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For many years Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and an English-Only approach to English teaching have characterised pedagogy at Hope College\(^1\) in Taiwan. These approaches have had a significant impact on the ways in which students understand their cultural identities and develop competency in both oral and written English.

Sometimes, in the EFL context in Taiwan, an English-Only policy can impact on students' learning in several ways. Firstly, it may cause students to doubt the validity of their own culture in comparison to English speaking culture. Secondly it may lead to students' resisting English culture because of enhanced feelings of nationalism. Furthermore, sometimes, students may feel disturbed when learning English in an English-Only class because the lack of cognitive understanding usually makes them misunderstand the content expressed in the target language (English) and misuse the target language.

In this paper I consider the need to reintroduce elements of the Grammar-Translation method to an EFL context and suggest an integrative pedagogy in which native English-speaking teachers, applying English only in the classes, focus on teaching listening and speaking to directly foster students' English linguistic competence, while local English teachers, applying both English and Chinese in the classes, focus on teaching reading and writing to foster students' in-depth cognitive ability of English culture and suitable written expression. The purpose of such integrative pedagogy is to keep students' cultural identity as well as advance students’ understanding and correct use in English.

Introduction

In 1966, a Dominican bishop invited Sisters of the Roman Union to found Hope College. At the beginning, the enrolment was open only to girls in English, French, German and Spanish departments. In 1980, to comply with a request from the Ministry of Education, the words "for girls" was dropped from the school name and Hope Junior College of Modern Languages began the recruitment of boys. Later on, the Division of Continuing and Extension Education, the Department of Japanese and the Evening Division were established. In 1999, the internal school system was readjusted. Hope College of Languages opened and began recruiting the first students for the Two-Year College Section, (Junior and Senior year of university). In 2002, the college started recruiting students for the Four-Year College Section. Right now, the college is the only one specializing in foreign languages under the Technical and Vocational Education System in Taiwan (www.wtuc.edu.tw).

Hope College of Languages is a college in the system of technological and vocational education of the Ministry of Education in Taiwan. During the past thirty nine years, while the college was developing its curriculum Taiwan has been

\(^1\) I use Hope College as the pseudonym of the college where I teach and that I discuss in this paper. Also, the interviewees’ names in this paper are all pseudonyms.
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developing its democracy step by step and taking on different aspects of its cultural identity. According to Ebele (2001) and Shih (2003), such a change is intertwined with globalisation and the challenges of globalisation to national identity.

Before the modern form of Chinese was promoted in the early 20th century in China, the subservient role of students to teachers was ensured as those who understood it predominantly managed knowledge of Classic Chinese. Learners had no choice but to accept such an authoritative, teacher-centred pedagogy. Even without the influence of Confucius, the Great Teacher-Saint in China, Chinese teachers could still be assured of being able to exercise authority because of their dominance over the means to basic social and political advancement within a Chinese society—the ability to teach Classic Chinese.

According to Larsen-Freeman (1986), the Grammar-Translation method basically focuses on explaining the meanings of the words and conducting the process of code switching between the source language and target language. This emphasis on semantics is also seen in Chinese language instruction, at least in terms of that approach of teaching Classic Chinese where teachers interpreted Classic Chinese to their students word by word, and sentence by sentence in dialects or modern Chinese. This approach has continued up to the present and therefore the adoption of Grammar-Translation method within English teaching in Taiwan was socially accepted and culturally justified, especially considering the influence of Chinese way of language and literature pedagogy on English teachers with Chinese educational backgrounds.

However, acceptance of Grammar-translation method has not been universal. One of my interviewees, Sister Faith, an English native speaker from England and the former Chairperson of the Department of English at Hope Ursuline College of Languages in Taiwan, stated “it’s too intellectual, it’s too brain-centred. It is not for language or for communication… I don’t think Grammar-Translation method in itself is a suitable vehicle for teaching languages anyway” (Interview with Sister Faith on Nov. 4, 2002). Probably because of such doubts and indications that it was not providing what students needed in order to learn to communicate, the Grammar-Translation method was replaced by Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) at Hope in the late 1970s.

