and within the direct methods and the audio-lingual methods of various kinds, the choice of methods and materials became more learner oriented. A greater eclecticism could be seen at this time that the teacher selects from various techniques and materials whatever is the best for a particular learner group. This meant that pedagogical theory was recognized as a theory which guides a teacher in formulating methods, ways and means which facilitate the process of language acquisition.

Although the Chomskyan cognitive theory did not bring about any concrete or substantial changes on the pedagogical scene, its indirect influence was a realization on the part of the teachers about the shortcomings of the structural discrete point approaches, and they started introducing certain innovative changes that had far reaching consequences, such as (i) strictly compartmentalized view of the four skills of language and discrete point approach to language structure gave way to the integrated view of language treating language in its totality; (ii) structures taught out of context as isolated discrete points were contextualized by means of audio-visual aids; and (iii) language teaching gradually became more learner centered.

This advancement in the area of linguistics exerted influence on English teaching in Korea. Many voices were raised for the necessities to replace direct/audio-lingual methods with newer methods based on the rationalism and cognitivism. However, as the cognitive theory did not present any concrete methods, eclectic methods were introduced in the teaching practice (Sang-ho Han, 1999).

4) Sociolinguistics: Communicative Approaches

For Chomsky, 'grammar' is a reproduction of the rules of competence that a native speaker/hearer acquires during the process of language acquisition which involves both his innate ability to learn languages and his interaction with the environment. It is this competence that the native speaker/hearer puts to use in generating new sentences, decoding the sentences he hears and distinguish between grammatical and ungrammatical sentences. This claim of Chomsky for linguistic competence as the basis

for a theory of cognitive processes for the actual use of language came under attack by several sociolinguists.

The sociolinguists and socio-semanticists who were concerned with the meaning and use of language in its social context regarded Chomsky's notion of 'competence' as rather restricted because the 'competence' provides no place for competence for language use, nor does the category of 'performance' despite his equating language use with performance. The group of generative-semanticists did so because it relegates semantics to a secondary place. The Chomskyan theory and grammar omit everything pertaining to language use and sociocultural significance. It is necessary to be reminded of Wittgenstein (1953, p. 43), who rightly defined the meaning of a word as its use in the language, maintaining that "we know the meaning of a word only if and because we know how to use it."

Hymes (1971, p. 277) develops the notion of competence further to account for the communicative functions of language. The target of linguistic analysis is not an 'ideal speaker-hearer', nor a 'homogeneous speech community', but a 'heterogeneous speech community', and 'differential competence' and the constitutive role of sociocultural features. A number of other linguists (e.g. Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Halliday, 1973; Johnson, 1979, etc.) expressed similar views stressing the need to study linguistic form in human contexts, and the rules of use of structure in appropriate contexts. Hymes recasts the notion of competence as 'communicative competence' so that the focus is on the use of an utterance in communicative acts, and on communicative functions of language in human contexts. A function oriented grammar or a communicative grammar is therefore a grammar which aims at reproducing the rules of communicative competence that a speaker/hearer internalizes while he undergoes the normal process of socialization. This process of socialization implies that the learner's language acquisition ability is a part of his total learning/acquisition abilities, and his interaction with the environment is not just confined to the linguistic environment. In fact, a child learning his language and learning to interact with his environment never receives linguistic data isolated from its sociocultural context. Through this process of socialization, the native learner captures the 'organized diversity' (Hymes, 1971) that is the characteristic property of every social system and that is reflected in every use of a formal structure of language.

Ideally speaking, a communicative grammar begins with isolating and describing the communicative functions that language is expected to perform and in doing so, establishes communicative categories for every function. Then, it attempts to describe the formal manifestation of these categories in a particular language, disambiguating the form and function relationship for every context of situation.

