ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN ROMANIA

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH

By

Ana-Maria Wetzl

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the

English

Program

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
May, 2006

English as a Foreign Language in Romania

The Implementation of the Communicative Approach

Ana-Maria Wetzl

I hereby release this thesis to the public. I understand this thesis will be housed at the Circulation Desk of the University Library and will be available for public access. I also authorize the University of other individuals to make copies of this thesis as needed for scholarly research.

Signature:

Ana-Maria Wetzl 5/4/06

Ana-Maria Wetzl, Student Date

Approvals:

5/4/06

Dr. Steven Brown, Thesis Advisor Date

5-4-06

Dr. Salvatore Attardo, Committee Member Date

5-4-06

Dr. Kevin Ball, Committee Member Date

5/8/06

Peter J. Kasvinsky, Dean of Graduate Studies Date

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) in Romanian schools. The ongoing process of implementation started in 1995, as part of the nationwide reform that followed some major changes in the political system, namely the Anticommunist Revolution of 1989. The reform is largely the result of the contact between Romanian intellectuals and Western methodologies that made the former acknowledge the need to change the old-fashioned approach to teaching employed in Romania.

As a student and later on as an EFL teacher, I witnessed the switch from the traditional Grammar-Translation Method to the Communicative Approach. In writing this thesis, I rely on the experience I gained during the three years I spent teaching EFL in Romania, and some of the data for this thesis is gathered in the form of interviews and a survey completed by Romanian EFL teachers.

The teachers interviewed for this study regarded some of the communicative activities as incongruent with the Romanian schools due to certain factors ranging from the size of the student body to the teacher-controlled environment imposed by tradition. Although the Ministry guidelines and the textbooks used in Romania promote the Communicative Approach, teachers sometimes avoid the communicative activities and employ strategies and activities that are specific to the Grammar-Translation Method or the Audio-Lingual Approach, although they are not formally instructed to do so. Without specifically naming the Audio-Lingual approach as the preferred method used in the classroom, they implement some of its components.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction

The present thesis looks at the various methods used for the past ten years, from approximately 1995 until 2005, to teach English as a foreign language (EFL) in Romania. The grammar-translation method previously employed there was declared outdated as a result of the increased contact with Western countries where communicative language teaching had been dominating since the 1970s.

The guidelines set by the Ministry of Education demanded a fast implementation of Communicative Language Teaching, in combination with elements that were specific to the functional-notional syllabus. The teachers, however, seemed to practice a combination of approaches, Communicative, Grammar-Translation, Notional-Functional, and Audio-Lingual, in an attempt to respond to the needs specific to a Romanian classroom.

Terminology

It is necessary to preview here some of the terms that are used throughout the thesis, although a more comprehensive discussion appears in the second chapter. This task turns out to be complicated especially when it comes to defining the methods used in teaching languages because they imply concepts that are so complex, that defining them in a brief manner is impossible. H. Douglas Brown, for instance, avoids definitions and he lists instead the major characteristics for the main methods employed in language teaching.

First, it is necessary to distinguish between two terms used in studying foreign languages: acquisition and learning. In The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications published in 1985, Stephen Krashen suggests that students acquire a foreign language as

a result of gradual exposure to comprehensible input in the form of spoken language that is a little beyond their understanding. This hypothesis challenges the traditional way of looking at foreign language study as a conscious study of rules and language items whose retention guarantees success. In this thesis, however, acquisition and learning are used interchangeably as none of the teachers interviewed see any difference between them. They are not familiar with Krashen's theory, either, probably because it is not feasible in the context of Romanian schools due to certain classroom variables. The students, for instance, are not grouped according to language skill, but are grouped arbitrarily, making it impossible for the teachers to use materials that are a little beyond each student's proficiency level because classes are made up of students with various language skills.

Used in Romanian schools as late as 1995, the Grammar-Translation Method (GT) was described by Prator and Celce-Murcia in 1979 as an attempt to teach foreign languages with the help of the students' mother tongue, while little attention is given to pronunciation and the focus of the lesson is on form and grammar rules. Discussing the use of GT in teaching English as a second language, H. Douglas Brown saw little benefit for the students because they would have "little motivation to go beyond grammar analogies, translations, and rote exercises" (19).

The Audio-Lingual Approach also influenced the way foreign languages were taught in Romania, probably due to the long tradition of the grammar-translation method with which the audio-lingual method shared some characteristics. David Nunan mentioned some of these characteristics in 1989 in Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom, writing that the "learner has little control; reacts to teacher's direction; passive, reactive role" (80).

Another concept used throughout the thesis is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) that replaced the Grammar-Translation method. Described in David Nunan's aforementioned book as a multitude of different approaches that had communication at the centre, CLT saw teaching as a process and not as an outcome. Nunan suggested that, without completely ignoring the benefits of grammar as an essential resource indispensable to certain classroom tasks, the teaching of foreign languages should move away from focusing on form and should follow a syllabus that would merge the goal of the curriculum, i.e. forming "individuals who are capable of using the target language to communicate with others" (13), with the means, namely promoting "classroom activities which develop this capability" (13).

An approach that is often used in combination with communicative language teaching is the notional-functional syllabus that, according to H. Douglas Brown, "focused strongly … on the pragmatic purposes to which we put language" (32) and employed functions, i.e. speech acts, as "the organizing elements of English language curriculum" (32). The focus of the class activity becomes learning how to perform real life-like tasks such as asking for information, giving advice, apologizing, etc.

The context leading to the implementation of the new approach

Because the political system before 1989 avoided any contact with both English-speaking countries and countries where this was taught as a foreign language, school teachers and curriculum designers were not familiar with the various teaching methods developed outside the Eastern block in the previous fifty years. The textbooks and the curricula promoted by schools under the directives of the Ministry were based on the

Grammar-Translation method, whose popularity had long before diminished in other European countries.

The 1990s, on the other hand, marked an increased free contact with the rest of the world, which led to several good outcomes for the English classroom. Books published in English-speaking countries became available through private vendors or bookstores. Tapes, CD's, and computer programs for learning English found their way into the classroom. Some schools and colleges even brought British or American teachers as employees or volunteers. As a consequence, curriculum developers and textbooks designers understood that a change needed to take place, now that they could grasp the gap between the methodology promoted in Romanian schools and the other European ones, like France and England. Eventually, factors like the sudden access to new information, the importance newly assigned to foreign language teaching, or the political aim of following the model of other European countries led to the acknowledgement of the need for reform in foreign language teaching.

The first wave of reform occurred in 1995, the year when the new textbooks promoting communicative language teaching appeared. Because British English had always been the default in Romanian schools, many textbooks were designed and published by British authors and publishing houses like Longman and Oxford, and they were still on the market in the fall of 2005.

The textbooks designed by Romanians teachers and published locally did not enjoy the same popularity as the ones imported, and they kept changing, maybe because people were afraid of the famed poor quality of Romanian textbooks, and were attracted by the thought of having materials which come directly for the source. Out of the eleven

textbooks for ninth grade approved by the Ministry for the school year 2004-2005, only one was published in Romania by local authors, Pathway to English, and the other ten were published in the United Kingdom and imported to Romania (see Appendix 1 for a complete list of textbooks used with ninth grade students).

Irrespective of the textbook the teachers used, certain problems appeared in 1995, when the first attempt to reform schools failed mainly because the Minister of Education did not coordinate the reform well. Nothing was done except for the release of the new textbooks, so the teachers did not receive any training at all, and they had to use the old curriculum, based on the Grammar-Translation Method, in conjunction with the new, communicative-oriented textbooks. This "error", as Minister Andrei Marga called it in 1998, was gradually addressed, and the curricula for primary school appeared in 1998-1999, with the rest of the system implementing new curricula by 2000 (1).

The new method was described in the curriculum (*programa scolara*) for teaching English as a foreign language released in 1999 by the Ministry. The curriculum was presented as "the result of research in the field of pedagogy, following the standards imposed by the present level of the Romanian education system on the one hand, and the new international tendencies in the teaching of foreign languages" (Ministerul Educatiei si Cercetarii 1).

The new national curriculum was analyzed by two university instructors, Georgeta Obilisteanu and Gabriela Mihaila-Lica, who singled out the most important characteristic of this new method, claiming that "the primary objective of today's programme is to develop *communicative competence* in learners; that is to make them

understand and produce language which is not only *correct* but *appropriate* in the varied functions which language serves in real life situations" (1).

Method and purpose of the thesis

EFL teachers in Romania were obviously affected by all these changes that occurred roughly in the last ten years. This thesis analyzes the way they adapted to some of the changes, such as the requirements of Communicative Language Teaching, the use of the new textbooks, and the needs of their classrooms. The research was done by interviewing six teachers: Ada, David, and Elena who taught primary and secondary school, Florina who taught high school, Cati who taught both secondary school and high school, and Barbu who taught at the college level (pseudonyms are used instead of the teachers' real names). Ada, Barbu, and Cati were interviewed in person during the summer of 2005, and David, Elena and Florina were interviewed over the phone during the fall of the same year. The following table contains information about the subjects who participated in interviews:

Pseudonym	Age	Sex	Level of education	Years teaching EFL	Urban/rural schools
Ada	29	F	BA	6	Suburban
Barbu	34	M	BA	2	Urban
Cati	57	F	BA	35	Suburban & rural
David	28	M	BA	4	Rural
Elena	25	F	BA	3	Rural
Florina	44	F	BA	18	Urban

The interviewer had a basic list of questions (see Appendix 2), but the teachers were encouraged to change the course of the conversation in the direction they thought relevant. Although they did not seem too comfortable at the beginning of the interview, they were eventually excited by the opportunity to explain what happened in their classroom and complain about the problems they had to deal with when they tried to follow the new curriculum.

In addition to the interviews, a number of about thirty teachers from various levels were asked to respond to a survey, which initially contained most of the questions that were asked during the interviews (see Appendix 3). The survey consisted of twenty open-ended questions focusing on classroom setting and methods used by teachers, offering the teachers the opportunity to asses the Traditional Method and the Communicative Approach.

The response on the part of the teachers was so weak, i.e. only one returned completed survey, that a new one was designed (see Appendix 4). The content was the same, yet the questions were phrased differently in an attempt to make the teachers' effort minimal: only three questions were open-ended, and twelve were multiple-choice. This time, thirty-four teachers answered the survey.

The purpose of this project was to see how the Communicative Method was described by the ministry and how it was implemented in the classrooms from second grade through college. The observations the teachers made revealed that some of the staple characteristics of the communicative method recommended in the documents released by the central authorities and used in the design of the activities suggested by the textbooks may not work in the context of a Romanian classroom. Instead of forcing the

implementation of a particular approach, a combination of several methods may be the better approach, as Obilisteanu and Mihaila-Lica suggested: "The learners should not be rushed into using … communicative exercises" (3) because the students may react better when challenged by activities specific to other methods.

Overview of the thesis

Although the Ministry of Education specifically recommended Communicative Language Teaching in 1995 and again in 1999, the information provided by the teachers participating in interviews and survey showed that the socio-cultural dimension of the educational process in Romania influenced the implementation of the Communicative Approach. According to the opinions expressed in interviews conducted with Romanian EFL teachers, the year 1995 initiated a mixture of approaches dominated by the Ministry-endorsed communicative language teaching, following a long tradition of predominant grammar-translation method. The Minister of Education Andrei Marga explained in 2000 that the motivation behind this change was the need to apply "the measures designed to make the Romanian system of education deeply compatible with European standards" (1).

According to the national curriculum published in 1999, the old Grammar-Translation Method that had been employed in foreign language classroom up until then was to be replaced by Communicative Language Teaching. The context in which this reform was applied proved a determining factor that eventually made many teachers subconsciously employ a method that would combine different approaches, instead of the recommended CLT only.

It seemed that even before 1989, despite the ban imposed by the political system on Western ideas and also despite the predominance of the traditional Grammar-Translation Method, some teachers and researchers praised the benefits of the Audio-Lingual Method in combination with structural linguistics and grammar-oriented exercises. As early as 1973, Victor Hanea suggested that "modern language teaching recommends a skilful complete method on the basis of the so-called *multiple line of approach*" (52).

This thesis looked first at the variables that could influence the way English was taught in Romania, such as the tradition of foreign language teaching in Romania, or the way textbook and curricula were designed, because these contributed to the way the teachers understood and applied the reform.

The organization of the thesis

The present thesis is organized in six chapters in an attempt to present the context in which the Communicative Approach was put to work in 1995, describe the problems that emerged as a result of this process, and finally present the way things are done in Romanian schools, where a purist Communicative Approach was never welcomed.

The introductory chapter presents the general overview of the thesis, while, at the same time, it explains some aspects of the Romanian educational process in general, and EFL teaching in particular. This chapter also introduces the main idea supported in the thesis, namely that Communicative Language Teaching, although imposed by the Ministry of Education since 1995, has to be adapted by the teachers to meet the needs of the classroom, and sometimes a combination of methods seems a better fit at least for the teachers interviewed for this project.

The literature review in the second chapter presents some studies discussing the implementation of the Communicative Approach in countries that do not have a long tradition in teaching English as a foreign language, including Romania. The articles focus on the problems emerging from the attempt to adopt an approach that is not designed for the needs of an EFL environment. The authors reviewed here suggest some solutions that may increase the success rate of the new approach.

The third chapter offers the background information that could provide some insights into the socio-cultural aspects of Romanian education in regards to foreign languages. This includes a short overview of the foreign language teaching in Romania from the Middle Ages until the present time. Knowing how this tradition evolved over time could help the observer to understand what the situation was when Communicative Language Teaching became the required method of teaching EFL.

The fourth chapter is designed to complement the previous one with a discussion of the approaches used in Romanian schools to teach EFL. The analysis is done using Clifford Prator and Marianne Celce-Murcia's description of the Grammar-Translation Method on the one hand, and the traits specific to CLT as they are described by H. Douglas Brown, Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rogers, and finally Mary Finocchiaro and Christopher Brumfit on the other hand.

The fifth chapter presents some of the challenges the teachers noticed when they tried to apply the principles of the recommended communicative method. Something as simple as doing group work during the English session, for instance, could be a daunting task due to the large number of students, often as many as thirty or more, and because most students were never required to collaborate like that in other classes.