Along with Communicative Language Teaching, an English-only policy has been adopted and applied in every English class at Hope College at the insistence of Sister Faith. There is little evidence to show that, when guiding English teaching programs at Hope College, Sister Faith demonstrates what Phillipson (1992) termed monolingual fallacy. Nor does Sister Faith follow centre ideology, i.e. the ideology of viewing the world from the views of the Western eyes. Yet, the notion that
students’ English communication abilities can only be formed when students learn English in English has undoubtedly supported the policy of applying the Communicative Language Teaching method in English-only classrooms at Hope College for more than 30 years. According to Sister Faith, she “has never given up using English as the medium of teaching” (Interview with Sister Faith on Nov. 4, 2002).

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the English pedagogy at Hope College. I will be answering the following questions:

What roles does Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) play at Hope College?
How does one re-evaluate the necessity of Grammar-Translation teaching (Code-switching/Code-negotiation) at Hope College?
What’s the relationship between the English-only policy, the integrated English pedagogies and students’ cultural identity in Taiwan?

The Controversial Roles of CLT at Hope College
Most students at Hope are used to classes where English teachers teach in English only. They don’t find it difficult to express themselves on topics when they are offered the chance to participate in such communicative activities as discussions, role-playing, group or individual oral presentations or even debates. Also, they feel at ease when communicating with native speakers of English in oral English. This has been seen as the advantage Hope alumnae and alumni have when searching for jobs in Taiwan that need people who can communicate in English. This is especially the case for international traders in Taiwan given their involvement with exporting products to America or other countries in the world.

Nevertheless, while Hope College tries to build its students’ communication skills by urging them to speak in English, it disregards the cultural impact of English language teaching. It also neglects the tasks of both educating the learners to realize the cultural essence of communication and guiding them to avoid the threat of the shading of cultural identity resulting from the compulsory and authoritative English-only policy in English classrooms. This gradually presents students with the risk of both the lack of intercultural communicative ability and the dilemma of seeing a fading cultural identity when Taiwan incorporates itself into a globalised community. Hope’s curriculum, in its emphasis on both Chinese culture education and foreign languages other than English, might weaken the impact. However, English is the most powerful language in the world, so the negligence at Hope College may inevitably broaden students’ risk.
When CLT is used in ESL teaching, the learners and the teachers have access to educational sources from the surroundings (Li 1998). For example, learners may learn English through the process of shopping by using English in a shopping mall and practicing the language in a natural environment with the chance to exchange manners and attitudes on the spot. Yet, in an EFL classroom, even with a native speaker teacher, the learners still learn English in an environment different from the social context existing in an English speaking country. What the learners acquire in an EFL classroom might be the so-called ‘bookish’ English instead of communicative competence. They might not gain the social and intercultural competence to communicate with people in the native environment. On this point, Tomalin and Stempleiski (1993) have shown that non-English native speakers might behave improperly in an English class because of the lack of intercultural communicative competence.

Consequently, when CLT was used in English classes at Hope College, it was an ESL pedagogy learned by those Taiwanese teachers who received TESOL Masters or Ph.D. degrees in foreign countries. The teachers, consciously or unconsciously, applied what they have been taught in an English-speaking educational context, such as in the USA, to a non-English-speaking context, such as in Taiwan, with the assumption that the teaching methods they have learned in the Western world are ‘good’ for students in Taiwan. The novelty of such teaching approaches from Western countries as CLT might earn the support of the school authority. The relaxing and activity-focused, student-centred teaching technique in CLT might make the teenager students who have had the authoritative teacher-centred pedagogy feel excited. Nevertheless, students at Hope College had been educated with the Grammar-Translation method before they attended Hope. They also used to listen to their English teachers’ instruction in the classroom, accepting the teacher-centred teaching approach. CLT, on the contrary, was developed in a Western educational context in which students are most of time encouraged to express their autonomy in a student-centred situation, but this is not taken for granted in an educational context within the Chinese cultural background. Therefore, when CLT was first used at Hope, such English native-speaker teachers as Sister Faith confronted certain cultural shocks:

