

修订版

上册

学生用书

高等学校教材（英语专业用）

交际英语教程 核心课程（二）

李筱菊 主编

COMMUNICATIVE ENGLISH
FOR CHINESE LEARNERS

CORE COURSE 2
(UNITS 1—5)
(REVISED EDITION)

CECL

上海外语教育出版社



高等学校教材(英语专业用)

交际英语教程

核心课程(二)

(修订版) 上册

主 编 李筱菊

副主编 萧惠云 王 虹

CECL

COMMUNICATIVE ENGLISH
FOR CHINESE LEARNERS

CORE COURSE 2

(UNITS 1 – 5)

(Revised Edition)

上海外语教育出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

交际英语教程核心课程. 2. 上册 = Communicative English
for Chinese Learners / 李筱菊主编. - 2 版 (修订版). - 上
海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2000
高等学校教材. 英语专业用
ISBN 7-81046-835-9

I. 交… II. 李… III. 人间交往 - 英语 - 高等学
校 - 教材 IV. H31-43/L494
中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2000) 第 25712 号

出版发行: **上海外语教育出版社**

(上海外国语大学内) 邮编: 200083

电 话: 021-65425300 (总机), 65422031 (发行部)

电子邮箱: bookinfo@sflap.com.cn

网 址: <http://www.sflap.com.cn> <http://www.sflap.com>

责任编辑: 江雷红

印 刷: 常熟市印刷八厂

经 销: 新华书店上海发行所

开 本: 787×1092 1/16 印张 25.25 字数 586 千字

版 次: 2000 年 11 月第 2 版 2001 年 7 月第 2 次印刷

印 数: 5 000 册

书 号: ISBN 7-81046-835-9 / H · 677

定 价: 20.10 元

本版图书如有印装质量问题, 可向本社调换

修订版前言

CECL 教程 1987 年初版以来, 不断重印使用, 至今已十二年。十二年后的今天审视 CECL 教程, 可以得出两点结论: (一) 十二年前 CECL 的编写, 以国际上先进、国内当时是超前的交际语言教学理论为依据。经过十二年的考验, 证明 CECL 的教学理论体系至今仍不失其先进性, 依然具有旺盛的生命力和发展潜力。这是 CECL 修订的价值所在。(二) 十二年来世界在不断地发展和变化。不断变化和发展的现实对英语教学自然有不断变化和发展的要求。从这个角度看, 十二年前编的教材, 内容和方式上都必然要有所更新, 以赶上国内外形势的发展。这是 CECL 修订的必要性。

根据以上两点结论, 我们作出 CECL 修订的决定。修订原则是: (1) 保持原来的交际语言教学的编写体系。保持原来的单元高度灵活多变特点。(2) 进一步发扬和落实交际语言教学思想, 同时更强调语言教学中文化知识的渗透。这除了在教程内容和方法上贯彻之外, 还特别在教师手册中作大量补充, 就教学思想和方法以及文化背景知识方面给教师充分的辅导。(3) 更新内容过时或受时间限制的材料, 增添反映新世纪新时代的材料。(4) 根据十二年课堂使用的经验, 对教学中效果不理想部分加以改进或删减, 薄弱部分加以补充或增强。

修订工作由前身为广州外国语学院英语系的现广东外语外贸大学英语语言文化学院教师负责。除了初版原主编李筱菊外, 增加副主编两人: 萧惠云、王虹。先后参加修订工作的教师还有以下八位: Rod Lawrence, Jon Fearon-Jones, 王义, 刘祥福, 程岸, 梁慧研, 周学麟, 谭智。谭智兼负责组织录音工作。参加录音的有本学院的教师和大学的外籍留学生。另外还特邀 CECL 的老朋友 Martin Wedell 和 Janet Beddison 参加。

梁简容负责电脑打字输入和排版。

修订版文字教材由上海外语教育出版社出版。录音磁带由广东外语外贸大学电教中心录制, 上海外语音像出版社出版。修订工作前后虽经数年努力, 但是必然还有不少错漏及需改进之处, 恳望使用修订版 CECL 的教师学生随时给我们提出意见, 帮助我们不断改进。

