

Implicit and Explicit Teaching of English Speaking in the EFL Classroom

Paul C. Talley, Ph.D.

I-Shou University

International College - Department of International Business Administration

No. 1, Section 1, Syuecheng Road

Dashu District

Kaohsiung, 84001, Taiwan, R.O.C.

Tu, Hui-ling

Tajen University

Department of Applied Foreign Languages

No. 20, Weisin Road

Sin-er Village, Yanpu Township

Pingtung County (907), Taiwan, R.O.C.

Abstract

Educators must reassess overall western teaching approaches in English teaching students in different language and cultural backgrounds. Although a westernized communicative teaching approach is ideal to implement language teaching, some Asian students are conservative to adopt or adapt it in their own English language learning. Accordingly, an adapted English teaching approach may be innovated using implicit and explicit teaching means. This paper focuses on the teaching of English speaking in the EFL classroom related to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and teacher-student roles using explicit and implicit teaching methods related to second language acquisition (SLA). Many Asian students now face direct inclusion into a classroom environment that is Western pedagogically-speaking due to the influences of globalized higher education. Any English speaking curriculum should have two design principles in mind: to expose students to authentic and practical settings for speaking English, and to encourage students' involvement and active participation in English speaking.

Keyword: Implicit teaching, explicit teaching, communicative language teaching, teacher roles, student roles, speaking strategies

1. Introduction

The diversity and hybridization of English language now requires learners to acquire a standard “international” variety that is intelligible (i.e. broadly recognizable or comprehensible outside the local culture), while at the same time “local” in terms of identity (Crystal, 2001, p. 57). To be specific “*bi-dialectalism*” (ibid.) has evolved to allow two varieties of English, one international and one local, to coexist as mutually acceptable targets. In the setting of different cultures and ethnic origins many EFL students may feel like they lose their identity. To deal with the problem, Crystal (2001) suggested students “recognize the importance of international diversity, as a reflection of identity” (ibid., p. 63). When students are exposed to globalization and transnational educational standards they will develop roles encompassing intercultural competence.

The English-speaking teachers' beliefs and practices often determine if the language items that are taught in the EFL classroom will match students' needs and expectations during EFL conversation classes. Based on study findings, Wu (2006) indicated that there were few similarities between instructors' teaching principles and students' expectations. She found that EFL learners often lacked access to native speakers' models for their linguistic input because of being non-native in the host culture. Accordingly, teachers who adopt the CLT approach in their local EFL institution may find a similar disconnect which will cause resistance from students who can neither understand nor appreciate what they consider as non-traditional teaching methods.

2. Explicit and Implicit Instruction in the EFL Classroom

Conventionally, teachers implement both implicit and explicit teaching in EFL classrooms worldwide. In explicit teaching, teachers give students rules to practice and make conscious efforts to learn. Oxford (1990) claimed that defined explicit instruction could help students develop awareness of the learning strategies used, learn to think of practicing the target language with the new strategies, students' self-evaluation of the strategies used, and students' practice of transferring knowledge to newer tasks. On the other hand, according to Lee and Van Patten (2003), "The acquisition of implicit knowledge in language learning involves three separate procedures: 1. Noticing; 2. comparing; and, 3. integrating (p. 171).

To illustrate, with implicit knowledge, learners may notice something and then become conscious of it in language learning. They may compare noticed input items and then compares them to what extent they are unknown to the learner. Or they may integrate a representation of the new input into "deep level" (i.e. long term) memory. In brief, with implicit knowledge exists when learners have intuitive knowledge (e.g. grammaticality) yet lack the ability to articulate it to others. The implicit teaching method is meant to create an opportunity for learning without the student's awareness of what has been learned. Implicit teaching methods help students "induce rules from examples given to them" (Ellis, 1994, p. 642). Implicit teaching of strategy instruction has been shown to help students reinforce their awareness of the language rules (Griffiths, 2003). For example, a fundamental understanding of grammar rules makes it possible for students to logically work out their own learning techniques and practical approaches.