However, not just the difficulties encountered with collaborative learning frustrated the teachers. Some other components of the communicative language teaching were not feasible in Romanian schools, either, for various reasons: they might go against the traditional classroom setup, be counter to what was taught in other subjects or in the students' home environment, or be hard to do in a typical Romanian classroom setting. Just as Obilisteanu and Mihaila-Lica recommended, "the students themselves, the community they come from, the reason they are interested in using the foreign language are important elements to consider by the teacher when he decides what method to use, what aspects of various methods to combine" (3).

The final chapter points out the major problems many countries encounter when using CLT, and it also mentions a few issues that may be more important in the Romanian educational system. The discussion then focuses on the measures teachers need to take to make EFL a success.

Conclusion

The accounts offered by the Romanian teachers participating in the study showed the impossibility to apply a single method when teaching EFL due to cultural and socio-economical factors. The teachers had to go beyond what the ministry and the textbooks recommended in order to meet the needs of the students and to have a successful class session. Regardless of how effective the communicative method may have proved in other countries, Romanian teachers did not regard it as feasible by itself, but only in combination with other approaches.

Adrian Holliday also looked at the implementation of communicative language teaching in Egypt, a country with a strong Grammar-Translation tradition. He suggested

something similar in connection to what he considered the crisis caused by the attempt to force Communicative Language Teaching on Arabic countries without taking into account the rules and restrictions of the local culture. After he saw the non-native teachers trying to use a method designed in English-speaking countries, without adapting it to fit the students' socio-cultural profile, he concluded that the "appropriate methodology is culture sensitive" (160), and "the regime of 'communicative' classroom, when a certain type of student behavior is demanded, is generally not very adaptable to other classroom cultures" (97).

Holliday's observations could stand true when it comes to the Romanian system of education where the communicative language teaching in its pure form would not have been successful, even though it worked in other countries. Just importing a curriculum was not enough because, as Holliday wrote, "the changed curriculum must belong to the host institution and connect absolutely with the *real world* of all the parties within it- with the social deep action that pervades all its relationships" (195).

Chapter II: Literature review

The implementation of modern approaches in the world: Egypt, Hong Kong, South Korea, China, Japan, and Romania

After the 1980s, once the Communicative Approach proved successful in teaching English as a Second Language (ESL), other countries throughout the world started implementing it in their EFL programs in an attempt to improve the students' proficiency in the foreign language. However, the socio-cultural characteristics of each country, in combination with the overwhelming tradition of using the Grammar-Translation Method and the Audiolingual Approach in the classroom, made the implementation of the Communicative Approach challenging in an EFL situation in countries like Egypt, Hong Kong, South Korea, China, Japan, or Romania.

Researchers and EFL specialists showed interest in the way this process of change occurred, and they eventually published a few interesting accounts of the way the new approach was integrated into the educational system of EFL countries. Some of the accounts offer a comprehensive overview of the process in general, like Adrian Holliday's Appropriate Methodology and Language Learning published in 1994; some challenge the interpretation of the communicative concepts in EFL countries, like Virginia LoCastro's 1996 article "English Language Education in Japan"; some present the EFL teachers' perspective on CLT, for instance David R. Carless' "A Case Study of Curriculum Implementation in Hong Kong" published in 1998 or Defeng Li's "Teachers' Perceived Difficulties in Introducing the Communicative Approach in South Korea" published in 2001; and some claim to focus on the students' understanding of CLT, for

example Zhenhui Rao's "Chinese Students' Perception of Communicative and Non-Communicative Activities in EFL Classroom" published in 2006.

Regardless of the point of view, all these accounts suggest that non-English speaking countries need to approach CLT carefully and either adapt the new method to the needs of the community implementing it, or be ready to design their own version of CLT themselves. Teachers cannot simply take a curriculum that has proved successful in ESL and use it in their classrooms because it may prove incongruent with the socio-cultural profile of the environment.

The implementation of the Communicative Approach in Egypt

In Appropriate Methodology and Language Learning, Adrian Holliday discusses the implementation of the communicative approach in countries where English is studied as a foreign language. He explains that the communicative approach originated in the so-called BANA countries, i.e. Britain, Australasia and North America, and it may not be a good fit for state education in developing countries (TESEP) because it is not culture-sensitive, ignoring the "psycho-social, informal and micro-political factors influenced by the wider social environment" (160).

According to Holliday, "any methodology in English language education should be appropriate to the social context within which it is to be used" (29). This context may take different forms, and Holliday makes the distinction between "macro context" (29), namely the society at large and its main institutions, and micro context or the "socio-psychological aspect of group dynamics within the classroom" (29). He uses a diagram to show how a student's culture bears the influence of the "classroom culture", the "host institution culture", the "international education-related cultures", the "professional-

academic cultures", and the "national culture (including urban, village, regional and other activity cultures)" (29). Thus the student is no longer seen as "an empty vessel which a teacher can arbitrarily fill with new knowledge and behavior" (167), but as an individual belonging to all those cultures and bringing his or her own cultural baggage of "experience and knowledge which are of value to the learning process" (167).

In Holliday's opinion, countries where English is not a first language may encounter problems when implementing the Communicative Approach in foreign language teaching due to the fact that many of the activities specific to CLT (as it was designed in BANA countries) go against the local culture dominant in the classroom: "The regime of 'communicative' classroom when a certain type of student behavior is demanded is generally not adaptable to other classroom cultures" (97). The students he interviews in Egypt are confused, for instance, by discovery-oriented activities because they are used to be told everything upfront (85), or they prefer theory to practical applications (81).

Holliday uses the experience gained when he was teaching in the Egyptian school system as a basis for his argument, but his observations hold true in the case of other TESEP countries. He claims that the communicative method has met resistance on the part of the teachers and researchers due to the lack of input they are encouraged to give when it comes to designing the curriculum and the classroom materials, and suggests that they need to move away from the "skills-based, discovery-oriented, collaborative-integrationist" (96) model of CLT, if necessary, in order to accommodate the needs and the peculiarities of the classroom.

Furthermore, the appropriate methodology that teachers should use in the EFL countries needs to be culture sensitive and "as non-prescriptive as possible" (181), and teachers have to first take upon themselves the role of an ethnographer, and then "subjugate their methodology to what they observed, to their interpretation of the text of the classroom" (181), accepting an active role in designing it.

Holliday finally calls for a "learn*ing*-centered approach … which acknowledges the social context of education" (176). Just importing the Communicative Approach from BANA countries to a community where English is only a foreign language is unlikely to ensure an effective learning experience. As Holliday concludes, "if it's going to work, and to avoid *tissue rejection*, the changed curriculum must belong to the host institution and connect absolutely with the *real world* of all the parties within it – with the social deep action that pervades all its relationships" (195).

The Communicative Approach in Japan

When analyzing the implementation of the Communicative Approach in Japan, Virginia LoCastro brings forth a very blunt conclusion: the concept of communication that is vital to CLT may not be understood the same way by all cultures: "communication itself may not be a universally shared concept" (45) and "what may appear to be common-sense notions – *communication* and *interaction* – …may entail different interpretations" in various cultural contexts (45). Thus, the Communicative Approach may not prove a success in Asian cultures because it is designed by Western scholars, and the Japanese teachers LoCastro talks about are supposed to only implement this approach under the orders of the Ministry, without being asked to be actively involved in its adaptation to the Japanese cultural norms.

Consequently, teachers may choose to avoid CLT, although the Ministry sees it as a way to improve the students' much-needed proficiency in English. Although the teachers are "paying lip service to communicative skills" (44), they stick to their traditional method: "despite the laudable intentions [on the part of the Ministry], the curriculum remains content-oriented – specifically grammar-oriented" (44).

LoCastro is very critical in her analysis, stating that the disparity between the local cultural norms and the principles promoted by CLT have lead to a resistance to innovation on the part of the teachers who continue to extensively use Japanese during the English class, provide little authentic input, teach linguistic content, and avoid spoken language and collaborative activities (53).

The implementation of the Target-Oriented Approach in Hong Kong

David R. Carless also discusses the premises that may lead to a successful implementation of a new approach in an area where the traditional approach in teaching is still practiced on a large scale. In "A Case Study of Curriculum Implementation in Hong Kong", Carless focuses on the new Target-Oriented Approach, and he singles out three factors that are likely to determine its success in the EFL classes there: "teacher's attitude, teacher training, and teacher's understanding of the innovation" (264).

In Carless's opinion, it is very important to involve the teachers in all the aspects of the curriculum implementation process because they are the key element that can decide whether the change is successful or not. Thus, instead of only passively putting into practice a curriculum designed by someone else, teachers are encouraged to have a say in what happens in the classroom, and "what is needed is the negotiation of meaning between developers and teachers" (265). In order to be able to do so, though, teachers

need to "have a thorough understanding of the principles and practice of the proposed change" (264) as a result of ongoing training. If the teachers are trained to understand the theoretical underpinnings and the practical applications of a new approach, then they are more likely to have a positive attitude towards innovation.

The case study Carless chooses to present is a success story because the teacher he observes and interviews is well-qualified due to extensive professional training in undergraduate and graduate school, is proficient in English, has a good understanding of TOC and consequently a positive attitude towards innovation, and is encouraged by peer teachers and superiors to apply the new approach.

However, Carless admits that the subject of his case study does not represent the average EFL teacher in Hong Kong, where "55% of the English teachers are not subject trained" (267) and "teachers whose background and experience tends towards more traditional teacher-centered methods" (264) usually resist to innovation. Thus very few teachers truly implement the new approach in the classroom, and "it is common for curriculum innovations to result in a façade of change, but with little noticeable impact on what goes on the classroom" (263).

The implementation of the Communicative Approach in China

Guangwei Hu briefly criticizes the claim that "CLT is best for China" expressed in an article published by Xiaoqing Liao in 2002. Hu readily dismisses Liao's claim that the Communicative Approach is a perfect fit for the educational system there because, in his opinion, a multitude of approaches works best in the context of Chinese schools: "Rather than impose CLT…, a more rational and productive stance to take is to

encourage them to adopt an eclectic approach, and draw on various methodological options at their disposal to meet the demands of their specific teaching situations" (67).

Hu makes reference to some aspects observed in Chinese schools that prevent a successful implementation of CLT, from resistance exhibited by the participants in the educational process to "imported methodologies" (65), to lack of resources and opportunities to use the target language in a real-life type situation. Moreover, Hu points out that teaching is more than applying the principles of a certain approach or method, and teachers "do not approach teaching in terms of these constructs" (67), as "their pedagogical decision-making is much more complex, fluid, and dynamic than these constructs suggest" (67).

Considering that too many accounts focus on the researchers' or teachers' perspective on the implementation of the new approach, while the students' voices are rarely heard although they are the main participants in the learning process, Zhenhui Rao uses their perspective to analyze the success of CLT in China in "Chinese Students' Perception of Communicative and Non-Communicative Activities in EFL Classroom". Through interviews and surveys, Rao describes the students' "perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities" (88) and he also identifies "the recurrent themes … and salient comments in regard to constraints that Chinese students had encountered in using communicative activities" (91).

The findings of the study show that Chinese students prefer activities specific to non-communicative methods over those specific to CLT; for instance all of them want the instructor to teach explicit grammar in class, but often this desire is caused by a lack of understanding of CLT on the part of the students, by the tendency to stick to the

traditional classroom setting with which they are familiar, or by the lack of resources like textbooks, dictionaries, and audio materials.

However, the participants do seem to respond enough to activities specific to CLT, too, if they are intermingled with non-communicative ones (98), and they can be applied to "the Chinese context" (94). As Rao points out, "any attempt to teach English in a communicative way without taking into account the actual teaching circumstances would lead to failure" (93).

According to Rao, teachers should devise their own Communicative Approach because they are the first to know the characteristics and the needs of the class, and they should not be biased against non-communicative activities because they may be appropriate in the context of Chinese education (98). Moreover, the teachers need to make sure that the students understand the underpinnings of CLT because misconceptions about the purpose of communicative activities often cause the students to completely reject them. Finally, the teachers also have the responsibility to design "authentic communicative scenarios for the real use of the language" (99) to compensate for the lack of chances the students have to use language outside the class, and they should also utilize as many authentic target language materials as possible (99).

Rao suggests that the results of his study are not necessarily specific to Chinese schools, and students from other countries where English is taught as a foreign language may have the same concerns as the students interviewed for this project: "much of what the Chinese students said about communicative and non-communicative activities in the Chinese classroom and about their difficulties in using communicative activities is common to many parts of the world" (100).

The implementation of the Communicative Approach in South Korea

In "Teachers' Perceived Difficulties in Introducing the Communicative Approach in South Korea", Defeng Li presents the teachers' perspective on the Ministry-imposed implementation of CLT in an environment where the traditional teacher-centered approach has dominated not only foreign language teaching, but the educational process as a whole.

Li explains that implementing CLT in EFL countries is likely to fail because this type of curriculum is designed and prone to succeed in ESL classrooms. He repeatedly stresses the importance of acknowledging the differences between EFL and ESL in terms of purpose, learning environment, availability of authentic materials, or teacher's target language proficiency (160). If these differences are ignored and the teachers are asked to implement an approach that is not precisely designed with the characteristics of the native culture in mind, problems usually occur.

Just like Carless, Li does not use average teachers in his study, but educators who are interested enough in improving their skills that, at the time when the research for this project is done, they are attending courses at a Canadian university. Regardless of that, they all confess that they avoid CLT because it is something they have tried to implement but "encountered difficulties in such attempt" (153), and they declare that "the grammar-translation method, the audiolingual method, or a combination of the two characterized their teaching" (153).

Using a survey and interviews, Li comes up with a list of the difficulties teachers point out as inherent to the use of CLT in the EFL classroom. He sorts them into four categories: first, difficulties caused by teachers, for instance "deficiency in spoken

English" or "lack of training in CLT". Second, problems caused by students, for instance "low English proficiency" and "lack of motivation for developing communicative competence". Third, the educational system contributes to the problem because it does not support the teachers who are open to innovations, it does not provide them with the necessary funds, and it maintains unusually large numbers of students per class. Finally, CLT itself may pose some problems. An example would be that it lacks "effective and efficient assessment instruments" (153).

According to Li, these issues are not specific to South Korea, but can also be encountered in other countries with a strong tradition in teacher-centered classes when they try to implement CLT. Li suggests that the teachers in each country should assess the socio-cultural parameters that may prove incongruous with CLT principles and adapt the approach to fit their classroom needs: "teachers of South Korea and other EFL countries should carefully study their TEFL situations and decide how CLT can best serve their needs and interests" (161).