It is important to note at this point that by the time linguistic theory had evolved and developed to the phase of sociolinguistics, language pedagogy had also gone through some evolutionary changes. During this evolutionary process, the context in which communicative vs. structure oriented language teaching debate started was already set, and this context could be characterized by the following features: (i) language pedagogy had acquired a certain amount of autonomy; (ii) pedagogical theory was distinguished from practical language teaching; (iii) the distinction between linguistic grammar and pedagogical grammar was considered necessary; (iv) structure oriented language teaching had already replaced the earlier grammar oriented language teaching; and (v) purpose oriented language programs, i.e. both materials and methods in the name of LSP (Language for Specific Purposes) and ESP (English for Specific Purposes) had already gained currency. The language practitioners consciously related language teaching to the factors pertaining to learner and his environment, taking language closer to his purpose of learning the target language.

At this juncture, some noticeable distinctions had also emerged between (i) language acquisition and language learning (Krashen, 1981) in terms of characteristics of learners as well as in terms of types of learning; (ii) a part of the total developmental process and an addition after the basic development is complete; and (iii) recognizing environment through language and language through environment, knowing this relationship between language and reality to learn another language as a means of expression in the same/different environment. The L2 learner already knows the 'potential' of language and can go straight to discover how that potential is realized in the L2 (Cook, 1978; Corder, 1980).

In addition, in terms of social functions of the language, differences between the second language (SL) and the foreign language (FL) were also recognized as - (i) skill using vs. skill getting (Rivers, 1981); (ii) SL acquisition involves implicit knowledge and mechanisms that guide automatic performance, while FL learning involves explicit knowledge and mechanisms that guide problem-solving performance (Selinker, 1972); (iii) L1 is acquired from linguistic data that is always varied, unsystematic and non-repetitive, whereas SL is acquired from similar data, and also learned in the controlled environment of a formal educational setup. On the other hand, FL is learned only in the strictly controlled environment in which data is controlled, systematic and repetitive; (iv) while SL acquisition is more of a restructuring of his L1, FL learning is better explained by 'creative construction hypothesis' (Krashen, 1981); and (v) SL is learned under pressure from the environment, and therefore learned with a lot of support from the sociocultural environment of the learner, whereas for FL learning there is no pressure, nor any reinforcement from the learner's sociocultural context of learning. So, a

wide use of audio-visual aids for appropriate contextualization of language is an essential component of FL teaching.

During the phase of communicative approaches of the 80's, one finds a change to communicative functions to be isolated as teaching units, and situations or speech events complete with function and form both to be taken as pedagogic units. Communicative functions of language were earlier ignored, and so were the communicative strategies that every speaker employs in a communicative act. The shift was towards giving priority to communicative function over form and to create situations where the learner employs necessary communicative strategies to control a linguistic/communicative situation (Dornyei & Scott, 1997). Those approaches that focus on meaning and interaction such as 'content-based language teaching' (Brown, 2001) or 'task-based language teaching' (Nunan, 2003) made their appearances in the pedagogical arena. That is to find ways and means by which the learner acquires forms and structures through the meaning-based interaction in the context of situation in which they are used, and are also likely to be used by the learner later on.

Such function oriented, communicative teaching techniques find theoretical support as the linguistic scene has witnessed an almost identical shift from the study of linguistic form in isolation to the study of linguistic form in human contexts. So it may be presumed that a communicative grammar based on the notion of 'communicative competence' (Hymes, 1971) or on the notion of 'meaning potential' (Halliday, 1973) or further, on the 'three-dimensional grammar framework' (Larsen-Freeman, 2001) which does not restrict itself to linguistic form alone but includes a systematic description of linguistic form, its meaning and use in the appropriate sociocultural context (i.e. pragmatics), will certainly suit the needs of language pedagogy better than a grammar which describes structures alone.

2. Social Aspirations

Language is situated in human contexts and so is an individual in the whole communicating and interacting network of relations in which he is one of the many interacting participants. Language serves a meaningful purpose because of its special relationship with the human context in which it is used. The intricate and complex relationship that exists between language and an individual, his thought processes, and between language and the social system exerts various kinds of pressures on language and its users. Language may change its form and/or function in order to suit the sociocultural changes which may take place in the social network, or it may change due to changes in the attitudes and perceptions of the people. Language is also expected to

function as a means of expression for established cultural norms, conventions and values of the society. There is generally a balance between the two, stability and change in the dynamics of the society. In developing societies it is often more towards change rather than stability due to the social aspirations of the society (Narang, 1993). Attitudinal factors and socio-psychological factors exert considerable influence on education system in general and on language education in particular.