Implicit understanding may result in explicit learning (Richards, & Renandya, 2002). An example of the process of implicit teaching in the EFL classroom may often be seen during the classroom instruction of rules of syntax governing English sentence structures. Based on universal grammar, the technical understanding of syntactic arguments, might lay outside the linguistic awareness many EFL teachers and students consciously maintain. This situation is perhaps why teachers and students alike will recognize the acceptable "sound" of a correct sentence or reject what "sounds" incorrect, but remain unable to explain why it is so.

By contrast, in explicit teaching, teachers apply conscious or overt strategies to teach students through an awareness that one is in the process of learning (Richards, & Schmidt, 2002). Explicit learning can involve language activities such as teaching memorization techniques, hypothesis formation, or testing. EFL teachers are encouraged to provide direct instruction in language learning strategies such as selective attention, activating prior knowledge, summarizing, questioning, and making inferences, to mention just a few (Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, & Robbins, 1999). As such, strategy training may be considered an explicit approach to teaching students how to apply language learning and language use strategies in the classroom. In his study, Seliger (1975) found that adult ESL learners in the U.S. were able to retain knowledge of rules better after such knowledge had been presented explicitly. Reber (1976) approved Seliger's study and added that the crucial factors for explicit teaching included the number of variables to be learnt, and the extent to which the critical features in the new input were salient.

In sum, explicit teaching in the EFL classroom will provide students with a direct awareness of language learning strategies, which constitutes one of the most important individual difference factors in L2 acquisition (Skehan, 1989). Explicit teaching of language learning strategies may be reduced when students are ready to accept autonomy for their learning. Implicit learning may be facilitated through the deliberate scaffolding of strategies instruction and allowing comprehension and memorization to take place. A carefully-planned and systematic instruction of explicit teaching (e.g. MacIntyre, & Gardner's (1994) path model of language learning) requires students to first become aware of strategies, have reason to use them, and have reason to involve themselves in language learning with some implicit degree of reflection, self-awareness, and internalization.

3. CLT and English Speaking in the Asian EFL Classroom

Speaking is an important part of teaching of any foreign language, and it requires a communicative approach integrative of both implicit and explicit teaching methods in order to achieve successful integration into the EFL curriculum. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is comprised of an approach to teaching a language through a syllabus designed for instruction, materials, classroom techniques, teachers, and learners. The teaching of spoken English in the EFL classroom requires students to learn English in their own cultural setting without using their target language in a real situation.

English speaking is a modified communicative activity that involves English spoken language to achieve a particular goal or objective in the English language medium.

In the case of any international college (i.e. a significant enrollment of foreign students), this cultural facet of language learning is not present. The EFL classroom environment represents the cultural boundaries of the host culture with full language immersion, ready access to English-language media, and the presence of western teachers. EFL students are fully expected to accept their portion of the “communicative burden” (Lee, & VanPatten, 2003, p. 100). This communication “burden” implies that students are expected to be responsible for initiating, responding, managing, and negotiating their part of the oral exchange. On the other hand, Rao (2000) suggested that teachers adapt their teaching to the way that learners from a particular community. This means that teaching styles and learning styles should be matched accordingly. In a classroom discussion involving teacher and students, the communicative duty is shared among all classroom participants. However, in an oral test situation, the burden falls clearly upon the individual student to speak rather than a collective effort commonly found in group discussion. Either way, spoken communication (i.e., interpretation, expression, and / or negotiation of meaning) will be expected by the teacher or of the students in order to determine learning-level progression or for evaluative purposes.