在修订中我们参考了兄弟院校在使用 CECL 的过程中所提出的意见和提供的部分补充材料, 在此表示感谢。

修订版主编

2000 年 3 月 29 日

初 版 前 言

CECL 的编写试用始于 1979 年。1980 年列入教育部高等学校外语专业教材编审委员会五年编审出版计划。1982 年起列为广州外国语学院与英国文化委员会 (The British Council) 的教学科研合作项目。1985 年经国家教育委员会高等外语专业教材编审委员会审查, 定为推荐教材出版, 在国内发行使用。

CECL 是专为我国大专院校英语专业一、二年级学生设计编写的。但经若干年的试用, 证明除了适用于综合大学、外语学院及师范大学英语专业学生外, 也适用于大专院校非英语专业 (包括文、理科) 学生、业余大学英语专业学生、进修英语的教师、准备去英语国家的出国进修人员以及其他从事外事工作的英语进修人员。

CECL 的编写以我国英语工作者面临的文化交流任务为前提, 在取材上注意了西方文化的介绍和中西文化的对比。在培养适应四化需要的英语工作人员这个目标指导下, CECL 结合我国实际, 吸收国外新的英语教学法, 针对我国英语工作者的实际需要设计了各种听、说、读、写、译的教学内容及教学活动, 在选材、编排及方法上力求做到实用、科学、多样、生动。

CECL 整套教材以核心课程为主, 按需要辅以语音、语法、词汇、听、说、读、写各科的辅助课程。CECL 核心课程共分四册, 以每周八个学时计, 每册可用一学期, 四册可供学员使用两个学年。非英语专业学员可视需要以及时间多寡酌情选用。CECL 核心课程 1—4 册包括的主要内容有: 衣食住行、社交礼节、文娱体育、医疗卫生、风俗习惯、经济贸易、政治、历史、少数民族、社会问题等。全书配有教师手册以及录音磁带。

CECL 从编写、试用直到出版, 除了广州外国语学院 CECL 教材、教学组同仁的协作外, 还得到校内外、国内外不少人士的支持。这些人士包括 (按时间先后为序):

正式全时参加教材编写的我院中外籍教师: Wendy Allen, Nina Spada, 林向荣, Tim Lockwood, Carol Pomeroy, Caroline Philcox, 杜锦江, 王初明, 朱林, 陈昉生, 黄小桦, 邹纪平, Susan Maingay, Gail Langley, 黄国文, 傅文燕, 李海丽, Christopher Joslin, Richard Farmer, 杨世宏, 吕鸿, 羊芳菲, Martin Wedell, 汤晓春;

短时参与编写工作的我院外籍教师: Glen Allen, Fiona Weston, Moya Brennah, Christopher Tribble;

帮助看稿提意见、提供资料、参加及协助录音的人员: Mary- Ellen Belfore, Richard Young, Shaun MacNally, Danielle MacNally, 陈明初, 孙熙, 萧惠云, 高喆, Alan Maley, Bob Fox, Robert Neilson, Theodore S. Rodgers, L. G. Alexander, Bob Hodge, Brian Abbs, Christopher N. Candlin, Keith W. Mitchell, Michael Short, Tim Boswood, Mary Stansfield, Christopher J. Brumfit, John Simpson, Debbie Simpson, Roger Berry; Janet Beddison;

负责资料、打字录音制作和编辑工作人员: 马俊伟, 顾睿哲, 邓玉珊;

北京外国语学院许国璋教授为本书撰写了序言、并给予了热情的支持;

北京外国语学院胡文仲教授担任了本书的主审, 复旦大学陆国强教授, 辽宁大学欧阳筱苏教授参加了本书的审稿;