Romanian Publications on the implementation of CLT

There are very few sources describing the implementation of the communicative approach in Romania, although some books describing the principles of CLT were published in an attempt to provide the teachers with a much needed tool. Books like Ecaterina Popa's Aspects of Theory and Practice in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, or Doina Clontea and Procopie Clontea's A Handbook of English Teaching Methodology explain the Communicative Approach from a theoretical perspective, yet they fail to analyze how that is applied in Romanian schools.

Georgeta Obilisteanu and Gabriela Mihaila-Lica's article "New Tendencies in Teaching Foreign Languages" is less general and more focused on the practical class-related aspects of CLT in Romania. Although very short, the article stresses the need for a new methodology, as the traditional method of teaching languages no longer meets the needs of society.

Obilisteanu and Mihaila-Lica recommend as the main purpose of the EFL class "to achieve a working knowledge of the language for definable purposes" (1), instead of trying to achieve an "all-purpose mastery of the foreign language" (1). They also suggest six types of activities teachers could use with the students, for instance problem solving, searching for specific information, relating personal experiences, etc. These activities are meant to gear the focus of the learning process towards "sorts of *uses* to which we put language in the real world" (3).

However, Obilisteanu and Mihaila-Lica warn that in order to "develop *communicative competence* in learners" (1) by practicing "language which is not only *correct* but *appropriate* … in real life situations" (1), teachers need to understand that sometimes just using CLT alone may not work. Although the benefits of the Communicative Approach are recognized in the article, the teachers "should not reject whatever is good in either the audiolingual or the cognitive approach" (3), but use a combination of the three that works best in a particular classroom.

One of the more comprehensive evaluations of the way the reform occurred in Romanian schools is the result of the collaborative research done by four professors, Alexandra Cunita, Janeta Draghicescu, Ecaterina Popa, and Dumitru Dorobat, who are part of the top four undergraduate and graduate foreign language programs in Romania.

Predarea si invatarea limbilor straine din perspectiva europeana discusses the new organization of foreign language teaching in Romania and the problems that occurred when the Ministry started changing the format and the content of the foreign language class.

The book is more descriptive than analytical, but it offers valuable numerical data, for instance charts showing the number of qualified and unqualified teachers functioning in the system as late as 1997, or the number of students taking one particular language during a given year. Although the numbers have changed in time, they still offer a good description of the conditions in which Romanian schools started the implementation of CLT.

The problems confronting the participants in the educational process are also discussed, from the lack of alternative textbooks to the inadequate continuing education opportunities available to teachers. Cunita et al. goes even further and explains why schools are not able to fulfill the requirements imposed by the reform. For instance, chapter five is dedicated to an acute problem caused by the insufficient number of qualified language instructors (43), and by the lack of continuing education opportunities that reflects negatively on the quality of teaching. As a consequence, although Romania officially implements CLT, "one can observe in many instances the continuing use of the traditional methods, in an authoritative climate" (65).

Conclusion

The articles discussing the implementation of a modern approach in countries with a strong tradition of Grammar-Translation and Audiolingual teaching seem to present the same situation in the EFL classrooms. Although CLT has proved successful in

an ESL environment, it may fail to meet the needs of an EFL classroom. It is not necessary, however, to completely discard the Communicative Approach. Instead of implementing CLT as it was designed for ESL, the teachers should design their own culture-sensitive communicative curriculum which may encompass activities specific to the other more traditional approaches.

Chapter III: Short history of foreign language teaching in Romania

Foreign languages taught in Romania over the years

Romania had a long tradition in foreign language teaching both in the public schools and in the private education system. English, however, was a more recent reality there, as it was massively introduced in schools only in the last three decades of the twentieth century. Before that, the system of education seemed to prefer other European languages, classical languages at the beginning, and French and German starting with the nineteenth century.

The learned people of medieval times were familiar with Latin and Greek, languages that were taught in high schools up until present times, although their importance diminished in the twentieth century. However, the most common foreign language of the Middle Ages in Romania was old Slavic because anything connected to the predominant orthodox religion was Slavic: the church service, the books, the instruction (as all schools were organized by churches and monasteries), the written and even the oral communication between intellectuals. The Slavic tradition was so overwhelming that the first secular document preserved from the sixteenth century, "Scrisoarea lui Neacsu din Campulung", was written in Romanian, but in the Cyrillic alphabet.

Later, during the nineteenth century, other foreign languages like French and German, and still later English, were integrated in the secondary school curriculum as a result of the socio-historical conditions of the time. According to Ecaterina Popa, the interest in modern foreign languages emerged as a consequence the fact that "the European community grew closer and the commercial and diplomatic contacts as well as

polarized around two areas, Banat and Transylvania, due to the long-lasting tradition existent is these areas and to the German minority living here" (46).

The end of World War Two left Romania as part of the Eastern Block which was under the influence and control of the USSR. As a consequence, Russian became the predominant foreign language, and French and German played a smaller role, but the study of foreign languages in general was considered decadent and not encouraged by a society that valued working in factories or on the collective state farms over education.

The year 1965, however, brought about a political change that would influence the educational process: Nicolae Ceausescu became the new president and he moved away from the Russian socialist model. The first ten years of Ceausescu's rule were marked by an increased contact with Western countries like England or the United States, and the school system absorbed some of the ideas and trends fashionable there. Cunita et al. mention the period between 1966 and 1978 as a time when "Romanian schools practiced a modern form of education that was compatible with the contemporary European one" (33).

According to the study conducted by Cunita et al., during this decade the importance of studying foreign languages as early as possible was acknowledged, and the students started studying their first foreign language in the second grade: "unlike other countries from the former socialist block, Romania introduced the teaching of the first foreign language (English, French, German, Russian) in the second grade, and of the second one in the sixth grade, and this system functioned well until 1978" (16).

Another positive result of the more relaxed socio-political environment was the publication of a few methodology books explaining the approaches employed in Western

traveling grew notably" (14) in combination with the "systematic democratization of school systems in Europe and the United States" (14).

In the last decades of the nineteenth century, it was very common for the upper middle and upper classes to know French, which became a must for anyone who wanted to be noticed in society, so, for instance, it was very fashionable to have a French nanny. Even high schools started teaching French, probably because, just like Romanian, French is a Latin language, and there was a certain feeling of brotherhood connected with anything coming from France.

German was also popular with anyone who claimed to be a scholar because most books that could be found in libraries were published in Germany. When the high school graduates wanted to get higher education, they would usually go to college in France or Germany because higher education had a slow start in Romania, where the first colleges appeared at the end of the nineteenth century. Another sign that showed how important these languages were for Romanians was the fact that most neologisms were borrowed from either French or German.

The period between the two world wars offered access to a wider variety of foreign languages, and young people did not have to go abroad to further their education, as more students attended indigenous high schools and colleges. Some schools started to include English in their curriculum, but French and German were still the predominant languages. German seemed to be preferred especially in Transylvania and the surrounding areas, where there used to be big communities of Germans who immigrated there during medieval times. This tendency could be observed as late as 1997, when Cunita, Popa, Draghicescu and Dorobat noted that "it is evident that German teaching is

schools, like the Audio-Lingual or the Direct Method, and even the Communicative Approach was mentioned in books like Marcela Dragomirescu's Metodica predarii limbii engleze in 1966, Victor Hanea's Metodica predarii limbii engleze in 1973, or Georgiana Galateanu and Ecaterina Comisel's Indrumator metodic in 1975. The relaxed political environment allowed exchanges between Romanian educators and the target language specialists from abroad, and the contact between Romanian teachers and Western countries resulted in an improved quality of the educational process (Cunita et al. 33).

However, the situation changed, again, under the influence of political factors. During the late 1970s, the president reverted back to a very strict totalitarian rule that followed the Soviet model, and studying foreign languages, with the exception of Russian, was not a priority any more. In the 1980s, for instance, most school children had to take two hours of Russian a week starting only with the fifth grade, and they still studied a second foreign language, usually French or German, from the sixth grade. Other languages like Italian, Spanish and English were very rare, and there were very few universities offering English as a major. According to Cunita et al., "the lack of interest for foreign languages, which became part of the state policy during 1978 and 1989 …lead to a decrease in the number of students the universities could accept, and even to a complete disappearance of foreign language colleges, and these eventually lowered the number of qualified teachers" (17).

The beginning of the 1990s brought about a major transformation in foreign language teaching, as the political environment changed and the Soviet influence in Romania diminished considerably. The Romanians were able to open up towards the West, and Russian slowly disappeared from schools, being replaced by other languages.

The main foreign languages became French and English because the authorities believed that these were the new universal languages of the world. Italian, German, Russian and Spanish played a secondary role. This observation was confirmed in the study conducted by Cunita et al. for the school year 1995-1996. The data published in Predarea si invatarea limbilor straine in Romania in perspectiva europeana showed the following distribution of students per foreign language (40):

French	2,341,119
English	1,338,942
Russian	405,853
German	256,240
Italian	11,092
Spanish	10,509
Japanese	265

After 1995, the study of foreign languages generally began in the second grade, although some parents could pay a fee for their children to have language classes as early as kindergarten. According to the regulations imposed by the Board of Education, public schools went back to the same pattern employed from 1965 until approximately 1975, and every student started studying the first foreign language in the second grade, while the second foreign language was introduced in the fifth grade. Both languages were compulsory until the eight grade or the senior year of high school. All college students, regardless of their major, took two years of foreign languages, and they usually studied English for Special Purposes in the hope that knowing the technical language of their specialty would help them in their future job. The teaching of foreign languages in

Romania was designed as a continuous process that provided the students with a steady contact with the studied languages from childhood until adult years.

However, the overall climate was not very stable yet, and changes in the school system still occurred in conjunction with the changes in political life. The state elections of 2004 were inevitably followed by another change in the organization of the educational system, and starting with the fall of 2005 colleges changed from a four-year, two-semester system to a three-year, two-semester pattern, with foreign languages being taught only for a year.

English teaching over the years

English as a Foreign Language was rarely taught in Romanian schools before 1990s, probably due to the predominance of the French and German influence before 1945, and then due to political reasons during the communist rule that lasted till 1989. During the 1970, though, the political regime seemed to be more open to novelty, so a few colleges offering English as a major appeared. The teachers graduating from universities like Bucuresti, Cluj, Craiova, or Iasi spread throughout the country, and, being staffed properly, schools started offering English as a foreign language.

The conditions the students had, however, made studying English rather difficult. The only resources available were the teacher and the textbook, and they both had their faults. The teachers, for instance, never trained abroad or with a native speaker because traveling to the Western countries was rarely allowed, for political reasons. Teachers learned English from books, practical courses, textbooks, and from tapes.

The secondary school and high school students also had very little access to native speaker models outside the classroom, too. As Western art was considered

decadent by the political regime, there were very few British or American shows in theatres or on TV, and people rarely found music from the English speaking countries on the Romanian market. Romanian publishing houses did not print books or magazines in English, and those could not be imported, either.

Thus the only source of spoken English for most students was the teacher, while the textbooks provided by the school had to do for written English. The textbooks were published in Bucuresti, Romania, and they were the result of the collaborative work of Romanian schoolteachers and assistant professors, without the help of a native speaker of the target language. They never changed much through the years, and they were only reprinted to meet the demand.

Very few schools had operational language labs, and teachers regularly taught up to thirty students in a regular classroom with the help of only a blackboard and some hand-made charts. The list of irregular verbs, for example, was considered a must have by the large majority of language instructors, but it was impossible to find in a store, so teachers just wrote it on big sheets of white cardboard and carried it around from classroom to classroom.

One may wonder how efficient English learning was, with these scarce resources. The minority of the students somehow did manage to acquire it, usually by going for private lessons and, thus, getting one-to-one instruction with a teacher. As the teacher was the only model for the students, they inevitably acquired the language impregnated with his or her accent, and often high school instructors ended up with a classroom full of various accents modeled after different middle school teachers. Textbooks and

dictionaries, though, did offer the British phonetic transcription of words, so the students could use those to model their pronunciation.

The transition period

The Romanian school system as a whole went through a period of transition after the anti-communist revolution. Because of the isolation imposed by the party line before 1989, the methods used by language teachers were outdated, and there was a need to catch up with what had happened in Western societies for the past sixty years when Romania had been culturally cut off from everyone else. As Codruta Stanisoara pointed out in her article "A Portrait of the European English Language Teacher", "[w]ithin the new European context of globalization and transparency the Romanian educational system has to operate profound changes of the school system in itself and of mentality, too" (64).

Romania in the 1990s teemed with promises for the foreign language speaker. It seemed that nothing could be achieved without knowing a modern language, not even getting a high school diploma because no one could graduate without passing a five-discipline exam, the *bacalaureat*, which included a language test. In order to be accepted for a doctoral program, too, the candidate had to prove solid knowledge of English, French, or German. As foreign investors started to open businesses around the country, the ability to speak a foreign language became a basic requirement for an employment application, even if the job meant just working as a fry cook for McDonald's. Traveling to Western countries was now permitted, and this also motivated people to learn a foreign language, while some even immigrated to countries like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, etc. and were trying to learn the language of the new country beforehand.

This was the first time when materials in English became easily available, from British and American TV soaps to comprehensive Oxford dictionaries. Private language schools like *Lexis* appeared, offering classes and the promise to train its often non-traditional students for internationally acknowledged tests like TOEFL and GMAT. Most high schools also started to offer programs that used a foreign language to teach various subjects, so students could now take all their classes in English. Tutoring, too, became even more fashionable, as parents and students felt that one-on-one instruction was the only way they could keep up with the changing environment.

For the participants in the educational process, however, it was a rather confusing period. The need for reform became obvious, as the previous political regimen had kept everything at a standstill for years, in an attempt to avoid at all costs what was coming from the non-communist world. Consequently, the Minister of Education, Andrei Marga, who held complete authority on the school system, decided in the middle of the 1990s that new textbooks were needed, and the British model was chosen as the most adequate.

Before 1989, there had been only one approved textbook that everyone had to use, as the system was very centralized. The new textbooks published starting with 1995. They were called alternative because, in an attempt to decentralize the system, the law required now to have several different textbooks for each grade level, and the teacher had to decide which one he or she would like to use.

The problem, however, was that the new textbooks were not accompanied by a new curriculum or by new guidelines. The English teachers were thus supposed to teach the new communicative textbooks using the same methodology that had been declared outdated. The Minister of Education Andrei Marga acknowledged this "error" in 1998

and announced a better-planned reform that had already started being promoted in 1997, offering as a deadline for its implementation the year 2000. In Marga's opinion, the main motivation for developing a new, modern system of education was largely political, as he announced in the beginning of a public letter: "In the present context of Romania's closure to the European structures and its starting the negotiations for adhering to the European Union, the Ministry of National Education looks at the year 2000 as the final one in the transitional process of reform and the moment when measures are taken to make our Romanian system compatible with the European standards" (Marga 1).