The goal of this approach is to develop learners’ communicative competence and performance (Richards, & Rodgers, 2001). In CLT, Richards and Rodgers (2001) suggested teachers and students to speak for communication. Rao (2000) stated, “Only by reconciling communicative activities with non-communicative activities (i.e. explicit learning) in English classrooms can students in non-English-speaking countries benefit from CLT” (p. 85). Wong (2005) pinpointed that the CLT approach had grown largely out of a realization that patterned practice and explicit grammar knowledge do not afford learners with the practical capability of speaking their L2s in a communicative fashion. CLT was considered to have the potential to encourage both practice and participation in authentic speaking situations. According to Chambers (1997), CLT promotes the use of authentic, spontaneous, and functional language in an effort to build students’ spoken fluency. Students in the EFL classroom are encouraged to deal with unrehearsed situations under the guidance, but not the control, of their teachers. In a communicative classroom, learners are regularly placed in situational transactions and role-play exercises (Crookall, & Oxford, 1991) that will involve selecting, sequencing, and arranging words, sentences, and utterances to achieve unified spoken discourse. Students are expected to demonstrate their comprehension in response to the task type and then to express themselves through some form of meaningful language output, verbally or in writing.

Spoken interaction is necessary for language learning to occur, but its simple occurrence is insufficient by, and of, itself. In an interactive linguistic environment, such as with the EFL classroom, the right amount and the right kind of verbal interaction must occur simultaneously for learning to take place. Long (1990) proposed three features of verbal interaction, including (a) input, (b) production, and (c) feedback” When interpreting a language by native speakers offered to the language learner (or by other learners) of a target language. Production (or output) is the language spoken by the language learners themselves. Feedback is the reaction offered by the conversational partners to the production of the language learner.

In classroom communication interaction, EFL students may achieve higher levels of speaking competence through appropriate strategies. Richard-Amato (1996) proposed four strategies for students to learn spoken English:

1. Think of what you are going to say.
2. Think about the structures you are using but do not let them interfere with what you want to say.
3. Do not be afraid to make mistakes (mistakes are normal as you are learning a language).
4. When you are not understood, use repetition, gestures, synonyms, definitions, acting out, whatever comes naturally as you begin to feel more proficient in the language (p. 55).

To practice the first strategy, learners have to reflect on existing background knowledge and how to frame what is to be said with the vocabulary available. It is suggested that learners cast and recast the structure of their sentences until it is comprehensible to the listeners around them. In addition, learners are encouraged to understand that speech production is of greater importance than grammatical perfection when communicating with others in the EFL classroom.

4. CLT May Be Used to Confront the Behavior of Reticence

Many educators may question why the implementation of CLT methods in an Asian-setting EFL classroom should be viewed as problematic. It is already an established fact that Asian students' reticence and passivity are often "over-characterized" (Li, & Jia, 2006, p. 192), "over-generalized" (Cheng, 2000, p. 441), "exaggerated" (Cheng, 2000, p. 445), "limited-in-scope" (Liu, 2001, p. 42), "misperceived" (Watkins & Biggs, 2001, p. 437), "stereotypical" (Belchamber, 2008, p. 59), or "cliché" (Debashish, 2010, p. 153). For example, Jackson (2003) portrayed Chinese learners of English in an English-medium undergraduate business course in Hong Kong as both reticent and quiet. Jackson said that this was evident due to contextual elements that were related to a lack of confidence stemming from their inability to participate orally in class. Tsou (2005) also approved to some degree with the general notion that Asian students were as a group "more reserved and reticent" (p. 47) in the amount of their oral classroom participation. This problem extends to the teaching context as well. Lee and Ng (2010) stated, "Reticence is a common problem faced by ESL / EFL teachers in classrooms, especially in those mainly with Asian students" (p. 302). So, the allegation represented in the literature that says Asian students, as a whole, are reticent despite attempts to reasonably explain continues unabated except for purposes of common attribution. Following these concepts, reticence remains as a potential obstacle to communicative competency in the EFL classroom, and as such a cultural barrier to learning requiring explicit instruction and implicit learning.