I found very quickly that it was necessary to save student’s face because to be, you know, to lose face in public is not anything any Chinese person likes to do. Yes, yes. Another thing I learned was the massive number of students who chased me to ask questions after the bell. They got to ask questions that they would not ask during class. That was another thing. And I do know some Western teachers had a lot of difficulties
in being accepted because they didn’t take into consideration the feelings Chinese
students had because of their cultural background (Interview with Sister Faith on Nov.
4, 2002).

Yet, even though CLT might have had some negative impacts upon the educational
contexts at Hope College, its effects upon the shaping of students’ attitudes toward
democracy could be positive because, with the application of CLT, students might
have the chance to express themselves freely either in discussions or in class
presentations. Besides, CLT not only encourages “individuality, fulfilment of
personal needs and self-expression.” (Hu 2002, p. 97) but also allows “freedom,…
spontaneity and student initiatives in the classroom” (Li, 1984 qtd. in Hu 2002, p.
100). This, more or less, offers the teachers opportunities to shape students’
attitudes toward autonomy instead of their having to keep students following the
guidance or authoritative instruction of teachers. Besides, because of the emphasis
of CLT upon the formation of communicative competence, the pedagogical activities
required in CLT offer teachers the means to mould students’ positive attitudes toward
communication. In considering this, Sister Faith explained:

Yes, it is positive that anything promotes communication, any methodology
that really promotes good communication, includes not only the ability to express
one’s personal ideas, or one’s concepts or principles or values, not only communicating,
but also listening to the other ones. I think good communication really includes
listening and hearing what the other people are saying, hearing what the other people are
meaning and then making value judgments. It seems to me that any methodology that
really does that shapes attitudes toward democracy whether consciously or not
(Interview with Sister Faith on Nov. 4, 2002).

However, when applying CLT to English teaching, if a teacher does not emphasize the
formation of students’ intercultural communicative competence but rather emphasizes
students’ linguistic competence, it is possible that students cannot be natural and
successful in communicating with native speakers when travelling, studying or even
working in such cities as New York, London or Sydney (Li 1998). In short, CLT
might not be as applicable in an EFL context as it is in an ESL context (Chen 1988;
argues that CLT does not distinguish the differences between 1st language acquisition
and 2nd language learning because CLT ignores the communicative competence that
an adult already has when he acquired his first language. Chowdhury (2003)
complains “the popular theories from the West are incompatible in Bangladesh
because of cultural differences between the West and Bangladesh” (Chowdhury 2003, p. 285). Further, Hu (2002) explains that in China “Learner-centred, interactive methodologies such as CLT that allow freedom, unpredictability, spontaneity, and student initiatives in the classroom are generally not well received” (Hu 2002, p. 100). He also argues that “it is difficult for Chinese teachers and students to accept pedagogical practice that tends to put teachers on a par with their students and detracts from teacher authority” (Hu 2002, p. 99). In discussing the similar experiences of South Korea in applying CLT, Li (1998) argues, “the research community, especially many Western language education researchers, has rarely differentiated EFL from ESL” (Li 1998, p. 694). Further, he argues, “our students would soon forget what they learn in a communicative class because they do not use English in their everyday lives” (Li 1998, p. 694).

Hence, the positive role of CLT in shaping students’ attitudes toward autonomy and communication is somewhat countered by drawbacks that developed from it and affected various aspects in the EFL educational context at Hope College. Too much emphasis on the shaping of communicative competence risked such problems for Hope students as: the lack of linguistic accuracy, the ambiguity in negotiating meanings, the incapability of intercultural communication and the sustaining of authoritative characters.