上海外语教育出版社和广州外语音像教材出版社承担了本书的编辑出版和录音磁带的录制发行工作。

对于以上及其他人士和单位的支持帮助, 我们一并在此表示衷心的感谢。

CECL 出版虽已经过试用修改, 但难免还有许多有待改进之处。我们恳切希望使用本书的各界人士不吝赐教, 以利今后修订。

主 编 者

1986 年 5 月 17 日

FOREWORD

WHEN Li Xiaojun launched her communicative approach from her Guangzhou base in 1979 or earlier, all her friends voiced support but did so with fingers crossed. After all, a text-based, teacher-centered learning pattern had dominated China for so long that although everybody thought a break was long overdue, few believed that to be possible. It was too deeply entrenched, in curriculums and books and educational thinking, to be pulled down by a handful of teachers, however inventive as experimentalists, and however devoted. It wasn't that China had remained static socially or educationally (although this has been our post-facto view), for between 1950 and 1976 there was a centrally inspired teaching reform once every three years, each with an enthusiastically acclaimed new method lasting an average span of about six months or slightly longer. It was on when a political movement was on, off when it was off, begun with fanfare and terminated as a rule with a sigh of relief. Whatever new method was adopted, in the center of it was the teacher delivering knowledge from a text and the student receiving it notebook in hand. Each reform promised a get-away from our stereotyped education but in the end invariably surrendered to tradition which was thought dependable though uninnovative.

Then something truly different came on the scene — in 1964, that mid-year in the lull before the storm. It was the audio-lingual method, or in plain Chinese, the listen-and-speak method. Some literature came along with it which gave the semblance of a rationale in TEFL. Language being in its primary state spoken language, the printed text was in some cases deliberately done away with and in most cases withheld from the students until audio-lingual drills had been thoroughly done. The lesson began with a story told by the teacher, who after rehearsals did it with skill and charm. The students listened avidly, knowing well they were to be questioned on the content after the telling was over. Then came the questions, all carefully structured, each with a statement followed by a tag question. Using the built-in answer for his response, the respondent was both quick and accurate. Classes were filled from beginning to end with an orchestrated pattern play, and the occasional visitor would be amazed and delighted — but for the first hour only. The second hour entertained him with much the same orchestration — that of word or phrase substitution in a given slot. It would then be seen that the whole performance was but a demonstration of Bloomfield's Stimulus-Response Theory, fashionable during the last war and for some years immediately afterwards, but already thought antiquated by the mid-1960s.

Now why was it that the S-R theory could have been so unquestioningly embraced in China, and went on well in to the 70's and this after Chomsky, after the two scathing reviews of B. F. Skinner, after the Colorado experiment, and after our own discovery that the 1964 - 1966

experiment failed to provide a sound foundation for a learner's first two years?

It is, I think, not difficult to give an answer. The audio-lingual method, in spite of its oral-approach novelty, fitted in well enough with the country's centuries-old tradition of teacher-centered education. It went one step further, and for worse. In the old type of education, teaching was at least meaning-related, and a student would be asked to pre-read a text, to make sense out of strings of printed forms, before coming to class, where he was expected to answer questions, generally on points likely to have escaped him. A thoughtful student did educate himself that way and speed away on his steam. Under the pattern drill orchestration, however, language was taught in formulas or patterns, and every exchange between student and teacher was pre-structured to perfection. Every sentence was made to be predictable although unpredictability was the very essence of human communication. With automatic response as the aim, the student was being trained as an automaton, who in actual communication finished his stock of drilled responses in a matter of minutes.

The early seventies saw the advent of Pingpong diplomacy and Kissinger and Nixon — and a variety of TEFL targets and the means to get there. Teaching began to be split into listening, reading, speaking and writing — no doubt a welcome change, but the Bloomfieldian S-R stayed on, and the teacher-centeredness remained unchallenged.

And there were other methods, each with a theory and a book to substantiate that theory. Then came Xiaoju's Communicative Approach, which differed from the rest in two important ways.

1. Because the method was new in every way, it met with considerable resistance from the start. It not only proposed the communicative approach: it actually viewed language itself as communication. What role was then left for the teacher, or for that matter, for examinations? How about grammar, which strings words into meaningful utterances, and general knowledge, which provides matter for communication? Your adult learners will of course be interested — but where are they going to learn the means for appropriateness and pointedness? Questions were followed by discussions and these by patched-up agreements — hardly a concerted effort aided by an unshaken faith which was so important to any innovator.

Xiaoju remained firm; she thought and read and revised and redesigned; her work went on as she went on undaunted; gradually, a feasible model evolved of itself, receptive to modifications but never losing sight of its original goal. The devotion she was known for now became infectious, and in time there grew up a core of devotees, loyal to the experiment, to its initiator and leader, to each other. One and all, they were the designer and writer of the book which is now before us.