The need for change that appears after 1989 did not spring only from political reasons, though. The massive amount of new information entering the country through books, television, visiting professors from Western countries, courses offered to EFL teachers by the British Council and similar organizations eventually led to a crisis in the English classroom because the participants in the learning process realized that there may be more efficient ways to learn or teach a foreign language than the traditional Grammar-Translation Method. The communicative approach was frequently mentioned, and eventually the Ministry and teachers started to single it out as the preferred way to teach English.

At point I. a) of the aforementioned public letter, Marga called on "applying in totality the new framework for the primary and secondary learning, and also applying the new curriculum for grades first through twelfth, according to the new National Curriculum, alongside with the extended use of the alternative textbooks"(1). Thus, the methods previously employed by EFL teachers were declared outdated, being replaced, at least in theory, by the "new communicative techniques" (Cunita et al. 47) recommended

in the new alternative textbooks and the Ministry-designed curriculum. A model English class was "planned following the principles of the communicative method and structured on the fundamental speech acts" (Cunita et al. 60), so the recommended approach was Communicative, yet applied within a Functional-Notional curriculum.

Eventually, though, observing real classroom interaction led to the acknowledgement that communicative teaching was not necessarily the only approach that teachers used in the classroom, and other methods had their place as well. Obilisteanu and Mihaila-Lica suggested that "the teacher should not reject whatever is good in either the audio-lingual or the cognitive approach to "swear by" communicative teaching only, since communicative teaching is definitely based on certain results obtained at a certain level of learning by using the other two approaches" (3).

Chapter IV: Approaches implemented in Romanian EFL classes throughout the years

According to the theorists who looked at the process of foreign language teaching in Romania (Doina and Procopie Clontea, Galateanu and Comisel, Hanea, Cunita et al.), it was impossible to use only one method when teaching foreign languages because the classroom variables dictated what approach the teacher should use in order to have a successful session, and in most cases the session would call for a combination of methods. According to Doina and Procopie Clontea, "the teacher of a foreign language has to be adaptable and flexible. There is no such thing as a perfect method which guarantees success, no matter how well the teacher masters its techniques. Success depends, among others, on socio-cultural environment, motivation, the group of students and a lot of other conditions" (18).

At the same time, it was considered normal for certain approaches to dominate what happened in class at least for a certain period of time, until another method would be regarded as more effective. Yet, because of the political situation in Romania that forced the country into isolation, the traditional Grammar-Translation Method dominated EFL teaching at a time when Western countries had long declared it outdated. After the country came out of isolation, the educational system became the scene of a major change, in an attempt to catch up with the advances and the new trends at work in non-communist countries. Thus, the approaches that dominated EFL teaching starting with 1990s were the Audio-Lingual Method (AL) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), with a focus on the Functional-Notional curriculum (FN).

The analysis of the textbooks employed in Romanian schools before 1995 and the words the teachers used to describe teaching during that time would suggest that the predominant classroom strategies were inspired by the traditional Grammar-Translation method. After 1995, the methodology recommended by the Ministry geared the teaching of foreign languages towards CLT, in an attempt to align Romanian schools to European standards. The present reality in schools, however, showed that a combination of approaches was used to teach EFL, due to several factors. The long tradition of the Grammar-Translation method, for instance, made it the preferred way in the case of older teachers, and the lack of instruction regarding CLT made it hard for everybody to implement it. Cunita et al. remarked that "although modernizing the educational system primarily requires a change in the teaching approaches, one could notice, in many instances, the use of the traditional methods and the preponderance of the authoritative attitude on the part of the teachers. This was caused by the lack of a coherent program for continued education for teachers" (65).

The implementation of CLT in Romania was not a very clear and smooth process. Analyzing the most important factors influencing it may lead to a better understanding of the unique characteristics of present EFL teaching in Romania. Thus, an overview of the method generally used in Romania until 1995 was necessary in order to see why it still lingered in schools at least as late as 2004, when Cati, one of the teachers interviewed, was still teaching by its principles.

The Traditional or Grammar-Translation Method

An analysis of the textbooks used in Romania before 1989 and even later on, until 1995, showed the tendency to keep everything under the strict control of the instructor,

and very few exercises were designed to get the students actively involved in the learning process. Group work was never recommended, and all class activities were teacher-centered. Grammar theory was perceived as an indispensable tool in the English class, and most drills usually required only substitution or rephrasing with focus on forms. All these suggested that the recommended method for teaching English in the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s was the one called Traditional or Grammar-Translation.

Clifford Prator and Marianne Celce-Murcia listed in "An Outline of Language Teaching Approaches" the characteristics of this method. They mentioned that "[m]uch vocabulary is taught in the form of lists of isolated words" (3), and, in fact, each text in the Romanian textbooks was preceded or followed by a list of words. One of the teachers interviewed, Cati, used to write them on the blackboard, and the students were required to have a special notebook, called *vocabular*, where they wrote the words, their phonetic spelling, and their meaning. The students at the University of Pitesti taking in 1999 the practical course with Doina Clontea (the same professor who coauthored A Handbook of English Teaching Methodology in 2001), also had a special workbook where they were required every week to list five words with all the meanings given by Andrei Bantas' English-Romanian dictionary (Ada).

Although vocabulary practice may seem less boring than grammar, it was controlled and did not provide enough opportunities for creative personal input on the part of the students. Lesson six in the textbook for the fourth year of study, for instance, began with "Vocabulary Practice", which consisted of seven exercises, but only one offered the students some freedom to express themselves. Exercise *F* required the students to "[m]ake apologies and replies to them for these situations" (78). This

exercise, however, was still somehow controlled because the students were given a chart with set-phrases that were used as apologies and replies to apologies, and they were also given the situations for which they need to come up with an apology (see Appendix 5).

Prator and Celce-Murcia also pointed out the concern for grammar specific to the traditional method, explaining that "[l]ong, elaborate explanations on the intricacies of grammar are given" (3) and "instruction often focuses on the form and inflection of words" (3). Indeed, all textbooks, starting with the one for the first years of study, appealed to the students' knowledge of grammar as shown by the use of grammatical categories like verb, tense, pronoun, voice, etc, that appeared in Georgiana Glateanu and Doris Bunaciu's textbook for the second year of study. Theoretical grammar was explicitly presented by the textbooks, at first in Romanian as shown in a textbook from 1965, and later on directly in English. The drills that followed the charts and definitions usually requested only a meaningless practice of a certain form (see Appendix 6). Another example of this focus on forms was the importance assigned to the complete list of irregular verbs which all high school students needed to know by heart.

The importance of theoretical grammar in the English class probably came as a result of the fact that students studied Romanian grammar in school for at least six years, from third until eight grade. Thus they had a solid theoretical knowledge of Romanian grammar, as they started working with concepts like noun, verb, adjective, adverb, etc in the second grade. By the eight grade, they had the whole grammatical system memorized and were able to take sentences apart and explain their syntax and morphology. In a way, one's academic future depended on grammar because at the end of the eight grade all students were tested and those who failed grammar could not register for high school.

A big part of the English class was devoted to drills which were supposed to familiarize the student with the use of a particular grammatical item. Lesson eleven in the textbook for the third year of study, for instance, presented the modal auxiliary *may* as a means to express permission, and there were three controlled drills and only one activity asking the students to creatively use the auxiliary verb to express personal experiences (see Appendix 7).

There was an obvious fear of taking chances and making a mistake because teachers were afraid that reinforcing a bad language habit might lead to the students' developing poor language skills, as the behaviorists predicted. Thus, most exercises were designed in such a way that the students had to try very hard to make a mistake because all they needed to do was replace one word in the model sentence with another one already provided by the textbook. At the same time, the repetition of the same pattern was thought to lead to acquisition. While this method of teaching grammar made life easy for both the teacher and the students because it did not require real use of the target language on either part, it probably discouraged the children from using that particular structure outside the safety net of a controlled drill.

The exercises usually had a model, and the students had to apply that model to a list of words or sentences. Everything was already provided by the book, and the students did not employ any creativity; on the contrary, it all became a matter of applying the formula on already given items. The only exercises that required the students to use the grammatical item in a context of their own were the optional ones concluding the grammar lesson. At page 104 of the textbook used by juniors in high school, for instance, the students had to "[s]ketch the portrait of a man of science, a sportsman or a public

figure discussing his/her achievements, present activities, preferences, hobbies, plans for the future" (Cojan et.al. 104), after having studied way of expressing wish, capability, intention, preference and permission (Cojan et.al. 104).

Just as Prator and Celce-Murcia suggested, "[o]ften the only drills are exercises in translating disconnected sentences from the target language into the mother tongue"(3), this being both a grammar exercise that focused on a particular form, and practice for the students who were eventually required to translate literary texts from English into Romanian and vice-versa. One of the most respected theorists and textbook authors, Georgiana Galateanu, had a study book often used by high school teachers, Sintaxa limbii engleze, which had each chapter named after a part of speech. Controlled drills were preceded by comprehensive grammatical explanations, and followed by sets of "disconnected sentences", (Prator and Celce-Murcia 3), which were given for translation. Each chapter ended with chunks of literary texts the students needed to translate.

Next, "[l]ittle or no attention is given to pronunciation" (Prator and Celce-Murcia 3), probably due to the lack of native language model speakers and the scarcity of audio tapes, alongside with the extensive use of Romanian in the English class. The phonetic transcription was the only guide to pronunciation, and students learnt it during their first year of English. Textbooks provided the phonetic transcription of the new words, and the teacher always asked the students to work with a dictionary.

The authors also suggested that "[l]ittle attention is paid to the content of the texts, which are treated as exercises in grammatical analysis" (Prator and Celce-Murcia 19), and, truly, some of the drills that followed a text focused on a certain grammatical form. The layout of the textbooks, however, encouraged the study of grammar separately

from the texts, and the grammar exercises were mostly grouped under the title "Grammar Practice".

With junior and senior high school textbooks, though, the tendency seemed to be towards discussing the texts from a literary perspective, and the role of comprehension activities was downplayed. The *bacalaureat*, or the final high school exam, also tested the students' ability to write a critical literary analysis: in1995, one of the assignments required the students to write a two-page account of the use of first-person narrative in one of Ernest Hemingway's short-stories that had been studied in class, "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber".

Alongside with Hemingway, the works of several writers like Charles Dickens, Joseph Conrad, William Shakespeare, and James Joyce appeared in the junior high school textbook, but adaptation of classical texts were introduced as early as the third year of study. According to Prator and Celce-Murcia, "[r]eading of difficult classical texts is begun early" (3) with the Grammar-Translation method, but in the case of Romanian schools, they were postponed until the students got through at least five years of study. Until then, they only studied simplified adaptations like the short adapted excerpt from Frank Baum's The Wizard of Oz included in the textbook for the fourth year of study (see Appendix 8). In high school, though, the students got to study the fragments in original; the textbook for the eleventh grade opened with a whole page of Charles Dickens's Bleak House, while Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar" was at the beginning of the twelfth grade book. The approach encouraged literary analysis and discussion as if the purpose of the English class was turning the students into competent literary critics. Thus,

they learned how to analyze the text from a literary point of view, and they were supposed to use technical words like omniscient, syntactic parallelism, alliteration, etc.

Prator and Celce-Murcia also discussed the issue of how much English could be heard in an EFL classroom, concluding that "[c]lasses are taught in the mother tongue, with little use of the target language" (3) with the Grammar-Translation method. This also happened in Romania because the teachers were uncomfortable speaking English unless they had the safety of a script, which usually was a text or a drill from the book. Florina was an exception to the rule, as she almost never used Romanian with her high school classes, although she admitted that half of the students were permanently confused by what happened during the course because they were used to getting explanations in their native tongue from their previous teachers. Cati, on the other hand, admitted using mainly Romanian in the classroom, and she taught both middle school and high school. English was spoken at the beginning of the class, when the students greeted the teacher, and then throughout the session when either the teacher or the students read from the textbook. She motivated the use of the students' native language instead of the target language with their inability to understand her explanations unless they were in Romanian.

Thus most of the major characteristics of the Grammar-Translation method as they were described by Prator and Celce-Murcia fit the way English was taught in Romania before 1995. The statements made by the teachers during the interviews were not the only source suggesting that the traditional method was at work in the EFL classroom in Romania for such a long time. The textbooks were also designed to fit this approach. Learning English in Romanian schools before 1989 used to imply a solid

knowledge of the grammatical system of the language combined with the memorization of long lists of words and set-phrases in a safe environment that avoided mistakes at the cost of creativity and personal involvement on the part of the students. It was, therefore, safe to assume that this was the main method used, although the teachers were not able to specify what type of an approach they used. During the interviews, the only answer I got each time I asked for the name of the method was an honest shrug.

The method promoted in the mid 1990s

The situation seemed to change at the beginning of the 1990s, when a more democratic political climate made the Ministry of Education ask for a reform in the school system as a whole, and especially a complete revision of the teaching methods and materials used in the Romanian public schools. The new textbooks published in 1995, alongside with the new national curriculum released in 1999, showed some important changes in the way grammar, vocabulary, and the four skills were taught. These changes, though, sometimes did not translate into reality, mainly because there was a shortage of qualified personnel, the teachers who were supposed to implement the new curriculum and use the textbooks were not properly trained to do so, and some preferred the old-fashioned way of teaching they had been using for years.

It was hard to find a reliable source that would definitely pinpoint the method the Ministry of Education recommended as the proper and most successful way to teach students English. The Minister Andrei Marga who supervised the reform of the educational system after 1995 showed concern about the new goals of the school system in general, as he asked for orienting learning from "memorizing data" (1) to "understanding the information and using it in a practical manner" (1). He acknowledged

the need to change the old system based on the exposure to as much information as possible, system used in schools before 1989, with one that implied a practical approach, encouraging the students to put into practice a smaller amount of information.

Georgeta Obilisteanu and Gabriela Mihaila-Lica discussed the new tendencies at work in Romanian EFL classes, pointing out the shift towards "the teaching of the foreign language as communication which considers the foreign language in terms of its communicative functions" (1). This post-reform characterization of the approach used in Romanian schools echoes the 1997 description of the teaching process included by Cunita et al. in their analysis of the reform in progress, where they concluded that the educational process was structured on "the principles of the communicative method, centered and structured on fundamental speech acts" (60). In their opinion, the Functional-Notional methodology underlying the Communicative Approach was the direction in which the EFL teaching was heading.

