
Title	Asian realities in language learning: The case of Singapore
Author(s)	Phyllis Ghim-Lian Chew
Source	<i>CELEA Journal</i> , 29(1), 1-11
Published by	China English Language Education Association

This document may be used for private study or research purpose only. This document or any part of it may not be duplicated and/or distributed without permission of the copyright owner.

The Singapore Copyright Act applies to the use of this document.

ASIAN REALITIES IN LANGUAGE LEARNING : THE CASE OF SINGAPORE¹

Phyllis Ghim Lian Chew
Nanyang Technological University , Singapore

Abstract

Until recently , communicative language teaching (CLT) was the much favored methodology in many Asian countries such as Singapore , Malaysia , India and Hong Kong . CLT began in the late 1970 s in Europe and gained momentum in the 1980 s in many English learning countries all over the world . A whole generation of younger Asians in the 1980 s and 1990 s grew up learning English through the CLT approach in the classroom . This paper will chart the reasons behind the rise and fall of CLT in Singapore and comment on its motivations and effects . It will also share findings from a study with regard to teacher attitudes towards the use of various teaching approaches . The paper will conclude with a discourse on “ Asian Realities ” where the adoption of language methodology is concerned .

Key words

communicative language teaching ; Singapore ; teaching methodology

Introduction

Until recently , Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was the most favored English language teaching methodology in Singapore . CLT started in the late 1970 s in Europe and gain momentum in the early 1980 s in many English learning countries all over the world , and one of these countries was Singapore . A whole generation of Singaporeans in the 1980 s and 1990 s grew up to learning English through the CLT approach in the schools . In this paper , CLT refers generally to increased participation by learners in decisions pertaining to course content as well as a more learner centered style of teaching . It is seen as a general movement in the 1980 s to break away from more traditional kinds of approaches (such as considering language only in terms of grammar and vocabulary) to the more communicative functions that a language may perform (Littlewood 1981 : 94) . It also refers to small group activities as well as role play and games in which learners are given opportunities to use grammatical structures . There is also more emphasis placed on learner s contribution through independent learning and the teacher s role is less dominant . Last but not least , the teacher s role as “ co - communicator ” also places him or her on an equal basis with the learners and help breaks down tension and barriers between them .

This paper will chart the reasons behind the “ rise ” and “ fall ” of CLT in Singapore and comment on its motivations and effects . It will also share findings from an ethnographic study undertaken in the Singapore classroom on English language teaching with regards to teacher attitudes towards the use of various teaching approaches . It will conclude with a discourse on “ Western ” methods , the phenomenon of change , and the suitability of “ Western ” methods in the Asian classroom .

CLT Teaching in Singapore

Like the world at large , Singapore has many distinct races and cultures . Its population of approximately four million is ethnically heterogeneous with about 77 % Chinese , 15 % Malay , 6 % of

Indian origin ,and 2 % of other ethnic definitions . At the time of independence from the British colonial authorities in 1959 ,there were four language stream schools in Singapore :English ,Mandarin ,Malay and Tamil . However ,by the 1970 s ,pupil enrollment in Mandarin ,Malay and English schools took a steep decline as parents were more desirous to send their children to English medium schools ,as that was where the more well paid employment opportunities were . Since then ,English had become the predominant working language in Singapore as well as the preferred lingua franca between the different ethnic groups in the country .² Today ,all schools use English as the medium of instruction and the teaching of English takes up a significant proportion of curriculum time (Batia & Chew 2004) .

In the 1980 s ,the British Council in Singapore was in the forefront in the promotion of teaching English through CLT . Through its close association with the other teacher training institutions of Singapore such as the Regional Language Center and the National Institute of Education ,³ it managed to convince language leaders to promote this “innovative and effective ” way of teaching . Consequently ,in 1985 ,Singapore began to implement the ACT (Active Communicative Teaching) training for in service language teachers . ACT emphasized the importance of language acquisition and the importance of immersing the learner in a print rich and stimulating environment in which the target language was used comprehensively to convey meaning . Teacher trained under ACT were encouraged to use a wide range of communicative teaching strategies to encourage pupil interaction and participation . Lessons tended to take the form of a number of activities and there was only incidental learning of language items . Reading was a starting point for a new experience and extensive reading an important component . ACT also emphasized the appropriacy of language use and the relevance of task based activities (Chew 2005) .

