



All Theses and Dissertations

2007-12-10

When West Meets East: Communicative Language Teaching in China

Rong Li

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Li, Rong, "When West Meets East: Communicative Language Teaching in China" (2007). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 1610.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/1610>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

WHEN WEST MEETS EAST:
COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN CHINA

By
Rong Li

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations
Brigham Young University

December 2007

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Of a thesis submitted by

Rong Li

This thesis has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

Date

Macleans A. Geo-JaJa, Chair

Date

Lynn E. Henrichsen

Date

Clifford Mayes

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the project of Rong Li in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

Date

Macleans A. Geo-JaJa, Chair

Accepted for the Department of
Educational Leadership and Foundations

LeGrand A. Richards

Accepted for the College
David O. McKay College of Education

K. Richard Young

ABSTRACT

WHEN WEST MEETS EAST: COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN CHINA

Rong Li

Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations

Master of Education

With radical social change and educational reform taking place in China since 1976, the English teaching system there has been changing accordingly. The Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) is giving way to the Western Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. This research is a study of both Chinese and expatriate English teachers who are involved in classrooms and affected by reforms. The goal of this research study is to identify the extent to which Chinese and expatriate English teachers use CLT in China, to discover the possible factors that prevent them from using CLT and to explore an English teaching method that may fit into the Chinese setting.

The finding shows that both Chinese teachers and Americans used the CLT approach in their teaching. As for the extent to which they use CLT, overall variation

between the two groups is not as obvious as variation within groups. Both Chinese and American teachers have encountered obstacles in introducing CLT. Recommendations were offered for teachers, students, and administrators.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express gratitude toward all those who have contributed to my thesis. First of all, I would like to thank the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations for giving me the opportunity to study and research on an international education topic. I would also like to thank the Kennedy Center at Brigham Young University for allowing me to work with the China Teachers Program.

I am grateful for my committee members without whose support and encouragement I could not have completed this thesis. I am thankful for my chair, Dr. Geo-JaJa, who made sure I was always on the right track with the administrative side of the thesis. I am also grateful for his insights in comparative and international development education. I am especially grateful for Dr. Henrichsen's expertise in EFL teaching in China. His comments and insight guided my writing. Without him, this thesis could not have been possible. Finally I would like to thank Dr. Mayes whose encouragement and support has given me confidence to continue writing. His knowledge in EFL education and cultural diversity has also been vital to the completion of my thesis.

I want to give special thanks to all my family and friends who have supported my endeavor. I want to thank my husband, John Carr, for his love and support and help with the video analysis and editing. I want to thank my friend, Penny Allen, for her professional editing. I also want to thank my American mother, Deanna Cole, for helping me with the video analysis and editing and everything else. I would also like to express my gratitude to my parents who have provided me with educational opportunities throughout my life. Their love and support have enabled me to complete this work. I dedicate this thesis to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	1
Definitions of CTM and CLT in China	2
Research Questions	3
Research Goals.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	4
Delimitations of the Study	5
 CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	 6
English Teaching in East Asia: Some Trends and Issues	6
ELT Methodological Development in Different Eras in China	11
ELT Methods in the Republican Period (1919-1949).....	12
Grammar- translation method.....	12
Direct method.....	13
ELT Methods in the Socialist Revolutionary Period (1949-1978).....	13
Intensive reading.....	15
Audiolingual method.....	16
ELT Methods in the Open-and-Reform Period (1978-2000).....	17
ELT Methods in the Globalization Era (2000-present)	19
Literature Review on CTM and CLT Status in China.....	22
Traditional English Language Teaching (ELT) Situation in China	23
Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in China	25
CTM or CLT	28
Obstacles in Introducing the CLT Approach in China	31
Cultural factors	33
Teacher factors	33
Student factors	34
Institutional factors	35
 CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	 38
School Selection.....	38
The BYU Kennedy Center’s China Teachers Program.....	38
Participating Schools	40
Study Procedures.....	41
Study Participants.....	42
Instruments.....	44
Quantitative Method: COLT Instrument.....	44
Qualitative Method: Interviews.....	50
 CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	 53
Results from the COLT Analysis of the Video Data	54
Parameter 1: Classroom Language	54

Parameter 2: Participant Organization.....	56
Parameter 3: Content	59
Parameter 4: Content Control.....	61
Parameter 5: Student Modality.....	64
Summary of COLT Analysis Results	66
Results from Interview Data: A Comparative Summary	67
Description of Observed Classes.....	68
Chinese teachers.....	69
American teachers.....	70
Overall Feelings toward CTM and CLT in Chinese universities	69
Chinese teachers.....	69
American teachers.....	69
Proportion of CTM and CLT in classrooms	70
Chinese teachers.....	70
American teachers.....	70
Difficulties in Using CLT	70
Chinese teachers.....	70
American teachers.....	72
A Better fit: CTM or CLT?.....	73
Chinese teachers.....	73
American teachers.....	73
The Ideal Method for ELT in Chinese universities	74
Chinese teachers.....	74
American teachers.....	74
An Integration of COLT Analysis and Interview Results	76
 CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 78
Review of Study Results.....	78
Recommendations	79
Limitations	82
Suggestions for Future Research.....	83
Conclusion	84
 REFERENCES.....	 86
 APPENDICES.....	 93

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

As the world becomes more interdependent in economic matters in this globalization era, learning English and teaching English are spreading all over the world, including People's Republic of China where English is considered a powerful tool to access world knowledge and technology. It is also used to promote image of the country to the outside world. With the influence of the global economy, there is no doubt that English will remain the most powerful tool for China to communicate with the world. The Chinese government has put great emphasis on English education at different levels of its educational system, and will continue to do so in the future. English teaching methods have been a hot topic on the research agenda of the Chinese government.

With radical social change and educational reform taking place in China since 1976 (the year when the Cultural Revolution ended), the English teaching system there has been changing accordingly. The Chinese Traditional Method (CTM), to a large extent contradicting the general social reform trends set forth by Deng Xiaoping's Four Modernization Theories and an open-door policy, is gradually giving way to the Western Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach.

Problem Statement

The Chinese Traditional Method (CTM), rooted in Confucian conservatism, is characterized by its teacher-centeredness and rote memorization of texts. It has produced large numbers of students who are skilled in the written aspect of the language, but weak in the communication aspect. Globalization has brought China to the world stage. With demands from the job market, good written grammar skills are no longer sufficient for

young graduates seeking a job. Instead, communication in English is promoted. In the past few years, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has been a buzzword in China. Teachers are asked to use a variety of teaching methods to encourage communicative competence of students. New regulations are given, regarding English as an instrument for personal development, as reported in the National Standards for English Curriculum (NSEC) (2001). Teachers are encouraged to adopt a flexible approach to language teaching, with the Communicative Approach being on top of the list.

However, many obstacles have been encountered by teachers who try to use the CLT approach in their classroom. Much skepticism is expressed as to whether CLT works in Chinese classrooms. Despite fervent advocacy of the Communicative Approach by westerners, many English teachers in China tend to believe that some idealized imported solution to the pedagogical problems cannot be expected to work in the Chinese classrooms without any adaptation to local conditions.

Definitions of CTM and CLT in China

The Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) is in many ways similar to the European Grammar Translation Method (GTM), which dominated foreign language teaching in Europe from the 1840s to the 1940s. It is a teacher centered, book centered, grammar translation method with emphasis on rote memorization. Teachers using GTM expect students to be able to read literature in the target language, translate passages, and understand grammar rules. Classes using GTM are teacher centered and directed. Teachers are knowledge givers and act academically. Students are passive receivers of knowledge. Scholars from all disciplines have found the root of CTM in Confucian

conservatism, a deep- rooted ideology that has been influencing the educational system even in modern China.

On the other hand, the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method is an integration of skills taught and learned with a communicative view. The objective of this approach is to help students develop communicative competence, i.e. the ability to communicate original messages in real life situations in meaningful contexts. This method was first developed in Europe in the mid 1960s. The increasing interdependence of European countries required the language teaching system to change. Linguists called for language teaching to focus on communicative proficiency instead of mere mastery of structures in order to meet the communicative needs of people across countries.

In this method, students are supposed to develop their communicative competence in real life contexts. Teachers act as facilitators and directors, while students are the main actors of the class. Authentic input and interactive activities are primary. It is fluency focused, achieving tasks through the *use* of language, not the analysis of the language. It emphasizes sensitivity to learner differences and variation in language use. Students' initiatives and interaction play a major role in language acquisition.

Research Questions

The majority of the research studies regarding the introduction of CLT into China have been theoretical works based on linguistics and pedagogy. In-depth ethnographic research examining the actual processes and dynamics experienced by individuals involved in and affected by the reform in English language teaching (ELT) is scarce (Ouyang, 2000). The following questions need to be researched: Do Chinese English

language teachers at the university level use CLT in their teaching? If so, to what extent? If not, why not? What factors prevent them from using it? Also, do expatriate English teachers at the university level use CLT in the Chinese setting? If so, to what extent? If not, what adaptations do they make to the Chinese setting and why?

In order to answer these questions, more studies in the ELT field need to be conducted from a sociological and broad educational perspective to examine the underlying philosophy that influences the ELT methods

Research Goals

This study is a comparative field study of both Chinese and expatriate English teachers who are actually involved in classrooms and affected by reforms. The goal of this research study is to identify the extent to which Chinese and expatriate English teachers use CLT in China, to discover the possible factors that prevent them from using CLT, and to explore an English teaching method that may fit into the Chinese setting.

Significance of the Study

As is said by Ouyang (2000), the majority of the research studies regarding the introduction of CLT into China have been theoretical works based on linguistics and pedagogy. As researchers know, there are big differences between theory and practice. Based on the theoretical literature on the CLT approach in China, certain conclusions could be made on the development of CLT in China. However, in-depth ethnographic research examining the actual processes and dynamics experienced by individuals involved in and affected by the reform in English language teaching (ELT) is needed. This research has enabled me to obtain valuable first-hand information regarding the CLT

approach in China.

Delimitations of the Study

English teaching methods have long been a popular topic in many parts of the world, especially in the East Asian countries where the Eastern traditional teaching method, which is characterized by teacher and text centeredness, prevails. As the world becomes more interdependent in economic matters in this globalization era, English learning and teaching will continue to spread to many nations, including the East Asian region, where English is considered a powerful tool to access world knowledge and technology and to promote the image of this region to the outside world. Due to limitations on the length of this thesis, only a brief literature review on the East Asian Region will be provided. The literature review focuses mostly on China, where the study was carried out.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides the literature background of the study. In this chapter, a brief discussion of the English teaching situation in East Asian Regions will be provided. English teaching methodologies in China are traced back in different four major eras from the year 1919 to the present. A detailed literature review regarding the status of CTM and CLT status in China is given. Obstacles in introducing the CLT approach in China are discussed at the end of this chapter from four different factors: cultural factors, teacher factors, student factors, and institutional factors.

English Teaching in East Asia: Some Trends and Issues

Since its inception in the West, Communicative Language Teaching has been exported to the entire world — Asia, Africa, Latin America, Oceania, etc. In some countries it has been well received; in others, it has run into obstacles to its implementation. These obstacles have been practical, administrative, pedagogical, and cultural. Since this research focuses on the implementation of CLT in China, this section will provide some background on the implementation of CLT in other East Asian countries in order to provide a general context for the study.

The term East Asia refers to 16 countries of Southeast Asia and Northeast Asia, including Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, P.R.China, Hong Kong SAR, Japan, Indonesia, South Korea, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam (Kam & Wong, 2004). Their commitment to education and

learning has led these countries to economic prosperity. The value of language, especially English has long been recognized in this region. These nations tend to believe that investments in the English language will enhance their integration into the global economy and bring them a more promising future. Different measures are taken to show the importance of English learning, including integrating English into the curriculum starting from elementary school. Instead of providing a detailed literature review on the CLT situation in each of the 16 countries, a generalization of issues and trends regarding CLT in these countries and regions is cautiously made to demonstrate an overall picture.

As globalization continues to affect the world economy, there is no doubt that English will remain the most powerful tool for these nations to communicate with one another. In the past few years, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has been a buzzword in the East Asian area. With demands from the job market, communication in English is promoted. Teachers are asked to use a variety of teaching methods to encourage communicative competence of students. In China new regulations are given, regarding English an instrument for personal development, as reported in the National Standards for English Curriculum (NSEC) (2001). Teachers are encouraged to adopt a flexible approach to language teaching, with the Communicative Approach being on top of the list.

However, different obstacles are encountered in using CLT in these nations, including the use of traditional methods featured by teacher-centered instruction and text-based grammar translation, large class sizes, lack of communicative teaching materials and qualified teachers, misunderstanding about CLT from both teachers and students,

integration of modern technology, local cultural contexts, etc. Therefore, despite the fervent advocacy of the Communicative Approach by many westerners, many English teachers of this region have come to a consensus that some idealized imported solution to pedagogical problems cannot be expected to work in classrooms without any adaptation to local conditions in the recipient countries.

Nunan (1987) has observed that in many seemingly interactive activities, one can still easily find the resemblance of the traditional pattern of classroom practices.

Kumaravadivelu (1993) reports that “even teachers who are committed to communicative language teaching can fail to create opportunities for genuine interaction in the language classroom (p.137).”

Kam & Wong (2004) commented that one major problem for the use of CLT in East Asian countries was the supply and demand of qualified teachers, especially in countries such as Thailand, Indonesia, Mongolia, Lao PDR, and Vietnam. These countries face a severe shortage of English teachers. Furthermore, teachers who are teaching need to improve their teaching quality. Therefore, it is important to distribute limited resources in these countries between recruiting and training new teachers and providing in-service for the existing teachers.

Letendre, Baker, Akiba, Goesling, & Wiseman (2001) in the comparative education field call this “national learning script” (p.3). They believe in teaching practices particular to a particular cultural setting. It would be difficult to graft ideas from one culture to another.

Widdowson (1989) has made the same points by saying that “the influence of

ideas does not depend on their being understood in their own terms. Usually it depends on their being recast in different terms to suit other conditions of relevance” (p.128).

Leather (2000), who has taught in Japan has expressed concern regarding the influence Japanese culture has on the English language. According to him, it is polite to prepare a well written and well considered answer beforehand. Discourse is regulated with respect as to what to say, not just when to say it. Therefore, CLT is “a product of the West” (p.13).

Li (1998) carried out a study of eighteen South Korean secondary-school English teachers studying at a Canadian university. He conducted surveys and interviews on teachers’ perceived difficulties in adopting communicative language teaching in South Korea. The results revealed that difficulties had their source in differences between the underlying educational theories of South Korea and those of Western countries. He concluded that in order to adopt CLT, EFL countries such as South Korea needed to change their fundamental approach to education. Before that change happened, CLT had to be adapted to suit the EFL contexts.

Ellis (1994) did a study investigating the experiences of three Australian teachers of English as a Second Language (ESL) who conducted teacher workshops on communicative language teaching methods in Vietnam. The results showed that the most difficulty in adopting CLT in Vietnamese classes was not from class sizes, grammar-based examinations, or lack of exposure to authentic language. It was from the radically different basic cultural beliefs between the Vietnamese and Western culture. He concluded that in order for CLT to work, cultural understandings about both cultures had to be achieved.

Musthafa (2001) described the issues in introducing CLT in Indonesia. He identified many difficulties teachers experienced in utilizing the CLT approach in their classrooms: teacher's lack of confidence and communicative materials, time constraints, outdated exam system, etc. Due to those reasons, he argued that CLT had failed to help students become more competent using English for real-life purposes.

Pit & Roth (2004) identified various difficulties in implementing CLT in Cambodia. Besides the common problems such as large class sizes, student resistance, and teacher incompetence, one major reason was lack of government funding. At the tertiary level in Cambodia, French was above English in status because the French government was significant in providing financial assistance to higher education in Cambodia.

Pandian (2004) talked about English education in Malaysia today. He believed that in choosing a syllabus or teaching method, it was important to take into consideration the local Malaysian socio-cultural context as well as the unique needs of English for the Malaysian learners. Methods developed in the West, which failed to consider these factors, could not be used in Malaysia without adaptation.

Wongsothorn, Hiranburana & Chinnawongs (2004) discussed the 1996 English curriculum change in Thailand. The change aimed at improving students' communicative competence and was proved to be a failure. They argued that English learners in Thailand spent most of their time on exams focusing on grammar knowledge and reading skills. The other skills such as listening and speaking were ignored. Also teachers were not confident teaching the communicative skills themselves. Therefore, these skills were underpracticed.

Kam & Wong (2004) believe that integration of modern technology is another challenge for the East Asian countries in the ELT classrooms. While many countries have great inclinations for change, many traditional practices still prevail in English teaching. Many teachers are reluctant to use modern technology in their classrooms, partly because of their lack of experience and training, but most importantly because of their mind-set of not wanting to change. In order to achieve a break-through in the ELT field in these countries, a change of technology is not enough. A change of mind-set is necessary.

