Dezavantajele utilizării instrumentelor digitale de învăţare asincronă on-line:
- participanţii se confruntă cu lipsa de contact personal şi comunicare verbală;
- e nevoie de mai mult timp pentru luarea deciziilor în grup;
- feedbackul poate fi oferit sau primit cu întârziere de câteva ore sau zile [1].

Concluzii: Stilurile de învăţare ale formabililor adulţi vor fi influenţate de componenţa lor genetică, experienţa anterioară de învăţare şi comunicare, tehnologii, cultura şi societatea în care trăiesc. Tehnologiile informaţionale şi de comunicare moderne au un efect pozitiv asupra procesului academic şi extind în mare măsură oportunităţile de învăţare prin oferirea materialelor didactice vizuale, demonstrative, ce sunt uşor de înţeles şi de perceput.

Odată cu apariţia educaţiei online, relaţia dintre profesor şi formabil poate fi modificată radical, deoarece studenţii se implică în procesul de învăţare şi devin mai interesaţi, motivaţi şi responsabili pentru obţinerea performanţelor. Utilizarea TIC contribuie eficient la formarea competenţei de comunicare şi interculturale.

BIBLIOGRAFIE

1. ALBEANU, G. GHERASIM, Z. ANDRONIE, M. Tehnologii de comunicaţie, multimedia şi e-learning în educaţie, Note de curs, Biblioteca virtuală a Universităţii Spiru Haret. 2014
2. BĂLAN, R., CEHAN. A. *In-service distance Training Course for Teachers of English.* Iaşi: Polirom, 2003. 350 p. ISBN: 973-681-308-8
3. BRUT, M. *Instrumente pentru e-learning: ghidul informatic al profesorului modern.* Iaşi: Polirom, 2006 disponibil la http://www.elearning.ro/mihaela-brut-instrumente-pentru-e-learning-ghidul-informatic-al-profesorului-modern
4. DOFF, A. *Teach English: A training course for teachers.* Cambridge University Press, 2012. 144 p. ISBN: 978-0-521-34864-5
5. https://www.ldoceonline.com/
6. https://www.cambridge.org/
7. https://www.macmillandictionary.com/

CREATING A COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING ENVIRONMENT FOR IMPROVING STUDENTS' COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Mardari Alina, university lecturer,
"Ion Creangă" SPU

Rezumat

Predarea limbilor străine este o arhivă dinamică a învăţământului în care au fost sugerate un sir de modificări în timp. Abordarea comunicativă de predare a limbii (CLT) este considerată o noua eră în predarea limbilor străine. In ce măsură aceasta abordare este benefică în predarea limbi engleze, în contextul limbii enleze ca limba străine (EFL) încă ramane de satbilit. Acest articol este o încercare de a evalua fezabilitatea aplicării abordari CLT în contextual EFL; vor fi explorate caracteristicile abordării; vor fi analizate unele dintre studiile empirice predominante în vederea aplicării abordării CLT în contextul EFL; vor fi sugerate câteva remedii pentru a evita obstacolele in procesul de implimenare a acesteia în contextul EFL.

Cuvinte-cheie: predarea limbilor, abordare comunicativă, contextul limbii engleze ca limbă străină, prearea comunicativă a limbii (CLT).

In response to grammar translation method and audio-lingual method, Communicative language teaching (CLT) was introduced in the 1960s, which became a dominant language teaching approach in the 1970s. Its development can be traced in Europe and North America where a large number of immigrants, international workers and an exceptional British linguistic and social behavior made the Council of Europe think to prepare a syllabus for second language learners which should be based on notional-functional, meaning-potential and situational-context

use of target language [16, p.112]. Initially designed for ESL context, CLT was applied in English speaking countries where English teachers supported a skill-based, discovery-oriented, collaborative approach to education [6, p.4]. Communicative needs of the learners were given priority in the target language instructional program. A number of CLT based language courses and textbooks were introduced in second language learning (L2) with an emphasis to improve communicative competence of the learners. The purpose of CLT was to provide the learners with opportunities to learn and use the target language in L2 context. Therefore, the focus in language teaching shifted from drill-based language activities to communicative-based activities to provide a natural growth of language ability. CLT refers to both processes and goals in classroom learning. Identification of learners' communicative needs provided a base for curriculum design [17, p.217]. According to Mey [12], the basic principles of CLT include learner-oriented classroom, opportunities to develop a wide repository of activities, multiple role of the teachers, and use of authentic materials.

Hymes [6, p. 248] a North American scholar forwarded the theoretical foundation of CLT. He urged that the knowledge of language does not only mean the knowledge of grammatical rules, i.e. Linguistic competence, but rather the knowledge how to use the language, i.e. Communicative competence. This idea gave new heights to the ELT in 1970s. Hymes' notion of the use of language was striking on Chomsky's [2, p.27] definition of language which highlighted the mastery of linguistic competence. Hymes [7, p. 281] argues that both knowledge of a language and ability to use it is the communicative competence in terms of its formality, feasibility, appropriateness, context, and performance of the language act. So this concept contracts with Chomsky's competence based on abstract grammatical knowledge. Communicative language teaching is defined as an approach to foreign or second language teaching which aims to develop communicative competence [14]. This reaction discarded the idea of an 'ideal native speaker'. Now the focus of applied linguistics was not only on the language learning but also language as a social behavior. Communicative competence of the second language learner became the core interest for the language instructors.