The theories of Canale and Swain (1980) ,Ellis (1984) ,Krashen (1985) were constantly referred to in the pre service and in service training of language teachers . Canale and Swain (Ibid .) differentiated “communicative competence ” from “grammatical competence ” (a knowledge of the linguistic system of the target language) ,“sociolinguistic competence ” (an understanding of the dynamics of conversation) and “discourse competence ” (understanding of interconnectedness of one text to the entire discourse . Richards and Rogers (1986) advocate an emphasis on “function ” rather than “forms ” . Krashen s (1982) Monitor theory proposed that adults have two independent systems for developing ability in second languages —subconscious language acquisition and conscious language learning . Language acquisition is very similar to the process children use in acquiring first and second languages — “natural ” communication —in which speakers are concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding . Following Krashen ,language teachers were urged to simulate conditions for “acquisition ” in their classrooms .

Subsequently ,the language syllabus for Singapore schools was revamped in 1991 to take into account the theoretical foundations behind CLT . This was quite a remarkable change because before this period ,the syllabus (1981) (Ministry of Education 1981) was a structural one where language was perceived as a collection of well practiced habits with a stress on the explicit teaching of vocabulary ,spelling ,phonics and grammar . In contrast ,the 1991 syllabus (Ministry of Education 1991) emphasized “fluency ” rather than “accuracy ” ;and “function ” rather than “form ” . Group work was emphasized and students were encouraged to work together to achieve common goals . More creative types of activities were encouraged such as the use of drama ,role play ,story telling ,poetry ,songs and games as a means of inspiring students to express themselves while enabling them to acquire language skills indirectly . It was the first syllabus in Singapore to view teachers as facilitators rather than as purely knowledge givers . The direct teaching of grammar was discouraged ,in line with the belief that the pupils assimilation of language is more effectively conveyed through the context ,the teacher being primarily a facilitator of the acquisition of language .

The teaching of writing also saw a significant change . Now ,there was an emphasis on the “process ” rather than the “product ” of writing with the theoretical ideas of Elbow (1981) Murray (1983) in the forefront of change . Before ,the teaching of writing was skill based ,with the use of good models as aids . Then ,the teacher taught writing in terms of the organization of key ideas and in terms of the use of good grammar . They would diligently introduce a topic ,talk about it ,perhaps explain how students could write it ,ask the class to write and after the pupils had written their compositions ,they would then check ,

mark ,and return the piece of work .In contrast ,process writing focused on the interaction between the writer ,the reader ,the writer s craft and the content of his writing . Drafting ,revising ,editing ,peer -group conferencing were now encouraged . The “ process ” of writing now became more important than the “ product ” and writing to learn rather than learning to write became the focus of attention .

The Study

A small study was undertaken in 2004 to discover the opinions of primary and secondary school teachers with regards to the use of CLT and process writing in their classrooms . 120 primary and secondary school teachers with a minimum of 5 years teaching experience from 7 neighborhood schools were surveyed . 3 of these schools were primary ones with students aged between 7 and 12 while four were secondary ones with students aged between 13 and 16 . The teachers involved in the survey taught a wide -ranging level of language classes —from Primary 1 to Secondary 4 . The average age of the teachers was 35 years of age and the average years of experience they had in teaching language was 10 .9 years . All had undergone either pre service or in service training in CLT . This age group was targeted as we felt that they would have more knowledge ,experience and opinions with regards to effective teaching and learning classroom processes . At the same time ,they would also have adequate knowledge ,experience and training in new methods . Teachers were asked to fill in a short questionnaire comprising only three questions . Space was provided after each question for them to write their comments (See Appendix) . The results were then tabulated and conveyed to the Heads of Department of English in their respective schools so that these could be shared with their respective teachers . In addition ,we observed 12 language lessons in the school ,which enabled us to glean further insights as to teacher attitudes and preferences in the classroom . Subsequently ,the teachers in these classrooms (10 % of the cohort) were also interviewed as to their personal opinions on syllabus guidelines and teaching methodology .