In summary, due to the local contexts, CLT cannot be adopted to the East Asian Countries without any adaptation. In order for CLT to work in these nations, obstacles have to be overcome. Cross cultural understandings have to be achieved. The next section will provide a detailed literature review on English teaching status in China.

ELT Methodological Development in Different Eras in China

Language teaching never happens by itself. The development of language teaching methods has always been largely influenced by the socio-cultural background of the country (Richards & Rogers, 2003). Therefore, it is necessary to provide some background information on the methodology development in different historical eras in China. In research studies tracing the modern history of foreign language teaching in China, four major periods are identified: the Republican Period (1919-1949), the Socialist Revolutionary Period (1949-1978), the Open and Reform Period (1978-2002), and the Globalization Period (2002-present) (Yao, 1993; Yang, 2000; Lam, 2001; Zhang, 2003). The specific political and social factors in each historical period gave rise to the development of different teaching methods.

ELT Methods in the Republican Period (1919-1949)

The year 1919 witnessed the famous “May Fourth Movement” in China. This movement was a student protest against Japanese territorial aggression in China and the corruption of the Chinese government. Before this movement, a large number of Chinese students chose to go to Japan to learn about Japanese advanced science and technology then returned home to improve their motherland with the knowledge they had acquired. After this movement, anti-Japanese feelings became strong, and Chinese students started to look for alternative options for advanced study abroad. Gradually, America became one of the major destinations for Chinese students, and English became an important foreign language to master. John Dewey, an American educator, began his two-year lecture circuit in China, trying to convince universities to switch from the teacher-centered traditional method to a more democratic, student-centered method (Keenan, 1977). At the same time, a large number of Christian missionaries found their way to China. Their new ideas brought about many experiments and reforms to the Chinese education system (Yeh, 1990). The prevailing ELT method used in Chinese colleges was the Grammar-Translation Method, which dominated foreign language teaching in Europe from the 1840s to the 1940s.

Grammar-Translation method. In this method, the goal of the teacher is to have students be able to read literature, translate passages, and understand grammar rules in the target language, thus building their “mental muscles.” Classes are teacher-centered and directed. Teachers are knowledge givers and students are passive receivers. Translation, rule memorization, and reading of carefully constructed passages are the

main activities in class. Rules are learned and applied deductively (Richards & Rogers, 2003). Despite the many defects of the Grammar-Translation Method, in its modified form, it is still widely used in China and many parts of the world.

Direct method. Another method used by some teachers, especially in schools started by western missionaries, was the Direct Method. The Direct Method was popular for a short while in Europe in the early twentieth century. This method is widely known in the United States as the Berlitz Method through its use by Sauveur and Maximilian Berlitz in their private language schools. In this method, classroom instruction was conducted exclusively in the target language. Only conversational vocabulary and sentences were taught. The classes emphasized correct pronunciation and grammar. Oral communication skills were built up through intensive question and answer exchanges between students and teachers in a small class. This method did not survive long in China due to its obvious drawbacks. There were not many teachers who were native speakers or had native-like fluency in China. The success of this method depended largely on the teacher's mastery of the language, which most Chinese teachers --even the foreign teachers at the mission schools --did not possess. In addition to that, teachers were not allowed to use Chinese at all. Therefore, it took a great length of time for teachers to explain simple vocabulary, which could have been done easier in teachers' native language. Due to these weaknesses, the Direct Method did not gain popularity in China.

ELT Methods in the Socialist Revolutionary Period (1949-1978)

The year 1949 witnessed the allied victory of World War II and the foundation of the People's Republic of China. With the new social, economic, and political system, a

new educational system had to be set up as well (Yang, 2000). The Korean War in the early 1950s and the Cold War between the East and West had impressed on the Chinese mind that English was associated with the Britain, the old colonizer, and America, the new imperialist (Zhou & Feng, 1987, as cited in Zhang, 2003). Missionary run schools were accused of serving imperialist and colonialist purposes, and John Dewey and his followers lost their popularity (Cleverly, 1985). In contrast to the resistance to America, China invited a great influence from the USSR, not only on its ideology, politics and economy, but also on its education (Yao, 1993). Russian educational models were adopted at different levels. Russian as a foreign language was popular. By 1954, Russian replaced English and became the most widely taught foreign language in China. This situation continued until the breakdown of Sino-Soviet relationships in the late 1950s, after which “learning from the Soviet Union” turned into “learning from all the advanced experiences in the world” (Dzau, 1990, p. 19). Foreign language study gained back its importance. In 1964, *The Seven-year Guideline for Foreign Language Education* was published by the Chinese government and English became the number one foreign language in Chinese schools once again. In the early 1960s, English teaching experienced a revival with the introduction of the Audiolingual Method.

However, it was not long before Mao Zedong started the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in 1966 in order to consolidate his power. The Great Cultural Revolution terminated the learning of English. This was a time when anything from the West was considered bourgeois and was banned. Scholars were distrusted and put into labor camps in the countryside or factories to receive re-education from the farmers and

workers. Foreign teachers were expelled and schools were closed. Between 1966 and 1971, no new students were enrolled in higher education institutions (Yao, 1993).

Foreign language learning suffered a great deal.

It was not until China's regaining of its legal position in the United Nations in 1971 and U.S. President Richard M. Nixon's visit in 1972 that China was reopened to the West. In the same year, under instructions from Premier Zhou Enlai, English replaced Russian as the foreign language of choice (Zhang, 2003). Also with Deng Xiaoping, who was persecuted during the Cultural Revolution, coming back to power as Vice-Chairman in 1972, the situation in higher education began to recover. Only after the death of Mao in 1976 and the downfall of the "Gang of Four" (a political group during 1966-1976 headed by Mao's wife Jiang Qing), did China start to open its door to the West again. English was back in the school curriculum.

With many political changes taking place during this period, English teaching methods also changed. During the 1950s, Soviet models, characterized by the Grammar-Translation Method, were completely adopted for teaching English in China. Intensive reading, an adaptation of the Grammar-Translation Method, was the main instructional method in classrooms.

Intensive reading. The *Intensive Reading* course has been the foundation of English teaching in China's higher education for the past several decades (Dzau, 1996b). Yao (1993) depicts a typical intensive reading class as follows. It is conducted in Chinese. The teacher starts a new lesson with an oral summary of the text and then reads the text multiple times while students listen. Then the teacher explains the text word for word

both semantically and grammatically with translation exercises for students. Recitation and retelling of the text are considered useful means for student learning. Students are taught to read the language instead of being taught to speak it (Hertling, 1996).

Due to this traditional teaching method, students ended up learning what was called “deaf and mute English” which vividly described English learning in China. Therefore, in the 1960s, many schools started to emphasize listening and speaking skills for students. Thus the Audiolingual Method was introduced into English classrooms in China.

Audiolingual method. The Audiolingual Method was first developed and used in World War II by the US army to train soldiers to speak different foreign languages. This method is based on the idea that in order to learn a new language, students need to form new language habits and learn patterns of the target language to the point of automaticity. Classes are teacher-centered. Acting like an orchestra leader, the teacher directs and controls the class and students. The teacher also provides a speaking model for students to imitate. Students imitate the teacher’s model (or the tapes in the lab). They follow directions and respond as accurately, rapidly, and naturally as they can. Dialogs present new vocabulary. Structures are learned through imitation and repetition. Various types of drills (based on the dialog) are conducted. Correct responses are positively and immediately reinforced. Errors are avoided as much as possible by carefully structuring and controlling practice activities. Grammar is learned by induction. Culture is included in dialogs. Reading and writing practice is based on the oral language students have learned through dialogs and drills (Richards & Rodgers, 2003, p.65). Eager to get

students to speak English, instead of just reading it, many Chinese teachers adopted this method in their classrooms.

During the 10- year Cultural Revolution, the Audiolingual Method was abandoned due to its association with America. If English was taught at all, it was taught by the Chinese Traditional Method. English teaching during this period was devastated and yielded a low quality in students' overall proficiency in all skill areas.

ELT Methods in the Open-and-Reform Period (1978-2000)

The year 1978 marked the starting of a new era for China. In this year, the new Chairman Deng Xiaoping proposed to realize the “Four Modernizations” in Chinese agriculture, industry, national defense, and science and technology by 2000 (Yang, 2000). In the same year, he introduced the Open-and-Reform policy in China, with the hope that China could learn advanced science and technology from capitalist countries in order to hasten the pace of modernization. Different from Mao, who insisted on self-reliance and independence, Deng was more of a pragmatist. This is reflected in one of his famous sayings, “Black cat or white cat, a cat that can catch a rat is a good cat.” As pointed out by Yang (2000), *black* or *white cat* here referred to capitalism or socialism, and *catch a rat* symbolized the achievement of economic success.

Thus modernization and economic development became the main tasks of the country, and English became more important than ever in China. The year 1978 marked a turning point for Chinese education, especially foreign language teaching. With changes in politics and ideology, Western educational theories were again introduced in China. “Creative thinking” and “quality education” became the key words in many journals (Lin,

1990). Higher education recruitment was resumed again, and the first group of foreign teachers came back to China. In 1982, English was announced as the main foreign language in secondary education (Lam, 2001). Since the 1980s China has become the world's largest market for language-study programs, with over 200 million children and adults studying English through different channels (Lingo Media, 2005). In addition, there are now over 150,000 Chinese students studying overseas, the majority of them in the U.S. (Ashmore, 2003). Modernization and China's economic and social development have spurred a nationwide English language fever. It symbolizes a new alliance with the western world, dismantling former ties with the Soviet Union.

During this period, English teachers started to study foreign language teaching methods, trying to find one to replace the traditional method and improve teaching quality. With the introduction of Western teaching methods, the Communicative Approach gradually became popular in China.

The CLT approach was first developed in Europe in the mid 1960s. The increasing interdependence of European countries required language teaching systems to change. Linguists called for language teaching to focus on communicative proficiency instead of mere mastery of structures in order to meet communicative needs of people across countries.

The objective of this approach was to help students develop communicative competence, i.e. the ability to communicate original messages in real life situations in meaningful contexts. The teacher acted as a facilitator, participant, guide, and organizer of activities. A learner-centered approach was used in curriculum design, teaching, and

testing. According to Anderson (1993), the CLT approach is characterized by the use and appropriateness of the language. It is fluency focused. It achieves tasks through the *use* of language, not the analysis of the language. It emphasizes sensitivity to learner differences and variation in language use. Students' initiative and interaction play a major role in language acquisition. Sun and Cheng (2000) also describe CLT methodology as emphasizing authentic language input and creative output. This methodology depends highly on real-life practices and authentic language contexts. It also requires authentic materials and highly qualified teachers to manage the creative classroom atmosphere. In theory, the Communicative Approach should be a cure for the "deaf and mute English" situation. However, due to many different obstacles (detailed description in the next chapter), its use is limited. In classrooms, Intensive Reading remains the main course in colleges. English is still learned from structured drill practice instead of communicative activities.

ELT Methods in the Globalization Era (2000-present)

The beginning of the 21st century marked the entrance to the globalization era in China. China has been more enthusiastic about adopting international norms than in preserving its ideological independence (Hertling, 1996). The fear of western ideological erosion has receded in the successive upsurges of English popularity. The successful 2008 Olympic bid and admission to the World Trade Organization have promised China a larger role in the global community. In order for China to survive in this global family, English has become a necessary tool. The government now encourages a full embrace of English in international business, law, and media (Hertling, 1996). Many different

English teaching programs have been established and are supported by the government. English has become one of the most important subjects in China, both at the national level and the individual level.

At the national level, English is a major manifestation of the ongoing economic and political reform in many ways. It fosters economic growth and reinforces reform outcomes. It creates a new national image for China, projecting a more open society that welcomes change. English satisfies the eagerness of Chinese people to import technology, attract foreign investment, and adopt international practices.

As China gains importance in world affairs and the global economy, interests in Chinese history, economics, policies, and legal system have also grown rapidly. Research and exchanges in these areas are mainly conducted in English. For the country to play a more important role in international affairs, the government feels the need to disseminate Chinese ideology and culture through English. English has become the engine that accelerates such exchanges, and bilingual publishing in English is encouraged in all areas.

The government has carried out corresponding policies to promote English learning throughout the nation. The Ministry of Education (MOE) recently directed schools to raise the quality of education by reforming curriculum, textbooks, teaching methods, and assessment procedures. Strategies include purchasing international teaching materials, hiring foreign experts, and requiring key colleges and universities to instruct science, economics, and management courses in both Chinese and English. The MOE has mandated English as a compulsory subject for millions of primary school students.

On 18 January 2001, the MOE issued *A Guidance for Energetic Implementation of English in Primary Schools* (Ministry of Education, 2001a) and in June 2001 issued the *Outline of Curriculum Reform in Basic Education (Experimental Version)* (Ministry of Education, 2001c). The State Council enforced these documents by declaring that, in order to further reform and accelerate quality education, English would gradually be introduced in primary schools at the district level.

In college, non-English majors are required to take the College English Test (CET), which contains two levels, Band 4 and Band 6. A pass in Band 4 is required for a college diploma. Moreover, international-oriented majors, such as international business and international law, require a pass of Band 6 to graduate. English majors are required to take the Test for English Majors (TEM), which also has two levels, Band 4 and Band 8. (MOE) Many employers, especially those from foreign companies, prefer job applicants with one or more level achievement certificates.

At individual level, people in China know that English is important for personal success (Dzau, 1990b). The recent trend for studying abroad, immigrating and postgraduate study further link English with better education, higher income, and improved social status. The positive correlation between English proficiency and income level is more apparent in today's China. The latest nationwide salary survey revealed that those who speak fluent English (or another foreign language) receive an average of 53,378 *yuan* (US\$6,431) annually while those with low language proficiencies are only paid an average of 31,211 *yuan* (US\$3,760) (*China Daily*, 10/9/02). English has become

the converging point of material gain, elevated social status, broadened opportunity, and a stepping-stone for intellectual pursuit, career advancement, and personal fulfillment.

The global economic market constantly seeks for employees with high English proficiency, which in a large part, means high communication abilities in English. However, although Chinese students learn English from a variety of channels and in multiple ways, most students focus on grammar, reading, and writing in order to pass many mandatory examinations. Many students are weak in listening, speaking, and communicating because they do not have enough chances to communicate and interact with native speakers due to geographical and economic difficulties. In order to improve the communicative role of English, English language examinations have to be updated. Traditionally, the CET focused on the form of the language, such as vocabulary, and grammar structures, etc. Recently, however, the CET has been reformed (Zhang, 2005). More listening is administered during the test, and speaking sections are added, which aim at developing students' oral English abilities. Moreover, the international test TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) also has a new addition, the speaking section. It serves the same purpose, which is to promote speaking skills of Chinese students.

Literature Review on CTM and CLT Status in China

The previous section makes it clear that despite different methods that have appeared in different historical eras in China, none has lasted long. The Traditional Chinese Method has been the main method used in English classrooms even when other methods are being tried out. However, at present, the Communicative Language Teaching

approach seems to have gained big favor in the eyes of many English teaching professionals in China. This section provides a review of literature regarding the CTM and CLT status in China.

Traditional English Language Teaching (ELT) Situation in China

The Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) is in many ways similar to the Western Grammar Translation Method (GTM), which dominated foreign language teaching in Europe from the 1840s to the 1940s. Teachers using GTM expect students to be able to read literature in the target language, translate passages, and understand grammar rules. Classes using GTM are teacher-centered and directed. Teachers are knowledge givers and act academically. Students are passive receivers of knowledge.

China is known for its traditional grammar translation method with emphasis on rote memorization (Anderson, 1993). Scholars from all disciplines agreed that Confucian conservatism, as a deep-rooted ideology, continued to influence the educational system in modern China (Lo, 1984; Hayhoe, 1996; Zhong, 1999; Ouyang, 2000). The traditional Chinese learning style, which is consistent with Confucian conservatism, is criticized as “mimetic and epidemic,” while the teaching style is mocked as “spoon-feeding” or “Beijing duck stuffing” (Ouyang, 2000). Teachers are considered the authorities, knowledge givers, and disciplinarians. Any form of doubting or challenging the teacher may be considered disrespectful and offensive (Ouyang, 2000).

According to English and Een (1985), in this century, different traditional Chinese teaching strategies have combined with Western influences. While Chinese strategies feature memorization, discussion, and grammar-translation, the Western methods focus

on communication, authentic input, literature and pronunciation. The result is a method focusing on grammar-translation, intensive reading, and study of literature. This teaching method emphasizes delivering knowledge *about* the language instead of building competence *in* the language. Grammar and language points are the infrastructure of a language. The underlying assumption seems to be that communicative ability will come along naturally if students master the knowledge (Sun & Cheng, 2000).