Realizing the importance of English as a lingua franca and a language of science and technology for the last few years, the scenario of English language teaching and learning has been changing at an international level. The establishment of English language centres (ELCs) in universities and schools around the world has played a fundamental role in initiating a positive academic shift towards learner-centered pedagogy instead of the traditional teacher-centered teaching methodology.

CLT has been derived from multidisciplinary practices that involve psychology, linguistics, sociology, educational and philosophical research which has remained a topic of hot debate for the language teachers, linguists and researchers. The primary concern from the very beginning of CLT has remained to elaborate and implement methodologies which can promote the use of functional language through participation in communicative episodes. Actually what CLT is, how it is implemented in real classroom situation and what characteristics of language should be emphasized has made the phenomenon a bit suspicious and complex for the educators as there had been a difference of opinion about this issue. Many definitions include meaningful communication and message conveying in CLT. The practice of language form is another important issue for some scholars and educators. Some arguments go to this extreme as to whether or not include other literacy skills in CLT like the use of L1, teaching of grammar and vocabulary. Many educators and linguists have urged to include language form and structure to

make CLT approach more meaning-oriented for L2 instruction [1, p.472]. CLT argues the difference of "learning to use English" and "using English to learn it". According to Howatt [5, p.213], 'the weak version of CLT stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use the target language for communication purpose and attempts to integrate such activities into a wider program of language teaching. The strong version of CLT is that language is acquired through communication'. Krashen's [8, p.20] input hypothesis and Long's [11, p.181] interaction hypothesis are significant in this area.

Krashen's Input Hypothesis

Krashen observed that L1 acquisition and L2 learning have almost same characteristics for the learner in learning grammar and phonological features of language. Although, he also pointed out that L1 acquisition by the speakers is more successful as compared to L2 learning. The reason for this, as he told, while acquiring L1 the learner does not encounter correction by others and he acquires structure and grammatical rules in a natural atmosphere during this process. While the L2 learner is taught grammar and given feedback in form of correction. This situation hampers the natural process of leaning. Eventually, he forwarded his hypothesis that if the Input conditions are similar in L1 acquisition and L2 learning, L2 learning will be complete and successful like that of L1. Thus Krashen proposed that the learner should be exposed to maximum meaningful input. As a result, the learner will integrate input into his inter-language system and learn L2 the same way as a child acquires L1. Krashen's Input hypothesis is influential in shaping CLT.

Long's Interaction Hypothesis

Another group of researchers was interested in knowing that how input becomes comprehensible for the learner. Long forwarded his hypothesis that conventional variety of language (greetings, making requests and apologizes, negotiations, etc) make input comprehensible for the learners which as a result, develops L2. Hatch. E [3,420] had already claimed that while learning L2, the learner needs not to learn grammatical rules; he will learn these rules through interaction. The L2 educators thus believed that giving maximum opportunities to the learner to engage into interaction will be sufficient to successfully learn L2. The effect of these two hypotheses is considered to pave way for the successful model of CLT. Both of these emphasized an instruction without form, i.e. grammar, and feedback.

Language is viewed as a vehicle for communication and conveying knowledge. It involves two parts, e.g., a speaker and a listener, and a writer and a reader. It suggests three principals in language learning, according to Richards and Rodgers, 'communication principle, task-based principle, and meaningfulness principle' [15, p. 161]. When these principals are applied in a language learning environment, functional activities and social interaction activities take place. Consequently, it is related to how well students are engaged in learning and makes authentic use of language. According to Nunan [13, p. 180) communicative approach characterizes five features which are emphasizing on learning to communicate; introducing authentic texts in learning environment, providing opportunities to focus on language and learning process, enhancing learner's own experiences in language learning, and linking classroom language learning experience with activities outside the classroom. Nunan's explanation of CLT suggests that any teaching practice that helps students develop their communicative competence in an authentic context is considered an effective instructional strategy in ESL/EFL situation. No matter how authentic the settings are, the learning or teaching takes place in a classroom which is far from being authentic. Teachers are supposed to create 'real settings' to provide the students

with chances to perform real life acts. Due to the unpredictability of communication, 'real things' are unpredictable and thus can't be created either. In addition, communicative approach requires a teacher of exceptional abilities. They must know what the real settings are and how to perform in these settings himself. They must be technically skilled so as to ask down-to-earth questions.

Many educators came to believe that an attention to language form in CLT activities will make learners use them on later stage. Some others, however, fear that if the learner's attention is diverted to form of language, their motivation for the use of language may decrease. While the cognitive psychology indicates that we best remember the form of language when recall the context in which we learnt it [10, p.174]. The research on CLT indicates to adopt a balanced view. But what that balance is, is still to maintain by the practitioners. Actually, CLT as a term refers mainly to both (i) processes, and (ii) goals in a class room setting. The basic concept is to improve communicative competence of the learners.