The following are the results of the study :

Question 1 . Teachers replies to “ I find the CLT approach to be a useful and effective way to teach language in my classroom . ”

Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Not sure (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
11	18	22	42	7

Only 11 % of teachers “strongly agreed ” with the statement while 18 % “agreed ” to the statement . 22 % were “neutral ” ,42 % “disagreed ” and another 7 % “strongly disagreed ” with it . This makes a total of only 29 % who may be said to be “comfortable ” with the use of CLT and who believed that it will help them in their classroom . In the comments section ,these teachers argued that CLT took the drudgery out of the learning process and injected elements of fun and creativity such as in the variety of language tasks and authentic information gap activities .

However ,these teachers were outnumbered by the 49 % (42 % +7 %) who disagreed that CLT was an effective method despite the fact that it had been officially promoted since the early 1980 s . These teachers preferred the more traditional chalk and talk approach ,with the teacher as the knowledge bearer and director of the classroom . Their reasons were apparent in the section on comments . First ,teachers pointed out that there was not enough time in the syllabus to effectively implement the CLT approach as there were too many continuous assessments and examinations each year ;and they felt that their main mission here was in ensuring a good grade for their students ,rather than in giving them a “good time ” conversing with their peers . Hence ,a teaching approach which followed the outline of the examination paper would ,in their opinion ,stand the student in better stead . Second ,CLT methodology involved a lot of “process ”time ,which they felt should be better allocated to topics such as grammatical knowledge so as to help students in the editing of their own work . Third ,huge class sizes (averaging about 40)also made it essential for teachers to possess good management techniques so as to control the noise level —and this many found difficult . The focus on students work rather than teachers knowledge also meant a loss of strict control by teachers and some teachers were obviously stressed (and threatened) by this . Some teachers also confessed that they only used CLT when there was a visitor or Ministerial

official around ,as such an approach would indicate that they were “trendy ” and “ modern ” in their teaching . Last but not least ,teachers were unwilling to adopt CLT whole heartedly because the ranking of teachers at the end of each academic year meant that teachers had to constantly prove themselves as “hardworking ” by giving out work that could be “ seen ” and easily quantifiable ,such as written compositions ,project work ,assignment ,test papers ,etc . This was preferable to group and pair work which were relatively “ ephemeral ” activities that could effectively take place but were unfortunately “unseen ” .

Question 2 :Teachers replies to “ what is your preferred way of teaching English in your classroom ?”

Methodology	%
Com m un icative approach group /pair work	18 %
Gram mar based structured approach	19 %
Reading comprehension (teaching language through the use of reading strategies)	38 %
Exam focused approach	21 %
Not sure /Don t know	4 %

The second question asked teachers to indicate their favorite methodological approach to the teaching of language . Here ,18 % indicated that their most preferred teaching strategy in the classroom was the CLT approach . 19 % indicated a preference for a grammar based structured approach ,38 % a reading comprehension approach ,21 % an exam focused approach and 4 % “ not sure /don t know ” . Teachers who favored com m un icative group /pair work (CLT) gave the reason that this was a welcomed variety to teacher talk and was also a popular activity with pupils . Group work would also enable students to take a “break ” from too much teacher talk and give them a valuable opportunity to practice language in a more natural way .