2. What was even more important than the formation of a core of devoted teachers was the formulation of a language-teaching theory, and I believe it was this that really distinguished Xiaoju and her group.

I love to read Xiaoju's theorizings. These sometimes assume a tone of finality which some may not like. But there is in-depth reasoning all through, and it carries conviction. She quotes

sparingly if at all. The theory is from her own experience, and from her own pen. Without using quotes, I shall now represent Xiaoju's position as I see it.

1st query: The student has got to have some foundation prior to communication. What would you say that foundation is?

I would not presume they would be ready for communication on the first day. Nevertheless we'll put them on communication right from the start. We *don't* believe in teaching students to learn. Rather, we believe in having students learn how to *learn* — *by themselves*. Of course the first lessons are going to be difficult — the students have to undergo a process — and language learning is a process, not an event — of reorientation from grammatical correctness to sociolinguistic acceptability.

2nd query: Sociolinguistic acceptability involves a good many things — perhaps too many to be teachable?

Exactly. Communication involves the forms of a language, the use of forms, and the information carried in the forms. Learning a language's forms, we thought, is not really learning the language but *pre-learning* it; real language learning begins only when learners start using it in a communicative context — authentic interpersonal exchanges where information is sought and given, attitudes are made out, opinions distinguished from facts, conclusions evaluated for their worth and so on.

3rd query: But perhaps there is a separate stage for everything?

There can be different stages. However, we believe in plunging students into a dynamic — three-dimensional if you like — use of language, our end-of-the-term tests avoid testing forms as such but only in relation to communicative effectiveness. Scoring is not going to be easy though, because it is still very much an empirical balance between form, use and content.

On the other hand, concentration on forms, held axiomatic in most of our TEFL classrooms in the end tend to be demotivating to the adult learner, who hates baby talk. Language lessons that seem to contain a little too much — and ours certainly do — may seem frightening to the learner at the orientation stage, but once that is over, he will be moving along until acculturation is reached.

4th query: As well as language, you took a holistic view of the learner. Please explain.

A learner is not a mark-book entity; it is sad to reflect that too many of our teachers view him that way. He, sitting in your class, is still in his formative years. His classroom experience will not be the begin-all and end-all of his education. The world outside the classroom is infinitely wide, richer, entirely unpredictable and totally challenging. His intellect grows as his exposure to the world widens, and his language grows with it. All right, here is his graduating essay and you as his supervisor give a mark to it. But what is that mark to what he will learn in future years? The learner, on his part, will have been fully aware of the world that always welcomes an inquiring mind. There is a learner beyond the classroom learner, a language beyond the teacher's language, a world beyond the campus world. A good teacher never thinks that he is totally capable — even within

the four walls of his classroom, where he is king; a good learner never despairs of learning things after leaving school and learning them well.

Finally let's see how Xiaoju and her colleagues make her students learn how to learn. Here is a splendid sample.

Inappropriate responses-reading & pairwork discussion.

You will read 12 short dialogues between a foreign visitor (F) and a Chinese guide (C). Discuss each dialogue in pairs and decide why the response given is inappropriate. Decide on an appropriate response and write it down. Then listen to the tape to compare.

1. F: Do a lot of Chinese people have the opportunity to travel in China?
C: Of course.
2. F: I really don't know how to thank you for what you've done for us.
C: Oh, it's my duty.
3. F: You've arranged everything so perfectly. Thank you so much.
C: No thanks.
4. F: You speak English so well.
C: No, my English is very poor.
5. F: It has been a most unforgettable experience visiting your factory.
C: Please give us your criticisms.
6. F: I'm sorry but this vase you sold me is cracked. I'll have to ask you to give me my money back.
C: Don't mention it!
7. F: Will you have some cheese?
C: I never eat cheese.
8. F: You look very nice today.
C: Not at all.
9. F: I'd love to visit that old building.
C: Foreigners are not allowed.
10. F: Why can't I have pictures here?
C: You just can't.
11. F: You mean I can't wear this on the beach?
C: No, it's not nice to look at.
12. F: Two weeks is really too short for seeing a great country like China.
C: Yes, China is a great socialist country.