Re-evaluation of the Need for the Grammar-Translation Methodology at Hope College

Students at Hope College started their English education with the Grammar-Translation method in their junior highs. Three years later they switched to CLT after entering Hope and had few chances to gain proficiency in English grammar. My situation was different as I had learned English by the Grammar-Translation method for over 7 years before being fully immersed in a native-speaking environment when studying for my Master degree in the US. I found that I had little difficulty recognizing the grammatical errors that I made and I knew how to correct them, but students at Hope couldn’t. I talked with Sister Faith, the Chairperson of the Department of English and my supervisor at the time, and told her my concern about the students at Hope College. Hope students demonstrated a lack of accuracy in English, though they seemed able to express themselves bravely and happily in oral English. Yet, my worry seemed not taken seriously.

One of the reasons that Grammar-Translation was replaced by CLT after the end of 1970s at Hope was the view that the former method overemphasized instructing students intellectually. Expanding upon this, Savignon (1987) contends that language teachers “need to understand the language acquisition process as one that
involves learners not only intellectually, but physically and psychologically” (Savignon 1987, p. 235). Savignon (1987) further argues, “Communicative competence, … has to do with more than sentence level grammatical competence. It has to do with social interaction. Communicative competence has to do with real speaker-listeners who interpret, express, and negotiate meaning in many different settings” (Savignon 1987, p. 236). Beyond this, the concern for accuracy within the Grammar-Translation method is viewed as an obstacle to enhancing communicative competence because it “…may cause teachers to feel guilty about their inattention to learner errors” (Savignon 1987, p. 239) in the process of teaching communicative competence.

However, my experience of teaching Oral Communication by CLT at Hope College reveals that when a teacher focuses on offering students the chance to acquire communicative competence in an EFL teaching context without trying to correct students’ grammatical errors, it might result in at least two drawbacks. One is that EFL students’ grammatical errors might gradually become what is known as fossilized. (Han 2004) As such fossilized errors are semantic and structural errors, they might cause serious misunderstandings when another person, native or non-native, tries to communicate with them. The other is that such students might misunderstand the exact meanings of the input contexts and give improper output and ruin the possibility of negotiating meanings successfully as they are without “the ability to negotiate meaning—to successfully combine a knowledge of linguistic, socio-linguistic, and discourse rules in communicative interactions” (Savignon 1987, p. 235).

The deprivation of the application of the Grammar-Translation method merely leads the learners into more ambiguity in the process of negotiating the linguistic and cultural semantics of both English and local language. Such ambiguity might in turn cause distrust and intolerance toward the local culture, make learners cast doubts on their cultural identity, and finally misguide them to be over-beautifying the Western world. At Hope College, on the one hand, both my student interviewees, Mira and Judy, express strong willingness to become a Briton and an American. This willingness may reveal their alienation from the local culture (Interview with Mira Fu on Dec. 12, 2002 and The Second Interview with Judy Lo on May 26, 2003).

In the discussion about the ways to resolve the above-mentioned problems caused by the controversial roles of both CLT and Grammar-Translation method, Canagarajah (1999) argues that in an EFL classroom, the application of L1 by the teacher or the students in translating the unfamiliar context could play a meaningful role in assisting students to understand the meaning conveyed in English grammar and to conduct further negotiation to understand the differences between English culture
and local culture. Ur (1994) supported it, arguing, “In some classes we may need to make extensive use of the students’ native language to explain, translate, make generalizations and so on” (Ur 1994, p. 7). Hence, the application of the Grammar-Translation method, even in a class conducted basically in CLT, can be beneficial instead of an obstacle as long as the teacher is familiar with operating both methods properly.

Furthermore, Ur (1994) offers many possibilities of integrating the process of acquiring effective grammar skills with communicative activities as she believes that although at an early stage we may ask our students to learn a certain structure through exercises that concentrate on virtually meaningless manipulations of language, we should quickly progress to activities that use it meaningfully. And even these activities will be superseded eventually by general fluency practice, where the emphasis is on successful communication, and any learning of grammar takes place only as incidental to this main objective (Ur 1994, p. 3).