The 19 % of teachers who favored a gram mar based structured approach felt that it was important that students understood the “ building box ” of language . Many teachers felt that the explicit teaching of grammar was necessary because society still had a serious preference for error free writing . These teachers felt that group work fostered only fluency in language but not accuracy ,which they felt was just as important . Their students would lapse into the speaking of Singlish during group and more informal classroom work ,and this would be at variance with their objectives as language teachers ,which was to foster the speaking of Standard English .

38 % of teachers listed their favorite language teaching approach as that of reading comprehension . They preferred teaching their students the English language through the use of reading materials ,e g . a traditional read question and answer sequence and occasionally with the help of directed reading thinking approaches such as the DRTA (Directed Reading and Thinking Approach) and KWL (Know — Want to Know — What I have learnt) . They felt that the reading approach was the best since the ability to read well played a large part in the examination . In their opinion ,there was no need to focus on speaking activities since students were already speaking Singlish fluently outside the classroom .

The 21 % who confessed to the preference of a more exam focused methodology said that this was because their students expected them to predict the likely examination topics for the coming year so as to enable them to score the best marks in the shortest possible time . The preferred strategy here was to go over the answers in the assessment book which followed the rubric of the examination paper ,and to pause briefly at opportune moments to explain significant points in gram mar ,vocabulary or style . Much of the learning would therefore be centered on the use of texts and worksheets . Teachers also commented that that if they were not exam focused in their classroom practices ,the parents of the students would have no recourse but to employ private tutors to do so . Teachers com mented that they had “ no choice ” in view of the macro goals of attaining higher school rankings in Singapore . These findings correlate with Tan s (2001) research which found that experienced teachers strongly endorsed learning activities that enhance

memorization, CLT student directed small group discussions that empower learners with responsibilities and encourage independent learning rarely take place since teachers prefer recitation and seatwork to sharing time and student directed small group activities.

Question 3 :Teachers replies to “ What is your preferred way of teaching writing ?”

Methodology	%
Process writing	20 %
Exam directed writing (Modeling with samples of good essays)	39 %
A mix of everything	45 %

Process writing, the method advocated by the 1991 syllabus in line with the main principles of the CLT, only engendered a favored count of 20%. Comments given by teachers in the questionnaire may explain these figures. First, the process approach was not favored because with an average class size of 40, it was almost impossible for the teacher to examine and comment on more than one draft of the paper of any student at any time. Second, while the need for peer group conferencing in the writing process was admitted as a way out of this problem, teachers could not find enough classroom time to incorporate such a technique. Planning, drafting, revising and editing, all requirements for a successful process writing class, were difficult to implement as these took up relatively more curriculum time. Third, peer group review sessions were difficult to implement as the competitive atmosphere in Singapore classrooms generally did not encourage genuine sharing. Pupils were distrustful of peers comments and almost always preferred feedback by adults or teachers on their work. An additional comment was that many of the less able students found it extremely challenging to formulate simple sentences correctly, let alone be left on their own or with their peers to “process” write and edit. However, teachers suggested that process writing might be a more effective strategy provided students already had a basic foundation of good grammar and a sizeable amount of vocabulary and language patterning skills.

The 36% of teachers who voted for exam directed writing (modeling with samples of good essays) as their preferred technique explained they felt it was “their duty” to teach in a way that would most benefit their students. One popular way was to train students to get their essay “perfect the first time round” as examination conditions did not provide the luxury of writing more than one draft. Process writing, it was explained, forefronted one to be a “writer” rather than a “scorer” in the examination, while the latter was more relevant for the society in which students were living in. Teachers felt that once the student had passed the examination, they could then concentrate on mastering the art of writing.

The last category, “a mix of everything”, managed to capture 45% of the votes. This indicated a preference towards flexibility in methodology by teachers and also a profound skepticism that any one way of teaching can solve “everything”. Indeed, the oral interviews revealed that experienced teachers were not against process writing as a methodology but rather, that they did not wish to be compelled to follow policies just for the sake of “keeping up with the times”. A significant number of teachers confessed to implementing process writing in the first six months of the year and then “switching” to exam directed writing in the second half of the year, not simply because of their “faith” in the process method but also because they believed that a “variety” of methods help make classroom life more vibrant and stimulating. Our study also found that over larger periods of time, it was likely for process writing to be implemented in Secondary 1 to 3 but not in Secondary 4 when pupils were preparing for their “O” levels. Similarly, a process approach might be attempted in Primary 3 to 5 but not in Primary 6 when pupils were sitting for their Primary School Leaving Examinations (PSLE).