Form-focused language instruction and meaning-based language instruction are still a matter of great concern for the new researchers in the field of language teaching and applied linguistics. An appropriate combination of these two types of instruction mainly depend on the learners' age, educational goals, environment and opportunities of the use of language outside classroom, teacher's readiness, the nature or length of classroom instruction, etc. Educators, however, have been found convinced to integrate form focused and meaning based exercises for developing communicative competence. The teaching of grammar is crucial up to some extent if the learners have to relate their communicative needs with experience.

Liao (2000) quotes the instructions given by State Education Development Council, China (in English Teaching Syllabus, 1992) to the English language teachers for implementing CLT approach in classroom instruction, which are appropriate for any English learning environment:

Teaching should start with listening and speaking - setting the context

- Drills on language form should not be excessive.
- English should be used in class.
- Use of translation should be limited.
- Audio-visual aids like realia, pictures, over-head transparencies, audio-tapes, videos, and computers should be fully utilized.
- The teacher's role should be a facilitator and helper to guide students to develop effective learning habits.
- Teachers should be aware of the individual differences among students in the learning process.
- Appropriate encouragement should be given to students to reinforce their initiatives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. CELCE-MURCIA, M. Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 25, 1991, pp. 459-480. doi:10.2307/3586980,
2. CHOMSKY, N. Syntactic Structure. Mouton de Gruyter, New York, ed.2, 2002. 117 p. ISBN 3-11-017279-8.
3. HATCH, E. Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), Second language acquisition: A book of reading. Rowley, Mass: New bury House, 1987. pp. 401-435
4. HOLLIDAY, A. The house of TESEP and the communicative approach: The special needs of state English language education. ELT Journal, 48(1), 1994. pp. 3-11. http://adrianholliday.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/holliday-94-tesep.pdf (vizitat, 20.03.2020)
5. HOWATT, A. A history of English language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984, p.413, ISBN 0194370755.

6. HYMES, D. Competence and performance in linguistic theory. *In R. Huxley, & E. Ingram (Eds.), Language acquisition: Models and methods*. London: Academic Press, 1971. 383 p. ISBN 13: 9780123634504

7. HYMES, D. On Communicative Competence. *In J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolingguistics.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972. 381 p. ISBN 0140226583

8. KRASHEN, S. Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press 1982. 209 p. ISBN 0-08-028628-3.

9. LIAO, X. Q. How CLT became acceptable in Secondary Schools in China, *The Internet TESOL Journal Vol. VI, No.10,* 2000. http://iteslj.org/indexPrev00.html (vizitat 19.03.2020)

10. LIGHTBOWN, P. M., & SPADA, N. How languages are learned. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. 208 p. ISBN-10: 9780194370004.

11. LONG, M. Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5, 1983. pp.177—193. doi: 0.1017/S0272263100004848

12. MEY, J. L. Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1998. 1200 p. doi.org/10.1017/S0022226799277742.

13. NUNAN, D. (1991). Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers. London: Prentice Hall, 1991. 264 p. ISBN 10: 0135214696.

14. RICHARDS, J., PLATT, J., & PLATT, H. Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics. London: Longman, 1992. ISBN:0582557089 9780582557086

15. RICHARDS, J. C., & RODGERS, T. Approaches and methods in language teaching (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 171 p. ISBN 0-521-32093-3.

16. SAVIGNON, S.J. Beyond communicative language teaching: What's head? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 2007, pp. 207-220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.09.004

17. VAN EK, J. *Systems development in adult language learning: The threshold level in a European unit credit system for modern language learning by adults.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1975. 240 p. ED108482.

DEVELOPING LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL AWARENESS THROUGH LITERATURE IN EFL

Petriciuc Lilia, lecturer,
„Ion Creangă" SPU
Grecu Jana, PhD,
„Ion Creangă" SPU

Rezumat

Articolul argumentează necesitatea utilizării de texte literare, indiferent de gen, în didactica limbii engleze ca limbă străină, evidenţiindu-se multitudinea de beneficii educaţionale ale acestora începând cu etapele timpurii de studiere a acesteia. Sensibilizarea faţă de alte culturi şi importanţa competenţei (inter)-culturale sunt abordate în mod aparte, ca valenţe cheie ale funcţionării eficiente în societatea post-modernă, care reclamă o abordare didactică multi-dimensională în procesul de predare-învăţare a limbii engleze ca limbă străină.

Cuvinte-cheie: Engleza ca limbă străină, literatură, sensibilizare (inter)-culturală, competenţă interculturală, abordare didactică.

The controversies in terms of using literature in foreign language classes has been debated extensively in many academic contexts ever since the 1980s, when an anti-literature movement started in Australia, which gradually gained force and had a tremendous impact on curricula across the world.

Denying the manifold educational benefits of literature in the language classroom has led to a significant number of deficiencies in the formation and education of the young generation among which: impoverished language proficiency caused by limited vocabulary, diminished attention spans,