

4. Яхнюк Т.О. Використання фрагментів художніх відеофільмів для навчання студентів мовних спеціальностей соціокультурної англійської лексики: Автореферат дис. ...к. п. н. 2004. – 24с.

5. Иванова Р.М. Использование учебного телевидения при обучении высказыванию в деловом профессиональном обучении: Автореферат. ...к. п. н. – Перм.

УДК 812.12.04

Sobetska N.
(Ternopil, Ukraine)

LINGUISTIC PROCESSING AND ACQUISITION OF SECOND LANGUAGE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

У статті розкриваються підходи до комунікативних навиків вивчення іноземної мови, їх зміни у використанні на практиці, у сприйнятті та розумінні всіх процесів вивчення мови іноземної мови зі сторони потреби й можливості студента. Робота допомагає осягнути вплив попередніх методів навчання комунікативної компетенції на сучасну їх імплементацію.

Ключові слова. *Комунікативні навиків мови, граматична обізнаність, методологія, лінгвістика, комунікативна компетенція.*

The article deals with communicative language teaching, its considerable change in understanding of all the second language learning processes at the range of demand and opportunity. Following exploration helps to gain the influence on recent methods of learners' communicative competence teaching.

Key words: *communicative language teaching, grammatical competence, methodology, linguistics, communicative competence.*

Constantly increasing need for good communicative skills in English has created an enormous demand for English teaching all over the world. Millions of people today want to improve their level of English or for their children to attain good English skills. The opportunities to study English are available in various ways such as formal training, travel, study abroad, and also through the mass media and the Internet.

Throughout the world demand for English has created a huge demand for quality of teaching foreign languages and language learning materials and resources. Students themselves set demanding targets. They want to be able to learn English at the high level of accuracy and fluency. Employers also claim that their employees have good knowledge and are fluent in English, what is a requirement for success and promotion in many spheres of employment in the modern world. Due to this the demand for corresponding technique of teaching is as strong as ever.

In the given material we aim to discuss the methodology known as communicative language teaching, and to explore the assumptions it is based on, its origins and evolution, and how it has affected modern approaches to language teaching.

© Sobetska N., 2013

Perhaps the majority of foreign language teachers today, when asked to define the methodology they use within their classrooms, mention “communicative” as the methodology of choice. However, when asked to give a detailed account of what they mean by “communicative”, explanations vary widely. Does communicative language teaching, mean teaching conversation, an absence of grammar in a course, or an emphasis on open-ended discussion activities as the main features of a course? What do we understand by communicative language teaching?

Communicative language teaching can be understood as a set of principles about the intentions of language teaching, how learners learn a language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning, and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom. Let us analyze each of these issues in sequence.

Communicative language teaching sets as its goal the teaching of communicative competence. What does this term mean? Perhaps we can clarify this term by first comparing it with the concept of grammatical competence. Grammatical competence refers to the knowledge we have of a language that accounts for our ability to produce sentences in a language. It refers to knowledge of the building blocks of sentences (e.g., parts of speech, tenses, phrases, clauses, sentence patterns) and how sentences are formed. Grammatical competence is the focus of many grammar practice books, which typically present a rule of grammar on one page, and provide exercises to practice using the rule on the other page. The unit of analysis and practice is typically the sentence. Whereas grammatical competence is one of essential aspects in language learning, it is obviously not all that is involved in learning a language since one can master the rules of sentence formation in a language and still not be very successful at being able to use the language for meaningful communication. It is the latter capacity which is understood by the term communicative competence. It includes the following aspects of language knowledge:

- Knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions;
- Knowing how to vary our use of language according to the setting and the participants (e.g., knowing when to use formal and informal speech or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication);
- Knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts (e.g., narratives, reports, interviews, conversations);
- Knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one’s language knowledge (e.g., through using different kinds of communication strategies).