Conclusion

The change from a basically communicative syllabus in 1991 to a more moderate syllabus incorporating both communicative and structural (grammatical) components in 2001 by the Ministry of Education may be said to signal a realization that CLT, reputedly successful in certain contexts in the West and in native speaking countries such as Australia and New Zealand, may not be as suitable for Asian countries such as Singapore. We can conclude from our study, three basic insights why interest in

CLT has waned .

The first insight has to do with the downplay of grammar in the 20 odd years that CLT was promoted as the dominant method for Singapore schools . This has unwittingly resulted in “declining standards in written English” , something which the Singapore government has delineated as crucial to Singapore’s global competitive ratings . While a focus on student centered activities gave students an opportunity to practice and speak the language fluently , it did not encourage them to speak it accurately . Hence , as Lowe (2005) points out , a CLT that relies exclusively on communicative tasks without language awareness is doomed to failure . Indeed , communicative groupwork did not help students practice Standard English as much as it helped them practice the speaking of Singlish . Here , the launch of the “Speak Good English Movement” (SGEM) , in 2000 in Singapore , may be said to symbolize the continued efforts by the Singapore government to halt the exponential growth of Singlish . As Deputy Prime Minister , Lee Hsien Loong (now Prime Minister) emphasized in 2001 : “Singaporeans should be able to speak and write and make presentations in internationally acceptable English that is grammatical , fluent and appropriate for the purpose , audience and context .”⁴

Accordingly , the current 2001 Language Syllabus placed equal emphasis on both fluency and accuracy in stark contrast to the 1991 syllabus . To stem the decline in grammatical proficiency , it became compulsory for English teachers to attend 100 hours of grammar training . Aware of the falling standards of grammar , the Ministry of Education issued a statement as early as 1995 that “the question is not whether we should or should not teach grammar , but rather when and how we ought to teach it” (Chew 2004) . Explicit teaching of grammar once again regained a legitimate place in school after 20 years of CLT . Most of the primary and secondary textbooks published in 2001 , such as “In Step ” and “Stepping Out ” , have reintroduced pedagogical grammar . However , where grammar is concerned , it is not to be taught through the structural or grammar translation approach as “in the bad old days ” but in “context ” — through the use of more modern “text types” . In this way , the Ministry of Education hoped to contemplate some kind of middle ground between the “structured ” and “communicative ” approach to teaching grammar .

The second insight revealed in this study is that the emphasis on examinations in Asian Confucian cultures such as Korea , Japan , Taiwan — and Singapore — may not be conducive to the implementation of a CLT type of methodology . Usually , the examination determines how language will be taught in class (no matter what the syllabus may dictate) . This is because for Singaporeans , and East Asian countries as a whole , what is really important in schooling for students is how they eventually fare in the job market . And what is important for the job market is the marks in the examination . It is the examination which determines which programme and school a particular student is eligible for and more importantly , what and how a subject is really taught . Cheah (1998) notes that a system of certification through examination plus a culture of meritocracy has resulted in an education system that is driven by an “examination type ” literacy . Even if teaching pedagogy in a particular school is not examination oriented , tutorial schools programme will be because this is what parents are willing to pay for . This study confirms that student-directed small group discussions that empower learners with responsibilities and encourage independent learning in the CLT syllabus rarely take place since teachers in general prefer recitation and seat work to sharing time and student directed small group activities . In addition , the increasing use of narrowly defined , easily quantifiable indicators meant that intense competition and inter school rivalry had become a fact of life . Such intense competition has served not to foster more creative methodology in teaching , but actually heightened conservatism and aversion to any form of risk taking that might affect performance indicators .