Instead of promoting linguistic competence, the teachers were asked to focus on communicative competence, as "the primary objective in today's programme is to develop communicative competence in learners; that is to make them understand and produce language which is not only correct but appropriate in the varied functions which language serves in real life situations" (Obilisteanu and Mihaila-Lica 1). Thus the direction instruction seemed to take was clearly communicative, following the fourth characteristic with which H. Douglas Brown described Communicative Language Teaching: "students in a communicative class ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts outside the classroom. Classroom

tasks must therefore equip students with the skills necessary for communication in those contexts" (43).

The new textbooks published in 1995 followed the guidelines of the Communicative Approach as it was understood by British scholars, whose guidance was sought by the Ministry in designing the textbooks in 1995 and the new curriculum to go with it in 1997. The Functional-Notional method directed the way the textbooks were structured, but, according to Cunita et al., the textbooks designed for younger students followed an Audio-Lingual, structure-based approach towards language teaching.

In order to encourage the students to see the information studied in schools as usable in real life situations, the alternative textbooks, especially the ones for older students, tried to stay in touch with what was new in the world and what was likely to interest the participants in the learning process. Advertising, culture clash, stereotyping, surfing the Internet, and the Titanic movie were among the topics in the Prospects Advanced. There were even some texts which went a little further, discussing controversial topics meant to stretch the students' understanding, like the one about edible bugs (see Appendix 9). The people whose photos appeared alongside with the texts were celebrities like Madonna, George W. Bush, Bruce Springsteen, etc.

Other techniques were employed to elicit the younger students' interest; for instance the textbooks for the first four years of study were disguised as an ongoing story. The students met the main characters in Unit 1, and they interacted continuously until the end of the book. With some textbooks, the story was an adventure that involved expeditions to the jungle, chases, smuggling, and all the ingredients of a good comic, even the good defeats evil ending. Regardless whether the unit would look like a comic

strip or focus on fashion the Cosmopolitan way, the main purpose was connecting the content of the text with the students' private life in such a way that they could see how the competence acquired in the classroom could be applied in real life, and consequently their involvement was almost guaranteed. Despite this, four of the teachers responding to the survey designed for this study complained that the textbooks are not interesting enough and the students are bored with the topics.

Another welcome change in Romanian schools was a better understanding of the need to teach all the four skills: speaking, listening, reading and writing, without the former preponderance of drills and exercises that encouraged only the last two and almost completely ignored speaking and listening. According to Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rogers, this was a defining characteristic of the CLT, and they recommend that the teachers should "develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication" (155).

These textbooks now included listening activities that were completely absent from the ones published before 1995. Splash, the textbook for the second year of study that third graders use in Ada's class, had 40 activities that involved listening to a tape only in the first 12 units of the book. The best part about using listening activities when a tape was provided was that the students got to hear a native speaker, but the downfall was the fact that the teachers had to purchase the respective tapes personally, as they were not bought by the school.

The listening activities were usually combined with written texts or with images in Splash. Lesson twenty-one, for instance, had at the beginning a dialogue between some family members, but it was set up in the form of cartoons, so the students could see

pictures and, at the same time, read what the characters said while listening to the taped dialogue as well. High school textbooks also combined some of the four skills, as listening exercises also had speaking and writing in them, and often the recordings were used to jumpstart class discussion (see Appendix 10).

Some teachers, though, still focused more on the writing and reading skills. The same teacher mentioned above, for instance, provided four model lesson plans to be used for this study, and none of them contained any listening activities, although she declared in the interview that she used the tape that came with the textbook during her English sessions. According to the lesson plans, the distribution of the other skills were writing 55%, speaking 35%, and reading 20%, and these percentages showed that Ada did not try to balance the four skills and relied mostly on writing.

Furthermore, there was a complete shift in the way grammar appeared in the textbooks published after 1995. As the students started to study English beginning with second grade, it would have been impossible for them to understand complex grammatical explanations at such an early age. Simple rules and charts, however, could still be found in Sally and Mike, one of the textbooks for the second grade, followed by controlled drills (see Appendix 11). Nonetheless, the grammar part of the unit in all the new textbooks was much smaller than in the old ones, even for the ninth grade textbook Pathway to English: English My Love, where only supplementary charts and explanations could be found at the end in the form of tables and short definitions (see Appendix 12).

The interviewed teachers, however, did not always follow the recommendations in the curriculum and textbooks, as they felt the need to supplement the so-called lack of

theoretical grammar with handouts and drills, especially with older students. During the interview, Ada expressed concern regarding the scarcity of grammatical rules and drills in the new textbooks, and she said she had to bring her own handouts with theory and drills. She included in the lesson plan for the fifth grade a focus on grammar, namely on the presentation of the Paste Tense interrogative form: "The teacher identifies the interrogative forms in the interrogative forms in the text and then explains students how the new language is formed- the use of the auxiliary did and it also shows cases with wh-questions" (3).

Thus the interviews conducted with the teachers revealed the discrepancies between some of the main communicative principles promoted by the national curriculum and by textbooks on the one hand, and the reality of an EFL classroom on the other. The focus on grammar, for instance, was reminiscent of the traditional method previously employed in Romanian schools. During the interview Cati, for instance, stated that she still dictated her students the rules associated with the English tenses, to "compensate" for the lack of explicit grammar in the new textbooks. This could be explained by the fact that she had been teaching English for about twenty-five years when the system of education was reformed, and it was probably hard for her to switch from the well-known Grammar-Translation method to CLT.

Another reason why teachers preferred to teach English grammar could be the fact that all students had to take Romanian grammar from third to eight grade, and they developed a good understanding of grammatical categories and structures. The English teachers encouraged the students to transfer some of that knowledge, especially as Romanian grammar is not that far off from the English because they are both Indo-

European languages. Just like David Nunan suggested in Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom, under certain circumstances "there is value in focus on form" (13).

The audio-lingual method also had an impact on the way teachers organized their classroom activities. According to Cunita et al., the textbooks for younger students, for instance, downplayed the need to communicate efficiently and encouraged a teaching approach that promoted language structures versus communicative habits (53).

A younger teacher, Ada did not trust communicative activities at times, and followed some of the audio-lingual guidelines. In her lesson plans, for instance, there was an obvious fear of giving the students the liberty to communicate without lengthy drills focused on a specific language structure, and this was specific to the Audio-Lingual method as it was described by Finnochiaro and Brumfit in 1983: "Communicative activities only come after a long process of rigid drills and exercises" (92). She also expressed in her interview the habit of close monitoring of the students' output, in order to avoid mistakes because "'[l]anguage is habit', so errors must be prevented at all costs" (Finnochiaro and Brumfit 92) and "[a]ccuracy, in terms of formal correctness, is a primary goal" (Finnochiaro and Brumfit 92).

Another issue observed during the interviews was the role of the teacher in the EFL classroom. Cunita et al. still acknowledged the predominance of the authoritarian educator who was afraid of losing control of the classroom, and Ada avoided group work because she could not keep all the students under her watch, and she felt that "only the very few good students try to work, while the rest of the class only talks in Romanian about issues not related to the class discussion". She also wanted her students to be as

accurate as possible, and she disliked group work because it hindered her control over the students' utterances. These complaints showed an attempt to implement the Audio-Lingual Method with which "[t]he use of the students' native language is forbidden" (Finnochiaro and Brumfit 91) and "[t]he teacher controls the learners and prevents them form doing anything that conflicts with the theory" (Finnochiaro and Brumfit 91).

Another interviewed teacher, David, also complained about the impossibility of organizing group work due to the lack of control over the students' activity. He further pointed out that sometimes the teacher did all the talking when eliciting the participation of a weaker student: "With the weaker students I ask the questions, and then I have to be the one to give the answers, too, because they can't".

Thus the profile of the EFL teacher was sometimes far from the one sketched by Communicative Language Teaching and closer to the one promoted by the Grammar-Translation and Audio-Lingual Methods. The teachers may shy away from adopting the role of facilitator and mere participant in the learning process due to the lack of an organized form of instruction that would inform the teachers of their duties in a communicative classroom.

Although officially CLT was dominant in Romanian EFL classes, the socio-cultural circumstances there encouraged the use of techniques associated with other methods as well. The discussion of the approaches used in Romanian schools continues in the next chapter where further characteristics of the EFL classroom will be analyzed.

Chapter V: Failures and successes in contemporary Romanian EFL

During the interviews conducted for this project, the teachers pointed out certain problems that emerged in relation to the implementation of the Communicative Approach in Romania, and some of the articles and books published since 1990 also pointed out some negative aspects about teaching foreign languages there.

The transition from a traditional to a modern classroom was by no means a smooth one, and the lack of guidance on the part of the Ministry and the local Board of Education did not help either. The participants in the educational process had to adapt and improvise, as teachers were left to make sense of the new approach on their own. Eventually, the implementation of the Communicative Approach took unique forms, as a result of the teachers' efforts to make sense of it and adapt it to the needs of the Romanian students.

Qualified teachers

According to H. Douglas Brown, "[s]ome of the characteristics of CLT make it difficult for a nonnative speaker who is not very proficient in the second language to teach effectively" (44), so in order to successfully implement communicative activities in the classroom, the teacher had to be very well-prepared. Yet, one of the most urgent problems the Romanian educational system faced was the lack of qualified teachers, especially in rural areas. When the Ministry of Education required in 1995 the introduction of foreign languages as early as second grade, the existing number of teachers did not cover the needs. Cunita et al. stated in 1997 that this problem was still serious, especially as many young graduates would choose to work for businesses that,

due to the opening of the market towards the Western countries, needed English speakers and were willing to pay better wages than what was offered in education (18).

In order to address this problem, the schools hired substitute teachers every year. These substitutes were generally people who only graduated from high school or who held a college degree in a field that did not have any openings. Thus many English teachers had trained to be engineers or lawyers and had to fulfill only two requirements: prove that they had taken English classes before, and take a yearly exam, without even having to pass it.

According to the information published by Cunita et al, during the school year 1996-1997 68% of the people teaching English in urban schools were qualified, 15.5% had other qualifications, while 16.3% had only completed high school. The situation was much worse in rural schools, where only 14.5% of the English teachers had proper qualifications, 30.8% had other qualifications and 54.5% were high school graduates (44).

Continuing education

Another fact that made the transition period hectic was the lack of instruction the teachers got before they were asked to implement the new curriculum. When the guidelines were finally released by the Ministry of Education, they suggested a change from the traditional teacher-centered classroom to the communicative one, but no instruction was provided for the teachers on how to do that. The only materials they got were the new national syllabus and copies of the alternative textbooks without any other recommendations. There were some books on the communicative approach that could be found at private vendors for Oxford and Longman publishing houses, and universities

recommended them to their students, so the younger teachers were more likely to be familiar with modern teaching methodologies. However, the teachers who had already graduated probably never heard of student-centered classroom, or, for that matter, of Communicative Language Teaching, because they went to school at a time when the traditional method was the default.

The Board of Education started to organize periodic trainings meant to prepare the teachers to implement CLT in their classrooms. The problem, however, was that these sessions did not reach a large segment of the EFL teachers, probably due to the fact that the teachers would have to go for the training on their own time and money. Approximately 58.8 % of the teachers completing the survey declared that they have never attended a training session explaining the new curriculum released in the 1990s.

A consequence of the lack of instruction on how to use CLT was the fact that some teachers had a hard time understanding the theoretical underpinning of the new approach imposed by the Ministry. The teachers were asked during each interview to mention the name of the preferred approach when teaching EFL, and most times they seemed at a loss for words. Furthermore, a young teacher with a four-year experience in the field, David, confessed: "The only times when we talk about teaching methods is once a year during the educators' meeting, and even then we really just watch someone teach a couple of classes to the best of his ability and then we go home. We can teach using any method we wish; there is not a definite guideline regarding that".

David did mention though that seminars were needed to explain how to teach according to the new curriculum and using the alternative textbooks, and especially "older teachers needed that, but no such seminars were organized". Thus, although the

teachers had to adopt a new curriculum based on new textbooks, the Ministry failed to offer them guidance and assistance, assuming that the teachers could simply shift from a traditional method to CLT on their own. Consequently, many did not grasp the essence of the new approach and reverted back to the better-known Grammar-Translation Method. Grammar, for instance, was downplayed in the new curriculum as consequence of the shift in the classroom goals, yet there were teachers who brought extra grammar drills to class because they felt that the new textbooks did not focus on grammar enough (Ada, Cati), and the students were in danger of uttering an incorrect sentence. Along the same lines, five out of thirty-four teachers complained in the survey that the alternative textbooks do not have enough drills.

The British Council and some British private publishing houses releasing textbooks in Romania, for instance Longman and Oxford, saw that the school system had failed to train its instructors properly in the intricacies of CLT, and they started to offer courses for the interested teachers. These seminars, however, were not free, and the schools were not able to pay or offer credit for them, so participating in one would help the teachers be better prepared to face the challenges of CLT, but it would cost them money and personal time. Out of the thirty-four teachers responding the survey, only four attended such trainings, two of them in Bucharest and two in the United Kingdom.

Availability of textbooks and other materials

The textbooks schools had since Communist times were outdated, while the information coming from various sources like magazines, TV, and practical courses published abroad could now be acquired easily. Because the new textbooks were not printed until the mid 1990s, the teachers had to use the old ones even after 1989, and

even when the new textbooks became available for purchase, schools could not afford them right away, and neither could most of the students. In order to solve this problem, some teachers like Cati had their students pair up and buy one textbook per pair, and then they asked them to donate the books to the schools once they were done with that particular grade. The school system eventually found the money to buy enough textbooks and starting with year 2000 this seemed to be less of a problem in urban and suburban schools.

Yet, about 44.1% of the teachers included in the survey were still forced to use the old textbooks. The lack of funds for purchasing the new textbooks and the other materials needed for a successful communicative lesson was especially severe in rural areas where the old textbooks were still in use as late as 2005. David, one of the few young teachers who agreed to commute for an hour and fifteen minutes to teach at a village school in Cuca, Arges, complained that only one or two students in his class had the new textbooks, while everyone else had to study from the same textbooks as their parents twenty years before. David was trained to teach the Communicative Approach, but the old textbooks focused on grammar and translation. In order to be able to employ some communicative activities in the classroom, he tried to encourage more students to purchase the books, and he also made a few copies of his own alternative textbooks that he would carry with him from one class to another.