The construction of relevant interpersonal meaning for language lessons will motivate greater student participation in classroom discussion. Real speaking activities related to speaking involve real communication and promote these kinds of practical learning experiences (Johnson, 1982). Such engagement presupposes the taking up of an active role in verbal interaction by students. It is important to consider how implementation of a westernized CLT approach can provide EFL teachers in English classrooms in Asia with a rationalization of the core characteristics, the format, and the nature of instruction in CLT. According to Chang (2011), CLT in EFL settings such as Taiwan may simply not fit the localized teaching setting. To illustrate, the overwhelmingly positive theoretical and practical implications found in the CLT approach provide teachers, educators, and policy-makers with reasons to implement CLT in university English education settings in Taiwan. However, there are still many cultural barriers that continue to prevent optimal CLT implementation in the international college classroom. The removal of these obstacles will require the direct involvement of both teachers and students in the EFL classroom.

The goal of CLT is the achievement of communicative competence which emphasizes how speakers may interpret intended meaning in a particular utterance, apart from its literal meaning. Hymes (1972) criticized Chomsky's (1965) earlier notion about linguistic competence by pointing out its inadequacy to make any real distinction between competence and performance aspects. Furthermore, Hymes commented that it is unrealistic to think that no significant linguistic progress will ever be possible without the study of how forms are actually put into use. As such, linguistic competence should fall under the domain of communicative competence since it comprises four competence areas, namely, linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic. This competence is also inclusive of "tacit, subconscious knowledge of language structures, not normally available for spontaneous report, but implicit in what the ideal speaker can say" (Brown, Malmkjær, & Williams, 1996, p. 114). It is hoped that students who use the language in a classroom setting will be able to approximately use it in a real-world situation with the scaffolding support of the teacher's direction and the opportunity to presuppose or infer with what needs to be said. Scaffolding allows EFL students to accomplish the socio-cognitive task of learning the English language (i.e., fluency) and to develop progressive linguistic growth (i.e., proficiency) (e.g. Ninio, & Bruner, 1978). This is true in large part due to Vygotsky's (1978) social-cultural theory which conceived of language learning as an expansive and collective process that serves to develop a Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD construct of a situated learning atmosphere).

In CLT, a learner is the key agent in the learning process and the teacher is the facilitator. Ultimately, the goal of CLT is to produce an autonomous learner through such interdependent means (Breen, & Candlin, 1980). Language educators may value what the learner autonomy concept has to offer because of its utility as an organizing principle within a broader framework of communicative or learner-centered pedagogies (Benson, 2001). In a CLT context, the role of the learner is assumed to be self-driven. The motivation of why someone chooses to learn a foreign language may be different from student-to-student, but the goal of communicative competency (i.e. fluency and proficiency) remains the same.

Holec (1981) indicated that students should have self-determined learning objectives, self-selected learning methods, self-evaluated learning progress, self-monitored learning behaviors, and self-assessed learning outcomes to become autonomous learners. Dörnyei (2001) claimed that learner autonomy is relevant to a learner's overall motivation to learn since it directly speaks to freedom of choice, which is a pre-requisite of motivation. Breen and Candlin (1980) claimed that the teacher should pass some control over to the students. To be specific, the power to help would either be relinquished or adapted to meet the learners' needs. However, it is easy for learner autonomy to be viewed as "a challenge to cultural and educational traditions" (Aoki, & Smith, 1999, p. 23) that is teacher-centered. In their study of learner autonomy of foreign students, Ho and Crookall (1995) found that Chinese students did not present learner autonomy as comfortable but they often felt it necessary to work independently of the teacher. Pierson (1996) indicated that traditional Chinese cultural values in education actually upheld autonomy in learning and that rote learning and overt teacher authority were actually legacies of British colonialist rule first established in the Hong Kong territories.