The Intensive Reading course has been the foundation of English teaching in China at the higher education level for the past fifteen years (Dzau, 1996b). In an intensive reading class, students read a passage and then analyze every word, phrase, punctuation mark, and sentence to find the correct explanation for every point of grammar (Hertling, 1996). A specially designed textbook series called *College English* is offered to non-English majors (Hertling, 1996). It focuses on reading and listening and ignores speaking and writing. It trains students to read technical manuals, but leaves them unable to carry on a simple conversation. Li (1984) criticizes the intensive reading course by saying that as the core class in the EFL curriculum, it is supposed to prepare students with all four skills, reading, writing, listening, and speaking. However, *College English* classes fail to do so. Li (1984), therefore, calls for a more integrated course where all four skills are taught.

Teacher training in China emphasizes study of language contents much more than teaching methods (Li, 1984). Anderson (1993) supports this statement by saying that foreign teachers whose expertise is literature are more popular with the administrators than those whose specialty is linguistic training of the communicative English teaching

approach. As for the status of teachers, those who teach grammar, literature, and linguistic analysis at the tertiary level enjoy greater prestige and are better paid than those who teach students to speak the language for communicative purposes (Burnaby & Sun, 1989).

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in China

On the other hand, the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach is an integration of skills taught and learned with a communicative view. Students are supposed to develop their communicative competence in real life contexts. Teachers act as facilitators, while students are main actors of the class. Authentic input and interactive activities are primary.

A large number of research studies have talked about the pedagogical aspect of CLT reform, focusing on how the CLT approach outperforms the CTM approach. Little has been mentioned about the appropriateness of CLT in the unique socio-cultural and political context in China (Ouyang, 2000). However, teaching and learning are so socio-culturally conditioned that teaching methodologies have to be context-specific (Li, 1999). Holliday (1994) observed that Chinese teachers coming back from CLT training programs from abroad are unable to implement what they have learned because of conflicts between the new western method and the old Chinese tradition. Maley also laments that “large numbers of foreign teachers return from China (after attempting the CLT methods) with dampened enthusiasm, feelings of disappointment and in some cases bitterness and rancor” (1990, p.103). Li (1999) identifies the problem that the transfer of the language teaching approach from one culture to another without considering local

cultural heritages, expectations, history, and educational philosophies has led to inefficiency and even failure of English teaching in China.

With the return of foreign teachers in the 1980s, the communicative language teaching approach has been introduced to Chinese classes. Canale and Swain (1980) define three aspects of communicative competence in developing a second or foreign language, grammatical, socio-linguistic, and strategic competence. They use a learner-centered approach in curriculum design, teaching and testing. The availability of authentic learning materials and a native speaking environment is the focus. According to Anderson (1993), the CLT approach is fluency-focused. Its tasks are achieved through the *use* of language, not the *analysis* of the language. In this approach, student initiative and interaction play a major role in language acquisition. Sensitivity to learner differences and variation in language use are emphasized. Sun and Cheng (2000) also describe CLT methodology as emphasizing authentic language input and creative output. This methodology highly depends on real-life practices and authentic language contexts. It also requires authentic materials and highly qualified teachers to manage the creative classroom atmosphere.

CLT has received great attention in the ESL field in China. One of the early teacher training programs for CLT, the Senior Middle School Teacher Training (SMSTT) program, was started in 1983 and assisted by the British Council, with the hope of improving the teaching quality of ELT in remote areas of China (Ouyang, 2000). In 1992, the State Education Development Commission (SEDC), the official authority for

educational policy making in China, introduced a new teaching syllabus and required all secondary school teachers to teach English for communication.

In 2001, the SEDC required all secondary teachers to use task-based language teaching, and relevant task-based communicative textbooks were introduced in different schools (Liao, 2004). Today, training programs are offered to Chinese teachers in order to introduce them to the new method and to prepare them to handle learner-centered classrooms. Scholars in the field believe that CLT could be incorporated into Chinese ELT, as long as it is done with caution, taking into consideration the social, cultural and political factors in Chinese society.

A large number of researchers have agreed with Lu (1987), a middle school teacher trying to change the traditional way of English teaching. He laments that students who have studied English for five or six years cannot effectively interact with a native speaker of English. The prescriptive English Chinese students have traditionally learned is given a vivid name “dumb English.”

Many researchers believe the communicative approach will improve the quality of English teaching and learning in China tremendously. Among this group, Liao (2004) fervently believes that the introduction of CLT will expose Chinese teachers to the latest developments in English teaching methods around the world and help communicatively incompetent learners to develop greater competence in communication with native speakers.

Since CLT focuses on various tasks, students can choose to talk about topics that are meaningful to their real life. It is more motivating since students learn to use the

language for their own purposes; they learn what is relevant and necessary for them. Students will be better equipped for the real world (Li, 1984).

CTM or CLT

As expressed by Sun and Cheng (2000), it is unrealistic to expect a country's language teaching methodology to change overnight. It will be a long and slow process. It also needs to be clarified that the belief that CLT is more effective does not necessarily mean that methodologies centered on structure do not work at all (Anderson, 1993). It is not wise to use a communicative approach exclusively in English teaching and to totally abandon the grammar teaching. Celce-Murcia (1991) further states that English teaching without grammar teaching can lead to the development of a broken, ungrammatical, pidginized form of the target language. There needs to be a methodology combining CTM and CLT, especially for the Chinese setting.

With the examination system requiring little communicative competence, teachers can put little emphasis on communication skills. Maley (1984) suggests that one way to help students be better communicators in English is to change the language testing focus. Therefore, teachers will have more time to spend on the communicative activities. Yang (2003) also proposes that alternative assessment, which emphasizes continuous and performance-based procedures, must be introduced to promote the process as well as the product of learning English.

Many researchers believe that traditional Chinese methods and communicative methods can be complementary to each other. Yalden (1985) has proposed a

“proportional approach” in which the traditional techniques are kept, but adapted to reflect more communicative functions in real-life situations.

Yao (1993) reports the ‘eclectic’ stage of English teaching in China. While CLT has been highly recommended and widely accepted, other methods, such as Audio-lingual, Direct Methods, Grammar-translation, still exist in modified variations. Language researchers and practitioners are trying to create effective ways by using the ‘eclectic’ methods from theorists of all schools.

Anderson (1993) also supports this perspective by saying that it is possible to introduce the communicative approach in China’s English classes as long as we are sensitive to traditional Chinese methods and unique needs of teachers and students. Taking into consideration the constraints of the Chinese teaching situation --lack of materials, pressure on teachers from educational officials, peers and students, and cultural heritage --an effective step-by-step way of communicative teaching can be developed.

Li (1999) has proposed a “border pedagogy.” He believes that conflicts between CTM and CLT come from a lack of knowledge of different cultural values and beliefs. Therefore, we should seek for a better understanding of both Chinese and Western cultural differences. In border pedagogy, a cultural synergy is created, cultural borders are crossed, differing views are respected and accommodated, and mutual trust and confidence are built.

Larsen Freeman (2000) proposes the concept of “relativism”, arguing for teaching in accordance to specific contexts. Many researchers have joined him in this relativist camp (Holliday, 1994; Bax, 2003). They believe that a single method is not equally

suitable to all contexts and that different methods suit different teachers and students in different contexts.

Sun and Cheng (2000) propose a way to combine the traditional and the communicative methods. Grammar, vocabulary and background knowledge can be put into a preparatory stage before the communicative activity or a consolidation stage after the communicative activity. Also teachers can use interactive activities in teaching grammar or transferring text analysis into classroom discussions so as to give students more opportunity to speak in English. They also believe language teachers cannot predict everything students will come across in the future. Therefore, it is as important to teach skills of learning independently in daily life as it is to teach contents of the language itself.

Despite many obstacles, there are encouraging experiences reported by foreign teachers in introducing the communicative approach (Anderson, 1993; Henrichsen, 2007). They all conclude that if students' needs and learning styles are taken into consideration and they are convinced that a different methodology can help them achieve their goal in learning the language, they tend to be more willing to try the new method. Therefore, it is important to explain to students the rationale behind communicative activities. Some teachers have developed a step-by-step method or structured approach to help students lose their fears and be more willing to participate. Ron Forseth, a teacher in Jiannxi Normal University, successfully introduced the concept of conversational skills practice in class. His method included steps of explaining the rationale of the approach, varying the format, designing a progressive and challenging syllabus, and maintaining a warm and controlled atmosphere (Forseth, 1991).

With China integrating into the global family and with the coming of foreign investment, more and more Chinese English speakers who are able to communicate with native English speakers in different situations are in great need. The CLT approach will help prepare Chinese students to interpret at meetings, carry on negotiations, read, summarize, or translate news items or technical literature because of its real-life task-oriented nature (Li, 1984).

As pointed out by Dzau (1990b), people in China know that English is important for personal success. The association between English and improved social status has caused a trend for postgraduate study, overseas study, and immigration. Communicative competency is especially necessary for those who will be studying in an English speaking country, interacting with native English speakers and becoming part of the native culture (Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Anderson, 1993). Therefore, it is important to find a way to teach English more effectively in China.

Obstacles in Introducing the CLT Approach in China

Despite the increasing popularity of the CLT approach in ESL settings, it has not been as successful in EFL settings, especially in China. The expatriate teachers in China have reported the resistance of Chinese instructors and students to the new approach and other constraints (Barlow & Lowe, 1985; Burbaby & Sun, 1989; Penner, 1995; Sun & Cheng, 2000). In the process of introducing CLT in China, the Chinese context seems to have been overlooked or at least inadequately estimated. Due to the huge variety of values, traditions, cultures, political regimes and educational structures in EFL context described by Mackey (1992), Sun and Cheng (2000) propose that in order to introduce

the CLT approach to China, a context assessment is necessary, which means preliminary work, a fact-finding stage. It is important to find out the local Chinese context in which English is taught, understand the differences and take into consideration these differences when designing a new English curriculum. This paper will address the context by analyzing several different factors, i.e. cultural factors, economic factors, learner factors, teacher factors and institutional factors.

Cultural factors. Thinking about cultural influences on Chinese educational system, one has to think about philosophical roots from Confucianism. Confucianism focuses on rote memorization and book-centeredness in academic learning, which has influenced the Chinese examination system for thousands of years. In the old times, whether or not one passed an exam depended on whether he could memorize all the required classic works. For a long time, study simply meant finding a good teacher and imitating his words and deeds. Educators also believed that knowledge was in books, and could be taken out and put into students' heads. Thus teaching should center on the strict, highly mechanized memorization of classic works.

The old Confucius root has also created a concept of *face* in the Chinese society. It is considered selfish to cause someone to lose face. The disrespectful action of students' challenging teachers is considered selfish and rude because it may cause them to lose face. Being modest and self-effacing is praiseworthy, while wasting other students' class time and showing yourself off by expressing independent judgment is selfish and egotistic. Therefore, students seldom question teachers in or outside

classrooms. They seldom discuss their opinions in class for fear of being considered rude and disrespectful.

Burnaby and Sun (1989) talk about the “cultural gap” between Chinese and English speakers. They tend to think that Chinese students consider many communicative activities mere games rather than serious learning. Anderson (1993) also comments that games are associated with entertainment, not learning. The Chinese culture considers learning serious because the student’s future depends on it.

Teacher factors. According to Sun and Cheng (2000), the reason for failure may be the dependence of CLT on its authentic language context. It is hard to create an English emergence environment in an EFL context. Lu (1987) states that an absolute adoption of a communicative approach is not applicable in China since students have hardly any opportunity to speak with foreigners. He does admit that students need more exposure to spoken English, but students’ language is also useful to explain meanings from time to time.

Researchers (Anderson, 1993; Sun & Cheng, 2000) have pointed out that some Chinese teachers misunderstand the essence of communicative teaching. They consider it as merely a focus on listening and speaking. Some simply think it is just a way of attracting students’ attention by language games. As pointed out in the previous section, communicative activities, such as games, are often associated with entertainment, not learning. Older teachers are resistant to new methods which go against the traditional way.

Barlow and Lowe (1985) report a Chinese English teacher’s comment on the attempt of foreign teachers to introduce the communicative approach. He thinks that

Chinese students learn better if they learn in their own way, which is exactly opposite to the western approach. They “start with rote memorization, grammar rules, sentence construction and then worry about conversation and shades of meaning” (p.155). He also comments that in their experience, “students speak English more fluently after four years of study than their counterparts in the US speak Chinese” (p.155). Even though this statement cannot stand valid considering the different factors in different language learning, it shows Chinese teachers’ negative views of CLT and positive views of CTM.

Chinese teachers are pressured to prepare students for national English exams, which are very important in student’s academic future. Exams are structured to test grammar, vocabulary, reading—no emphasis is put on speaking (Anderson, 1993). Therefore, teachers use most of their time helping students pass exams and allocate little time for communicative activities.

One of the most obvious obstacles to teaching English communicatively is lack of properly trained Chinese teachers or foreign teachers. Chinese teachers are not confident about their English and cultural knowledge in using the CLT approach. They do not feel secure enough to move away from the traditional teaching method (Anderson, 1993). Thus it is clear that cultivating a cadre of highly qualified CLT teachers is the key to promoting high-quality education in English classrooms in China (Ashmore, 2003).

Student factors. Students are not accustomed to the communicative approach either, and they may be resistant. They tend to trust prescriptive explanations regarding the correct grammar and vocabulary usage more than unsystematic explanations given by native speakers.

Anderson (1993) gives some reasons for inactivity in an open discussion that involves speaking class: unwillingness to participate in discussions for fear of losing face, deficiency in language skills due to the little exposure to native speakers, different needs and motivations of learners. Chinese are not risk takers, and they are afraid of losing face in front of people if they say something wrong. Therefore, they tend to choose the safer way in class, which is being quiet. Sun and Cheng (2000), after observing Chinese students in a private English school, comment that most Chinese students have three motivations for learning a foreign language: to prepare for a future job, to read technical materials only available in English, and to pass an examination to graduate. Very few students expect to immigrate to English-speaking countries or to study there. They consider true communicative ability to be unnecessary. Therefore, their motivation to speak is not strong.

Institutional factors. Large class size has often been mentioned in the literature as one of the main obstacles to carrying out communicative teaching activities (Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Anderson, 1993; Britsch, 1995). Many university English classes, especially those for non-English majors, usually have 50 to 70 students and meet for only about three hours a week. Burnaby and Sun (1989) did a case study on CLT application in China. Teachers involved in these classes indicate that it is difficult to use communicative methods with large groups, especially when they have to cover the curriculum effectively within the given time.

Lack of resources and equipment is another difficulty in communicative teaching in China. Many Chinese higher institutions do not have audiovisual equipment,

photocopiers, or resources such as a variety of authentic materials. Britsch (1995) reports on interviews with thirteen expatriate teachers in China. Six of them mentioned the inadequate resources or inaccessibility of the library. They said libraries in China were not helpful because they did not have useful books and were not easy to use.

Textbooks were designed to teach grammar, reading and writing with little emphasis on speaking, and supplementary materials were very rare and very expensive (Anderson, 1993). Cowan, Light, Mathews, and Tucker (1979) reported that few original works of English were found in the Chinese bookstores. They also noted that Chinese textbooks were pedagogically flawed because of their focus on grammatical structures. Since one of the main focuses of the CLT approach is the authenticity of teaching materials, the lack of them makes it hard to carry out activities. However, Henrichsen (2007) observed on his recent research trip to China that great changes had taken place in English classrooms. He noted that in classrooms and bookstores throughout China, a large variety of modern textbooks could be found, including audio, video, and computer software.

In summary, the Chinese Traditional Method and the Communicative Language Teaching approach coexist in English classrooms in China. With demands from the global job market, CLT is gradually replacing CTM, gaining favors from both teachers and students. However, many obstacles have been encountered by teachers who try to use the CLT approach in their classroom. These obstacles come from different factors: cultural factors, teacher factors, student factors, and institutional factors. It is believed

that CLT cannot be expected to work in China without adaptation to Chinese conditions.

Teachers need to be flexible in choosing a method for their classes.

Richards & Rogers (2003) tried to explore alternative approaches for language teaching in different contexts. They believed that most methods were never realized in their pure forms in actual classrooms because they were not derived from actual classroom experiences. They suggested that teachers should know how to teach and act within the academic and administrative constraints of their particular teaching situations (institutions, curricula, textbooks, etc.) Individual teachers should be able to draw on different methods at different times for different classes they were teaching. A “post-method era” had come (p.251). In order to find out the CLT status in Chinese classrooms and current obstacles for teachers using CLT, this first-hand study in China was carried out.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will explain procedures of the study and analysis methods following the study. Five out of seventeen Chinese universities associated with Kennedy Center's China Teachers Program sponsored by Brigham Young University (BYU) were involved in the study; 9 teachers, including 4 Chinese and 5 Americans, participated in the study. One Chinese teacher was missing because one of the universities involved, Qingdao University, did not offer a listening/speaking class taught by Chinese teachers. All nine teachers were observed and videotaped during listening and speaking classes, and were interviewed with more qualitative questions regarding the CTM and CLT approach at Chinese universities. The COLT scheme was used to analyze the video data and provided a comparative summary of the interview data between two groups. Each of these points will be explained in greater details in sections that follow.