The third insight which we may glean from this study is that Western methodologies which stresses student initiatives at the expense of the teacher are not likely to succeed . A Confucian cultural underlying lifestyle , apparent in countries such as China , Korea , Taiwan , Hong Kong Japan , and Singapore , tends to regard education as a serious undertaking not quite associated with chatting or peer group games and quizzes (Hu 2002) . In addition , the Confucian tradition sees education not just as a means of intellectual development but also the inculcation of moral qualities . An educated man is one who has learnt and imitated great models , preferably tested and socially approved , and once he has achieved this , he is able

to advance to the upper ranks of society. The relevant classroom methodology in such a mindset is therefore a goal oriented one rather than a process of self discovery. Knowledge is something which is to be attained rather than something that one innately possesses and discovers by "process" and "intuition". True knowledge also resides with a teacher (or a textbook), someone older and who has gone through life and has acquired wisdom and from whom one may refer to and which acts as a "standard". In other words, the classroom is more comfortably viewed as a place where knowledge can be amassed rather than as a place for experimenting and rediscovering innate knowledge.

Where process writing is concerned, an approach that tends to play down authoritative knowledge and which concentrate on the "process" rather than the "product" is not something which Asian teachers, especially the older ones, feel comfortable with. Indeed, the encouragement of peer group evaluation and peer group conferencing in the teaching of process writing appears inimical to the Singaporean teacher. Results of our teacher interviews have shown that teachers remain suspicious of peer group evaluation, as they believe that evaluation is basically the job of the teacher and they, as well as their students, do not believe their students are qualified to correct or conference the work of other students. In addition, the majority of teachers felt that although process writing was a good teaching methodology, it was often unrealistic in large classes and in an exam oriented culture.

However, the current backlash against CLT does not mean that CLT is completely without merit. There is recognition of the growing importance of group collaboration, the reduction of threat, the importance of play, and the moderation of the role of the teacher from knowledge giver to facilitator where language learning is concerned. Last but not least, one of CLT's greatest contributions is perhaps the emphasis on oral skills which has been relatively neglected until its advent. Accordingly, the Singapore English Language Syllabus of 2001 retained its 1991 emphasis that the development of listening and speaking skills is as important as the development of reading and writing skills. It states categorically that "the more pupils listen to and speak English, the better will be their language use" (2001 §) and that "the learning environment affects language acquisition and language use" (2001 §). Hence, teachers are urged to continue to create opportunities for pupils to interact in class and they themselves, are viewed as models of appropriate language use.

Perhaps the most telling finding in our study is that what is advocated by the Ministry of Education may not be what is carried out at ground level. There is often a gap between the theoretical and the applied. Inevitably, the teacher lies at the heart of education and without her cooperation and understanding, no new approach will be able to succeed. The teacher may appear to be obedient, following dutifully the dictates of the new policy or teaching approach but this may be done superficially because in her heart and through her experience, she knows it cannot work and she cannot believe that it can work. Furthermore, if the teacher encounters too many changes in curriculum and teaching approaches, this also leads to confusion as well as a "burn out" and the possibility that a process that is no longer innovatory can turn into a routine.⁵ A change is introduced, it lives and dies. It spreads far and eventually become marginalized. It takes hold and eventually disappears. Skepticism creeps in and becomes the order of the day.

It is also apparent from our study that any enduring teaching approach will always have to be a moderate one, incorporating both the ideals of the West and East, giving respectful space to the teacher to choose the advantages of either, because only a teacher knows her classroom best. Contextual knowledge and the ability to analyse such contexts are integral for effective teaching. As history has taught us, any language teaching approaches if taken to extreme will have its own unique set of strengths and/or weaknesses. In the future, we can expect many more language approaches and techniques to rise and fall. Whatever position language planners and teachers take, they will need to accept the pedagogical consequences of their action. In the end, the hybrid and/or eclectic approach will probably result (e.g. the 2001 language syllabus of Singapore can be said to be a hybrid of the communicative syllabus of 1991) not simply because of theoretical considerations but because in the day to day world of teaching, this will be the compromise which will satisfy most groups.