The understanding of the processes of second language learning has changed considerably in the last years and communicative language teaching is partly a response to these changes in understanding. Earlier views of language learning focused primarily on the mastery of grammatical competence. Language learning was viewed as a process of mechanical habit formation, which is formed by having students produce correct sentences and not through making mistakes. Errors were to be avoided through controlled opportunities for production (either written or spoken). By memorizing dialogs and performing drills, the chances of making mistakes were minimized. Learning was very much seen as under the control of the teacher.

In recent years, language learning has been viewed from a very different perspective. It is seen as resulting from processes such as:

- Interaction between the learner and users of the language;
- Collaborative creation of meaning;

- Creating meaningful and purposeful interaction through language;
- Negotiation of meaning as the learner and his or her interlocutor arrive at understanding;
- Learning through attending to the feedback learners get when they use the language;
- Paying attention to the language one hears (the input) and trying to incorporate new forms into one's developing communicative competence;
- Trying out and experimenting with different ways of saying things.

The type of classroom activities proposed in communicative language teaching also implied new roles in the classroom for teachers and learners. Learners now had to participate in classroom activities that were based on a cooperative rather than individualistic approach to learning. Students had to become comfortable with listening to their peers in group work or pair work tasks, rather than relying on the teacher for a model. They were expected to take on a greater degree of responsibility for their own learning. And teachers now had to assume the role of facilitator and monitor. Rather than being a model for correct speech and writing and one with the primary responsibility of making students produce plenty of error-free sentences, the teacher had to develop a different view of learners' errors and of her/his own role in facilitating language learning.

In planning a language course, decisions have to be made about the content of the course, including decisions about what vocabulary and grammar to teach at the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels, and which skills and microskills to teach and in what sequence. Solutions on these issues belong to the field of syllabus design or course design. Decisions about how best to teach the contents of a syllabus relate to the field of methodology [3; 678].

Language teaching has seen many changes in ideas about syllabus design and methodology, and communicative language teaching prompted a rethinking of approaches to syllabus design and methodology. We may conveniently group trends in language teaching recently into three phases:

Phase 1: traditional approaches (up to the late 1960s);

Phase 2: classic communicative language teaching (1970s to 1990s);

Phase 3: current communicative language teaching (late 1990s to the present).

Let us first consider the transition from traditional approaches to what we can refer to as classic communicative language teaching. As we have mentioned above, traditional approaches to language teaching gave priority to grammatical competence as the basis of language proficiency. They were based on the belief that grammar could be learned through direct instruction and through a methodology that made much use of repetitive practice and drilling. The approach to the teaching of grammar was a deductive one: students are presented with grammar rules and then given opportunities to practice using them, as opposed to an inductive approach in which students are given examples of sentences containing a grammar rule and asked to work out the rule for themselves. It was assumed that language learning meant building up a large repertoire of sentences and grammatical patterns and learning to produce these accurately and quickly in the appropriate situation. Once a basic command of the language was established through oral drilling and controlled practice, the four skills were introduced, usually in the sequence of speaking, listening, reading and writing.

Methodologies based on these assumptions include Audiolingualism and the Situational Language Teaching. Syllabuses during this period consisted of word lists and grammar lists,

graded across levels. In a typical lesson according to the situational approach, a three-phase sequence, known as the P-P-P cycle, was often employed: Presentation, Practice, Production¹. Such lesson structure has been widely used in language teaching materials and continues in modified form to be used today notwithstanding being strongly criticized in recent years. [2; 18].

Under the influence of communicative language teaching theory, grammar-based methodologies such as the Presentation, Practice, Production have given way to functional and skills-based teaching, and accuracy activities such as drill and grammar practice have been replaced by fluency activities based on interactive small-group work. This led to the emergence of a “fluency-first” pedagogy [1] in which students’ grammar needs are determined on the basis of performance on fluency tasks rather than predetermined by a grammatical syllabus. We can distinguish two phases in this development, called classic communicative language teaching and current communicative language teaching.