School Selection

Schools involved in this study are associated with the China Teachers Program of the David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies at Brigham Young University. Before describing each school, it is necessary to give a brief introduction of this program.

The BYU Kennedy Center's China Teachers Program

The China Teachers Program of the David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies at Brigham Young University has been going on for over 16 years. Each year the program recruits, screens, trains and places approximately 60 volunteer professionals at

more than a dozen colleges and universities in China. Most teachers are retired educators and have graduate degrees. Some are mid-career professionals, and others are students. They teach mostly English, but also current events, history, law, business, and other subjects.

There are hundreds and thousands of English teaching programs I could have chosen. However, I chose the China Teachers Program at Brigham Young University (BYU) for the following reasons. First and foremost, I have a personal feeling toward this program. I was, in a way, brought to America because of some teachers from this program. They came to teach oral English classes at my campus in China. I became acquainted with them and improved my English with them. During the several years I spent with different teachers from the same program, I discovered that they lacked some understanding about the English teaching situation in China before they came to teach and due to lack of knowledge, they experienced many obstacles teaching in their western style. I believed that if they were better informed, they could have made bigger differences on Chinese campuses. Therefore, it is my hope that this research can explore some real situations in the Chinese EFL classrooms and provide some suggestions for the foreign teachers before they go into classrooms, so that they will be better prepared. Secondly, I study at BYU, which makes it easier for me to obtain information about and consent from the program. Also, this program represents many programs of a similar nature, for example ERIC (Educational Referrals & Resources-China) at Berkeley, California, PESI (Professional & Educational Service International) in Hongkong, Volunteers in Asia at Stanford, Bridge to Asia at Oakland, California, etc.

The China Teachers Program covers seventeen universities in eight cities, including Beijing, Jinan, Nanjing, Guangzhou, Xi'an, Qingdao, and Shanghai. I focused on three schools in Qingdao and two schools in Shanghai. They are Shanghai Jiaotong University (SHJT), Tongji University (Tongji), Qingdao University of Science & Technology (QUST), China Ocean University (COU), and Qingdao University (QD). The reasons for me to choose these schools instead of others are discussed in details in the following section.

Participating Schools

Of the five schools involved, three of them are among the top 50 universities in China, with SHJT the 6th, Tongji the 24th, and OCU the 38th. These three universities are among the leading universities in China directly under the State Ministry of Education in China. The other two are also among the top 200, with QD the 157th, and QUST the 188th (Chinese University Rankings, 2003). These two schools are run by the Shandong Provincial Government.

As one of the oldest universities in China, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, formerly the Nang Yang Public School, was founded in 1896. The university is known for its famous alumni, including Jiang Zemin, the former President of China, Qian Xuesen, the Father of Chinese Rocketry, and so on. Of all academicians of China's Academy of Sciences and Academy of Engineering, more than 200 are alumni of Jiao Tong University. A number of its disciplines have been advancing towards the world's first-class level, such as communication and electronic system, naval architecture and ocean engineering, automatic control, composite materials, and metal plasticity

processing.

Tongji University, formerly Tongji German Medical School, established in 1907, is also one of the oldest and most prestigious higher education institutions in China. It is now a comprehensive university with seven disciplines in engineering, science, medicine, management, arts, law and economics with its strength in architecture, civil engineering and oceanography.

Ocean University of China originated from the Private Qingdao University which was first founded in 1924. In October 1960, it was defined by the Central Government as one of the 13 national key comprehensive universities. OUC is now a comprehensive university with its strength in oceanography and fisheries science.

Qingdao University, authorized by the National Committee of Education and Shandong Provincial Government in 1993, is now a comprehensive university. It has incorporated the former Qingdao University, Shandong Textile Engineering College, Qingdao Medical College, and Qingdao Teachers' College, and has become the largest university in Shandong Province.

QUST, formerly known as Qingdao Institute of Chemical Engineering, was first founded in 1950 as an advanced vocational school in light industry. It is now a comprehensive university with its strength in materials science, chemical engineering, applied chemistry, mechanical engineering, and information technology. It is also known for its international exchange and cooperation programs.

Limitations of time and money are two of the main reasons for me to choose these schools instead of others. Travel between cities and between classes within one city takes

time. It takes thirteen to fourteen hours to go from Shanghai to Qingdao on the train, about two and one half hours on the plane. Due to money shortage, the train is the only practical option. Considering the fact that Shanghai is the largest city in China, travel between schools in Shanghai is time consuming. It takes me three hours on the subway to get to one campus from another. Often I have to walk for an extra half an hour. It took me almost two months to gather all my data in the five schools. Though the Kennedy Center was kind enough to offer me some help on my travel, it was far from enough. I have families and friends in Shanghai and Qingdao, with whom I was able to stay at no cost. Another reason I chose those five schools was that I had personal contacts from those schools. In China, your personal network, *guan xi* in Chinese, is of vital importance in getting things done efficiently. My *guan xi* made it easier for me to obtain consent from the administration, which could have been more difficult at unfamiliar schools.

Study Procedures

Before I went to China in February 2007, I emailed all the relevant administrators, mostly the deans of the English Department, and asked them whether I could observe some of their listening/speaking classes taught by both American and Chinese teachers. With the help from my contacts in the Kennedy Center and in China, I was able to get their permission easily. Then I went back to China and observed nine classes at five universities, namely Shanghai Jiaotong University, Tongji University, Ocean University of China, Qingdao University, and Qingdao University of Science & Technology. I was able to contact all five deans and get contact information of the teachers I was allowed to observe. (Unfortunately Qingdao University was not able to find me a listening/speaking

class taught by the Chinese teachers.) I contacted all nine teachers, including five Americans and four Chinese, and got their permission to observe and record their classes. I had teachers sign the consent forms before classes started. Then I was able to observe and videotape their listening and speaking classes.

I came back to America and was able to transfer the videos to DVDs to make them easier to watch. Then I did an observational comparative analysis of the different teaching methods on video using the COLT instrument.

I also administered interview questionnaires to teachers I observed and videotaped to supplement the observations. I planned to do a sit-down interview with all teachers after the observation of their class. However, due to time constraints and teachers' busy schedules, they were only able to answer my questions via email. After I obtained their responses, I did a comparative summary of results from both groups.

Study Participants

Five out of seventeen Chinese universities associated with the Kennedy Center's China Teachers Program sponsored by Brigham Young University (BYU) were involved in the study, including Shanghai Jiaotong University (SHJT), Tongji University (Tongji), Ocean University of China (OCU), Qingdao University (QD), and Qingdao University of Science & Technology (QUST). A description of each school has been provided in the previous section.

Five American teachers and four Chinese participated in this study, due to the fact that Qingdao University did not offer a listening/speaking class taught by Chinese teachers. The four Chinese teachers observed were much younger than the American

teachers. All of them were in their late 20s or early 30s. They all graduated with an English-related master's degree from different Chinese universities. The American teachers, in contrast, were all in their 50s or 60s. They were retired professionals from different fields. None of them had taught English as their profession. However, many were teachers. Each year before teachers depart for China, the BYU Kennedy Center provides them with two weeks' intensive training in ESL instruction, based on the CLT approach.

Instruments

In this study, the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) was used as the quantitative method and interview questionnaires were used as the qualitative method. Each of these methods will be discussed.

Quantitative Method: COLT Instrument

Different research methods have been used in observational research studies in the ESL field, for example Flanders' Interaction Analysis (FIAC), Fanselow's FOCUS, and the Communicative Orientation Language Teaching (COLT). All three methods are designed to capture the communication process in different language classrooms in different ways and with different emphasis.

Flanders (1970) defines teaching behavior as "acts by the teacher which occur in the context of classroom interaction" (p.4). He devised a system which is divided into three broad areas: teacher talk, pupil talk and silence. It consists of ten categories of communication which are said to be inclusive of all communication possibilities. Seven categories are used when the teacher is talking and two when the pupil is talking. The

major feature of this method is the analysis of patterns of initiative and response. When someone is initiating, it means that he or she is making the first move, introducing an idea or concept for the first time. When someone is responding, it means he or she takes action after an initiative, trying to react to ideas already expressed. It is expected that in a more communicative teaching situation, pupils will show more initiating than teachers.

Flanders is clear, easy to learn and decipher. It provides reliable data that can be used in quantitative analysis, such as the calculation of teacher response ratio or pupil initiative ratio (Flanders, 1970). However, as pointed by McKernan (1996), FIAC has many limitations. First, it may indicate the percentage of time when the teacher is talking in class; however, it does not tell us what he or she is saying. Second, FIAC fails to describe the cultural settings where the research is carried out. It does not mention artifacts and other objects involved in a class. Third, the ten parameter behaviors are pre-specified, which means that the many behaviors that do not fall into the preset categories are lost. Fourth, FIAC seems to work well in classes which are formally organized with teachers as didactic leaders. It does not seem appropriate for more open structured classes, such as CLT classes.

A series of similar schemes have been developed later based on Flander's model. Most of these schemes followed Flander's model of "observing, describing, and assigning numerical values to teacher talk and student talk using preselected and predetermined categories and coding procedures" (Kumaravadivelu, 1999, p.455).

In order to classify communications people send and receive in both teaching and non-teaching settings, Fanselow (1977) has developed an instrument called FOCUS, an

acronym for Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings. He believes that, communications both inside and outside classrooms are “a series of patterned events in which two or more people use mediums such as speech, gesture, noise, or writing to evaluate, interpret, or in other ways communicate separate areas of content such as the meaning of words, personal feelings, or classroom procedures, for one of four pedagogical purpose: structuring, soliciting, responding, and reacting” (p. 19). Therefore, this instrument focuses on five characteristics of communication, including source, medium, use, content, and pedagogical purpose.

This instrument provides a way to analyze in great detail communication both in and outside classrooms at parties, on the job, and at home. It analyzes every sentence in a conversation. However, there are many problems with this method. One problem is that the instrument is tedious and time consuming. It takes about six hours to transcribe a typical fifty-minute class. In this study where classes are usually two hours long, it will take about twelve hours to analyze one class. The excessive amount of time it takes makes the method not very practical. Another problem with FOCUS is that it assumes only one person in class does one thing at a time. In other words, it does not allow simultaneous activities, which are typical in a communicative oriented class. Third, FOCUS fails to indicate the intended audience of each communicative act. Moreover, little attention is paid to receivers and receptive activities.

As pointed out by Kumaravadivelu (1999), the use of interaction analysis has undoubtedly led to a better understanding of classroom aims and events, especially regarding teacher and student talk. However, as mentioned above, they all have severe

limitations. One major limitation is that they exclusively focus on the verbal behavior at a micro level and pay little attention to class processes at a macro level.

An important development in observational analysis occurred when the COLT instrument was developed in the early 1980s by Allen, Frohlich, and Spada (1984). COLT is an acronym for the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching. This instrument was developed mainly to describe differences in the communicative orientation of language teaching (i.e. form-focused or meaning-focused) and to determine whether and how this contributes to differences in L2 (the target language, which is English in this study) learning outcomes. Compared to other methods, the COLT scheme has several main advantages. It is based on theories of communicative methods of language teaching, theories of communication, and theories of first and second language acquisition. It is designed for real-time coding as well as for analysis of recordings. Besides capturing verbal interactions at a micro level, it also provides a macroscopic analysis of L2 classrooms at the level of activity types.

COLT consists of two parts: Part A, which contains categories derived primarily from pedagogical issues in the communicative language teaching literature, describes classroom practices and procedures at the level of activity. It contains five different parameters, including activity, participant organization (whether it is a whole class activity, a group, or an individual), content control, content of the class (focus on language form, function discourse, socio-linguistics, or the subject matter), and student modality (whether they are listening, speaking, reading, or writing). These five major categories are further divided into sub-categories. These categories are designed to

measure the extent to which a class is communicatively oriented, which is one of the major research questions for this thesis study. In the literature review, Communicative Language Teaching is characterized by student centeredness, group work, meaningful tasks, authentic materials, less emphasis on language form, and more on function, discourse, sociolinguistics, etc. Therefore, classes with similar characteristics are often considered more communicatively oriented. The parameters in COLT Part A happen to capture these communicative features.

Part B, which is based on research theories in first and second hand language acquisition, describes verbal interactions of teachers and students within activities at a micro level. It contains five different parameters, including the target language, information gap, sustained speech, reaction to form/message, and incorporation of student utterance. These five categories are divided into forty subcategories.

The COLT scheme has been used in a variety of L2 contexts to examine process and product relationships and to discover matches and mismatches between L2 program goals and practices. Depending on research goals, it may not be necessary to use both parts of the scheme or all of the categories within each part. Researchers are free to either select or adapt relevant categories from the two parts or to develop a new set of categories.

Since the research goal for this study is to obtain a general picture of the communicative orientation of teaching in the L2 classes at the level of pedagogical activities, the method does not need to capture every detail in classrooms. Therefore, COLT was chosen over the other microscopic analysis schemes such as Flanders' Interaction Analysis

(FIAC) and Fanselow's FOCUS. Since COLT Part B is also used to capture details during activities, it was sufficient to use COLT Part A. With Part A, all five parameters were kept and one was added: the languages used in classrooms. Use of languages in classrooms can also reflect communicative features of a class. COLT was designed originally in ESL settings, where students come from many native language backgrounds and English is the unquestionable medium of instruction. China, in contrast, is an EFL setting, where all students in a class speak the same L1. COLT design did not anticipate such a situation. Therefore, the instrument was adapted to better fit the Chinese setting. The sub-categories were also reduced because many are unnecessary for the purpose of this study. (See Appendix A for a complete copy of the revised version of CLOT)

While viewing each class again on video, I made records of the time spent on each activity in class and communicative features reflected in each activity. I captured these data by using five different parameters, including languages used in the classroom (English or Chinese), participant organization, content of the class, content control, and student modality. The Activity parameter was used for open-ended description of different activities in class. As explained in Chapter Four, five comparisons were made from COLT analysis data, each reflecting one parameter used in the COLT scheme.

A number of studies (Spada & Frohlich, 1995) have shown that compared with its predecessors, COLT has shown its advantage in its capacity to help its users better capture communicative features in their teaching. However, it has its own limitations. Allen (in Allen, Frohlich, & Spada, 1984) finds it necessary to supplement COLT with "a more detailed qualitative analysis, with a view to obtaining additional information about

the way meaning is co-constructed in the classroom” (p.143). Spada and Frohlich (1995) also recommend another method if the researchers are interested in more detailed discourse analysis of classroom interactions.

In order to overcome the weakness of the COLT scheme, qualitative interviews with teachers were used in this study to follow up with classroom observations. This is also in harmony with Allen’s suggestions to supplement COLT with additional qualitative analyses.

Qualitative Method: Interviews

In order to supplement the quantitative data from the COLT video analysis, I administered interview questionnaires to all 9 teachers from the observed classes with their consent. A sit-down interview was planned with each teacher after the observation of their class. However, not all teachers could accommodate me. Some of them had to go to other classes, while others had to catch school buses. I was able to either walk them to their next class, or walk them to their buses and talk to them briefly on the way. Since I did not have enough time to ask all my questions and get complete answers, I sent the questionnaires to all of them via email and obtained written answers from them, which turned out to be a positive experience. In the response via email, they had more time to think and were able to provide a more detailed answer to each question. However, the drawback for not having a face-to-face interview was that follow up and extra questions were not possible. It was also not possible to pick up trivia information, which could have been enlightening.

Six questions were asked in the interview questionnaires:

1. Please briefly describe your class, including your student composition, your course objective, etc.
2. How do you feel about the Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in Chinese universities?
3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is CTM and how much is CLT?
4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in different class? If yes, what are they?
5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the Chinese setting better than the CTM? Why?
6. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in Chinese universities? Why?

For the purpose of simplification, letters and numbers are used to represent different teachers and classes. Table 1 shows the coding for each teacher and class observed. This coding system works in both video analysis and interview descriptions. Group A includes all Chinese teachers and their classes, and Group B has all American teachers and their classes. The table also indicates the university each teacher belongs to. Due to reasons of confidentiality, names of teachers are not mentioned. There is no significance in the listing order of classes. Note that teacher A5 and Class A5 are missing. The reason for that is because Qingdao University does not have a listening/speaking class taught by a Chinese teacher. All listening/speaking classes are taught by foreign

teachers. Therefore, five classes were taught by American teachers and only four taught by Chinese teachers.