The earlier phase of the 19th century historicism and grammar methods, historical method and cognate methods are some examples indicating how attitudinal and socio-psychological factors influence language education. The high esteem that the literary classics and the language of the classics enjoyed resulted in historical orientation in language teaching and learning. Language teaching included a lot of etymology, words and their derivations with their genealogical connections. Language learning was considered as a slow and tedious intellectual process like any other academic and intellectual exercise.

Socioeconomic factors like better job opportunities due to the knowledge of a particular language can always motivate a learner better for learning that particular language. Such socioeconomic reasons can bring about changes in the methods /methodology of language teaching as well. Almost a revolution has taken place in many countries where English is used as a second language, in the name of ESP because of the socioeconomic pressures to link language education with actual use in various vocations, and to make language education more purpose oriented.

Socio-political pressures of various kinds can also exert influence on language pedagogy, both in materials as well as methods. The examples can be drawn from the time when the whole world was facing extraordinary situations, and political pressures ultimately culminated in the second world war. This period overlapped with the prestructural phase of linguistics changing in favor of structural, descriptive linguistics, but language pedagogy was dominated by grammar methods or GTM. Deductive and explicit methods of teaching the rules of grammar which described and prescribed certain forms of language as standard and left out the spoken language to be just picked up by the learner himself. With the fast changing political circumstances people wanted to learn the languages spoken by the other ethnic groups. People working for the various political groups, or for the army, for instance, needed to communicate with the target language (TL) groups in their vernacular. GTM aiming at the high literary standard of the TL could hardly be of any use. A native or near native pronunciation and perfect skills of the vernacular was absolutely essential for soldiers who may have faced the enemy in various circumstances. His language could conceal or reveal his identity, and a linguistic mix-up or accented articulation which reveals his identity could ultimately cost

him his life.

The compulsions of this kind forced language teachers to devise methods which aim at training the learner in native or near native pronunciation of the TL. Therefore, the stress was placed on oral, communicative skills, on spoken, colloquial, vernacular forms of language, and on knowledge of subtle variation between social classes and their corresponding low or high speech habits. ASTP (Army Specialized Training Program in 1943) is one such example. These methods also had to be quick, intensive training methods, and the evolution of direct methods was led into various kinds of short term oral methods of language teaching such as mim-mem method, army method, audio-lingual method, phonetic method, and so forth.

3. Learner-related Factors

The phase of behaviorists' theories of learning coincided with the phase of structural linguistics and its dominance in language pedagogy. Due to the stimulus-response theory of language, language learning was regarded as all environment oriented process of habit formation and also of inductive generalization. This encouraged pattern practice methods, rote-memorization, mechanical drilling of linguistic structures. An ideal method of environment oriented language teaching was proposed in the name of 'total immersion method' in which the learner was presumably isolated from his L1 linguistic environment for a certain duration and placed in a setup where he could only interact with the TL environment through all his waking hours. Formal classroom of the TL learning was also a part of his daily routine in this new setup.

However, some practical problems can arise. It is wondering whether one can really produce a replica of the native environment which is identical with the original in all respects. One may produce similar buildings, shops and food stalls with the same food items that the TL speaker enjoys, but the very fact that the members in this community are not the same or even similar makes it an artificial community. Native speakers of the TL with their own ways of living and ways of thinking, with their stereotyped beliefs and conventions, and with their kind of upbringing make the real TL environment. However, the members of this artificial community are all learners and some teachers with perhaps similar, if not identical, sociocultural background. One may be able to practice linguistic structures in artificially created contexts of this kind, but that can be achieved by audio-lingual/visual methods and by using language laboratories as well. Another problem centers around the difference between the learners of L1 and L2. Placing the learner in this environment is only to ensure that the L2 learner gets as close to the TL environment as the L1 learner does, and that the L2 learner gets as much

practice and opportunity to interact with the TL environment as the native learner. The learner in this case is an individual who is not recognizing his environment through language and language through environment, and is fully aware of the relationship that holds between language and its users, language and the society and between language and the material world it represents. He is aware of the potential of language and is only to learn another system of communication used in another sociocultural setup. The learner being an adult may face problems adjusting to the new system and to the unreal environment. The problem is that these methods ignore the role played by human mind in the process of language acquisition, and in consciously learning another language.