Ada, on the other hand, used only alternative textbooks with her students, as the suburban school where she was employed was able to provide them. She complained, though, that the school did not agree to buy any supplementary materials like tapes and exercise books, and it did not provide audiovisual equipment either. As she wanted to

encourage her students to be able to hear target language speakers, Ada herself purchased the tapes designed for the alternative textbooks, and used her own tape player.

Each textbook came with an exercise book, and this was a complete novelty for foreign language teaching in Romania. Before the 1990s, only mathematics textbooks had exercise books, but when the alternative textbooks were introduced on the market, they came with exercise books as well. The latter, however, were not provided by the school, and it was the responsibility of the students to purchase them. As a consequence, they were not used countrywide because many students could not afford them (Cunita et al. 48). Two of the teachers surveyed considered the lack of exercise books as one of the major complaints they had about the implementation of CLT in Romania.

Choice of materials

When the new textbooks were released in 1995, choosing what alternative textbook to recommend to the students became another challenge for the teachers who had never been asked before to take such an important decision, and were not instructed by the Ministry on what made a good textbook. The teachers were left to decide on their own, and evaluate the textbooks according to personal standards. This was especially hard between 1995 and 2000 when they still had to work with the old curricula, so they did not have proper guidelines to guide them.

The most successful textbooks had British authors and were printed in Great Britain, like the Splash series for primary school students, but some were printed in Romania by non-native speakers (school teachers and university assistants). When interviewed for this project, primary and secondary school teacher Ada bluntly explained her preference for the British textbooks:

> I have noticed more problems with the books made by Romanians; for example the text, the reading part is too long, they don't have assessment materials, they don't have enough grammar exercises, or they have too many…the percentage of skills in not balanced. I usually prefer books form Oxford [the publishing company]….The British textbook is better; it has posters and a tape and cassettes and CD's, but you need to buy them. The state offers you the textbook, and you need to buy the rest if you are going to use them.

Organizing the classroom activity

Traditionally, a Romanian classroom was teacher-fronted, probably as a consequence of the grammar-translation method being employed in schools for such a long time. The type of social hierarchy existent in Romania also fueled the perpetuation of the teacher-dominated classroom. Teachers were much respected and feared by the students who showed that respect and fear from the very moment an instructor would walk into a classroom by standing up while greeting. The parents generally encouraged this attitude and usually supported the teacher's suggestions. Although a good educational environment should be based on respect, too much of it could interfere with the sincere communication between teacher and student.

Some of the activities endorsed by CLT required a change in the teacher's status and the role of the teacher needed to be reevaluated. According to Codruta Stanisoara, "new roles should be assigned to educators generally" (62) as a result of "profound changes of the school system in itself and of mentality, too" (64). Stanisoara compared the two typical profiles at work in Romanian schools, pointing out that, ideally, there

should be a shift from the traditional to the modern teacher as characterized in the table below (67):

Traditional	*Cooperative-Modern*
Evaluator	→consultant
Director	→observer
Distant	→friendly, approachable
Omnipresent	→visitor
Imparter of knowledge	→participant in the process of knowledge
Authority	→'learner among learners'
Frontal person	→facilitator of learning in small groups
Controller	→facilitator

Yet, some of these roles modern teachers should play did not seem congruent with a typical classroom in Romania. Something as little as the fact that the students' desks were generally bolted to the floor prevented an arrangement that would encourage collaborative learning and equal status among the participants in the learning process. Some of the teachers interviewed (Ada, David, Cati, and Elena) confessed that they avoided the role of "facilitator of learning in small groups" (67) because the students did not perform well when they were not closely supervised by an omnipresent teacher.

Testing

According to Stanisoara, in CLT testing was downplayed as the teacher became a "consultant" (67), and not an evaluator. A consequence of this shift was the reduced number of tests in the alternative textbooks, yet Ada, for instance, saw that as a slip on the part of the textbook authors, and came up with the tests herself.

Although teaching grammar was not a priority any more and communicative activities became the stated purpose of the classroom, the high school graduation exam, called *bacalaureat*, still required the understanding of complex grammatical rules, and for the 2005 *bacalaureat,* the exam subjects based on grammar were worth a third of the total score (see Appendix 13). Thus, the teachers were likely to insist on making the students learn grammar rules, practice translating texts, and rephrasing sentences in preparation for this very important exam, feeling the pressure to help the students pass the *bacalaureat* as successfully as possible.

Using the target language in the classroom

The English class was a good opportunity for the students to be exposed to the target language. Unlike the students from urban schools who often supplemented this input with television shows and music imported from English-speaking countries, the students in the rural areas depended exclusively on the contact with the target language they had during the English class. Consequently, many teachers believed that it was very important to reduce or eliminate the use of Romanian in the classroom in order to expose the students to as much English as possible. This approach, however, went against the tradition because the Grammar-Translation Method employed until the 1990s encouraged the extensive use of the native language during the English class.

The general tendency, however, showed that the percentage of English heard or spoken by the students did not change that much. Out of the teachers taking the survey, five marked down that they speak approximately 75 % of the time they spend in class, ten vocalized about 50 % of the time, and only three teachers tried to speak only 25% of the time they were in front of the students. Older teachers, like Cati, considered that it was

vital to prevent any confusion when teaching, so she spoke Romanian each time the grammatical, lexical or conversational item seemed difficult to understand. Other teachers, like Ada and David, explained that the younger students need to hear more of their native language, but older students can handle long stretches of the target language only. Thus the age of the students combined with the years of English taken in school determined the amount of the target language uttered, but the teacher's decision to use the native language in the EFL class with younger students prevented the latter from hearing as much of the target language as possible at earlier ages when acquisition was easier and faster. Yet, the teachers were not to blame for not providing enough input because they did not get the necessary training that would allow them to plan communicative activities tailored to the student's age and skill level.

Another way of dividing the class time between English and Romanian was mentioned by David who declared that "good students talk a lot and I only correct the mistakes, but in the case of weak students I do the asking, and then I have to do the answering, too". This split within the group between students who were able to perform well in the target language and those who never went beyond "hello" was an overwhelming reality mentioned by all the teachers interviewed, and it was the result of the fact that students were randomly grouped together, with no concern about their level.

Discussing the percentage of time the students were heard during the session, Codruta Stanisoara wrote that "there is the possibility that not everyone speaks during a class hour is the teacher does not call on them" (68). She acknowledged Godlad's findings, confirming that "teachers on average do almost 80% of the talking in the classroom, without taking into account time taken for management" (68). The teachers

interviewed, however, pointed out that it depended on the group of students and the percentage of time the teachers speak varies. David, for instance, explained that with some groups of students he needs to speak 80% of the time, while the students participate only 20%, but in the case of well-prepared groups, the percentage is reversed.

Group work

A major component of the communicative approach was the accent laid on developing collaborative skills through group work. Yet, some teachers were not comfortable having the students work in groups, feeling that anything beyond pair work failed miserably. The students did not perform well when they were put in unsupervised groups due in part to the lack of collaborative work outside the English class. Because of this lack of practice, the students did not generally understand the principles of group work, and spent most of the time talking in Romanian about things not related to the topic. Ada tried collaborative activities, but she ended up with frustration only because, as she said:

> English is the only subject where they work in pairs, and they are not used to [it], so it becomes a mess….It is very difficult for them to work in groups maybe because they are not used to it…they can't come to a common thing, … they can't agree, they can't decide, so it is difficult. Sometimes I just leave away the [collaborative] projects and do something else".

It was not only the students who had a hard time understanding how working in groups should occur, as teachers also struggled with this way of organizing the class activity. They got minimal, if any, instruction on the new methods and on organizing collaborative activities. This could be said especially in the case of the older teachers who

graduated from college before 1989. Cati, for instance, complained during her interview that she had been teaching for twenty-five years when she was asked to change her teaching style, and when she tried to encourage students to work in groups and take charge of what happened in the classroom, she was not comfortable with the change. She avoided group work, and now and then she would use pair work, but only with very controlled drills.

Although the new approach encouraged a student-centered classroom, many teachers were not ready to give up the absolute control of the students, and avoided group work because they felt like they could not keep a tight control over the students. Two of the surveys contain comments about how noisy and unfocused the students are when they work in groups, mainly as a result of the large number of students. There were regularly between twenty-eight and thirty-three students in a classroom, a deterrent for Ada who declared during the interview that group work "is effective if the students aren't more than fifteen in a class. In my class, I think it's not effective".

Conclusion

During the interviews and in the surveys, the teachers pointed out several instances when the socio-political-cultural circumstances, on the one hand, and the components of the educational process, on the other hand, made the implementation of the communicative approach rather difficult. In order to respond to the needs of the students to the best of their ability, the instructors often chose to substitute communicative activities with exercises that followed the principles of other approaches and methods employed in EFL, like the Grammar-Translation Method or the Audio-Lingual Approach. Rather than improvising a communicative activity whose

underpinnings were never explained to them, teachers felt safer going back to grammar drills and translations.

Looking back at the past fifteen years, one of the teachers interviewed remarked that the reform of the school system had taken too long, mainly because it wasn't planned right from the beginning. Another factor slowing down the reform was the difficulty in balancing the huge amount of information pouring in from other countries with a tradition in EFL and ESL with the rigidity of the traditional classroom. At the same time, the teachers noted that the lack of resources posed problems when trying to implement the new approach.

The school system is likely to eventually find its balance. Since 1989 until 2005, some of the textbooks disappeared from the market, and only the ones the teachers thought better remained. The British Council now has a big library in Bucuresti, with branches in some of the important cities, making methodology books available to all interested teachers. Foundations and publishing houses like Longman or Oxford have began offering courses for teachers who want to get some official training in applying the Communicative Approach. Moreover, the teachers overall seem to acknowledge that they "should express more openness, flexibility and empathy" (Stanisoara 64) while implementing whatever strategies work for each classroom environment, whether modern or traditional.

Chapter VI: The Romanian experience in global perspective

As late as 2005, the implementation of the Communicative Approach in Romania was still an ongoing process, although it had started more than ten years before, in 1995, when the new communicative textbooks were released on the Romanian market. The length of the process was not unusual, though, because China, for instance, was still working on implementing CLT, although secondary schools there had started using it in the 1980s.

Just like other school systems where English was studied as a foreign language, the Romanian system experienced several problems trying to implement CLT. Researchers from China, Hong Kong, and South Korea mentioned the following factors that may be responsible for the rocky start CLT had in Romania and other TESEP countries:

- CLT is designed to meet the needs of an ESL classroom, and that is different from an EFL environment. South Korean Defeng Li claims that CLT is designed for ESL classes, and it is unlikely to work in an EFL setting because there are major differences between the two, for instance the students' motivation, the opportunities for real life interaction, or the lack of authentic materials
- The new curriculum does not take into account the socio-cultural characteristics of the country where it is implemented. Adrian Holliday considers this the main obstacle preventing the success of CLT in Egypt
- The resources are often scarce or non-existent. Zhenhui Rao complains about the scarcity of authentic language materials in China

- The number of qualified teachers does not cover the needs, especially in rural areas. David Carless, for instance, points out that 55% of the teachers in Hong Kong are not qualified
- The teachers do not get enough training and are not aware of the principles specific to CLT. Carless also points out that qualified teachers do not understand the new approach due to lack of specific training in CLT
- Sometimes the principles of CLT are not completely understood by all the participants in the learning process. Rao explains that the misconceptions Chinese students have about CLT lead to a negative attitude towards the activities specific to this approach, and they prefer the traditional way of teaching
- The students' study habits may go against some of the requirements specific to communicative activities. The Egyptian students described by Holliday have a hard time accepting an inductive approach in grammar, just because they are used to learning deductively
- Finally, the teachers sometimes say they employ CLT because they know that this is the fashionable approach, but they keep using the old methods with which they are more familiar. LoCastro wrote that Japanese teachers of English claimed that they taught CLT, but they used GT instead.

All these problems were mentioned in several articles describing the implementation of CLT in other TESEP countries, and they were not specific to Romanian schools only. Some different aspects, though, came up during the interviews and in the survey, and may be more important in Romania than everywhere else. There

was a general difference, for instance, between rural schools on one hand, and urban and suburban ones on the other, in the sense that rural schools often lacked any resources (books, tapes, or exercise-books), and their teachers were mostly substitutes unqualified to teach.

Another area where the Romanian system of education seemed to face more problems than other TESEP countries was mentioned by David during the interview. He stated that a big percentage of teachers did not received any training on how to implement the new method recommended by the Ministry or on how to work with the communicative textbooks. Twenty out of the thirty-four teachers responding the survey designed for this study stated that they never participated in workshops presenting the Communicative Method, although *Inspectoratul scolar* (the Board of Education), the British Council, and several other British organizations offered these workshops free or at a relatively low cost.

Another feeble attempt to organize continuing education, i.e. the quarterly teachers' meetings, was meant to give some depth into the best way to include the new approach in the classroom activity. However, as David pointed out, teachers hosting the meeting at their schools did a demonstrative lesson in front of their colleagues, but they seldom strived to include communicative activities, probably because they did not have the theoretical understanding of CLT principles.

Despite these differences, the difficulties Romanian schools had when implementing CLT were similar with what happened in other TESEP countries, so it was probable that the EFL specialists could come up with the same solution to those problems, regardless of the country they were discussing. Holliday, Carless, LoCastro,

Li, Rao, Guangwei Hu, Nicos Sifakis, Obilisteanu, Mihaila-Lica, and Cunita et al., all suggested two solutions to the problems, namely the need to adapt rather then adopt CLT, and the need to use a combination of approaches and methods rather than the Communicative Approach by itself.

Keeping these suggestions in mind, it seems important to adapt CLT to the characteristics of each environment because the circumstances in a particular school may decide its success. Maybe a change of mentality is needed, and that takes time. In the past group work, for instance, was unlikely to have an immediate success in Romanian classrooms because the teachers did not know how to organize it and were also afraid of giving up the tight control of the group. Moreover, the students were not used to this type of activity, they rarely had a genuine desire to use the target language unless the teacher was listening, they were used to being prompted and closely supervised by the teacher at all times, and they complained that the classroom setting, i.e. the way the desks were designed and arranged, was not conducive to working in groups. Thus, in order to have successful group work in a Romanian classroom, a change of mentality is necessary: the teacher needs to offer the students more freedom, while the students need to take charge of their learning and work not because they are afraid of the teacher, but because they want to accomplish something in the EFL classroom.