Now these short dialogues were each of them sociolinguistically designed, with appropriateness as the target of training. They offered a marked contrast to what

prevailed in the audio-lingual classroom less than a decade ago. There the emphasis was on form and the problem of appropriateness didn't seem to matter, and many of the 12 answers given here would have actually delighted some teachers, thinking that here at last were some thought-bearing answers which, though crude, were yet a lot better than the robot-like "Yes, I do. No, I don't." type. What great progress we have made since the termination of mindless learning! If this is not modernizing China's TEFL, I do not know what is.

* * * * *

I have been asked to write a short preface, but had to end up with a not too short one: I had facing me such a plethora of ideas that I found it difficult to be brief. In my own writings I took cognition, not communication, to be the primary function of language, but obviously this is not the place to argue. I began by saying that Xiaoju's friends, hearing of her 1979 undertaking, all wished her well. Her book is now out, her ideas have matured into a beautifully-thought-out presentation, her experiment, tentative in its initial years, has grown into an accepted project that not even diehards in our profession would want to ignore. Pleased and relaxed, her friends will now say: "Well done! There is still uphill work to do, and most likely no end of it. But never fear the fear of Sisyphus: we are behind you."

Xu Guozhang
Beijing

致 CECL 学员

1. 学什么?

英语课学的是什么?自然是学英语。学英语,就是要获得用英语交际的能力。交际在这里不限于社交往来,也不仅仅指会话交谈,而是指人与人之间一切思想感情的交流。以英语为主要工具的交际,包括听、说、读、写、译等等方式。

怎样才算获得英语的交际能力,才算学会英语?一般的概念是:这不外乎学会英语的语音、语法、词汇。可是,即使英语语音、语法、词汇全学会了,是不是就能用英语进行交际?设想,一部计算机里装进整个英语语音体系、语法体系和全部词汇,这部计算机是否能用英语进行交际?显然还是不可能的。计算机要能用英语交际,除了必须能造所有可能的英语句子外,还得知道在什么场合或上下文中,为了达到什么目的,对什么身份的人该说什么话。即使它贮存了全部英语单词的全部意义,随便给它一句话,它也还必须能分辨这句话在此时此地由此人以这种方式说出来,到底是什么意思、什么意图、表示一种什么态度、指望一种什么反应。更根本的是,计算机还必须有思想感情,否则即使它能造出交际用的句子,却没有交际的内容,还是不能真正像人一样交际。

可见,掌握英语的语音、语法、词汇,远远不等于具备英语的交际能力。英语的交际能力,是多种能力的综合体。仅就英语教学范围而言,这综合体包含下列三种能力:英语的语言能力,英语的实用能力,以及认知和感受能力。

1) 英语的语言能力

这是指有关英语形式(语音、语法、词汇)的知识及这种知识见诸于耳、口、眼、笔的听说读写技巧。也就是传统的英语教科书所教和所要求的全部内容。这种能力是很必要的,但是我们已证明,这不等于交际能力,只是交际能力的一部分。

2) 英语的实用能力

这可以分为三个方面:

一、对英语在一定情况下实际使用的规矩的认识。换言之,就是知道在什么场合、什么关系的人之间用什么语言形式去体现什么交际功能。在实际交际中,如果不懂这些规矩,别人说的、写的话的语音、语法、词汇你全都懂,也未必知道真正的意图。自己说的写的话,

即使语音、语法、词汇都没错，别人听来却可能全然不是你原来的意思。举一个例，“You will do that, won't you, mate?” 这样一句话，表面是问句，实际的功能，在不同的情况下却大不相同，可能是询问、请求、期待、肯定、建议、忠告、挑战、讽刺、挖苦、威胁等等。不会区别这些，就无法进行交际。

二、有关英语语篇结构的知识。实际交际中的语言，不管是一人的讲话文章还是数人互相对答，从来都不是孤立零散的，而是编织在一起的，这就叫做语篇。要用语言交际，自然得知道语言怎么组织成语篇。比如说，英语语篇用什么手段保持前后连贯，如何标志各部分之间的关系（主次关系、并列关系、对比关系、总体和部分关系等等），如何表示每部分在语篇结构中的作用（启引、承转、发挥、例证、归纳、预示、总结等等）。不懂得这些，就无法在上下文中了解及表达意义，无法在听和读的时候跟上别人的思路，在讲和写的时候引导对方跟随自己的思路。