Table 1

Teacher and Class coding

Schools	Group A: Chinese	Group B: American
SHJT	Teacher A1/ Class A1	Teacher B1/ Class B1
Tongji	Teacher A2/ Class A2	Teacher B2/ Class B2
QUST	Teacher A3/ Class A3	Teacher B3/ Class B3
OUC	Teacher A4/ Class A4	Teacher B 4/ Class B4
QD		Teacher B5/ Class B5

In summary, this chapter explained procedures of the study and analysis methods following the study. Spada's COLT system was used for the observations, and interview questionnaires were administered for more qualitative data.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter answers the research questions: Do Chinese English language teachers and expatriate English teachers at the university level use CLT in their teaching? If so, to what extent? If not, why not? What factors prevent them from using it? The first two questions are answered by results from the video analysis. The last two are answered by interview responses from teachers.

The COLT system was used to analyze the video data because it was able to capture communicative features in classrooms. Results from the COLT analysis were discussed in five categories, which covered the five parameters used in COLT, namely *languages used in the classroom, participation organization, content, content control, and student modality*. The *Activity* parameter is used to provide additional descriptions if necessary. Supportive data evidence is presented in Tables 2-6.

Six questions were asked in the interview questionnaires. This chapter provides a complete summary of answers to all six questions. Answers are presented in two groups, the Chinese teachers and the Americans, for the purpose of comparison.

At the end of this chapter, an integration of results from the two data sources is provided. Comparisons are made between what teachers said about CLT use in their classes and what actually happened in their classes.

Results from COLT Analysis of Video Data

Parameter 1: Classroom Language

The first parameter addresses the language used in classrooms by teachers and students. In a communicative oriented classroom, only the target language, which is English, is expected. Table 2 shows which language (Chinese or English) was used in the classes observed. It might be well to remember that the official policy is that English should be used exclusively in all listening/speaking classes in Chinese universities.

Table 2

Language Used in Class: Mean Percentages of Observed Time

Class	Chinese	English	Class	Chinese	English
Class A1	50	50	Class B1	0	100
Class A2	16	84	Class B2	0	100
Class A3	0	100	Class B3	0	100
Class A4	0	100	Class B4	0	100
			Class B5	0	100
Mean	15.3	86	Mean	0	100

From these data, we see that the Chinese teachers used Chinese in class more frequently than the American teachers did. This, of course, is only natural because the American teachers do not know Chinese, so they cannot not use anything but English in the classroom. The fact that on average 15% of the time the Chinese teachers used Chinese is a bit troubling since they are supposed to be speaking in English. Apparently,

the temptation to use the common native language of both students and teachers is very strong.

An important question is what did they use Chinese for? From Table 2, we see that Class A1 used Chinese 50% of the time. From the video and COLT analysis of that class, we see that the teacher was explaining pronunciation rules and analyzing text materials in Chinese. She also used Chinese for housekeeping issues and homework assignments. The only other class taught by a Chinese teacher where Chinese was used was A2. In that class, according to the video and COLT analysis, the teacher was using Chinese in translation exercises. It is important for a teacher to explain some pronunciation rules once in a while, but more importantly, in a communicative listening/speaking class, teachers should allocate enough time for students to practice rules they have learned. In Class A1 the teacher used the first half of class explaining rules. Then without having students practice, she moved on to other activities. This is typical teacher-centered instruction, where students are fed passively by whatever the teacher has to offer. According to CLT principles, it should not be encouraged in classes aiming to improve students' oral fluency. In Class A2 the teacher tried to introduce some colloquial English through a translation exercise. Sentences such as "I've frisked a thousand young punks," "What I want is that I have a guarantee: No more attempts on my father's life," and many others were introduced without any context. We need to be reminded that one major feature for the CLT approach is the use of English in meaningful tasks, in contexts that are real. The translation exercise in this case stood alone in the class and could not be considered a meaningful task.

Another point that is worth mentioning is that the other two Chinese teachers were able to carry out their classes in English only, and from the video it appears that the method was well received by students. Therefore, it is possible for qualified Chinese teachers to carry out a class in the target language only, and they should be urged to do so if it can help improve students' speaking proficiency.

Parameter 2: Participant Organization

In this section, percentages were calculated for the following categories: *class*, *group work*, and *individual*. *Class* activities happen when the whole class is involved in the same activity. *Class* is further subdivided into the following: teacher interacting with individual students or the entire class (T-S/C), students interacting with the class or with other students while one main activity is going on in class (S-S/C), or choral activities, where the whole class repeats after the teacher. *Group activities* refer to activities where students have to work in pairs or small groups. *Individual activities* usually happen when an individual student is giving a presentation.

The CLT Approach is characterized by group work. When students work in pairs or small groups, especially on meaningful tasks, they are communicating in the target language. Therefore, the higher the numbers were in the *Group* column, the more students were talking to each other to accomplish a task, and the more communicative the class was. On the other hand, the T-S/C parameter shows how teacher centered a class is. It reflects the non-communicative feature of the class. Therefore, the higher the number is in the T-SC column, the less communicative a class is.

Table 3

Participant Organization: Percentages of Observed Time

	Class				Ind.		Class				
	T-S/C	S-S/C	Choral	Group			T-S/CS	S-S/C	Choral	Group	Ind.
Class						Class					
A1	70	30	0	0	12	B1	58	32	0	35	43
Class						Class					
A2	27	2	17	25	15	B2	19	0	10	0	61
Class						Class					
A3	78	10	8	1	16	B3	92	5	8	24	24
Class						Class					
A4	59	52	16	32	12	B4	29	0	53	27	14
						Class					
						B5	68	38	9	38	5
Mean	58.5	23.5	10.3	14.5	13.8	Mean	53.2	15	16	24.8	29.4

The data show that the mean percentage of time spent on group work in the American teachers' classes is a lot higher than that of the Chinese teachers, which, according to COLT, indicates that just based on this parameter, the Communicative Language Teaching Approach was used more frequently in the American teachers' classes.

Table 3 also indicates that one teacher from each group did not employ any Group activities in his/her class at all. The COLT video analysis shows that the Chinese teacher from Class A1 spent most of her time (70%) giving instructions on pronunciation rules. It is obvious that she did not give students any time to practice in groups (0%) or chorally (0%). This is a typical class under the Chinese Traditional Method with the teacher being the center of the class and prepared instruction as the main focus. On the other hand, the American teacher from Class B2, who did not use any group work in class, spent most of her time on individual student presentations. The COLT video analysis

showed that she gave out a list of topics about Chinese culture, and each student had to choose a topic from the list to prepare a three minute presentation in front of the whole class. For the first few students, it was more of a spontaneous speech since they did not have much time to prepare their answers. But for students who presented later, many of them, as recorded in the video, had their presentation written down, and when it was their turn, they simply read out their presentation. Individual work is not the perfect way to achieve communicative purposes because it is one-way communication. Students do not get feedback when they share their ideas with others. A monolog does not help improve their intercommunication skills. A better way to be more communicative-oriented would be to combine group activities and group presentations, just as the teacher from class A2 did. COLT analysis shows that the teacher from Class A2 had her students discuss in groups about several meaningful subjects, she then chose a couple of groups to present in front of the whole class. The only thing she could have done more communicatively with those activities would be to have given more constructive feedback on group presentations.

As was explained earlier, teacher centeredness is a major feature of the Chinese Traditional Method, and it is often assumed that Chinese teachers would use this approach more than American teachers. However, the T-S/C parameter in Table 3 shows that on average, no great difference is found in the use of this method between the Chinese group and the American one(58.5 VS 53.2). In fact, some American teachers also used a heavily teacher-centered approach. However, variation within groups is more obvious. For example, within the Chinese group, the percentage of time spent on

teacher-centered instruction varies from 27 percent to 78 percent. Within the Americans, variation is between 19 to 92 percent. It is safe to say that not all Chinese teach the same way. In fact, the same teacher may teach differently depending on the topic or purpose. The same is true of the American teachers.

Overall the American teachers used more group work in their classes on average. But they spent no less time on teacher-centered instruction than the Chinese teachers did. Therefore, no apparent pattern is identified based on teachers' nationality. Greater variation is shown within groups.

Parameter 3: Content

In the *Content* parameter, the subject matter of class activities is addressed. Descriptions of what is being talked about, listened to, read, or written about the target language are provided. In this study the categories and subcategories of the COLT scheme are adapted into five groups: namely *form* (explicit focus on grammar, vocabulary, or pronunciation), *function* (explicit focus on illocutionary acts such as requesting, apologizing, and explaining), *discourse* (explicit focus on the way sentences combine into cohesive and coherent sequences), *sociolinguistics* (explicit focus on the features which make utterances appropriate for particular contexts), and *other topics* (the subject matter of classroom discourse, apart from management and explicit focus on language). Data for these categories are presented in Table 4. It is important to note that two categories were never coded. One is discourse and the other is function. Although students were exposed to spoken and written discourses through listening and reading activities, explicit reference to aspects of cohesion or coherence was never made. Nor

was there explicit reference to function, which is the illocutionary acts such as requesting, apologizing, and explaining. In other words, no class observed used a task-based curriculum.

Table 4

Content: Percentages of Observed Time

	Content				Content		
	Form	Socio- Ling	Other Topics		Form	Socio- Ling	Other Topics
Class A1	38	0	50	Class B1	2	1	78
Class A2	32	16	55	Class B2	11	67	58
Class A3	16	17	87	Class B3	25	46	21
Class A4	0	0	97	Class B4	47	42	54
				Class B5	25	17	48
Mean	21.5	8.3	71	Mean	22	34.6	51.8

According to the definitions of form, function, and sociolinguistics, it is obvious that the more time spent on Form, the more teacher-centered the class will be. Table 4 shows us that there is no big difference between the Chinese teachers and American teachers as far as content goes in the classes. The American teachers, on average, spent about the same amount of time teaching forms of the language as the Chinese teachers. But according to the COLT video analysis, when the American teachers were giving instructions on language forms, it was mostly on pronunciation, and it tended to be a choral activity where all students would repeat after the teacher pronunciations of certain words or phrases. Class B4 is an example: The teacher had on a PowerPoint slide a grid of words that were difficult for Chinese students to pronounce. Students would read each

word after him, and the teacher would point out their pronunciation problems if he could identify them. In this case, it might not be a bad thing for form instruction in class, as long as there was practice time for students after the instruction. On the other hand, the Chinese teachers, when teaching about the form of the language, usually taught more pronunciation rules and did translation exercises between Chinese and English.

Another point worth noticing is that on average the American teachers spent much more time on sociolinguistics, which entails using proper language under different circumstances. Cultural scenarios play a big role in the sociolinguistic aspect of a language. From the video analysis, all American teachers (except B1) devoted quite a large amount of time teaching about different cultural backgrounds in America, while only two Chinese teachers mentioned this aspect in a relatively small amount of time. This result is natural considering the fact that the American teachers know more about English cultural backgrounds than the Chinese teachers. Actually, later in the interviews many Chinese teachers commented that one major reason they did not want to use the CLT Approach was because of their lack of cultural background knowledge about English speaking countries. For example, the American teacher from Class B3 spent some time in class demonstrating dinner table etiquette, which Chinese teachers would find hard to do.

Parameter 4: Content Control

This category addresses the issue of the source of materials in the class: teacher, textbooks, student, or combinations of all. When class is controlled by teacher/text, teachers are usually dominating the class by explaining textbook information, reflecting a

more teacher-centered classroom. If the class is controlled by teacher/text/student, teachers are usually leading a major activity with the participation of the whole class or talking to an individual student. In order to judge how communicative the class is by this parameter, we have to know how much the teacher is talking and how much the student is. In the COLT system, this can be analyzed by the open-ended description under Activities & Episodes. For example, Table 5 shows that 42% of the time in class A1 was spent on Teacher/Text/Student, which means the teacher was leading an activity where students were participating. According to the activity description, the teacher from class A1 would ask some questions and ask volunteers to answer. But then she would spend a longer time commenting on the student's answer. Although there was 42% of student time during the class, the teacher took more than half of it.

When the content is controlled by students, they are usually giving presentations or doing group activities where they create their own content about which to speak. This parameter should also be used together with the open-ended description under Activities and Episodes. The reason is that when students are controlling the class content through group activities, the class is more communicative-oriented. When students are doing presentations, it is less communicative. For example, Table 5 shows that in class B2 students controlled 61% of the class time. But the activity description records that the only thing students did during that time was individual presentations without much teacher or peer feedback, which does not reflect the communicative feature of a class.

Therefore, of all three parameters in Content Control, it is only safe to assume that the more time spent on Teacher/Text, the less communicative the class is. The other two

parameters have to be used together with the open-ended description under Activities and Episodes. This qualitative description feature is one of the advantages COLT has over many other interactional analysis schemes.

Table 5

Content Control: Percentages of Observed Time

	Teacher/ Text	Teacher/ Text/ Student	Student		Teacher/ Text	Teacher/ Text/ Student	Student
Class A1	41	42	10	Class B1	7	50	41
Class A2	55	34	15	Class B2	26	0	61
Class A3	0	70	30	Class B3	22	53	18
Class A4	2	45	52	Class B4	51	32	13
				Class B5	27	19	45
Mean	24.5	47.8	26.8	Mean	26.6	30.8	35.6

As is shown in Table 5, no great difference is identified for average teacher/text time spent in class across the two groups (24.5 VS 26.6). However, major variation is shown within each group. For example, within the Chinese group, the variation of percentage of time spent on teacher-centered instruction is from 0 to 55 percent. Within the Americans, the variation is from 7 to 51 percent. Of the 4 Chinese teachers observed, 2 of them hardly spent any time explaining text details. However, the other 2 spent half of their class time explaining texts. The same is true for the American teachers. They all spent different amounts of time on text explanation. Therefore, it is safe to say that, according

to the Content Control parameter, no major difference is identified between the two groups regarding the communicative orientation of the classes observed.

Parameter 5: Student Modality

This section identifies various language skills practiced in a classroom activity. The focus is on students, and the purpose is to discover whether they are listening, speaking, reading, or writing. In a communication oriented class, the skills of listening and speaking are expected more often than reading and writing. However, listening and speaking skills are expected to be used in meaningful communicative activities. Therefore, when students are listening and speaking, it is important to decide whether they are using those skills in meaningful tasks, instead of mechanical repetitions. This is reflected in the open-ended activity description parameter. Table 6 shows that the overall time spent on all four skills exceeds 100%. The reason is that most times, students could be using both skills at the same time. It could also be the case where one student was talking and the other students were listening. The numbers from the COLT analysis alone do not cover this detail. They have to be combined with details in the open-ended description under Activities & Episodes in order to determine how communicative the class was. When students were just repeating single words after the teacher to practice their pronunciation, which happened in many classes, they were not being communicative. However, when they were speaking on assigned topics in small groups, they were being communicative.

However, reading and writing skills do not exactly reflect the communicative feature of a listening/speaking class. Therefore, it is safe to say that in a class where these two skills are used, communication is limited.

Table 6

Student Modality: Percentages of Observed Time

	Listen- ing	Speak- ing	Read- ing	Writ- ing		Listen- ing	Speak- ing	Read- ing	Writ- ing
Class A1	96	50	4	0	Class B1	89	74	66	48
Class A2	52	65	13	24	Class B2	90	70	0	0
Class A3	90	49	44	21	Class B3	75	41	36	14
Class A4	90	58	53	5	Class B4	55	60	41	0
					Class B5	82	59	60	0
Mean	82	55.5	28.5	12.5	Mean	78.2	60.8	40.6	12.4

Table 6 shows that of the four parameters in Student Modality, there is no major difference across groups in three of them. The only difference that is shown is the time spent on reading in class. It is obvious that the American teachers, on average, spent more time on reading in class than the Chinese teachers did (40.6 VS. 28.5). According to COLT analysis, of the 2 American teachers who spent over half of their class time on reading activities, one of them (B1) had students read textbook articles to find difficult vocabulary, and the other (B5) had students practicing poetry reading most of the time. Apparently unlike the other teachers who did not have a textbook, the teacher from class B1 had one and had to cover required textbook materials in class. From the COLT analysis, she did a good job helping students learn the vocabulary. She divided them into

groups and had them read the designated article, find out difficult words, learn them in groups, and present them in front of the whole class. Therefore, despite the fact that students spent a long time reading, it was an activity with communicative features. The fact that the teacher had to allocate a large amount of time for student reading is due to department requirement on covering certain materials, which is one of the obstacles for using CLT in China. More on this topic will be mentioned in questionnaire responses.

Summary of COLT Analysis Results

At this point it is necessary to go back to the research questions: Do Chinese English language teachers and expatriate English teachers at the university level in China use CLT in their teaching? If so, to what extent? If not, why not? What factors prevent them from using it? As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, COLT analysis of the videos will answer the first two questions. And questionnaire responses will answer the last question. As for the first question, the answer is simply yes. Both Chinese and American teachers use CLT in their listening/speaking classes. The extent to which CLT is applied in classrooms depends on individual teachers. Some used a lot, others not much.