5. Roles of Teachers in the Asian EFL Classroom

The interactive role of the teacher in the EFL classroom should not be underestimated. Teachers play an important role of who does and does not speak in the EFL classroom. Nation and Newton (2009) indicated that teachers were usually the people who have the power to control both the content and the procedure of classroom learning, the discussion topic, and the decision of who may or may not participate. For example, when she was examining factors for students' reticence, Tsui (1996) found that the role of the teacher (i.e. way of interacting with students) directly influenced students' reticence in the classroom. According to In addition, he found that the teacher regulates the speaking turns, provides both positive and negative feedback to encourage or discourage learner behavior, and motivates students through constructive criticism and meaningful dialogue. In other words, teachers either facilitated or inhibited the participatory patterns for learners to deal with reticence.

Beyond the directive or controlling roles that EFL teachers assume, the teacher's roles that are most significant for students are to provide a good English speaking model and to scaffold assistance for EFL students. Voller (1997) outlined three metaphorical roles for teachers: (a) facilitator, (b) counselor, and (c) authoritative resource. As a facilitator, the teacher is to provide verbal support for the learners in the classroom. In the role of counselor, the teacher may counsel learners on a one-to-one basis to make sure that they understand what said. In the role as an authoritative resource was, teachers provide learners with the necessary informational support they need until the process of fading, removal of the scaffolding, becomes suitable.

Holec (1985) proposed that the teacher could function in a less directive way as a facilitator by personalizing the learning experience through intrinsic motivation and awareness-raising strategies. By making the learning process more accessible (i.e. helping learners to clear away obstacles, find shortcuts, and negotiate difficult passages) to students, the teacher could facilitate planning, independent language learning, self-evaluation, and the acquisition of skills and knowledge. Voller (1997) indicated that the least directive role teachers could assume would be to act as instructional counselors since they were the people in the best position to "provide information and answer questions about self-access resources and how best to use them" (p. 104). Wolff (1994) indicated that teachers could serve as an authoritative resource for language learners since teachers were capable of sharing "action knowledge" (p. 14) in the form of meaningful learning experiences and personal exemplars of goal achievement in learning how to speak authentic English. In the role of authoritative resource, teachers can demonstrate the kind of desired learning behaviors that facilitate language learning according to the better judgment of the teacher vis-à-vis the student.

Another important role of the teacher in the EFL classroom is as an implementer of effective EFL speaking strategies whenever students are reluctant to speak. Tsui (1996) formulated six teacher-centered speaking strategies to help students overcome anxiety and reticence: (a) to lengthen wait times between question and responses, (b) to improve questioning techniques, (c) to accept a variety of answers rather than a set response, (d) to allow for student rehearsals, (e) to focus on content over form, and (f) to establish good relations with students. In addition, Tsui suggested that teachers can remind students to avoid rote answers or given responses by replacement with those that demonstrate individuality. Practically speaking, Teachers also can provide some clues or references for students can to reflect on those ideas and expressions in class discussions. And, of course, the level of rapport between teacher and student is of great importance in creating the trust required for open and meaningful classroom discussion.

Lee and Ng (2010) claimed that the directive role of teachers was significantly important in classroom interaction and speaking development. Accordingly, three types of teacher-initiated interaction strategy were proposed for use in the EFL oral classroom: teacher-fronted, facilitator-fronted, and learner-oriented. In his study, Cullen (2002) found that the teacher-fronted strategy allowed teachers to transmit and construct knowledge to students, but directly influenced student initiative to speak. However, this strategy was almost always form-focused, which did little to encourage the kind of meaningful (i.e. spontaneous) classroom interaction. In their study, Lee and Ng (2010) found that the facilitator-fronted strategy was best at allowing teachers to facilitate spoken interaction through the personalization of topic matter. Students were also more inclined to use referential questions relevant to other students and themselves, reformulation of personal utterances, elaboration of self-referential content, commentary of a personal nature, and the repetition of subjective points. Teachers using the facilitator-fronted strategy tend to impose longer wait times for student responses, thus allowing reticent students more time to formulate responses. Garton (2002) that EFL teachers using the preferred facilitator-fronted strategy to teach speaking were able to break free of the obvious constraints of the IRF interaction pattern.