三、对英语的交际策略的掌握。交际是一种你来我往的过程。这当中有一套策略。比如交谈，整个过程中交谈者要不断发出信号，表示自己要继续、停止、插话、换题或让对方继续、停止、插话、换题等等。这些信号往往不见于字面，而寓于字里行间，谈话者如果不会发出并接收这种信号，谈话就难以进行。这是交际策略的一种。又比如听演讲和看文章，不免碰到听不清的音、不懂的单词、或者不明白的结构，这就必须知道怎样跳过障碍从上下文抓意思。自己说话或写文章时，也会遇到想不起的单词或没把握的结构，也得知道怎样绕过难点把要表达的意思表达出来。这些，也都属于交际中必须会运用的策略。

以上三个方面构成英语的实用能力。

3) 认知和感受能力

有人认为，这种能力不属于英语课的任务范围。其实，学语言和提高认知、感受能力必然是相辅相成的。学语言不是学一套形式，而是学交际，而交际又不仅仅是发出和接收单词句子，交际必须有内容。内容正是来自思想感情，来自人的认知和感受能力。当然，英语课毕竟是学使用英语这个工具的课，不是文化知识或思想品德课。但是，让学生学语言却不给以有意义的内容，就像叫学徒学用斧子却不让他砍树木，只让他在空气中练习挥舞斧子一样可笑。事实证明，要学会使用语言这工具，最有效的途径正是把它作为工具来学——就是说，让它作为学习某种内容的工具，小孩学话，并不是通过语言课，而是通过用语言来交流思想感情，用语言来学其他知识。因此，我们认为，语言教材应当有丰富、充实的内容，为学生所需要的内容，而且是能针对性地提高学生的认知和感受能力的内容。CECL 是为我国大学英语专业学生编写的。这些学生毕业后将担负我国和英语国家之间文化交流的工作。教材

有责任帮助增进他们的学识，提高他们的素养，增进他们对英语国家文化的了解和兴趣，提高他们对中外文化交流的认识和热情。没有这种了解和兴趣，没有这种认识和热情，没有这种学识和素养，不能算是具备了适应中外交流所需要的交际能力，也不能算是合格的国际文化交流工作者。

以上便是学英语所应获得的英语交际能力的三个构成部分。三个部分缺少任何一个，都会是片面的，都难以达到获得交际能力这个目的。

2. 怎样学

既然所要“学”的是交际能力，是交际过程中实际运用的能力，最好的途径自然就是通过交际去学。通过交际去学交际，这话说来道理显浅，实际上并不那么简单。比如说，背课文，记单词，也是学习方法，算不算交际？两人背对话，就课文问答，算不算交际？我们认为，真正的交际，应该符合四个条件：

一、交际是通过语言媒介送出或收取情报。目的在情报内容上，不在语言上。为了把某种内容传达给对方而讲而写，这是交际；为了练习某种语音、语法、词汇而讲而写，那不是交际。为了获知文章或讲话的内容而读而听，这是交际；为了学语音、语法、词汇而读而听，那不是交际。

二、交际不能脱离具体情况。这具体情况包括社会背景、时、地、场合、人的身份与彼此的关系、题材范围、交际方式、交际目的、语篇的上下文等等。悬空的语言不是交际。比如说：“Is this a pen?” “Yes, it is.” 能说得出什么实际交际情况下什么身份的人之间为什么交际目的说这样的话，才能算是交际，否则只是无交际意义的句型操练。

三、交际必然有自由和不可预料性。在具体情况所允许的范围内，讲或写的人可以选择他要讲要写的意思，也可以选择表达这个意思的方式。听者读者，一方面对对方要说什么、如何说法不可预料，一方面对对方的话如何去理解，也有一定的自由。这就是交际。如果甲学生说什么、乙学生说什么，都规定好了，这就不能算交际。提问回答，未问已知答案；读文章听讲话，未读未听已知内容；文章讲话里单词、语法也全不出所知范围，这些都只是语言操练，没有交际价值。