Overall, variation between groups is not as obvious as that within groups. Not all Americans teach the same way. In fact, the same teacher may teach differently depending on the topic or purpose. More on this will be discussed in the limitations section. The same is true of the Chinese teachers. However, several differences are noticed from observations and video analysis.

First, the Chinese teachers used more Chinese in their classes for explanation of rules, vocabulary, and translation exercises. A proper amount of Chinese instruction in

these areas could be helpful. But in a listening/speaking class, teachers are not encouraged to use Chinese, especially for a relatively long period of time. Student practice should follow the instruction to allow them to apply rules to their conversations. As pointed out earlier, it is possible for all the Chinese teachers with adequate English skills to carry out a class in the target language only. Therefore, they should be urged to do so especially when doing so creates a more native environment which helps improve students' speaking proficiency.

Second, the American teachers are overall better at employing group work in their classes. They tried to give students enough time to practice. The Chinese teachers have a tendency to lead a major activity for the whole class and call on volunteers to answer questions. For both groups, more time should be given to student practice and more constructive feedback should be provided after student presentations.

Another difference worth noticing is that compared to the Chinese, the American teachers spent much more time on sociolinguistics, in which cultural scenarios play a big role. This result is natural considering the fact that the American teachers know more about English cultural backgrounds than the Chinese teachers. As recorded in the interviews in the next section, the Chinese teachers' lack of western cultural backgrounds is one of the major obstacles using the CLT approach in class.

Results from Interview Data: A Comparative Summary

In order to supplement the quantitative data from COLT analysis of the video-tapes, interview questionnaires were administered to all 10 teachers. Of the six questions asked, five of them were about the CTM and CLT approach used in Chinese universities.

The first question was a demographic question about the classes observed, including a brief description of the class, the composition of students, and the class objectives. This section provides a summary of interview results of all six questions. Results were organized into two groups, the Chinese teachers and the American teachers, for a better comparison. In the presentation of results, classes are coded the same way as in the video analysis. The Chinese teachers are referred to as teacher A1, A2, A3, A4 respectively, while the Americans are referred to as teacher B1, B2, B3, B4 and B5.

Description of Observed Classes

Chinese teachers. Of the four classes taught by the Chinese teachers, class A4 was the only class with English majors as the majority of the class. All the other three were listening/speaking classes for non-English major students, with 30 to 40 students in each class. They would usually meet four hours a week to practice their listening and speaking skills. As for the course objective, teacher A1 understood that it was “to provide students with the opportunity of practice their spoken English together with listening, writing, and reading.” Teacher A4 thought that the objective of the listening and speaking class was “to help students acquire skills and interest in improving their listening, speaking, reading and writing.”

American teachers. Of all five classes taught by American teachers, three of them were comprised of all English major students. Class B1 was offered to non-English majors, and class B5 was offered to master’s degree candidates of different majors. All teachers seemed to have the same objective for their classes, which was to help students

with their spoken English. Teacher B4 summarized it as “to help enhance students’ ability to understand spoken English and to speak the language with increased fluency.”

Overall Feelings toward CTM and CLT in Chinese universities

Chinese teachers. When asked about the feelings toward CTM and CLT in English classrooms in Chinese universities, the Chinese teachers expressed different opinions. Several teachers thought that different methods should be used for different classes. CLT would work better in an oral English class, but CTM was more practical in courses like Intensive Reading. Another common lament was that teachers were given a heavy content schedule for the classes they taught. CTM made sure that they could cover a wide range of content within a short period of time because teachers were in control of the class with this method. Teacher A1 also mentioned that CLT was challenging for them because they might face situations that were beyond their English skills. Teacher A4 mentioned that after years of learning under CTM in high school, students did not seem to be accustomed to the CLT approach. Because students had to pass different written tests, they wanted more instruction and to spend more time on grammar and reading. Therefore, they did not have much time for the listening/speaking practice.

American teachers. When asked about the overall feelings toward CTM and CLT in Chinese universities, all the BYU teachers interviewed thought that CLT was more effective in their class. It created a more relaxed environment and was therefore more enjoyable for students. It also gave students more opportunities to verbalize. The communicative activities made students think in English. Most lessons taught by the BYU teachers were centered on “giving students a chance to express themselves in

English in a variety of situations.” Many communicative activities were used in their classrooms, such as debate, role-play, group and partner discussions, word games, music, etc. One example of such activities was described by teacher B5 teaching a *Watching, Listening, and Speaking* class with 48 students in it. She described that activity as follows:

One successful technique I use is the Cocktail Party. The original lesson, last semester, centered on the proper etiquette when an invitation is received to a cocktail party, the meaning of RSVP, introductions, shaking hands, and types of polite conversation appropriate to such an event. I divide the class into two lines. Each student has a partner. They shake hands and introduce themselves to each partner and converse for three minutes. I call “stop” and the person at the head of one line goes to the end, and all other students move up one person.

Some American teachers mentioned that they occasionally used the CTM when they had lessons on pronunciation, culture, grammar, and the like. But the use of CTM was minimal. One thing several teachers mentioned was that no matter how big their class was, they tried to give each student “upfront exposure” at least two to three times per semester by doing presentations or performing dialogues.

Proportion of CTM and CLT in classrooms

Chinese teachers. CLT seemed to be the main method Chinese teachers used in their listening/speaking class.

American teachers. Of the five BYU teachers interviewed, one said all her teaching was CLT. The other four tended to use a combination of both CLT and CTM, with a proportion of 90% to 10%.

Difficulties in Using CLT

Chinese teachers. Many difficulties were encountered by the Chinese teachers in using the CLT approach in their classrooms. As reflected by several teachers, one of the

major difficulties was students' different levels of proficiency. Some students were more willing and confident about participating than others. Teacher A1 said,

If most of students in one class do not have sufficient English ability to express their idea, teacher may find it difficult to push them to involve in CLT. In other cases, if only a handful of students in one class demonstrate English ability way (more) advanced than their classmates, others will easily feel depressed and unconfident to stand up and do class activity.

Another difficulty also came from students. Teacher A3 mentioned that it was harder to implement the CLT approach at the beginning of a new semester because students were not familiar with each other and therefore were shy about interacting with one another. Also, coming right out of high school, where speaking opportunities were rare, they were not used to the communicative activities.

Big class size was another issue for communicative activities. Some teachers had ninety students in one class, which made it impossible for every student to talk. Teacher A2 said, "The great number also increases the formality in class, and students may feel nervous and unwilling to volunteer to contribute ideas."

Another issue for using CLT in Chinese universities was inadequate teacher training. Many teachers had a rather vague idea about the concept of CLT itself. They were neither confident about their own speaking skills nor their understanding of the cultural background of English speaking countries. They were afraid to make mistakes or be embarrassed in class by not being able to answer questions students might ask. Teacher A2 mentioned that she did not know how to give students feedback on their speaking tasks because she had not been trained to do so.

Several teachers made the comment that it was hard to control the class using CLT. Teachers had to face unexpected situations all the time, and it was challenging for them to handle a class like that. Teacher A4 also mentioned that CLT was often time-consuming. It took a longer time to explain the same language points using CLT than CTM.

Lack of communicative teaching resources such as movies, games, and interactive resources was another big difficulty for teachers. Many teaching materials were outdated. There was a great need for authentic materials.

American teachers. One common difficulty for all the BYU teachers came from students. They were shy and not used to talking. They were overwhelmed at the beginning and were hesitant to participate. They were not used to volunteering to answer. However, it seemed that after the teachers had worked with students for a while, they did “relax and become responsive.” They were usually prepared to be called on at any time to answer questions, and “they are always willing to give the answer a try.” Teacher B5 mentioned that occasionally she would have a few students who did not interact in a group situation, and sometimes the better speakers monopolized the conversation. Big class sizes and poor teaching equipment were also big problems for the BYU teachers who were used to small group instruction and modern technology in classrooms. Teacher B3 said,

In my Western English-speaking Culture class (72 students and only a blackboard), I found I had to mainly use the lecture method, although I did have them research and give reports on subjects, both individually and as a “committee.” A second time around, I would do more role play and perhaps

reader's theatre type of things. Again we were following a text in a crowded, miserable room.

A better fit: CTM or CLT?

Chinese teachers. When asked about whether CLT fits into the Chinese setting better than CTM, most teachers answered: "It depends." It depended on the teacher's recognition of the effectiveness of CLT or not. It depended on teachers' understanding of the CLT approach and their ability to manage it. Teacher A4 commented:

CLT is preferable in theory. But here in China, students are faced with many "they-cannot-afford-to-fail" exams, such as TEM 4 and TEM 8. CTM is good at helping them pass exams and learn a lot of words and rules within the limited time in class.

Teacher A3 thought the traditional Chinese classroom culture made it difficult for students to accept the CLT approach. She said, "Students are taught to listen to their teachers in class, to respect teachers and other Chinese traditions." She did not think students could change their mentality in a short time, but that we could expect changes slowly in the future.

American teachers. When asked about which method was a better fit for the Chinese situation, CTM or CLT, 2 teachers from two cities preferred CLT. They thought both students and teachers, especially the younger ones, were accepting the CLT approach in learning and teaching and "finding satisfaction and success." Teacher B4 said, "We want to maximize students' opportunities to increase their English speaking fluency. These days, they are becoming accustomed to the western approach of teaching; the younger teachers are eager to incorporate it into their teaching."

The other 3 teachers tended to think that a combination of both methods worked better in the Chinese setting. They recognize the strong effect CLT approach had on improving students' oral English. But they also realized the stress students had from many written tests, which required them to be familiar with the texts and be able to recall information for the tests. Teacher B3 summarized this point rather well:

I do think the more relaxed, flexible approach helps these students who are accustomed to rigidity and sometimes harsh brow-beating criticism. Many students have expressed great distress during times when they were preparing for tests. However, I think we have to hold them to a high standard and respect the discipline which has made them such diligent students. Every process has plus and minus characteristics, so a mixture seems to be working for me.

The ideal method for ELT in Chinese universities

Chinese teachers. Most teachers do not know which method is ideal for ELT in China. They thought a combination of both CLT and CTM would be more desirable than simply choosing one of them. "The reason is obvious," just as teacher A4 said: "Students need to know how to communicate in English as well as how to pass exams in China." Teacher A3 explained that universities are different and students are different. Even students in the same department are different. Therefore, teachers should have the ability to find a suitable method for different situations. This echoes the beliefs of the post-methods era advocates who believe that individual teachers should be able to draw on different principles at different times, depending on the type of classes he or she is teaching (Richards & Rogers, 2003).

American teachers. Similar to the Chinese teachers, the BYU teachers did not think there was a perfect method for ELT in China. Teacher B1 thought the CLT

approach was better because the most important thing for Chinese college students in their English learning process was their speaking and understanding; however, she also realized it took time for the CLT approach to be fully accepted and used in classrooms. Schools were trying their best by having their teachers take classes from English-speaking teachers. In these classes they improved their English speaking abilities and learned teaching methods from the West. Teacher B5 thought occasional prompts in Chinese from electronic dictionaries or another student was very helpful in her class. She joined a couple of others in saying that teachers should be able to use a variety of teaching methods. It would “prevent boredom” and would “allow teachers to reach students who respond to different methods.”

Teacher B3, instead of giving an ideal method, offered some suggestions for the English departments in Chinese universities:

A practical, student listening review system is needed. I would like to see English departments provide listening practice -- tapes/CDs/on-line -- which students can use on their own to review oral language and listening skills, both individually and with roommates (all are English majors). Books-on-tape with a vocabulary and pronunciation segment at the beginning of each chapter would help also; students are hungry for western stories and literature. Additionally, I think the English department should exclusively talk-write-advertise-post information-etc in English.

Teacher B4 also commented that in order to improve the English skills for Chinese students, we should not be focusing on universities at all. Instead, “ensure that effective teaching take place in primary and middle school.” He found in his evening class (comprised of older folks as well as middle school students) “the younger ones have a pretty good command of English, because they are being taught well.”

An Integration of COLT Analysis and Interview Results

The COLT analysis of the classroom happenings reflects many things teachers expressed in the interviews. It is interesting to see the similarities and differences of the two sources.

When asked about the teaching methods used in their listening/speaking classes, all the Chinese teachers indicated that CLT was the main method. However, the video analysis contradicted them by showing that most of them did not use as much CLT approach in their teaching as indicated in the interviews. On the other hand, the majority of the American teachers indicated that they used a combination of both CLT and CTM, with an emphasis on the CLT approach, which was supported by the COLT analysis. One possible reason for the inconsistency between what the Chinese teachers said and did could be their vague idea about the concept of CLT. They did not know for certain what constitutes a CLT class. Another reason could be that the Chinese teachers knew and wanted to use CLT most of the time in their class. However, the influence from the CTM was strong. In actual class procedures, they tended to forget about CLT and go back to the CTM.

Some obstacles expressed by teachers in the interviews are shown in the classroom videos. One obstacle mentioned by the Chinese teachers was lack of confidence in their own spoken English and their cultural background in western countries. The video showed minimal feedback for student pronunciation and cultural background explanation by the Chinese teachers. On the other hand, the American teachers are more confident about correcting students' pronunciation, and answering

questions regarding cultural backgrounds. Another obstacle for the use of CLT is the pressure from all form-focused tests. This was shown in the videos when teachers had to talk about tests and help students practice for them through reading and writing activities. Teachers also indicated that students were not willing to participate in communicative activities for different reasons. However, the video showed that they were enthusiastic in participating in group activities and individual presentations. It is important for teachers to realize the fact that students are not like before any more. They are more open to new ideas and new teaching styles. They are embracing the CLT approach more than teachers have expected. Teachers should not use students as an excuse for their own teaching styles.

In summary, this chapter presented results from the observations and the questionnaires. The COLT analysis showed that both Chinese and American teachers used CLT in their listening/speaking classes. The extent to which CLT was applied in classrooms depended on individual teachers. Overall, variation between groups was not as obvious as variation within groups. However, differences were noticed from the observation and the video analysis. The interviews identified different obstacles the Chinese and American teachers faced in their classrooms: lack of systematic understanding of the CLT approach, Chinese teachers' lack of confidence in their own English and English cultural backgrounds, big class sizes and poor teaching equipment, Chinese students' misunderstanding of the underlining theories of the CLT approach, exams focusing on the form of the language, etc. Based on the findings, recommendations will be provided in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review of Study Results

As a comparative study, this thesis compared and contrasted the teaching styles of both Chinese and American English teachers at Chinese universities. It answers the following research questions: Do Chinese English language teachers and expatriate English teachers at the university level use CLT in their teaching? If so, to what extent? If not, why not? What factors prevent them from using it?

Both Chinese teachers and Americans used the CLT approach in their teaching. As for the extent to which they use CLT, overall, variation between the two groups is not as obvious as that within groups. Not all Americans teach the same way. In fact, the same teacher may teach differently, depending on the topic or purpose. The same is true of the Chinese teachers. It is an encouraging finding, implying that the Chinese teachers have the ability to teach with CLT as much as the American teachers. They still have their obstacles, possibly more than the Americans, but their attitude of embracing the CLT approach instead of opposing it is encouraging. This positive attitude will motivate them to continue to learn about CLT and use them in their classes to help students learn the language more communicatively.

Both Chinese and American teachers comment on the obstacles they have experienced in using the CLT approach in China, including lack of systematic understanding of the CLT approach, the Chinese teachers' lack of confidence in their

own English and English cultural backgrounds, big class sizes and poor teaching equipment, Chinese students' misunderstanding of the underlining theories of the CLT approach, exams focusing on the form of the language, etc.

Recommendations

Studies in the past have indicated that some Chinese English teacher are resistant to the CLT approach because they are used to the CTM and do not want the change. However, results from this study echo the more recent literature that younger Chinese teachers are excited about CLT (Henrichsen, 2007). They are using it in their classroom to a certain extent. However, due to the many obstacles they encounter when using CLT, many of them are frustrated. Likewise, the American teachers, who are assumed to use more CLT in their classes than the Chinese teachers, also used CTM occasionally due to different reasons. Therefore, based on results from this study, I would like to offer some recommendations for the future development of EFL teaching in China, especially regarding the application of the CLT approach to promote the communicative aspect of the language. These recommendations apply to teachers, students, and administrators at the institutional and national level.

First, Chinese teachers need more systematic training in the CLT approach. Results from the interviews show that many teachers have a rather vague idea about the concept of CLT itself. They are confident about neither their own speaking skills nor their understanding of the cultural backgrounds of English speaking countries. They are afraid to make mistakes or be embarrassed in class by not being able to answer questions students might ask. Therefore, I give my strong recommendation for teacher training in

China. Teachers need to have a thorough understanding of the CLT approach. They need to be informed of the underlining theories of language learning of CLT, the different learning activities associated with this approach, the communicative materials they can use in a communicative class, and procedures of CLT in classrooms. Demonstration teaching using the CLT approach is highly recommended. Through demonstrations, teachers will learn how to carry out the detailed procedures of CLT and also learn to create a more relaxing environment for their classes. They also need to learn how to cope with unexpected situations in class when using the CLT approach.