In sum, the essential role of teachers in the EFL classroom is to provide students of English speaking with learning opportunities. The role of teachers in the EFL classroom directly influences students because teachers have the power to control and direct the content and the procedures used to learn. They act as facilitators, counselors, and authoritative resources for their students. Teachers must make a personal connection between what students need to learn in order to speak and scaffold every effort students attempt until they are ready to learn interdependently. Teachers can also personalize the learning experience in such a way that engages students to participate and create the need to speak. Teachers are the best resource for fulfilling the vital task of overcoming reticence in the EFL classroom.

6. Roles of Students in the Asian EFL Classroom

Students learn speaking by engaging in tasks because the focus is on process rather than on product. Thus, the various tasks that students engage in will dictate the role they will take on in the EFL classroom, in general, and during communicative interactions in particular (Lee, & VanPatten, 2003). This orienting role taken by the student in the EFL classroom may be clearly defined as an application of the interaction hypothesis (Long, 1985) which assumes language learners as interactive participants who engage in a shared attempt to communicate in a target language. Students in the EFL classroom are expected to “learn-by-doing” and challenge the paradigmatic boundaries of their previous language learning experience. Richard-Amato (1996) indicated that EFL students who did classroom interaction are affected and often changed by the contact and by the total social situation surrounding it. However, Richard-Amato was quick to add, “More often than not, students play only passive or superficial roles in the events in the classroom” (p. xii). The implication of this last remark is that more effort needs to be expended in making the EFL student autonomous and which teachers will have to take responsibility to make this happen.

The initial role of the language learner in a classroom is to follow the teacher’s direction. Traditionally, students are expected to become increasingly independent as a logical outcome of the learning process. However, autonomy in the EFL classroom does not imply full independence of the student from the teacher. Instead, students are expected to become interdependent on peers and teachers alike to scaffold their classroom progress and intercede on their behalf when they need help or encouragement. Larsen-Freeman (1986) identified the sequential movement of this dependent-to-mutual-interdependency role through five recognizable stages. In Stages I, II, and III, students assumed a supported role that required the teacher’s scaffolding and intervention classroom instruction. In Stages IV and V, teachers relaxed this directed role, allowing students to benefit from increased self-assurance, overall corrections, and a focus on the students’ role as an accurate speaker.

Typically, students are expected to play the roles of listeners, performers, and interactors while speaking in the language classroom (Nunan, 1999). When teachers choose to use the CLT in the EFL classroom, emphasis should be placed on the processes of communication, rather than keep the form of a language which influences learner roles (Richards, & Rodgers, 2001). The stated purpose of communicative language teaching is to facilitate rather than to hinder language production and acquisition. The achievement of understanding and being understood is of greater importance than proper grammatical structure as long as the input and the output are meaningful (Krashen, 1985). Students also act as negotiators in the language process.

Breen and Candlin (1980) described the language learners' role as negotiators in the EFL classroom by accepting shared responsibility for the interaction by stating:

The role of the learner as negotiator – between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning – emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn an interdependent way (p. 110).

The proposed role of “joint negotiation” between the instructor and the learners in answering the question would be to recognize that communication is a shared concern in which successful communication is a shared accomplishment, jointly shared and openly acknowledged.

A similar study, Gass (1997) found that language learners should be expected to take individual responsibility for their own speaking by negotiating the flow and the quality of input directed to them whenever engaged in some kind of discourse. Lee (2000; cited in VanPatten, & Lee, 2003) offered the following components of negotiation in a speaking context:

Negotiation consists of interactions during which speakers come to terms, reach an agreement, make agreements, resolve a problem, or settle an issue by conferring or discussing; the purpose of language use is to accomplish some task rather than to practice any particular language forms (p. 65).