In addition, these methods also overlook the fact that the learning abilities of individuals vary from person to person. Learning ability, especially the language learning ability is a complex of several factors. In case of an adult learner, his learning ability depends a great deal on the environment, the social, economic, cultural setup, socio-psychological constraints and pressures. Since there is no way of evaluating or measuring the learning ability of an individual, one must take a number of learner-related factors into consideration when devising a language program for learners with similar background. Some of these factors are age, education and linguistic background, linguistic ability, socioeconomic background, home environment, aptitude for learning languages in general and motivation to learn the target language in particular, attitude of the individual as well as his community towards the TL and the speech community where the TL is spoken. While age, linguistic and educational background are definitely considered important in choosing the appropriate materials and methods for a specific learner group, other factors such as the learners' socioeconomic background, aptitude for language learning, motivation to learn the TL and his attitude towards the TL and the TL speech community also contribute a lot to an individual's learning ability. It may be difficult to quantify any of these factors, but the learning abilities of individuals and groups can be evaluated in relative terms. For example, a particular kind of FL teaching program may be very successful with learners who join after graduation, but the same program may not succeed if/when it is administered to the same age group with a lower educational background. Similarly, when a person coming from a high socioeconomic background (in relative terms) may be placed with the underprivileged, his frustrations and problems of adjustment with the group may result in failure in the FL teaching program itself.

Learner's attitude towards the TL and the TL community plays a role in the process of language learning. A positive attitude motivates and thus helps in learning language. A study of the attitudes conducted by Narang (1993) in an Indian province showed that definite ethnic stereotypes in certain social classes led to their success/failure in learning

a language. According to Stem (1970), there are differences between societies in social attitudes towards the importance of other languages, and other cultures, and as a result, milieu that is created for learning particular languages can range from supportive or indifferent to hostile.

4. Teachers' Experiences

The language teachers' success, frustrations and failures during the process of language teaching, all lead to changes and innovations in methods they employ for language teaching. A theoretician even with his most innovative and convincing theory cannot bring about any change until and unless the practicing teacher is aware of the theory, convinced by the logistics of the theory, and is willing to apply the theory to practice. If the teacher wants to succeed and develop his/her teaching, he/she has to keep trying ever newer methods and modes of presentation of the materials prescribed, and may also need to change the teaching materials to suit the needs and requirements of his/her specific group of learners. While the shift from GTM to direct methods was attributed to changes in linguistic theories and to the socio-political circumstances around World War II, the evolution within the direct methods from discrete point structures to structures with contextualization by means of audio-visual aids was primarily dictated by teachers' own failures and success with certain methods.

It is interesting to note that the change from structure oriented teaching to communicative function oriented teaching has been quite independent of the developments in the area of linguistics. It is sometimes suggested that the shift from structural to communicative approaches is matched by and may be due to the sociolinguistic approach to the study of language and the notion of communicative competence. But that is simply overrating the contribution of sociolinguistics in language teaching. The shift, rather than the evolution, of communicative function oriented language pedagogy has been primarily due to the fact that the teachers in the classrooms found it hard to use strictly structure oriented discrete point approaches and yet produce good results. Segmentation of language into 5-6 levels and compartmentalization of language into four skills, combining the two to give 20 to 24 discrete units to serve as teaching points and as the basis of designing a syllabus can give the satisfaction of making an exhaustive syllabus, but using this to teach the language cannot yield results in terms of learners' ability to use structures for communication purposes. So, mechanical drills by means of audio tapes and language laboratories were almost immediately supplemented by films and other kinds of audio-visual aids to provide proper contexts for linguistic structures. These were some of the simpler

solutions to the problems that were far more complex and could not be solved by the structural syllabus and pattern practice methods of language teaching. Growing needs for appropriate and optimum contextualization of linguistic structures led to material production of a very different kind on a large scale. Teaching materials for graded language teaching films, or a series of slides with commentaries had to be very different from texts and exercises to be used in classroom situations. However, films and other audio-visual aids still remained supplements to the main teaching programs and were not complete programs by themselves. Thus, the classroom teaching remained guided by the structural syllabus, and structural teaching lasted for a much longer period of time.