Soon a reaction to traditional language teaching approaches began and spread around the world as older methods such as Audiolingualism and Situational Language Teaching fell out of fashion. The centrality of grammar in language teaching and learning was questioned, since it was argued that language ability involved much more than grammatical competence. While grammatical competence was needed to produce grammatically correct sentences, attention shifted to the knowledge and skills needed to use grammar and other aspects of language appropriately for different communicative purposes such as making requests, giving advice, making suggestions, describing wishes and needs, and so on. What was needed in order to use language communicatively was communicative competence. This was a broader concept than that of grammatical competence, and as it was mentioned above, included knowing what to say and how to say it appropriately based on the situation, the participants, and their roles and intentions. Traditional grammatical and vocabulary syllabuses and teaching methods did not include information of this kind. It was assumed that this would be picked up informally.

The notion of communicative competence was developed within the discipline of linguistics (or more accurately, the subdiscipline of sociolinguistics) and appealed to many within the language teaching profession, who argued that communicative competence, and not simply grammatical competence, should be the goal of language teaching. The next question to be solved was, what would a syllabus that reflected the notion of communicative competence look like and what implications would it have for language teaching methodology? The result was communicative language teaching. This created a great deal of enthusiasm and excitement when it first appeared as a new approach to language teaching, and language teachers and teaching institutions all around the world soon began to rethink their teaching, syllabuses, and classroom materials. In planning language courses within a communicative approach, grammar was no longer the starting point. New approaches to language teaching were needed.

¹ **Presentation:** The new grammar structure is presented, often by means of a conversation or short text. The teacher explains the new structure and checks students’ comprehension of it.

Practice: Students practice using the new structure in a controlled context, through drills or substitution exercises.

Production: Students practice using the new structure in different contexts, often using their own content or information, in order to develop fluency with the new pattern.

Rather than simply specifying the grammar and vocabulary learners needed to master, it was argued that a syllabus should identify the following aspects of language use in order to be able to develop the learner's communicative competence:

1. As detailed a consideration as possible of the **purposes** for which the learner wishes to acquire the target language; for example, using English for business purposes, in the hotel industry, or for travel.

2. Some idea of the **setting** in which they will want to use the target language; for example, in an office, on an airplane, or in a store.

3. The socially defined **role** the learners will assume in the target language, as well as the role of their interlocutors; for example, as a traveler, as a salesperson talking to clients, or as a student in a school.

4. The **communicative events** in which the learners will participate: everyday situations, vocational or professional situations, academic situations, and so on; for example, making telephone calls, engaging in casual conversation, or taking part in a meeting.

5. The **language functions** involved in those events, or what the learner will be able to do with or through the language; for example, making introductions, giving explanations, or describing plans.

6. The **notions** or concepts involved, or what the learner will need to be able to talk about; for example, leisure, finance, history, religion.

7. The skills involved in the "knitting together" of discourse: **discourse and rhetorical skills**; for example, storytelling, giving an effective business presentation

8. The **variety** or varieties of the target language that will be needed, such as American, Australian, or British English, and the levels in the spoken and written language which the learners will need to reach.

9. The **grammatical content** that will be needed.

10. The **lexical content**, or vocabulary, that will be needed.

This led to two important new directions – proposals for a communicative syllabus. A traditional language syllabus usually specified the vocabulary students needed to learn and the grammatical items they should master, normally graded across levels from beginner to advanced. But what would a communicative syllabus look like? Several new syllabus types were proposed by advocates of communicative language teaching. These included:

A **skills-based syllabus**: This focuses on the four skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and breaks each skill down into its component microskills. For example, the skill of listening might be further described in terms of the following microskills:

- Recognizing key words in conversations;
- Recognizing the topic of a conversation;
- Recognizing speakers' attitude toward a topic;
- Recognizing time reference of an utterance;
- Following speech at different rates of speed;
- Identifying key information in a passage.

Proponents of communicative language teaching however stressed an integrated-skills approach to the skills' teaching. Since in real life the skills often occur together, they should also be linked in teaching, it was argued.

A functional syllabus: This is organized according to the functions the learner should be able to carry out in English, such as expressing likes and dislikes, offering and accepting apologies, introducing someone, and giving explanations. Communicative competence is viewed as mastery of functions needed for communication across a wide range of situations. Vocabulary and grammar are then chosen according to the functions being taught. A sequence of activities similar to the P-P-P lesson cycle is then used to present and practice the function. Functional syllabuses were often used as the basis for speaking and listening courses.