Negotiation is required for successful communication to occur, for conversations to progress naturally, and for speakers to be able to understand one another. It helps speakers and listeners to understand each other's expressions and ideas.

Roberts and Ching (2011) indicated that students in different majors displayed different views, strategies and practices representing a blending of contradictory positions and discourses. These differences require the teacher to adapt the lesson to match a wide range of priorities and expectations. Liu (2001) asserted that students coming from different learning styles displayed different modes of classroom behavior that are culturally specific. Learners carry their own conceptions of what is appropriate behavior to the classroom, which may be entirely at odds with their teacher's expectations. They will have to realize the need to develop multiple personalities in the learning community so that they consider active participation as an opportunity to achieve their own cultural transformation. Students at different English speaking proficiency levels displayed different challenges to instruct, so teachers may take advantage of class size to get quiet or less-proficient students to speak. Accordingly, large classes afford ample opportunities for cooperative, interdependent learning to take place.

In sum, the role that students assume in the EFL classroom has a great deal to do with their success in English speaking. The various tasks that students engage in will dictate the role they will take on. In the beginning, the initial role of the language student is to follow the teacher's direction. Students are expected to play the roles of listeners, performers, and interactors whenever speaking in the language classroom. They also are supposed to act as negotiators in the language process because of their mutual acceptance of a shared responsibility for the communicative interaction taking place. Finally, the most important role that an EFL student may assume is to be an interactive participant who becomes increasingly independent through the learning process.

7. Discussion and Conclusions

In light of the above given research findings, it is strongly believed that curriculum developers, educators, and administrators need to make a number of changes in their overall approach to the explicit and implicit teaching process with a view of creating the ideal learning environment in their schools:

- Become more willing to participate in English activities outside the classroom because the teacher regularly encouraged them to do so
- Make inquiry about what they were planning to do outside the class that week. Such inquiry became a regular part of the classroom discussion.
- Insure that the discussion topics are creative since the classroom mix of videos, songs, role play, and self-selected presentations promotes regular inclusion and participation.
- Provide students with numerous opportunities of intercultural exploration. When students encounter new cultural aspects or reflect on their own culture through the perception of foreign eyes, it is possible to gain their interest.

The English speaking curriculum design should be meaningful and inspiring for students. For most EFL students, reticence in the classroom is a result of habitual behaviors that are culturally-based and institutional in nature (Tsui, 1996). Many students at Taiwanese colleges now face direct inclusion into a classroom environment that is Western in its pedagogical premise due to the influence of globalized higher education. Liu (2009) approved that students should become more aware of the practical importance of English in their daily lives and become anxious to have a good command of spoken English.

Finally, to achieve the purposes of both implicit and explicit EFL language speaking instruction, the English speaking curriculum should be designed with two major principles in mind. The first principle is to expose students to authentic and practical settings for speaking English. The next principle is that teachers should encourage students to be involved and actively participate in English speaking for communication in the classroom. By doing so, communications between the teacher and students and the students and students may be ultimately increased for the benefit of all.