In addition to time for change, the school system also needs qualified teachers who are familiar with the principles behind CLT because teachers cannot put into practice something they hardly understand at a theoretical level. Once the teachers become familiar with CLT, then they can take an active role in implementing it and then modifying it in order to meet the needs of the classroom. The rigid implementation of

CLT needs to be replaced by an approach formulated by the EFL teachers who not only understand what communicative teaching is, but are familiar with the socio-cultural context in which CLT is used. In the end, Romanian teachers and researchers have to come up with a culture-sensitive Communicative Approach of their own.

The benefits of having the teachers and researchers adopting an active role in introducing CLT in the local school system are obvious. They are aware of what is likely to work or fail in the EFL classroom because they understand the local culture, as members of that culture. For instance, local teachers understand that it is hard in Romania to share the power with the students because the power structure there has always been very rigid, and the students get confused if the teachers step down from their dominant position. Teachers are also likely to know the students' expectations and biases, and Romanian instructors, for instance, are aware that the students did not trust the information coming from their peers and are looking at the teacher and the textbook as the only sources of valid information. Teachers already know what needs to change or what needs to be left untouched, and, for instance, students still need to focus on reading because they are likely to use this skill in the future to be able to access current information on the Internet and to read printed materials that may help them in their career.

The characteristics of the local culture may lead the teachers to believe that one method alone cannot respond to all the needs of the EFL classroom and a combination of various approaches should be used with the students. The teachers interviewed for this study, for instance, declared that they often followed principles specific to the traditional Grammar-Translation Method or the Audio-Lingual Approach because they made sense

in the context of the classroom. They preferred to explicitly teach grammar, for instance, because the students already had a good understanding of how grammar works from their Romanian language classes.

A combination of approaches may also help the older teachers who have been using other methods than CLT for years and may feel lost if they are required to use the Communicative Approach only. These teachers could already have a defined teaching style developed throughout the years, and they may develop dislike for the new approach if they are forced into using it exclusively, which would imply a complete change of style. CLT can eventually find its place in the EFL classroom if it is tactfully introduced little by little and not forced into the curriculum.

Although the introduction of Communicative Language teaching in Romania has not caused any major crisis so far, some problems have occurred in the past fifteen years. There are, however, ways to avoid these problems in the future, if the teachers take an active role in planning and implementing a culture-sensitive CLT-based curriculum. Encouraging the local teachers to come up with their own version of CLT and to use a multitude of approaches in the classroom can be the first steps towards developing a curriculum that not only responds to the needs of the classroom, but also aligns Romanian education with other successful systems throughout the world.

Appendix 1

These are the ninth grade alternative textbooks for the school year 2004-2005, as they are listed in Concursul national unic pentru ocuparea posturilor didactice declarate vacante in invatamantul preuniversitar: Programa pentru limba si literatura engleza.

MANUALE APROBATE PENTRU 2004-2005

CLASA a IX-a

LIMBA 1 (First foreign language)

Pathway to English – English My Love-L1, Rada Bălan, Miruna Carianopol, Ştefan Colibaba, Cornelia Coşer, Veronica Focşeneanu, Vanda Stan, Rodica Vulcănescu, E. D. P.;

Language in Use Intermediate; A. Doff, C.Jones; Cambridge University Press;

Upstream Intermediate Plus; Virginia Evans, Jenny Dooley, Express Publishing;

Mission 1, Virginia Evans, Jenny Dooley, Express Publishing;

Enterprise 4 Intermediate, Virginia Evans, Jenny Dooley, Express Publishing;

Click on 4, Virginia Evans, Neil O'Sullivan, Express Publishing;

Rising Star Pre-First Certificate, Luke Prodromou, Macmillan;

Prospects Intermediate, Ken Wilson, James Taylor, Macmillan;

Inside Out Intermediate, Sue Kay, Vaughan Jones, Jon Hird, Macmillan;

Going for Gold Upper Intermediate + Literature Companion 1, Richard Acklam, Araminta Grace, Pearson Education – Longman;

Opportunities Intermediate, Michael Harris, David Mower, Anna Sikorzynska, Pearson Education – Longman.

Appendix 2

Interviews

The interviews will start from the questions used in the survey, and the discussion will focus on the adaptation of the communicative method to the characteristics of the Romanian system of education. Here are the twenty questions in the survey and a few more; however, the interviewer will eventually use this list only as a prompt for the discussion.

Classroom Settings

1. What are the necessary materials and equipment in a lab? What do you normally use during your class?
2. What textbook do you use? What determined you to choose it?
3. What percentage of the classroom activity is based around the textbook and how much on other materials?
4. Name a few problems you have noticed with the new textbooks.
5. Except for the textbook, what other teaching aides do you employ in class?

Traditional Method

6. Did you ever use the traditional grammar-translation method employed in Romanian schools before the 1990s?
7. If possible, could you mention a few differences between the traditional grammar-translation method and communicative method?
8. Do you think that the traditional method is better than the communicative one, and in what way?

9. What did you like about the traditional method? Are there some things you still use?

Communicative Method

10. When did you start using the communicative method?
11. In your words, please describe this new method.
12. How did you train in the communicative method? For instance, did you learn about it in college, during the regular yearly training sessions, or did the local Board of Education (*Inspectorat*) organize special workshops?
13. Please name some classroom variables that have changed once the communicative method replaced the grammar-translation one, (for instance number of students, etc).
14. How effective do you think this approach is?
15. Name some activities you like to use to teach:
    - Listening
    - Reading
    - Speaking
    - Writing
16. How often do the students work in groups? Please list some pros and cons of group work.
17. What activities work best in the classroom, and why?
18. What activities usually fail in classroom, and why?
19. Overall, do students seem to respond to this method better than to the grammar-translation one?

20. What are the downfalls you have noticed about this method?
21. Do you think that the communicative method is better than the traditional one, and in what way?
22. What seems to motivate the children? Do you see a change in motivation between this method and the traditional one?
23. How much are the students influenced by their own culture during the English class? For instance, do boys tend to show less knowledge, for fear of posing as nerds?
24. Do you think that Romanian is ready for this method or is better off with the grammar-translation one? Why?
25. What can be done to ease the implementation of the communicative approach in Romania?

Appendix 3

The Implementation of the Communicative Approach in Romanian Schools

Survey

Classroom Settings:

Number of students/classroom	Number of students who own their textbook	Number of English sessions/week	Language lab usage percent time/week	English usage percent time/session

1. What are the necessary materials and equipment in a lab? What do you normally use during your class?
2. What textbook do you use? What determined you to choose it?
3. What teaching aides do you use?

Traditional Method

4. Did you ever use the traditional grammar-translation method employed in Romanian schools before the 1990s?
5. If possible, could you mention a few differences between the traditional grammar-translation method and communicative method?
6. What did you like about the traditional method? Are there some things you still use?

Communicative Method

7. When did you start using the communicative method?
8. In your words, please describe this new method.

9. How did you train in the communicative method? For instance, did you learn about it in college, during the regular yearly training sessions, or did the local Board of Education (*Inspectorat*) organize special workshops?
10. Please name some classroom variables that have changed once the communicative method replaced the grammar-translation one, (number of students, for instance).
11. How effective do you think this approach is?
12. Name some activities you like to use to teach:
    - Listening
    - Reading
    - Speaking
    - Writing
13. What activities work best in the classroom, and why?
14. What activities usually fail in classroom, and why?
15. Overall, do students seem to respond to this method better than to the grammar-translation one?
16. What are the downfalls you have noticed about this method?
17. Do you think that the traditional method is better than the communicative one, and in what way?
18. Do you think that the communicative method is better than the traditional one, and in what way?
19. What seems to motivate the children? Do you see a change in motivation between this method and the traditional one?

20. Do you think that Romanian is ready for this method or is better off with the grammar-translation one? Why?

Appendix 4

EFL in Romania Survey

Please address the following questions and statements with regard to the present situation teaching English as a Foreign Language in Romania. Circle whatever option seems to best describe your classroom activity.

1. Is the reform of the curriculum still ongoing?

Yes No

2. What method/approach do you employ when you teach?

Grammar-Translation Audio-Lingual

Communicative Notional-Functional

A combination of several approaches (please list them here):

3. Do you use only the new alternative textbooks?

Yes No

4. Do you prefer the textbooks published in UK by British authors?

Yes No

5. Do you think the alternative textbooks you are using with your students have

- Enough grammar explanations and definitions

Yes No

- A balanced presentation of the four skills

Yes No

- A presentation and materials that interest the students

Yes No

6. Did you ever attend a training explaining the new curriculum released in the late 1990s?

Yes No

Additional questions:

- Who organized the training?
- How many hours of training did you get?
- What do you remember from that training?

- Were you explained how to use the new textbooks?
- What was most helpful in understanding the new approach?

7. Do you ever use the resources provided by the British Council?

Yes No

Additional question: What other resources do you use when you prepare your lesson?

8. On average, what percentage of time do you use group work?

25% 50% 75% 100%

9. On average what percentage of time does the teacher speak during the English class?

25% 50% 75% 100%

10. Do you use audio and video tapes?

Yes No

11. Do your students use exercise books?

Yes No

12. What do you want your students to be able to do at the end of the school year? Please mark the importance of the following on a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being the most important and 5 the least important.

Communicate in an accurate manner Understand how language works

Learn about the target language culture Simply communicate

Use real-life language

13. In as many words as you wish, please describe the main objectives you follow when you teach.

14. Please single out some of the problems you are facing when you try to implement the new curriculum and use the alternative textbooks.

15. Please list the strengths of your teaching style.

Appendix 5

E. **How do people apologise** (sic)**? Read this:**

Apologies:	*Replies to apologies*
1. Sorry. I'm sorry I'm so sorry. *(The intonation goes down)*	1. That's all right That's O.K. Never mind.
2. I'm sorry to be such a trouble. to cause you all this trouble.	2. Nonsense! There's no trouble at all. It's no trouble at all, really.

Make apologies and replies to them for these situations:

1. .You are late for school.
2. You have lost your mother's pen.
3. You have asked someone for a lot of information.
4. It was raining heavily but your friend came to bring you the book you needed.
5. Someone has spent a lot of time helping you to find your way to Brasov.

You are on the bus and you are struggling to get to the door, as you must get of at the next stop. (Georgiana Farnoaga and Doris Bunaciu. Limba Engleza: Manual pentru clasa a VIII-a (anul IV de studiu) 78)

Appendix 6

The presentation of theoretical grammar has changed throughout the years. Initially, the complex explanations were provided in Romanian, and some drills in English would follow. This can be observed in a textbook from 1964 presenting the cases when the zero article is used:

1) Absenta articolului (sistematizare)

Articolul nu se foloseste:

a) inaintea celor mai multe nume proprii:

Bucharest, John, Smith, Shakespeare

b) inaitea substantivelor la plural, atunci cand acestea sunt folosite in sensul lor cel mai general; de exemplu:

Children like to play.

c) inaintea substantivelor nume de materie si abstractiuni, folosite in sensul lor cle mai general; de exemplu:

Chalk is white – Creta este alba.

Electrical energy exists in the form of electro-magnetic waves. – Energia electica exista sub forma undelor electro-magnetice.

Long live *Peace*!

d) inaitea anumitelor substantive diviziuni ale timpului; de exemplu:

In March. In summer.

e) in unele expresii si constructii; de exemplu:

at shool; to school; at breakfast.

Exercise:

Inserati articolele (acolo unde sunt necesare):

Petrica! Go to … blackboard and write … following sentence: "… capital of the Rumanian People's Republic is Bucharest." Yesterday there was … meeting at our plant; worker spoke at …meeting and said many interesting things about … work of their workshop.

Last summer we decided to go on … trip to … seaside. We went to … North Station early in … morning. … weather was fine.

(Maria Taranu, Leon Levitchi and Sarah Medregan 55)

Later on, the explanations were given in English. In the textbook for third year of study designed in 1983 and revised in 1990, the review of the passive voice is done in English:

Remember to use the *Passive Voice*:

1. When **the subject is passive** and something happens to it:
2. *The baby is dressed every day.* (He can't dress itself).
3. When **the action is important** and not who did it. (especially in science texts):

Hydrogen is mixed with oxygen. (We are not interested who does it).

4. We can say **who performed the action** using **by+ (pro)noun.**

*This composition was written **by Alice (not by Eliza).***

5. We don't use *people, we, they, some* in **BY phrases.**

Your book has been found (by someone).

The tenses and the rules for their use are the same for the Active Voice:

Tense:	*Active Voice*	*Passive Voice:*
Present Tense:	They *build* many new blocks of flats in our town every year.	Many new blocks of flats **are built** in out town every year.
Past Tense:	They *built* this hospital last year.	This hospital **was built** last year.
Present Perfect:	They *have just built* a community centre.	The community centre **has just been built**.
Past Perfect:	They *had built* the new hotel before we moved to the town.	The new hotel **had been built** before we moved to the town.
Future Tense:	They *will build* a new town hall next year.	A new town hall **will be built** next year.
Modal Verbs:	You *must keep* your town clean.	The town **must be kept** clean.

13. What happens on your birthday *every year*?

Example:

My friends (*be invited*)
My friends are invited.

1. All the rooms (*be aired*).
2. Nice food (*be cooked*).
3. Cakes (*be made*).
4. Pepsi-cola (*be bought*).

5. My Sunday clothes (*be cleaned for me*).
6. The table (*be laid*).
7. All my friends (*be invited*).
8. Funny games (*be played*).
9. The T.V. programme (*be watched*).
10. Jokes (*be told*).

(Georgiana Farnoaga and Doris Bunaciu. Limba Engleza: Manual pentru anul III de studiu 146-47)

Appendix 7

1. *Situation:* there are some things that young people may do, but little children may not. **Make sentences about them:**

go to the cinema alone
A youth **may** go to the cinema alone. A little child may not go/ mustn't go to the cinema alone.

1. cross the street on its own;
2. drive a car;
3. go to the mountain alone;
4. work in a factory;
5. do experiments in the Chemistry lab;
6. go to a youth camp.

3. **Situation:** You were ill last week and the doctor allowed you to do only certain things. Now you are telling your friends what you were and what you were not allowed to do.

Example:

drink tea/drink milk
I was allowed to drink tea. **I wasn't allowed to drink** milk.