四、交际的具体情况及语言都必须有真实性。对我国学生来说，给父母用英语写信，这个具体情况是不真实的。课本里学的一对美国青年讨论度假的语言我国学生用起来也是不真实的。这样的活动让我国学生去做，前者可以说是练习，后者可以说是演戏，都不能说是交际。

上面这四个交际的条件，自然不是课堂里时时都能做到。我们在课堂里学外语，只能尽可能地创造进行交际活动的条件。CECL 教材里的活动，有些可以说是交际性的，有些就只能说是半交际性的，有些则是非交际性的。事实上由于交际能力也包括语言能力，所以有时也要有一些非交际性的语言活动（语音、语法、词汇练习等）。但是有一点必须明确，整个学习过程，重点是交际活动。语言活动只是辅助性的，为交际服务的。归根结底，交际能力还是要通过交际活动才能获得。

以上说的是怎样学的大原则。以下谈怎样学的一些具体问题。

1) 量与质

任何一种语言，都是一个变化无穷、非常复杂的体系。不通过大量的接触、大量的交际实践，是无法掌握的。每周“精读”一篇课文，每学期熟读一本教材，这种传统的学习方法，是完全不能达到掌握语言作为交际工具的目的的。试想我们学习母语汉语，所听的、讲的、读的、写的，一共有多少？难道不超出语文课程里所接触的无数倍？这样一算，我们就会明白，我们在国内，学的是英语，像 CECL 这样的教材，份量虽然比传统教材多了至少十倍，还是不能说太多，而只能说不够。在教材之外，还必须尽可能地寻找更多的接触真实英语的机会。

这种大量接触真实英语的学习方法，自然和过去捧着一本书死啃的方法完全不同。曾有些学生开始还想用逐个记生词、逐篇背课文的方法来学我们的教材，结果发现是行不通的。我们说要大量“接触”语言材料，就是对大量语言材料进行交际性的处理——在交际中听、说、读、写、译。教材里的语言材料，按每个活动规定的要求去处理。每项任务的完成过程，就体现了对交际能力一定的要求。一次一次地完成任务，就逐步地训练出了交际能力。我们的收获，见诸于交际能力的获得，并不见于记住了多少个单词、多少条语法、多少篇课文。

这样说，是不是排斥了有意识地去“练”去“记”的学习方法？也非如此。为了更有效地完成某项交际任务，某些语音、语法、词汇需要专门花点功夫去练一练记一记，当然也可以去练去记。重要的是不要以为练了记了就是学到了。语音、语法、词汇都是在交际中随时自由地运用，才算真正学到。其实，“练”和“记”的方法，只能帮助你获得前边说的三种能力的第一种——语言能力。语言能力，通过交际活动，也能获得，甚至还能更有效地获得。至于第二、三两种能力——实用能力和认知、感受能力，只有通过交际活动才能获得。你到底获得了多少交际能力（包括第二、三种能力，也包括第一种能力），还得到交际活动中去落实、巩固和检验。

概括地说，与传统教材相比，我们对英语学习无论从量还是从质上都有更高的要求。更高的量体现于大量的语言材料和大量的交际活动。更高的质体现于对学习的所得都要求能在活的交际中实际运用。

2) 学生与教师

交际是一种活的过程，学生必须通过交际学英语，这就意味着学习的过程也是一个活的过程。这个过程，必须学生自己去经历，不能由教师去代替。而且，这个过程学生不但要用耳、口、眼、笔去经历，还要时时刻刻都用脑子去经历。

比如阅读，教师把生词都讲了，难点都解释了，语法都分析了，大意也点出了，这样，学生岂不是被剥夺了亲自经历阅读这个交际过程的机会，也就被剥夺了学习如何在阅读当中独立解决问题的机会？其他交际活动，也都有同样的问题，教师要放手让学生自己去应付真实交际中必然会遇到的种种情况。学生也要自觉地这样做，不要存在依赖教师、等待教师的心理。进行每一项活动，比如回答一个问题，解释一个疑难，寻求一个解答，觅取一个结果，都不能只等教师拿出一个“正确答案”或者一篇“样板”，即使教师拿出来了，也要问一个为什么。重要的不是得出答案和结果，重要的是寻求答案完成任务的过程。而这个过程，是谁也不能代替你自己去经历的。