References

- Aoki, N. (1999). Affect and the role of teachers in the development of learner autonomy. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp. 142-154). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Belchamber, R. (2008). The advantages of communicative language teaching. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved January 14, 2012, from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Belchamber-CLT.html>
- Benson, P. (2001) *Teaching & researching: Autonomy in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Breen, M.P., & Candlin, C. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 89-112.
- Brown, G., Malmkjær, K., & Williams, J. (Eds.) (1996). *Performance & competence in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chambers, F. (1997). Seeking consensus in course-book evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 27-54.
- Chamot, A.U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P. B., & Robbins, J. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Chang, M. (2011). EFL teachers' attitudes toward Communicative Language Teaching in a Taiwanese college. *Asian EFL Journal*, 17-34.
- Cheng, X.T. (2000). Asian students' reticence revisited. *System*, 28(3), 435-446.
- Chomsky, N. (1965), *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Retrieved on February 20, 2014, from <http://books.google.com/books?id=u0ksbFqagU8C>
- Crookall, D., & Oxford, R. (1991). Dealing with anxiety: Some practical activities for language learners and teacher trainees. In E. K. Horwitz, & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 141-150). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Debashish, B. (2010). Asian students' perceived passivity in the ESL/EFL classroom. *Language in India*, 10(10), 150-179.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: OUP.
- Garton, S. (2002). Learner initiative in language classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 47-55.
- Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System*, 31, 367-383.
- Ho, J., & Crookall, D. (1995). Breaking with Chinese cultural traditions: Learner autonomy in English language teaching. *System*, 23 (2), 235-243.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford, (UK): Pergamon.
- Holec, H. (1985). On autonomy: Some elementary concepts. In P. Riley (Ed.), *Discourse and learning* (pp. 173-190). London: Longman.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jackson, J. (2003). Case-based learning and reticence in a bilingual context: Perceptions of business students in Hong Kong. *System*, 31 (4), 457-469.
- Johnson, K. (1982). *Communicative syllabus design & methodology*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London: Longman
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques & principles in language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Lee, J. F. (2000). *Tasks and communicating in language classrooms*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Lee, W., & Ng, S. (2010). Reducing student reticence through teacher interaction strategy. *ELT Journal Advance Access*. doi:10. 1093/elt/ccp080.
- Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). Making communicative language teaching happen. Taipei: McGraw-Hill International.
- Li, X., & Jia, X. (2006). Why don't you speak up?: East Asian Students' Participation patterns in American and Chinese ESL classrooms. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 15(1), 192-206.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Liu, J. (2001). *Asian students' classroom communication patterns in U.S. universities: An emic perspective*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.
- Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass, & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M. H. (1990). The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(4), 649-666.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second-language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, 39, 251-275.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44, 283-305.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009) *Teaching ESL / EFL listening and speaking*. New York: Routledge.
- Ninio, A., & Bruner, J. S. (1978). The achievement and antecedents of labeling. *Journal of Child Language*, 5, 1-15.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Pierson, H. (1996). Learner culture and learner autonomy in the Hong Kong Chinese context. In R. Pemberton, E. Li, W. Or, & H. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 49-60). Hong Kong: HK University Press.
- Rao, Z. (2000). Chinese students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in the EFL classroom. *System*, 30, 85-105.
- Reber, A. (1976). Implicit learning of synthetic learners: the role of the instructional set. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, Human Learning and Memory*, 6, 88-94.
- Richard-Amato, P. A. (1996). Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom: From theory to practice. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W.A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Ambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Ltd.
- Roberts, A., & Ching, R. (2011). Concepts, contributions, and challenges of the contemporary university community in Taiwan. In J.D. Palmer, A. Roberts, Y.H. Cho, & G.S. Ching (Eds.), *The internationalization of East Asian higher education: globalization's impact* (pp. 41-62). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Seliger, H.W. (1975). Inductive method and deductive method in language teaching: A re-examination. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 1-18.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning*. London: Arnold.
- Tsou, W. L. (2005). Improving speaking skills through instruction in oral classroom participation. *Language Annals*, 38(1), 46-55.
- Tsui, A.B.M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K.M. Bailey, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145-167). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Voller, P. (1997). Does the teacher have a role in autonomous language learning? In P. Benson, & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 98-113). London: Longman.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watkins, D., & Biggs, J. (Eds.) (2001). *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives*. Hong Kong: Central Printing Press.
- Wolff, D. (1994). *New approaches to language teaching: An overview* (Vol. 39, CLCS Occasional Paper). Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language & Communication Studies.
- Wong, W. (2005). *Input enhancement: From theory and research to the classroom*. Taipei: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Wu, W. S. (2006). A study of the views of EFL university English-major students and native English-speaking teachers towards conversation classes in Taiwan. *Journal of National Formosa University*, 95-104.