Second, the Chinese teachers commented in the interviews that they were neither confident about their own speaking skills nor their understanding of the cultural backgrounds of English speaking countries. Therefore, another aspect of teacher training is to improve the Chinese teachers' English. They need to improve their own spoken English in order to help students. Teachers also need to acquire more knowledge of English speaking countries in order to feel more confident in class. If possible, schools should try to provide opportunities for the Chinese teachers to get some professional training abroad.

Third, as is shown in the COLT analysis, both Chinese and American teachers need to employ more meaningful group activities in class for students to practice in a communicative way. They also need to give students opportunities to present and give constructive feedback on their presentations.

Fourth, it is expressed by both Chinese and American teachers that big class sizes and poor teaching equipment are both problems in their teaching, especially for the

Americans who are used to small group instruction and modern technology in class. It would be helpful if school administrators and other responsible personnel realize the advantage of having smaller classes and take some measures to solve this problem.

My fifth recommendation goes to students who play a major role in classrooms. Their understanding of the CLT approach is crucial to the successful implementation of this approach. Both Chinese and American teachers in this study support the literature review in saying that many Chinese students do not understand the underlying theories of the CLT approach. They do not consider CLT a serious way of learning because of the relaxed learning atmosphere. Like teachers, students also need to be educated about the whole concept of CLT and gain an understanding of its underlining philosophy. They need to understand that learning takes on other forms besides teacher instruction and rote memorization. They need to be encouraged to participate in class without feeling disrespectful or embarrassed. This study has shown some encouraging facts of students starting to accept the CLT approach.

Another recommendation is on the exam reform. Teachers have lamented often that they are under the pressure to prepare their students for all kinds of exams focusing on the form of the language. Therefore, they do not have enough time for communicative activities in class. The Chinese government has taken great steps in exam reform. Spoken English is added to the CET 4 and 6. The new TOEFL test has also added a whole section for spoken English. However, there are still many other important tests in China that do not have anything to do with speaking skills. Students and teachers are still pressured by these form-focused exams. It is my hope that changes will occur on more English-related

tests in China where the communicative aspect of the language is tested.

The last recommendation is inspired by the interview response from Teacher A4 and B4. Teacher A4 makes the comment that students do not participate in communicative activities because they are never exposed to this new style of teaching. Until college their communicative opportunities are rare. Teacher B4 has discovered that in his evening classes (comprised of older people as well as middle school students) the younger ones have a better command of English because of their early start. He also believes that it is easier for younger children to adapt to and accept new ideas that take place in classrooms. Therefore, it is recommended that teaching English communicatively should start with younger children. Effective language teaching should start in primary and middle schools.

Limitations

Due to time and financial factors, only 9 teachers from five schools were selected to participate in this study. Among the five schools, four of them were among the best in the nation, with one exception of Qingdao University of Science & Technology (QUST), which was upgraded from an institute in 1999. The small number of participants is a constraint in generalizing the results. Another drawback due to the small sample is that teachers all teach differently. Even the same teacher may teach differently on different days in different classes. If a different day or different teacher had been chosen, the results might have differed.

Another important intervening factor is the different backgrounds of teachers in the two groups. As is described in chapter 3, all the Chinese teachers observed were

young, mostly in their 20s or early 30s. They all have a master's degree in an English related major. More than likely, they are devoting their entire life to English teaching. On the other hand, most of the American teachers were retired educators in their 60s. Many had had only a brief EFL training period before they had come to China. Their different qualifications in the field may have made differences in their teaching.

Also different student composition may have been another relevant factor. In some classes, students were all English majors. In others, students were non-English majors. Their different backgrounds may have given them different motivations to learn English. For example, the English majors may be motivated to learn how to communicate in English because they want to study abroad some day or use English as their career tool. On the other hand, the non-English majors may want to only learn enough to speak about things concerning their professions. Therefore, different motivations may have resulted in different participation patterns.

Despite the limitations, this study is a good glimpse of what is happening in the EFL classrooms in China. I believe the other universities in China will follow the lead of these top universities as far as English teaching goes.

Suggestions for Future Research

I have several suggestions for future researchers. First, involve students in the study. Only teachers were observed and interviewed in this study, due to the time factor. Since students are the main beneficiaries in this kind of study, their voices would be beneficial. Students have learning experience with both Chinese and American teachers. They would be able to provide a valuable comparison and contrast of the two teaching

styles. Researchers and teachers need to know their needs in order to satisfy them.

Another suggestion is to find samples that are as identical as possible. This includes both teacher and student participants. It is important to find teachers with the same qualifications in English teaching and students from the same background. That way the results will be more valid.

As mentioned earlier, Chinese teachers have the advantage of speaking Chinese. Many teachers assume that some amount of Chinese instruction in presenting language forms, such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation is effective. However, there is no research to support this assumption. It would be interesting to carry out a study to determine whether some amount of Chinese instruction is helpful for EFL teaching and learning processes, especially in language presentations. If yes, what is the appropriate amount of Chinese instruction?

Conclusion

In conclusion, both Chinese teachers and Americans used the CLT approach in their teaching. As for the extent to which they used CLT, overall, variation between the two groups was not as obvious as that within groups. This encouraging finding implies that Chinese teachers have the ability to teach with the CLT approach as much as American teachers do. In spite of obstacles teachers have encountered in introducing CLT, they believe that the CLT approach will help their students speak better English. This positive attitude will motivate them to continue to learn about CLT materials and use them in their classes to help students learn the language more communicatively.

Both Chinese and American teachers have encountered different obstacles in introducing CLT, including lack of systematic understanding of the CLT approach, Chinese teachers' lack of confidence in their own English and knowledge of English cultural backgrounds, big class sizes and poor teaching equipment, Chinese students' misunderstanding of underlining theories of the CLT approach, exams focusing on the form of the language, etc. Due to these contextual obstacles, CLT cannot be transferred to Chinese classrooms without any adaptation. I agree with the post-method advocates that teachers should be able to draw on different methods and teach within the academic and administrative constraints of their particular teaching situations.

Based on the findings, recommendations are offered for teachers, students, and administrators. Only when all three parties work together, can the CLT approach make a big difference in the communicative competence of Chinese students.

REFERENCES

- Allen, J.P.B., Frohlich, M., & Spada, N. (1984). The communicative orientation of language teaching: An observation scheme. In J. Handscombe, R.A. Orem, & B.P. Taylor (Eds.), *On TESOL '83: The question of control* (pp.231-252). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Anderson, J. (1993). Is a communicative approach practical for teaching English in China? Pros and cons. *System* 21(4), 471-480.
- Ashmore, R. A. (2003). How the Chinese teach English. *Phi Delta Kappa* 512, 7-48.
- Barlow, T.E., & Lowe, D. (1985). *Chinese reflections: American teaching in the People's Republic*. New York: Praeger.
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal* 57 (3), 278-87.
- Britsch, S. (1995). *A teaching situation analysis for requalifying teachers who will teach English as a foreign language in the People's Republic of China*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Brigham Young University. Provo, Utah.
- Burnaby, B., & Sun, Y. (1989). Chinese teachers' views of western language teaching: Context informs paradigms. *TESOL Quarterly* 23(2), 219-238.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1,1-47.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 25(3), 459-478.

- Cleverly, J. (1985). *The schooling of China: Tradition and modernity in Chinese education*. Sydney, Australia: George Allen & Unwin.
- Cowan, J.R., Light, R.L., Matthews, B.E., & Tucker, G.R. (1979). English teaching in China: A recent survey. *TESOL Quarterly* 13 (4), 465-482.
- Dzau, Y. F. (1990). Historical background. In Y.F. Dzau (Ed.), *English in China* (pp.11-39). Hong Kong: API Press.
- Dzau, Y. F. (1990b). How English is taught in the tertiary educational institutions. In Y.F. Dzau (Ed.), *English in China* (pp.41-58). Hongkong: API Press.
- Ellis, G. (1994). *The appropriateness of the communicative approach in Vietnam: An interview study in intercultural communication*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, La Trobe University, Bundoora Victoria, Australia.
- English, S. L., & Een, J. A. (1985). *English teaching methodology in the People's Republic of China*. Unpublished manuscript, George Washington University.
- Fanselow, J. F. (1977). Beyond Rashomon: Conceptualizing and describing the teaching act. *TESOL Quarterly* 11 (1), 17-39.
- Flanders, N.A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Forseth, R. (1991). Conversation in class: How to keep your students talking (in English). *ELIC Teaching* 8, 35-44.
- Henrichsen, L. (2007). English language teaching in China: An update on the state of art. *TESL Report* 40 (2), 1-13.
- Hertling, J. (1996). China embraces the English language. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 42(17), 49-50.

- Heyhoe, R. (1996). *China's universities 1895-1995: A century of cultural conflict*. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kam, H.W., & Wong, R.Y.L. (Eds.). (2004). *English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices (2nd ed.)*. Singapore: Eastern University Press.
- Keenan, B. (1977). *The Dewy experiment in China: Educational reform and political power in the early republic*. Cambridge, MA: Council on East Asian Studies. Harvard University.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximizing learner potential in the communicative classroom. *ELT Journal* 47(1), 12-21.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(3), 453-484.
- Lam, A. (2002). English in education in China: Policy changes and learners' experiences. *World Englishes* 21(2), 245-256.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching (2nd ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leather, S. (2000). Taking account of culture or "It's communicative, so why doesn't it work?". *Folio* 6 (1), 13-18.
- LeTendre, G. K., Baker, D.P., Akiba, M., Goesling, B., & Wiseman, A. (2001). Teachers' work: Institutional isomorphism and cultural variation in the US, Germany and

- Japan. *Educational Researcher* 30(6), 3-16.
- Li, D.F. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly* 32 (4), 677-703.
- Li, M. (1999). *Perceptions of the place of expatriate English language teachers in China*. Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria, Australia.
- Li, X. (1984). In defense of the communicative approach. *English Language Teaching Journal* 38 (1), 2-13.
- Liao, X. (2004). The need for communicative language teaching in China. *ELT Journal* 58(3), 270-273.
- Lin, J. (1990). *Education in post-Mao China*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Lingo Media. (2005). *Understanding the market in China*. Retrieved January 10, 2007, from <http://www.lingomedia.com/s/China.asp>
- Lo, B.L.C. (1984). Teacher education in the eighties. In R. Hayhoe (Ed.), *Contemporary Chinese Education* (pp.154-177). Armonk, NY: M.E.Sharpe.
- Lu, L. (1987). Different ways for different circumstances. *English Teaching Forum* July, 32-33.
- Maley, A. (1990). Xanadu—"A miracle of rare device": The teaching of English in China. In Y. F. Dzau (Ed.), *English in China* (pp.95-105). Hongkong: API Press.
- Mckay, S. L. (1992). *Teaching English overseas: An introduction*. *Oxford handbooks for language teachers*. Oxford University Press.

- Ministry of Education, P. R. China. (2001). *Yingyu kecheng biao zhun (National standard for English curriculum-for full day compulsory education and senior high school)*. Beijing: Beijing Teachers' University Press (in Chinese).
- Musthafa, B. (2001). Communicative language teaching in Indonesia: Issues of theoretical assumptions and challenges in the classroom practice. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education* 2 (2), 1-9.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: Making it work. *ELT Journal* 42 (1), 136-145.
- Ouyang, H. (2000). One-way ticket: A story of an innovative teacher in mainland China. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 31(4), 397-425.
- Pandian, A. (2004). English language teaching in Malaysia today. In H.W. Kam & R.Y.L.Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices* (2nd ed., pp. 272-293). Singapore: Eastern University Press.
- Penner, J. (1995). Change and conflict: Introduction of the communicative approach in China. *TESL Canada Journal* 12 (2), 10-25.
- Pit, C., & Roth, H. (2004). English language teaching development in Cambodia: Past present and future. In H.W. Kam & R.Y.L.Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices* (2nd ed., pp. 102-118). Singapore: Eastern University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rogers T. S. (2003). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*

- (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Spada, N., & Frohlich, M. (1995). *COLT observation scheme*. Sydney, Australia: Macquarie University, National Council of Educational Research and Training.
- Spada, N., & Lyster, R. (1997). Macroscopic and microscopic views of L2 classrooms, *TESOL Quarterly* 31 (4), 787-795.
- Sun, G., & Cheng, L. (2000). *From context to curriculum: A case study of communicative language teaching in China*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
- Widdowson, H. (1989). Knowledge of language and ability for use. *Applied Linguistics* 10 (2), 128-37.
- Wongsothorn, A., Hiranburana, K., & Chinnawongs, S. (2004). English language teaching in Thailand today. In H.W. Kam & R.Y.L.Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices* (2nd ed., pp. 435-446). Singapore: Eastern University Press.
- Yalden, J. (1983). *The communicative syllabus: Evolution, design and implementation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Yang, Y. (2000). *History of English education in China (1919-1998)*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Yang, Y. (2003). *"My English is lopsided": Chinese EFL learners' perceptions of their English language journey in China and the US*. Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Yao, X. (1993). Foreign languages in Chinese higher education. *Language Learning*

Journal 7(3), 74-77.

Yeh, W. H. (1990). *The alienated academy: Culture and politics in republican China.*

1919-1937. Cambridge, MA: Council on East Asian Studies. Harvard University.

Zhang, H. (2003). *Chinese Englishes: History, contexts and texts.* Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign, Illinois.

Zhang, Y. (2005). Meeting highlights English teaching reform. *China Daily*, p.5.

Retrieved October 17, 2007, from

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2005-11-08-content_492169.htm

Zhong, B.L. (1999). Actively promoting teaching method and methodology reform. (In Chinese). *Teaching and Teaching Material* 121 (3), 8-10.

Appendix B

Consent to be a Research Subject

Introduction

This research study is being conducted by Rong Li at Brigham Young University to determine the extent to which the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method is used in English classrooms by the Chinese and the expatriate teachers and to explore the possible obstacles in using CLT in the Chinese setting. Your class was selected to participate because it is a listening/speaking class.

Procedures

The researcher will be going to your classroom to videotape one of your class sessions. An observational analysis of the video will be done. Then an up to 30-minute long follow-up interview will be arranged at your convenience.

Risks/Discomforts

There are minimal risks for participation in this study. However, you may feel nervous or uncomfortable under the camera.

Benefits

There are no direct benefits to subjects. However, it is hoped that through your participation the researcher will learn more about the current English teaching situation in China and be able to suggest a better way to teach English in the Chinese context, thus benefiting many English teachers and learners in the future.

Confidentiality

All information provided will remain confidential and will only be reported as group data with no identifying information. All data, including interviews, and videos/transcriptions, will be kept in a locked storage cabinet, and only those directly involved with the research will have access to them. After the research is completed, the interview sheets and videos will be destroyed.

Compensation

There will be no compensation involved.

Participation

Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time or refuse to participate entirely without jeopardy to your standing with the university.

Questions about the research

If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Rong Li at (801) 687-4260, or lirongsherry@hotmail.com.

Questions about your Rights as Research Participants

If you have questions you do not feel comfortable asking the researcher, you may contact Dr. Renea Beckstrand, IRB Chair, (801) 422-3873, 422 SWKT, Brigham Young University, renea_beckstrand@byu.edu

I have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix C

Transcripts of Interview Responses

Participant ID Number: A1

Interview Questions

1. Please briefly describe your class, including your student composition, your course objective, etc.

The purpose of English Speaking Class is to provide students with the opportunity of practice their spoken English together with listening, writing and reading.

As for sophomores, their English writing abilities are quite different. Some good students can express their ideas in a logical and coherent way with an advanced grammatical and vocabulary ability, while some students' English writing is too poor for readers to understand due to many basic grammatical and vocabulary errors, let alone idiomatic English expressions.

2. How do you feel about the Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in Chinese universities?

CTM is easy for teachers to adopt in class while boring for most college students.

CLT is quite effective in training students language ability while different and unexpected class performances can be challenges for teachers, esp those who are not familiar with CLT.

3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is CTM and how much is CLT?

I use about 70% CLT and 30% CTM in my class.

4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in different class? If yes, what are they?

Yes.

CLT need active class participation and performance. If most of students in one class do not have sufficient English ability to express their idea, teacher may find it difficult to push them to involve in CLT. In other cases, if only a handful students in one class demonstrate English ability way advanced than their classmates, others will easily feel depressed and unconfident to stand up and do class activity. So in my point of view, teachers should encourage students, esp those ordinary ones, from time to time to make them feel comfortable in speaking.