Such integrative practices have the roles of both offering students the opportunities to understand the meanings of the sentence structures and providing them with the educational circumstances to negotiate the social and cultural meanings of English in communicative activities. Because of the application of the Grammar-Translation method, the learners acquire accurate cognition about English grammar during the input process of communication, i.e. listening and reading, and when they try to conduct the output process of communication, i.e. speaking and writing, they will produce the linguistic structures that both non-native and native speakers can understand.

**English-only Policy and the Impact on Students’ Cultural Identity**

In discussing English pedagogy, my basic stance is that the educational contexts of ESL and EFL should be considered differently. For a non-native English teacher like me, the burden of cultural negotiation in an EFL classroom is much greater than I imagine it would be in an ESL classroom. In an ESL classroom, the learners need English as survival skills, and social communication. In EFL contexts, however, students might find that they do not necessarily count on English in order to survive in their societies; nor do they need to build their social relationships in English (Ebele 2001). Further, nationalism might distance EFL learners from or even resist the power spread by English. Under such circumstances, the insistence on an English-only policy in EFL classrooms might unexpectedly make students regard English learning as a strong demand and incur their resistance to English cultural
power or even ruin the possibility of the dialogue of cultural negotiation either in or outside of the classrooms. In the end, students might form negative attitudes toward the West (Grant 1999) and the possibility of shaping students’ democratic attitudes might be replaced by the development of students’ authoritative attitudes.

The English-only policy, according to Phillipson (1992), is a ‘monolingual policy.’ That is, more or less, the advocates of this policy find it natural to use English as the only language to teach English. The policy is not only criticized by Phillipson (1992), but also challenged in Canaragajah (1999) when he argues the need to apply the learner’s mother language to teaching English in an EFL context. Likewise, Auerbach (1993) supports the adoption of L1 in English teaching. He argues, “since students don’t start by thinking in the second language, allowing for the exploration of ideas in the L1 supports a gradual, developmental process in which the use of L1 drops off naturally as it becomes less necessary” (Auerbach 1993, p. 20). Cummins (1981) also argues, “strong initial literacy is a key factor in successful second language acquisition and academic success” (Auerbach 1993, p. 15). The English-only policy meets more challenges when we further study the research conducted by Rivera (1990), Hemmindinger (1987), D’Annunzio (1991), Strei (1992), Schamash (1990), Strohmeyer and McGrail (1988), Garcia (1991) and Piasecka (1986) and find that using only English in the classroom “rests on unexamined assumptions, originates in the political agenda of the dominant groups and serves to reinforce existing relations of power” (Auerbach 1993, p. 12).

As the English-only policy may serve to intensify the linguistic power over the learners in the EFL context, the relationship between the teacher and the learner might turn out to be the relationship between the dominator and the dominated. In a Chinese society where the teacher-student relationship has been similar to the dominator-dominated relationship (Hu 2002), the authority of the teacher in an English-only classroom is gradually substituted by that of the English-only policy. Students’ attitudes toward the West are dictated by the authority of the English-only policy and the West, replacing Chinese teachers’ authority. Consequently, they become a new authority in the mind of Chinese students. On the one hand, the policy may produce a group of pro-Westernisers as well as authority-followers. On the other hand, it may produce another group of anti-Westernisers as well as authority-rejecters. To prevent the appearance of extreme attitudes toward the West, either extreme-positive ones such as that of Taiwanese Federation Party members who advocated a vote on whether to join the USA as the 51st state (TVBS, Nov. 25, 2003, Taiwan) or extreme-negative ones such as that of Communist China during the Korean war, an integrative teaching policy or methodology accepting both English and local language might be more suitable for an EFL society.
Accordingly, I would suggest that accepting both English and the local language in an EFL classroom is a better option. According to Canagarajah (1999), the negotiation of English and native language in an EFL classroom has proven to be successful in developing students’ communicative competence as well as maintaining their cultural identity. When accuracy cannot be achieved, the local language is allowed to be applied so that the negotiation of meanings between the learners and teachers will not be deterred. Also, the compromise of periphery and centre-cultures will make the learners feel that their cultural identity is not threatened. Thus, students accept the English culture and native culture, and students’ ability to negotiate the dialogue of both cultures is formed. Students could learn English language skills, English culture, communicative competence as well as intercultural competence without losing their cultural identity.