1. eat vegetables/ eat meat and eggs;
2. drink tea/ drink pepsi cola;
3. play in my room/ play in the garden;
4. listen to the radio/watch T.V.;
5. draw/read;
6. walk in the garden/run.

4. Situation: Adrian and Eliza are talking about the things Adrian will be allowed to do after he finishes his homework.

Example:

go out
Adrian: **I won't be allowed to go out** until I finish my homework. *Eliza:* Well, but you**'ll be allowed to go out** after you finish it.

1. play football;
2. go to the cinema;
3. watch T.V.
4. have a walk;
5. go swimming;
6. talk on the phone;

5. **Say:** a) three things **you were not allowed to do** when you were younger;

b) three things your mother says **you may do** now as you are 13 years old;

c) three things **you will be allowed to do** when you are 18 years old.

(Georgiana Farnoaga and Doris Bunaciu. Limba Engleza: Manual pentru anul III de studiu 102-4)

Appendix 8

On the Way to the Emerald City

Dorothy and Toto followed the Yellow Brick Road for many miles. After a while they stopped beside a large maize field and sat down to rest. It was a bright sunny day and a light wind was blowing.

Not too far away, high on a pole, Dorothy could see a Scarecrow. The Scarecrow's head was a small sack stuffed with straw. On its face someone had painted two eyes, a nose and a mouth. The Scarecrow was dressed in a blue suit and wore balck shoes and an old straw hat.

While Dorothy was looking at the scarecrow, she suddenly saw its eyes open and look at her. All this seemed very strange to her and she walked up to the scarecrow.

"Good afternoon," said the Scarecrow.

"Did you speak?" asked Dorothy.

"Certainly," answered the Scarecrow. "How are you?"

"I'm very well, thank you," replied Dorothy, "How are *you*?"

"I'm not felling very well high on this pole," said the Scarecrow. "I can't get down."

Dorothy felt sorry for the Scarecrow and helped it down.

"Thank you very much," said the Scarecrow. "I feel like a new man now."

All this seemed very strange for Dorothy. She had never seen a stuffed man who could walk and talk.

"Who are you and where are you going?" asked the Scarecrow.

"My name is Dorothy and I am going to the Emerald City to ask the Great Oz to send me back to Kansas."

But the Scarecrow had never heard of the Great Oz or the Emerald City. He explained to Dorothy that because his head was stuffed with straw he had no brains.

Dorothy felt sorry for the unhappy Scarecrow.

The Scarecrow wanted to know if he could join Dorothy on her journey to the Emerald City. He wondered if the Great Oz would give him some brains. He said to Dorothy, "Do you think that if I go to the Emerald City with you, the Great Oz will give me some brains?"

"I cannot tell," she answered, "but you may come with me if you like. If Oz does not give you any brains, you will be no worse off than you are now."

And so the Scarecrow joined Dorothy and her dog Toto on their journey to the Emerald City.

(*Adapted from:* Frank Baum – *The Wizard of Oz* 24)

(Farnoaga, Georgiana, and Doris Bunaciu. Limba Engleza: Manual pentru clasa a VIII-a (anul IV de studiu) (50-1)

Appendix 9

Waiter, there's a bug on my plate. Delicious!

Fancy a snack? Then why not dig into a bag of mixed fried insects? Or sample a silkworm pupae. *Justin Hunt* on why the most fashionable food at the moment is 'critter cuisine'.

If you are organizing a dinner party and are keen to offer your guests some unusual nibbles, why don't you offer them a plate of insects? While the idea of eating crispy crickets or lightly fried beetles probably fills most of us with absolute horror, insect eating is apparently becoming highly fashionable in dot.com land. Swarms of trendy new media types are reportedly logging wacky Thai food websites and ordering samples of freshly cooked insects to serve at their hip dinner parties.

This bizarre form of snacking – known in some circles as 'critter cuisine' – apparently goes on at Revolution magazine, the glossy bible of the new media industry where, rumor has it, journalists work with open tins of freshly cooked insects sitting on their desks. Not content with revolutionizing the way we work, it now appears that the architects of the new economy want to try to revolutionize what we eat.

Christopher Edwards, an advertising executive at Revolution, would like to see insects re-appraised as food items. He argues that they are high in protein and low in fat. But until attitudes to food fundamentally change he believes there will be only a niche market for edible bugs.

'I think the British are too squeamish,' he explains. 'It's just a case of educating people to try them. I scoffed a cricket. I saw this bug in my hand and thought "Oh my

God, I can't eat it!' It had all its legs and its antennae. They were all there. But I shoved it in and crunched it.'

So how did it taste? 'It was slightly crispy and soft on the inside. It was quite a bland taste,' he says, adding that insect mini-buffets could go down well at parties. 'I think you need to have dips with them – probably some garlic.'

To reassure highly skeptical UK consumers, the Thai food website www.dcothai.com explains that all its bugs are carefully sterilized, preserved and spiced before being packed. But news of the campaign to market insect snacks to the UK has received a mixed response from leading Thai restaurants chefs in this country.

(Ken Wilson, James Taylor, Deirdre Howard-Williams 54)

Appendix 10

c. Now you are going to hear a follow-up news item about the theft, which was broadcast the following day. You will hear a description of the two men who were seen driving away in the Mercedes. Read the text (below) as you listen. It isn't quite the same as what you hear. Some of the differences don't change the details, but others do. Find three changes to the details.

Both men are white. The one who drove the car away is described as tall and well-built, probably in his mid-thirties, with a beard and medium-length fair hair. He was wearing khaki trousers and a leather jacket. The second man is slim, younger than the first man, of average height, with dark closely-cut hair. The witness put the age of the second man at about 25. He was wearing glasses and a tracksuit.

d. Now look at the pictures below. Which men does the newsreader describe?

(Ken Wilson, Mary Tomalin, and Deirdre Howard-Williams 80)

Appendix 11

Remember!

We use the construction am/ are/ is going to in order to express predictions and future plans.

Affirmative Form

1. John is going to watch a serial on T.V. tonight.
2. It's going to rain.
3. She's going to buy a new dress.

Interrogative Form

What are you going to do this afternoon?

I'm going to work in the garden this afternoon.

Negative Form

Are you going to draw a camel?

No, I'm not going to draw a camel. I'm going to draw a giraffe.

What are you going to do this weekend?

Choose the words from the box. You can use both affirmative and negative forms.

play tennis	travel to the moon	see a film at the cinema
play the piano	write a letter	listen to a concert
travel to London	sing a song	

Model:

I am going to play tennis this weekend.

I am not going to play the piano this weekend. (Cristina Ionescu 51)

Appendix 12

BASIC TYPES OF CONDITIONAL SENTENCES

Time reference	**Degree of probability**	**Verb tenses**	
		Conditional clause	Main clause
future	**possible**	**present**	**will**+infinitive
	e.g. If I have time, I'll go see the match.		
		present perfect	**will**+infinitive
	e.g. If you have found a mistake, he will check it again.		
		present	**present**
	e.g. If I hurry, I can catch the beginning of the game.		
		present	**imperative**
	e.g. If you see him, give him the message.		
present or **future**	**improbable**	**past**	**would**+infinitive without **to**
	e.g. If I had time, I would go to see the match.		
past	**impossible** (i.e. the event did not happen)	**past perfect**	**would**+perfect infinitive without **to**
	e.g. If I had had time, I would have gone to see the match.		

We can express hypothetical wishes and desires with:

- The verb *wish* (often for something that may happen)
- The phrase *if only* (often to express longing or regret)

After **wish/ if only** we use:

- A verb in the **past tense** to refer to **present time;**

I **wish** *I didn't have to spend so much time studying.*

If only *I had more time for myself.*

- a verb in the **past perfect** to refer to **past time.**

Now she **wishes** ***she had never met him.***

If only *you had told him where he could find me…*

Though they may be used interchangeably, **if only** expresses more strongly the idea that the situation wished for does not exist, whereas **wish** is used for something that might happen.

(Rada Balan et al. 205)

Appendix 13

The high school graduation exam, *bacalaureat*, is divided in three sections, and each is worth 30 points. Here is the second section from the exam taking place in June-July 2005 in all Romanian high schools, as it appeared in Proba scrisa la limba romana that was released by Ministerul Educatiei Nationale.

Subject 2 **30 points**

a. Translate into English:

Ti s-a intamplat vreodata sa spui lucruri de genul "I ate uita, inseamna ca e fericita de arata asa de bine"? Ei bine, nu pacaleste pe nimeni – poate doar pe tine insati. Ori esti invidioasa, ori iti dai aere de superioritate si ai impresia ca esti mai buna decat toate. Daca te-ai analiza putin, ti-ai da seama care sunt motivele tale reale. Iar data viitoare s-ar putea sa te gandesti de doua ori inaite sa mai faci asemenea observatii.

(Cosmopolitan, 2005)

b. Rephrase the following sentences beginning as shown so that the meaning stays te same:

1. I'm sure it wasn't the coffee that made you ill.

It can't .....

2. I think you'd better not take too much exercise.

If I were you .....

3. It's a pity she said that to him!

I wish .....

4. I like her sense of humour.

What .....

5. Please leave the classroom immediately after the bell ring.

As soon as ……..

c. Complete the following sentences with a suitable word or phrase.

1. I thought this dress looked really nice in the shop, but now I wish I ……it.

2. I can't help admiring his honesty, though I totally ……his points of view.

3. Everyone …….told to be present, ……?

4. It was very ……of him to lose his temper …….something so unimportant.

5. Let's talk this over between you and ……, …….we? (2)

Works Cited

Ada. Personal interview. 30 July 2005.

Ada. "Lesson Plan: Class V A." Class Lesson Plan on EFL. Scoala Generala Stefanesti. 6 March 2003.

Balan, Rada, Miruna Carianopol, Stefan Colibaba, Cornelia Coser, Veronica Focseneanu, Vanda Stan, and Rodica Vulcanescu. Pathway to English: English My Love; Student's Book 9th Grade. Bucuresti: Coresi, 1999.

Brown, H. Douglas. Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 2001.

Carless, David R. "A Case Study of Curriculum Implementation in Hong Kong." System 26 (1998): 353-68. 5 Feb. 2006 <http://journals.ohiolink.edu:20080/local-cgi/send-pdf/060303212900236514.pdf>.

Cati. Personal interview. 3 Aug. 2005.

Clontea, Doina, and Procopie Clontea. A Handbook of English Teaching Methodology. Pitesti: Caligraf Activ, 2001.

Cojan, Corina, Radu Surdulescu, and Anca Tanasescu. Limba engleza: Manual pentru clasa a IX-a. 2nd ed. Bucuresti: Editura Didactica si Pedagogica, 1994.

Cunita, Alexandra, Janeta Draghicescu, Ecaterina Popa, and Dumitru Dorobat. Predarea si invatarea limbilor straine in Romania in perspectiva europeana. Bucuresti: Editura Alternative, 1997.

David. Personal interview. 19 December 2005.

Farnoaga, Georgiana, and Doris Bunaciu. Limba Engleza: Manual pentru anul III de studiu. 2nd ed. Bucuresti: Editura Didactica si Pedagogica, 1990.

Farnoaga, Georgiana, and Doris Bunaciu. Limba Engleza: Manual pentru clasa a VIII-a (anul IV de studiu). 2nd ed. Bucuresti: Editura Didactica si Pedagogica, 1991.

Finocchiaro, Mary, and Christopher Brumfit. The Functional-Notional Approach. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Hanea, Victor. Metodica predarii limbii engleze. Bucuresti: Centrul de Multiplicare, 1973.

Holliday, Adrian. Appropriate Methodology and Social Context. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Hu, Guangwei. "'CLT is best for China' – an untenable absolutist claim." ELT Journal 59 (2005): 65-8. 25 Feb. 2006 <http://journals.ohiolink.edu:20080/local-cqi/send-pdf/06020519563322377791.pdf >.

Ionescu, Cristina. Sally & Mike: Limba engleza: clasa a doua. Bucuresti: Aramis, 1999.

Krashen, Stephen. The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications. London: Longman, 1985.

Li, Defeng. "Teachers' Perceived Difficulties in Introducing the Communicative Approach in South Korea." Innovation in English Language Teaching: A Reader. Ed. David R. Hall and Ann Hewings. London: Routledge, 2001. 149-69.

LoCastro, Virginia. "English Language Education in Japan." Society and the Language Classroom. Ed. Hywel Coleman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 40-59.

Marga, Andrei. Reforma invatamantului in anul 2000. Ministerul Educatiei Nationale. Bucuresti. 31 July 2005 <http://www.edu.ro/inv2000.htm>.

Ministerul Educatiei si Cercetarii. Concursul national unic pentru ocuparea posturilor didactice declarate vacante in invatamantul preuniversitar: Programa pentru limba si literatura engleza. Bucuresti, 2004.

Nunan, David. Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Obilisteanu, Georgeta and Gabriela Mihaila-Lica. "New Tendencies in Teaching Foreign Languages." Online posting. 5 November 2005 <http://www.actrus.ro/biblioteca/anuare/2004/a24pdf>.

Popa, Ecaterina. Aspects of Theory and Practice in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Sibiu: Herman Press, 1995.

Prator, R Clifford and Marianne Celce-Murcia. "An Outline of Language Teaching Approaches." Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Ed. Marianne Celce-Murcia and Lois McIntosh. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc, 1979. 3-5.

Rao, Zhenhui. „Chinese students' perception of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom." System Volume 30: (2002): 85-105. 25 Feb. 2006 <http://journals.ohiolink.edu:20080/local-cqi/send-df/060205202256241524.pdf >.

Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S. Rodgers. Approaches and Methodologies in Language Teaching. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Romania. Ministerul Educatiei Nationale. Notificare nr. 12727/21.09.1998 privind decongestionarea planurilor de invatamant in scoli si licee. 21 September 1998. 31 July 2005 <http://www.edu.ro/no12727.htm>.

Romania. Ministerul Educatiei Nationale. Proba scrisa la limba engleza. Bucuresti: Ministerul Educatiei Nationale, 2005.

Stanisoara, Codruta. "A Portrait of the European English Language Teacher." Education Facing the Contemporary World Problems. Pitesti: Editura Universitatii, 2004.

Taranu, Mariana, Sarah Medregan, and Leon Levitchi. Limba engleza: manual pentru clasa a IX-a. Bucresti: Editura Didactica si Pedagogica, 1964.

Wilson, Ken, Mary Tomalin, and Deidre Howard-Williams. Prospects: Student's Book, Super Advanced. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers Limited, 2002.