换言之，就是必须打破旧的上课的概念。旧的课堂里，教师主动，学生被动。教师给学生上课，学生接受上课。新的课堂里，不是教师给学生上课，而是学生自己进行活动。教师只不过是配角，有时是观察者，有时和学生是平等的参加者，当然也做组织工作，也给学生一定的指点，但是每场活动的主角毕竟是学生，不是教师。交际能力本来就是一门知识，不是旁人能教得来的；也不是嘴皮子笔尖子上的表面功夫，单纯操练操练就能上手。交际能力的获得，要有极大的主动性，极生动的灵活性，还要有极深刻的领悟性。一句话，每个人只有自己去取，才能真正取得一种新的语言的交际能力。

3) 流利与准确

流利与准确是英语教学中一个常引起争论的问题，有人主张先要准确，有人主张先要流利。传统的教学法从一开头就全力以赴地抓准确，他们的理论是：一旦容许错误，就会养成错误的习惯，再也难以改正。他们的办法是：对学生严格控制，只限于一、两页的课文范围之内，只限于学过的语法词汇，只限于教师解释过或示范过的，只限于学生有把握不会错的，才能说、写，才能读、听。于是乎学生战战兢兢，半步不敢越雷池，课堂里似乎不出什么乱子。事实上是扼杀了流利，扼杀了交际，也扼杀了学生真正学英语的机会。到头来即使学生在课堂里取得所谓的准确性，一旦离开课堂，投入无控制的真实交际中，不但流利说不上，

连苦心培养的准确也丢掉了。

我们认为，这种教学法是违反学语言的自然规律的。学语言，犯错误是正常的，是进程中必不可少的现象。战战兢兢、畏畏缩缩的心理是绝对妨碍学语言的。学生进入大学，首先应当克服这种心理，要放开步子去听、说、读、写。小孩学话，只知道想说就说，脑子里从来没有会不会用错了词搞错了语法的概念，结果学得又快又好，也不会发生错误形成了习惯改不了的问题。先解除顾虑，树立信心，养成这种主动的习惯，就等于学语言取得了第一步的胜利。

有人说，用我们的方法学习的学生比用老方法的学生犯错误犯得多。我们说：如果是，这也是自然的。假定一个学生每星期用一百页的语言材料，做五十次交际活动，当然比只用一页的语言材料，做十次机械练习，犯的错要多些。归根结底，学生是否获得了准确性，不是看他们在学习过程当中或者课堂里的表现，而是看最后，看他们在真实的交际当中的表现。有人说，我们的教学法是牺牲准确去取得流利。我们并不牺牲准确，而是通过流利去取得准确，而且是真正的准确——交际中的准确。我们也并不认为有了流利，准确就自然而然的会来。小孩学母语，经过一段时间，一般总会达到够用的准确标准。但是成年人学外语就不一定。有些人可以很流利，但始终只是洋泾浜。因此我们也要有意识地对自己提出准确的要求。只是不能让这种要求成为绊脚石。不应该是任何时候、任何活动中都一律全面要求准确，而是在不同的阶段、不同的单元、不同的活动中有不同的具体的准确性要求。如此一步一步地提高要求，最后就能达到准确与流利的结合——有效的交际，符合国际文化交流工作所要求的有效交际。这才是我们真正的目标。

附录：一、讨论参考题：

1. 你在中学学英语用的是什麼方法？比如说：是不是每个生词都查词典，每个句子都分析，每篇课文都读熟或背熟？还有什么别的方法？你觉得这些方法好吗？
2. 用本文中对英语交际能力的描写来衡量，你觉得你现在具备了多少交际能力？具备了哪方面的交际能力？最缺的是哪方面？
3. 你到大学来，对大学里的英语学习本来的想法如何？（比如对教材，对教师，对教和学的方法的想法。）现在的想法又如何？
4. 你有没有下决心用功？具体怎样用功？你今后打算如何学习？用什么方法？
5. 大学毕业后，你打算干什么类型的工作？你认为要胜任这些工作，应具备什么条件？