5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the Chinese setting better than the CTM? Why?

I think whether to adopt CLT or CTM in class is due to teachers' recognition and understanding of English teaching. It is also, more or less, related to teachers' teaching ability.

6. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in Chinese universities? Why?

Honestly speaking, I have never thought about it. I even don't know what kind of

teaching method can be regarded as an ideal one. As long as students like to go to English class and practice English with teachers and classmates, the method can be regarded as a successful one.

Participant ID Number: _____ A2 _____

Interview Questions

1. Please briefly describe your class.

Students are cooperative and attentive. They seem to be eager to practice their oral English. I do my best to help them, though sometimes I'm in need of help myself.

2. How do you feel about the Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in Chinese universities?

They are both useful methods, but which method to use depends on who students you have and what kind of class you're teaching. In an oral English class, CLT would be more appropriate. If I'm teaching courses like "intensive reading", CTM is more often used. I'm teaching some evening classes too. CTM seems to be most suitable because students are poor in grammar and reading, though their oral English is worse. But they are there to pass WRITTEN English tests or the like, so it's meaningless to apply CLT in the classroom.

3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is CTM and how much is CLT?

Mainly CLT, because it is an oral English class.

4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in class? If yes, what are they?

- a. Students' level of English is not the same.
- b. I'm short of teaching resources like movies, interesting tasks such as games, etc.
- c. I need to give more feedback to students, but sometimes I don't know how.
- d. Actually I have a rather vague idea about the concept of CLT itself.

5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the Chinese setting better than the CTM?

Not necessarily so. Again, it all depends on who students you have and what kind of class you're teaching.

6. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in Chinese universities?

A combination of the two methods.

Participant ID Number: _____A3_____

Interview Questions

- 1. Please briefly describe your class, including student composition, class objectives, etc.**

Comparing with students last year, they are quite good. I ask them to write a journal every week and one coursework per month. The writing skill is different according to different students.

- 2. How do you feel about the Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in Chinese universities?**

Last term, I applied CLT often. I found they liked it. But in China, especially the first year students, teachers are better to combine these two methods together.

- 3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is CTM and how much is CLT? How is it reflected in the classroom (e.g. the type of activities you do in class)**

It all depends. For example, I ask them to act out the texts in our textbook. I ask them to say 5 things. Eg: five things in your bedroom, five things in the university, five fruits etc. I found it not only could widen their vocabulary, but also stimulate their interests.

- 4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in class? If yes, what are they?**

At the beginning of new term, it is difficult. Students are not familiar with each other. They are shy. When they were in high school, they were rare to speak English in class.

- 5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the Chinese setting better than the CTM? Why?**

CLT is a good method. But it all depends. Students are taught to listen to teachers in class, respect teachers, and other Chinese traditions. They cannot change suddenly in universities. But in the future I think it will be better.

- 6. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in Chinese universities? Why?**

There is no ideal method in Chinese universities. Universities are different and students are different. And even students in the same department are different. I think teachers should be experienced to find the suitable method.

Participant ID Number: _____A4_____

Interview Questions

- 1. Please briefly describe your class, including student composition, class objectives, etc.**

Most of students are first year English majors; only three of them are non-English majors. The objective is to help students acquire skills and interest in improving their listening, speaking, reading and writing.

- 2. How do you feel about the Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in Chinese universities?**

CTM enables teachers to cover a range of contents within a short period of time; it also makes it easy for teachers to control the class. But CTM is weak in improving students' communicative skills. CLT restores language leaning to its communicative nature, but students don't seem to be accustomed to it after years' drudgery in high school. Considering the present situation in China, it's good to combine these two.

- 3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is CTM and how much is CLT? How is it reflected in the classroom (e.g. the type of activities you do in class)**

CTM and CLT are half to half in my class. For listening and speaking parts and class report presented by students themselves, CLT is adopted. For the explanation of the text, CTM is adopted.

- 4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in class? If yes, what are they?**

Sometimes, it is hard to control the class. And also it seems to take more time than CTM to make the same language points covered in class.

- 5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the Chinese setting better than the CTM? Why?**

I don't think so. CLT is preferable in theory. But here in China, students are faced with many "they-cannot-afford-to-fail" exams, such as TEM 4 and TEM 8. CTM is good at helping them pass exams and learn a lot of words and rules within the limited time in class.

- 6. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in Chinese universities? Why?**

CTM plus CLT. The reason is obvious: Students need know how to communicate in English as well as how to pass exams in China.

Participant ID Number: _____B1_____
Interview Questions

- 1) My class has 40 freshman English students. They have all had at least 6 yrs of English with most having 10. They are all most science majors. This is an oral English class. We have a text and an hour in the listening lab every week. We meet 4 hours a week.
 - 2) My students say the CTM method follows the text precisely. They do all the exercises etc. On the other hand CLT approach seems more relaxed and students get to verbalize more. To have exercises that make them think in English.
 - 3) I cover text A every two weeks in class and try to work on vocabulary and of course we have to listen to the VOA tapes in listening lab which takes about 20 min. I try then to have different kinds of activities. I always have group work, sometimes we do role play, sometimes we have a reader's theater, lots of activities where they actually speak English. In my class students also have to make a class presentation and not read it. AS you know our program, we have lots of activities in our classbook from the summer at the conference and also from our Hong Kong conference. We try to make the activities relate to whatever the text is talking about.
 - 4) The only difficulty is Chinese students aren't used to volunteering to answer but after working with them for awhile they all know I could call on them at any time so they are usually prepared. They are always willing to give the answer a try.
 - 5) I think the approach is better for practicing oral English but because in our case we have no input into the mid and final exams the students need to still use the CTM approach for preparation. We go over the text quite carefully but I do not always do all the exercises, I figure they can do those on their own. They have all the answers.
 - 6) Since they have had so much grammar before coming to the university I think practicing their written words as well as speaking is best. However, their sentence structure is so difficult for some of them, they use the wrong articles and present tense for past, and pronouns he and she, him, and her are especially hard. It's hard to instill correct writing even when you correct all the errors and sometimes I'm more interested in having them just write than anything else. An example is their journals. More over, I think the most important thing is their speaking and understanding.
 - 7) Some. I think I had the idea I couldn't correct how I wanted things done when it wasn't up to standard. Also, this lose face business is rather hard to understand but I don't think it's as hard as some speakers made it appear at BYU. It has been a real learning experience for me and I find my students are willing to work very hard in class. They seem to enjoy the way I teach but I'm not sure if they think it's very effective for the

exam. It's especially hard to find new and different ways to work on vocabulary words.

Participant ID Number: _____ **B2** _____

Interview Questions

- 1. Please briefly describe your class, including your student composition, your course objective, etc.**

Sophomore English Majors – Oral English

- 2. How do you feel about the Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in Chinese universities?**

I prefer CLT because I want to hear students talk!

- 3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is CTM and how much is CLT?** All my teaching is CLT

- 4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in different class? If yes, what are they?**

Yes. At first, many students are shy and not used to talking. However, I put them in discussion groups and have everyone talking and presenting.

- 5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the Chinese setting better than the CTM? Why?**

CLT fits for BYU teachers because we are used to the “Western” approach to teaching and learning. Some Chinese teachers are starting to use the CLT approach and finding satisfaction and success.

- 6. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in Chinese universities? Why?**

I think the CLT approach is better because of the reasons I listed above. However, I think it will take time. That is why many universities are having their teachers take classes from English speaking teachers. We are and have taught classes of teachers. In these classes we help them improve their English speaking abilities but also show them teaching methods they can use.

Participant ID Number: B3

Interview Questions

- 1. Please briefly describe your class, including your students, your course objective, etc.**

Our class consists of 30 students, 22 girls, 8 boys, and from a predominantly rural-small town farming community background. The Listening-Speaking class for freshmen follows a text of listening to taped portions, viewing short CNN video presentations per the chapter theme, intermingled with points of grammar and cultural exploration. I tend to follow the text fairly closely as they all have it and can read (sight recognition of words and language) as well as hear the spoken language. I try to key on language weaknesses I observe and to help them correct the pronunciation, especially stressed syllables.

- 2. How do you feel about the Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in Chinese universities? 3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is CTM and how much is CLT?**

As I understand CTM, the teacher-lecture method predominates. I utilize some of that when explanations on culture, grammar, pronunciation and the like are needed. However, I use group and partner discussions and creative writing experiences regularly. Last semester I gave this class about 40 minutes at the beginning to make reports and short talks, cycling through the 30 students about 3-4 times. However, this semester, I am focusing on building their vocabulary and using that time for students to share “discovered” words (pronunciation, meanings, usage), yet still give them upfront exposure at least 2-3 times this semester. Word games, group debates, and music are a variety of things I’ve used so far. When measuring individual progress, I have found recitation, journals, short written works and fill-in testing useful for evaluating their personal progress.

- 4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in different class? If yes, what are they?**

In my Western English-speaking Culture class (72 students and only a blackboard) I found I had to mainly use the lecture method, although I did have them research and give reports on subjects, both individually and as a “committee.” A second time around I would do more roll play, and perhaps reader’s theatre type of things. Again we were following a text in a crowded, miserable room.

- 5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the Chinese setting better than the CTM? Why?**

I do think the more relaxed, flexible approach helps these students who are accustomed to rigidity and sometimes harsh brow-beating criticism. Many students have expressed great distress during times when they were preparing for tests. However, I think we have to hold them to a high standard and respect the discipline which has made them such diligent students. Every process has plus and minus characteristics, so a mixture seems to be working for me.

- 6. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in Chi-**

nese universities? Why?

I have never observed Chinese teaching situations, so cannot really address this. However, I have a few suggestions for improvements which English departments could make here. A practical, student listening review system is needed. I would like to see English departments provide listening practice - tapes/CDs/on-line - which students can use on their own to review oral language and listening skills, both individually and with roommates (all are English majors). Books-on-tape with a vocabulary and pronunciation segment at the beginning of each chapter would help also; students are hungry for western stories and literature. Additionally, I think the English department should exclusively talk-write-advertise-post information-etc in English.

In the classroom, I think an emphasis on student participation in groups and with partners works well for these students as they are accustomed to support from peers. This also works when they must perform for their group to report, organize and share; the smaller group is less threatening.

A caution is to watch for dominant individuals who constantly do the major performing; this can be circumvented by assigning responsibilities.

Participant ID Number: B4

Interview Questions

- 1. Please briefly describe your class, including your students, your course objective, etc.**

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

This course is designed to enhance your ability to understand spoken English, to speak the language with increased fluency, and to write with increased competency. We know that conversational skills are developed through participation and practice; therefore, in this course, you will be involved in large and small group discussions, individual and team presentations, and impromptu and prepared speeches.

To assist with the development of your writing skills, you will be given opportunities to write on a variety of topics*. You may also be given an opportunity to correspond by e-mail with a “Canadian friend”, pre-selected and screened by the teacher.

In summary, this course will concentrate on strengthening your skills in the following areas: Listening/Comprehension, Speaking, Pronunciation, Fluency, Communication and Writing.

Our students are young and not-so-young OUC faculty members who wish to improve their English fluency so that they can become qualified to teach their courses in English; also, to assist them in publishing in English, which seems to be the only way for them to “get ahead” in their profession.

- 2. How do you feel about the Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in Chinese universities?**

[I assume by CLT you mean the student participation vs. teacher lecture approach?] It's quite obvious that CLT is more enjoyable for students (and for teachers), and seems to be effective. I'm sure that each method has its place.

- 3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is CTM and how much is CLT?**

Probably CLT:CTM = 90:10

- 4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in different classes? If yes, what are they?**

Students are a little overwhelmed at first – hesitant to participate. They soon relax and become quite responsive.

- 5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the Chinese setting better than the CTM? Why?**

We want to maximize students' opportunities to increase their English speaking fluency. These days, they are becoming accustomed to the western approach of teaching; the younger teachers are eager to incorporate it into their teaching.

- 6. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in Chinese universities? Why?**

We shouldn't be focusing on universities at all. Instead, ensure that effective

teaching take place in primary and middle schools. We find in our evening class (comprised of older folks as well as middle school students) the younger ones have a pretty good command of English, because they are being taught well.

Participant ID Number: _____ **B5** _____

Interview Questions

1. Please briefly describe your class, including your students, your course objective, etc.

I teach six classes of Master's Degree Candidates. The class is listed as Watching, Listening and Speaking. A DVD player was installed in one of the two computers I use this week, so I haven't been able to give them much opportunity to watch.

My largest class has 48 students, the smallest one has 26. Four of my classes are doctors, from a variety of fields. The majors in the other two classes are textiles or engineering.

My objective is to help students improve their English skills. I schedule my lessons so that they have as much time as possible to speak English in class. The class size makes it difficult for me to hear all of them speak each week.

2. How do you feel about the Chinese Traditional Method (CTM) and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in Chinese universities?

I occasionally use the CTM of teaching when I have lessons on pronunciation. Most of my lessons are centered on giving students a chance to express themselves in English in a variety of situations. Last semester we were asked to teach debate. I dedicated parts of four lessons to debate, but the results were mixed so I discontinued this method of teaching.

Students are often divided into pairs, or small groups to answer questions, solve problems, or discuss topics from a short lesson given at the beginning of the class. One successful technique I use is the Cocktail Party. The original lesson, last semester, centered on the proper etiquette when an invitation is received to a cocktail party, the meaning of RSVP, introductions, shaking hands, and types of polite conversation appropriate to such an event. I divide the class into two lines. Each student has a partner. They shake hands and introduce themselves to each partner and converse for 3 minutes. I call "stop" and the person at the head of one line goes to the end, and all other students move up one person.

I considered changing my lesson for Wednesday to include the Cocktail Party but it would have interfered with my weekly plan. This is a successful class activity which students enjoy.

3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is CTM and how much is CLT?

I use the CTM about 10% of the time.

4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in different class? If yes, what are they?

On occasion I have a few students who do not interact in a group situation. Sometimes the better speakers monopolize the conversation, but basically this is a good method, allowing the maximum number of students a chance to speak. Someone in the BYU training said she did not allow electronic dictionaries in her classroom and that students are to speak only English. I do not agree. I feel electronic dictionaries are very helpful with vocabulary. Also, if a student is having a difficult time expressing himself, I believe a prompt in Chinese from another student is very helpful.

5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the Chinese setting better than the CTM? Why?

See above.

6. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in Chinese universities? Why?

I don't think there is an ideal method. Using a variety of teaching methods prevents boredom and will allow the teacher to reach students who respond to different methods.

COLT Analysis of Class B1

Time	Activities & Episodes	Language used in class		Participant Organization					Content			Content Control			Student Modality					
				Class			Group	individual				Teacher/Text	Teacher/Text/Student	Student	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Other	
		English	Chinese	T<->S	S<->S	Choral			Form	Sociolinguual	Other Topics									
00:00-02:30	writing poetry on board	x		x							x	x		x	x					
02:31-03:11	Introducing observer	x		x							x			x	x					
03:12-06:15	house keeping	x		x							x			x	x	x				
06:16-13:01	vocab review, small groups	x		x	x		x		x	x			x	x	x	x	x			
13:02-16:50	explaining instructions	x			x		x				x		x	x	x					
16:51-17:51	T instructs	x		x				x			x		x	x	x					
17:52-26:00	S sharring stories	x						x					x		x	x				
26:01-26:35	put vocab into contex	x		x							x		x		x					
26:36-28:50	T explains vocab act	x			x		x				x		x				x	x		
28:51-33:06	S act	x			x		x				x			x	x	x	x	x		
33:07-33:56	T explains related act	x									x			x						
33:57-35:20	S use words	x											x							
35:21-36:30	T explains vocab act	x		x							x			x						
36:31-38:10	T instructs on vocab	x		x							x			x						
38:11-39:50	T explain act	x		x							x		x		x					
39:51-44:43	S act	x			x		x				x			x						
44:44-60:40	S present	x		x				x			x		x	x	x	x	x			
60:41-61:07	T summerizes	x		x							x			x						

COLT Analysis of Class A1

Time	Activities & Episodes	Language used in class		Participant Organization					Content			Content Control			Student Modality				
				Class			Group	individual				Teacher/Text	Teacher/Text/Student	Student	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Other
		English	Chinese	T↔S	S↔V	Choral													
00:00-06:40	student presentation		x				x			x		x	x						
06:41-20:40	Q&A on presentation		x		X					x		x	x	x					
20:41-24:40	house-keeping issues	x		x									x						
24:41-50:20	pronunciation instruction	x		x				x			x		x						
50:21-53:20	reading an article on hobbies	x	x				x			x	x	x			x				
50:21-53:20	call on volunteers to comment	x	x	x						x			x	x					
53:21-53:50	analyzing text materials paragraph	x	x	x				x			x		x						
53:51-58:10	call on volunteers to answer questions	x	x	x						x		x	x	x					
58:11-01:17:50	homework assignments	x		x									x						