Adherents of communicative language teaching also recognized that many learners needed English in order to use it in specific occupational or educational settings. For them it would be more efficient to teach them the specific kinds of language and communicative skills needed for particular roles, (e.g., that of nurse, engineer, flight attendant, pilot, biologist, etc.) rather than just to concentrate on more general English. This led to the discipline of needs analysis – the use of observation, surveys, interviews, situation analysis, and analysis of language samples collected in different settings – in order to determine the kinds of communication learners would need to master if they were in specific occupational or educational roles and the language features of particular settings. The focus of needs analysis is to determine the specific characteristics of a language when it is used for specific rather than general purposes. Such differences might include:

- Differences in vocabulary choice;
- Differences in grammar;
- Differences in the kinds of texts commonly occurring;
- Differences in functions;
- Differences in the need for particular skills.

English courses soon began to appear addressing the language needs of university students, nurses, engineers, restaurant staff, doctors, hotel staff, airline pilots, and so on. As well as rethinking the nature of a syllabus, the new communicative approach to teaching prompted a rethinking of classroom teaching methodology. It was argued that learners learn a language through the process of communicating in it, and that communication that is meaningful to the learner provides a better opportunity for learning than through a grammar-based approach. The overarching principles of communicative language teaching methodology at this time can be summarized as follows:

- Make real communication the focus of language learning.
- Provide opportunities for learners to experiment and try out what they know.
- Be tolerant of learners' errors as they indicate that the learner is building up his or her communicative competence.
- Provide opportunities for learners to develop both accuracy and fluency.
- Link the different skills such as speaking, reading, and listening together, since they usually occur so in the real world.
- Let students induce or discover grammar rules.

In applying these principles within the classroom, new techniques and activities were needed as we saw above, still nowadays we are to look for new roles for teachers and learners in the classroom to achieve some other goals. Instead of making use of activities that demanded accurate repetition and memorization of sentences and grammatical patterns, activities that

require learners to negotiate meaning and to interact meaningfully must be improved and the new spheres of communicative language teaching should be discovered.

LITERATURE

1. Brumfit, C. Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. – 305p.

2. Skehan, P. Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis and D. Willis (eds). Challenge and Change in Language Teaching. Oxford: Heinemann, 1996. – 129p.

3. Tarnopolsky, O. Intensive immersion ESP teaching in the Ukraine: Theoretical foundations and practical results. A European perspective. Barcelona. – 1998. - pp. 675-684.

УДК 371.13: 811.111

*Бочкарьова О.Ю.
(Київ, Україна)*

TEACHING EAP VIA 'LANGUAGE ACROSS CURRICULUM' CONCEPT

Стаття присвячена розгляду питання навчання англійській мові для академічних цілей через призму концепції «мова крізь навчальний план». У статті уточнюються поняття «англійська для академічних цілей», її складові та її відмінності від загальної англійської.

Ключові слова: англійська для академічних цілей, «мова крізь навчальний план», вміння, лінгвістична, когнітивна та соціокультурна площини.

Статья посвящена рассмотрению вопроса обучения английскому языку для академических целей через призму концепции «язык через учебный план». В статье утоняются понятия «английский язык для академических целей», его составляющие и его отличия от общего английского.

Ключевые слова: английский язык для академических целей, «язык через учебный план», умения, лингвистическая, когнитивная и социокультурная области.

The article focuses on the issue of English for academic purposes through the prism of 'language across curriculum' concept. The following notions are analysed: English for academic purposes, its components and distinctive features from general English.

Key words: English for academic purposes, 'language across curriculum', skills, linguistic cognitive and sociocultural dimensions.

This paper explores the issue of English for academic purposes. Literally, it is possible to divide the work into two parts. In the first part, we are going to dwell on a broader topic. More specifically, we are going to touch upon the nature of English for academic purposes (EAP) and its differences from everyday, or conversational English. What is more, we are going to look at

© Бочкарьова О.Ю., 2013