The Integrated English Pedagogies and Students’ Cultural Identity

Though CLT advocates teaching communicative competence, it neglects the differences between first language acquisition and second language learning. One of the differences is that “the second language learner does not have to learn the new language skills from scratch” (Chen 1988, p. 69). Possibly the older an EFL learner is, the more he has acquired communicative competence via his mother tongue. What an EFL learner needs is to learn how to use English to express his communicative competence. In other words, in an EFL class, “the language teacher should not concentrate on teaching students how to communicate in English, but how to use English to communicate” (Chen 1988, p. 71). To do so, the integration of CLT with the Grammar-Translation method that Chinese EFL learners followed for so many years has been reconsidered as a significant issue. (Sun 2002; Choudhury 2003; Rao 2002; Hu 2002; Vallette 1993; Chen 1988)

The integration of Grammar-Translation method with CLT demonstrates a respect for the local culture and also offers learners the potential to move in and move out from English culture cognitively. However, in reality, the confinement from applying CLT with the English-only policy in classrooms may signify strong centre-culture (English speaking–culture) dominance over both the learners and their cultures and may sow the seeds that form the learner’s attitudes toward authority or that shape the learner’s egotism unnoticed or purposely neglected by the advocates of the English-only CLT pedagogy. It may breed either blind pro-Westernisation or extreme anti-Westernisation as well as cause the ideological split in the periphery societies.

Besides, although CLT “is firmly opposed to teacher dominance in the classroom and advocates a more equal relationship between teacher and student” (Hu 2002, p.
95), essentially, it is not easy for a Chinese teacher to accept that a teacher is equal to a student; nor is it to a Chinese student. Therefore, when the application of CLT makes students feel equal with their teachers, students tend to feel that they are more Westerners than Chinese (Interview with Mira Fu on Dec. 12, 2002). They may start to ponder their cultural identity and doubt whether they want to be a Chinese or a Westerner (Second interview with Judy Lou on May 26, 2003) or whether they are Chinese or not Chinese. (Also refer to Ang 1992).

Meanwhile, according to such post-structural ideas as suggested in Foucault (1972), in language learning the negotiation of different meanings in the centre culture and the local culture requires a process focusing neither on ‘marginalized necessity’ nor on the ‘centre necessity’. Accordingly, I propose the integration of a Grammar-Translation method that allows the native language to assist the learners’ cognitive understanding of the target language with CLT that requires using a target language to shape communicative competence in a target language context. That is, in EFL education, both the native language and culture and target language and culture need to be used together “since we cannot conduct thought by conforming to institutionalised discourses, or by abandoning them completely in favour of personal originality, it is by traversing these polarities that we find space for ourselves” (Canagarajah 1999, p. 183).

In my experiences of both learning and teaching English, I learned that when most Chinese learners of English are beyond the stage of childhood and have acquired a certain level of Chinese language and culture, depriving them from using Chinese language usually makes them feel uneasy in either conducting context analysis of English or clearly understanding the linguistic and cultural differences between Chinese and English. As a matter of fact, Chinese and English are different in their linguistic structure systems. When a Chinese learner tries to understand the inner meanings of English culture such as those of philosophy, literature, ethics and so on, the process of cognition becomes slow or might even be deterred. This is because the Chinese learner needs to cross the borders of two highly different linguistic structures before grabbing the inner meanings of the contexts. This is why Piasiecka (1988) proposes that the “possible occasions for using mother tongue include language analysis, presentation of rules governing grammar, discussion of cross cultural issues…” (Piasiecka 1988, pp. 98-99).