Pedagogical decisions must be grounded in a sound understanding of micro and macro cultures. It is always important in syllabus construction to remind ourselves of the specific individual needs of our

possible target groups (and not just the need to be trendy). "For whom is the curriculum intended?" is an important question, and there are usually many diverse groups of learners in many different contexts. Because of this diversity, we may conclude that there can never be a definitive approach or any one best approach for all times and all circumstances. Likewise, as there are no universally valid tests, there are no universally valid curricula or approaches. Both tests and curricula or approaches are valid only under specific circumstances. Rather than impose CLT, or any other methodology for that matter, on teachers, a more balanced way is to encourage teachers to adopt an eclectic approach and draw on various methodological options at their disposal to meet the demands of specific classroom situations. What we need to do here is to heighten teachers' awareness of contextual constraints and provide them guidelines as to which method would be suitable for which particular occasion, which kind of students, and from which particular cultural and social psychological backgrounds.

Notes

1. Keynote speech delivered at the 5th China English Language Education Conference (CELEA) in Xi'an, October 14-18, 2005.
2. Before then, the lingua franca most often used between the different races in Singapore was Bazaar Malay and Hokkien, a Chinese dialect.
3. The National Institute of Education is the only teacher training institute of Singapore and hence is greatly influential in how certain subjects are taught in schools.
4. Project Eyeball, 6 April, 2001, p. 6.
5. The Ministry of Education has in recent years been aware of the "burnout" rate among teachers and have taken steps not just to attract but to retain teachers in the service through financial incentive schemes.

References

- Canale, M. & M. Swain. 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1, 1: 47.
- Cheah, Y. M. 1998. The Examination culture and its impact on literacy innovations: the case of Singapore. *Language and Education* 12, 3: 192-209.
- Chew, G. L. P. 2005. ESL/EFL development: National case studies (Singapore). In P. Robertson, P. Dash & J. Jung (eds.). *English Language Learning in the Asian Context*. Korea: The Asian EFL Journal Press.
- Batia, H. & G. L. P. Chew. 2004. Singapore: Schools in the service of society. In I. C. Rotberg (ed.). *Balancing Change and Tradition in Global Education Reform*, pp. 244-260.
- Elbow, P. 1981. *Writing with Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1984. *Classroom and Second Language Development: A Study of Classroom Interaction and Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Graves, D. 1983. *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Hu, Guangwei. 2002. Potential resistance to pedagogical imports: the case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 15, 1: 93-105.
- Krashen, S. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Littlewood, W. 1981. *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ministry of Education. 1991. *English Language Syllabus for Primary and Secondary Schools*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. 2001. *English Language Syllabus for Primary and Secondary Schools*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.
- Tan, A. G. 2001. Elementary school teachers' perception of desirable learning activities: A Singaporean perspective. *Educational Research* 43, 1: 47-61.

Appendix

School _____ Age _____ Years of Teaching _____

This is a quick survey on language methodology . All information received will be treated confidentially .

Question 1 . “ I find the CLT approach to be a useful and effective way to teach language in my classroom . ” Tick only one box .

Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Not sure (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)

Comments (if any) :

Question 2 . “ What is your preferred way of teaching English in your classroom ? ” Tick only one box

Methodology	Please tick only one
Communicative approach group / pair work	
Grammar based structured approach	
Reading comprehension (teaching language through the use of reading strategies)	
Exam focused approach	
Not sure / Don t know	

Comments (if any) :

Question 3 . “ What is your preferred way of teaching writing ? ” Tick only one box

Methodology	%
Process writing	21 %
Exam directed writing (Modeling with samples of good essays)	36 %
A mix of everything	45 %

Comments (if any) :