With all the structural syllabus prescribed in various language teaching institutions, it becomes the sole responsibility of the teacher to relate the structures to meaning and use in appropriate contexts. The approaches became eclectic with a structural basis. Leech and Svartvik (1975) claimed that a pedagogical grammar aimed at improving the range and extent of communicative skills of the learners, and the learners are expected to know the basics of English grammar and this pedagogical grammar is to enable the learners to use grammar for the purpose just mentioned. This is an excellent example of a descriptive grammar rewritten to suit certain pedagogical functions. It is called as a communicative grammar not because it is based on a communicative theoretical grammar, but simply because of the pedagogical function it is expected to serve.

Wilkins (1976) proposed 'Notional Syllabus' which is yet another pointer to the fact that demands for more communication, meaning and use oriented pedagogy were certainly ahead of communicative linguistic theory. Similarly, van Ek (1975) also refers to no theoretical/linguistic grammar to describe his teaching units in terms of learner roles, setting, topic etc. When Widdowson (1978) compared and contrasted language as a formal system and language use as a communication event, he described these in terms of linguistic categories and communicative categories, associating the former with 'correctness', 'cohesion', and 'sentence' as a 'proposition'; and the latter with 'appropriateness', 'coherence', and 'utterance' as an 'illocutionary act'. He was also ahead of sociolinguists and theoreticians in demanding a shift of focus from structure to function in theoretical linguistics.

It may be worth reiterating the point that during this evolutionary process, language pedagogy as a theoretical science has acquired a certain amount of autonomy from linguistics. Thus, communicative language pedagogy does find theoretical support from linguistics, but its development and evolution cannot be attributed to communicative competence or any sociolinguistic theory of language. The evolutionary process in linguistics and language pedagogy can be summed up as one from the focus on linguistic structures in isolation to linguistic structures in human contexts.

5. Physical Contexts

Physical contexts are related to the environment in which the language is being taught and learned. Physical contexts in the concrete refer to the choice of media and facilities available for the presentation of the materials. A pedagogical theory may recommend the use of language labs, hi-tech equipment, computers, multimedia, etc. The developed societies with a greater pace of change and modernization, and their hi-tech revolutions could always afford to apply high technology to language teaching and learning. Justification for the use of language labs and hi-tech equipment came from pedagogues suggesting ever newer methods like computer-assisted language learning (CALL) or multimedia-assisted language learning (MALL) of giving maximum practice in minimum time, enabling the learner to make full use of a class hour. In order to make an optimum use of high technology in language teaching, there had to be a revolution to match in the materials for teaching languages. So, the choice of teaching materials, selection, and gradation were to a large extent governed by the modes of presentation. In a way, the methodics and methodology had to be reoriented in order to suit an audio-lingual/visual method, or even for a total immersion method, and the latest computer/multimedia-assisted learning of languages. Use of these hi-tech aids and such methods encouraged learning without teaching, which ended up in more 'self-teaching' flooding the markets and audio-visual aids becoming audio-visual methods of language learning.

This hi-tech revolution in language teaching led to an excessive use of language labs, overhead projectors, computers, multimedia and the Internet as the use of hi-tech aids and materials indicated modernization. First casualty in this process was the interaction with the teacher and subsequently creativity in teaching and learning of languages which is very important for learning to progress. Language is extremely complex and so is the process of language learning. Finding quick and easy remedies or solutions to these problems means, first a superficial reading of the problem itself, and second looking for simple and straight solutions where there are none. Disillusioned with the use of hi-tech aids in language teaching, the learners started looking for more contact programs so that there is contact with language in human contexts. Nevertheless, the hi-tech revolution traveled to developing societies as well, through aids and grants of various kinds and are still being used for instance in India (Narang, 1993).