According to Sun & Cheng (2002), an integrative program of CLT and the Grammar-Translation was conducted in the Private Pui Ching Commercial College in Guangzou, China at the beginning of the 21st century. In this program, Chinese teachers teach reading and writing courses with the Grammar-Translation method and traditional ways; while speaking and listening courses are taught by Western teachers
using CLT and Western ways. The result from this is that students feel more secure in their reading and writing classes, and learn more grammar and vocabulary than in CLT classes. At the same time, in speaking and listening classes, students acquire autonomy, interaction, and oral communicative competence. This example illustrates how teaching English instrumentally and communicatively can happen simultaneously (See also Li 1984; White 1989; Sun 1990; Forseth 1991; Tool 1992).

Accordingly, the application of the Grammar-Translation method in the local language may help the learners realize the differences of language structure, values, attitudes and manners between the cultures of two different cultural heritages. It may advance the understandings and prevent the misunderstandings between two peoples of two different cultures. It may also diminish the egotism in a culture and forward the open mind of accepting and respecting the ‘Others’.

Both the contention that the pedagogy of CLT may be expanded into cross-cultural acquisition (Kramsch 1993) and the advocacy of Intercultural Language Teaching in Crozet and Liddicoat (1999) support the necessity of relinquishing ambiguity in meaning negotiation caused by CLT. Also, Kramsch (1993) and Crozet and Liddicoat (1999) support what such post-colonialists as Said (1993) and Spivak (1990) intend to construct—the hybrid of the centre and periphery cultures in which “the ‘strong’ or ‘perfect’ person achieves independence and detachment by working through attachments” (Canagarajah 1999, p. 183). It also justifies the integration of Grammar-Translation method and CLT as well as the use of both local language and English in EFL classrooms. Thus, by moving fluidly between the Grammar-Translation method and CLT in English classrooms, the teachers and learners may “move fluidly between multifarious discourses and cultures” (Canagarajah 1999, p. 183).

**Conclusion**

Hope College has established a prestigious English teaching program in Taiwan and has tried to educate English learners with success. CLT, the pedagogy Hope College has depended on for many years, helps the learners at Hope College avoid the constrictions presented by the Grammar-Translation method adopted by most of the schools in Taiwan and broadens students’ visions of learning as well as enhances their ability to express English fluently. Its English-only policy in the English classrooms is adopted to provide students a nearly native environment in which students may be immersed in English learning naturally. However, the frequent appearance of inaccurate English expression in both oral and written English by students at Hope suggests the necessity of rethinking the pedagogy adopted at Hope and reconsidering its influence on students’ cultural identity.
The inaccuracy and ambiguity in English expression by Hope students not only expose the limit of the pedagogy at Hope but also highlight the possibility of the appearance of authoritative characteristics in students. The hybrid of the Grammar-Translation method and CLT along with the acceptance of the application of both English and Chinese in English classrooms is put forward to solve the problems Hope College faces and to renovate its English pedagogy. Hopefully, more remarkable results in English education may appear in Taiwan and Taiwanese students’ cultural identity may be intensified and consolidated.
Bibliography

Chu, Mary. 2002, Interview, Hope College, December, 23, 2002, Kaohsiung City, Taiwan.
Fu, Mira. 2002, Interview, Hope College, December 12, 2002, Kaohsiung City, Taiwan.


Lou, Judy. 2003, Interview, Hope College, May 26, 2003, Kaohsiung City, Taiwan.


Sister Faith. 2002, Interview, the Department of English at Hope College, November 4, 2002, Kaohsiung City, Taiwan.

Soong, Sandy. 2002, Interview, Hope College, Nov. 12, 2002, Kaohsiung City, Taiwan


AARE 2004 Conference in Melbourne, Australia, Nov. 28—Dec. 2


www.wtuc.edu.tw.