Physical contexts also include the time factor that is one of the important considerations in choosing a set of materials and methods for a particular course. The time factor in L2 teaching and learning would be different depending on the learning

context. In the SL context one would require a certain number of contact hours, or teaching hours, while exposure to real life linguistic situation is taken care of by the social settings outside the classroom situation, as in the case of teaching of English in an urban setting in India, which does not require separate hours for media-exposure, nor demand extra hours for pattern practice drills with or without the labs. On the other hand, in the context of an FL like English teaching in Korea, teaching would require time slots for all the three kinds of activities like classroom teaching, pattern practice sessions, and controlled audio-visual sessions for appropriate contextualization of the language as there is a scarcity of exposure to natural language outside the classroom.

III. CONCLUSION

Over the centuries language teaching has witnessed a multitude of changes in its methods and models. This paper has outlined the evolutionary process that teaching methods have undergone from the traditional linguistic era to structural linguistic, to cognitive linguistic, and to the latest sociolinguistic phase. The development of language teaching methods as discussed in this paper represents a paradigm shift from one pedagogical theory, one set of principles, methodics, methodology and methods to another paradigm, another set of pedagogical principles and pedagogical grammars and another set of methods. In tracing the development of a method which amounts to tracing the development of a pedagogical theory, it has been found out that the language teaching methods have changed and developed due to and in response to a number of factors. Some of the important factors influencing the developmental changes in language teaching methods have been divided into five major groups and labeled as linguistic theories, societal aspirations, learner-related factors, teachers' experiences and physical contexts. A shift or development from one kind of method to another has been caused by a combination of these factors. At one time some factors were effective in bringing about a change, while at another time other factors dominated the scene.

The evolution process of language teaching methods is still ongoing. With the advent of the globalization era, thanks to the rapid development of information technology, a new paradigm shift in methods is expected to take place to suit the social and educational needs that are increasingly becoming complex and diversified.

REFERENCES

- Allen, J., & Davies, A. (1977). Testing and experimental methods. In J. Allen & A. Davies (Eds.), *The Edinburgh course in applied linguistics*, Vol. 4 (pp. 233-246). London: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Choe, Yongjae Paul. (1996). English education in Korea: Past, present, and future. *Theses Collection (Soong Sil University)*, 26, 331-357.
- Cook, V. (1978). Second language learning: A psycholinguistic perspective. *Language Teaching & Linguistics: Abstracts*, 11, 73-89.
- Corder, S. (1980). *Second language acquisition research and the teaching of grammar*. Plenary address at BAAL Conference, University of Leeds, Leeds.
- Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47, 173-210.
- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. (Eds.) (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Halliday, M. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M., McIntosh, A., & Stevens, P. (1964). *The linguistic sciences and language teaching*. Essex: Longman.
- Han, Sang-ho. (1999). Directions for learner-centered English education in the 21st century. *Studies in Modern Grammar*, 17, 191-206.
- Hymes, D. (1971). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). London: Penguin.
- Johnson, K. (1979). Communicative approaches and communicative processes. In C. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp. 192-205). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Teaching grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia. (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 251-266). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1975). *A communicative grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Mackey, W. (1965). *Language teaching analysis*. London: Longman.
- Narang, Vaishna. (1993). Communication of time in language. In H. S. Gill (Ed),

- Structures of signification*, Vol. III (pp. 826-881). New Delhi: Wileys International.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rivers, W. (1981). *Teaching foreign language skills* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-231.
- Spolsky, B. (1969). Linguistics and language pedagogy: Implications or applications? *Monograph Series On Languages And Linguistics*, 22, 143-155.
- Stem, H. (1970). Perspectives in second language teaching. *MLCP, No.1*. 121-136.
- Stem, H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Ek, J. (1975). *The threshold level in a European unit/Credit system for modern language learning by adults*. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe.
- Widdowson, H. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Miyang Cha
Department of General Education
Namseoul University
21 Maejuri Seonghwaneup Cheonan-city Choongnam, 330-707 Korea
Tel: (041) 580-2558 /H.P.: 019-533-9634
Email: miyangcha@nsu.ac.kr

Vaishna Narang
Centre of Linguistics
School of Languages, Literature and Culture Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi 110 067 India
Tel: (91-11) 26704231
Email: vaishna_narang@yahoo.com

Received in May 31, 2008

Reviewed in June 24, 2008

Revised version received in July 25, 2008