

**SCIENTIFIC PAPERS
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PARDUBICE**
Series C
Faculty of Humanities
6 (2000)

**REFLECTION OF ROGERIAN PSYCHOTHERAPY
IN COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING**

Olga Zderadičková
Fakulta humanitních studií Univerzity Pardubice

INTRODUCTION

Although I am aware of the extensive research and analyses that have been carried out concerning humanistic approaches, I indulged in yet another such analysis to stress the incredibly strong ties between a particular teaching/learning style and a particular therapeutic school, both being termed as *person-centred*: the Communicative Language Teaching and Rogerian psychotherapy.

Thus, first of all, I will try to describe my first encounters with the Rogerian approach and explain what attracted me to it so much. Approximately three and a half years ago I was invited to interpret at a newly established *Course of Rogerian Psychotherapy* which took place in Brno and was organised by the *Centre of the Psychological Services*. Good standard as well as connection with the contemporary Rogerian world was secured by the participation of the foreign facilitators, most of whom have been Rogerian psychotherapists for many years, e.g. David and Michaela Buck, and some of them even have an authentic experience from a training led by Carl Rogers himself, e.g. Gerald Bozart.

There was only one condition concerning the participants, they were required to be qualified psychologists, psychiatrists or teachers. The training itself took three and a half years and most of this time was devoted to individual work of the participants (personal therapy, supervision, recordings of the sessions with clients to be presented for supervision are examples of the obligatory part of the individual program). Intensive week meetings of the entire training group and the facilitators took place every half a year in Brno and will be described in greater detail in the following paragraphs. Apart from these, there were also so-called weekend meetings for smaller groups of participants. These meetings were organised by the participants themselves and usually involved groups of five to fifteen people. In the end of the training the participants received a certificate of a Rogerian therapist.

As somebody who has never encountered or even approached the world of psychology before, I knew nothing of what I should expect, and decided to limit myself strictly to my interpreting job, without noticing much of the contents of the

interpreted utterances. Very soon after the beginning I found myself so much drawn into the whole process of the Rogerian training, that I not only decided to stay faithful to the group and be their interpreter for another three years, but I also took a large interest in investigating more about the Rogerian or Client-centred Approach. It was not only the friendly atmosphere of the training group which was so pleasant, it was also the excitement of sharing a completely new experience.

One of the first things we heard about the PCA was that it is a *non-directive* approach. That surely sounded exciting and relieving at the same time. Only later did we realise how unusual and difficult will such non-directive behaviour be to us, who are used to being “directed” from the early childhood. It soon became impossible to make any decision, to make an appointment, to choose a seat, etc. It took many hours of silence, anger and even tears, before each one of the trainees realised that the whole new system of communication needs to be employed, which offers more freedom not only for our colleagues, companions, partners etc., but also for ourselves. So even though non-directiveness is not the only principle of the PCA, it is one of the first steps towards “being Rogerian” and, for many of the trainees, the most difficult. Yet, this first step over the threshold opened up a whole new space for learning through one’s own experience.

There are several points in Rogerian approach which, in my opinion, bear significant importance for this work. I would like to present them, in connection with the above mentioned training, at least briefly, because thus, the explanation why I chose this topic, hopefully will become even clearer. I have already suggested, that the whole training was non-directive. This also implies, that the role of the instructors “leading” the training was going to be quite different from the role of a teacher in a “traditional” educational situation. In fact, no *teacher* appears in the training: instead, there are *facilitators*, who do not direct, but assist the process of learning. It means, that they function as one of the participants, mostly just following the “natural movement” of the training group. Their task is to help in case the group gets stuck in a “dead end”, but a question or a comment on their part is usually enough to get the group moving again. Most of the facilitators in such cases simply tried to put into words what, in their opinion was happening with the group, spoke of their own feelings and invited the other participants to do the same. This was usually more helpful than a long monologue or a lecture. I believe that it made many participants feel that they are really working *themselves* and furthermore, it brought them much closer to the responsibility for *what* and *how* they are learning. The necessary theoretical background to the course was provided by means of self-study from the suggested literature, or by the *options* offered by the facilitators. It means, that the participants themselves decide, whether the suggested topic is relevant and useful for them, or whether it should perhaps be put off and offered later in the course of the training. Thus, the role of the facilitator is active yet, it leaves most of the space and freedom for the trainee.

The facts concerning the freedom and non-directiveness of the training imply, of course, a new and unusual role of the trainee or participant as well. It was very hard for most of the participants to dare to acknowledge the responsibility for their own learning. To a person brought up in the traditional way it often seems that the facilitators are too passive and lack involvement on their part. But sooner or later most of the trainees realised, how carefully the facilitators observe the behaviour of the training group, and how sensitively and *empathetically* they

react to the participants' needs. This encouraged the trainees to take the risk of "opening up" and resulted in clearer and more opened communication. Thus, the participants gradually became more comfortable in this "new" and active position and tried to interact with each other and the facilitators as much as possible, in other words, they realised that in order to gain the most from the training, they must play active part. In practice it meant that the sessions did not have any prescribed themes. Instead, the theme was suggested and agreed on by the participants, or simply emerged from the first few interactions. I have already mentioned that the theory was brought to the trainees in the form of options. These were often offered by the facilitators, but the participants themselves were always invited to offer an option too, if they felt they can share something helpful with the others. Surprisingly, there were many successful options presented by the participants themselves, which were often not only amusing and entertaining, but also closely related to the Rogerian training. Such moments proved, that the above described type of training is highly efficient, and that, although it may be quite a difficult and long process, the participants will accept and even enjoy the independent and free position offered by the training.

Another point worth mentioning is the actual procedure of the training. Let us not forget that the aim was to produce new Rogerian psychotherapists. The only demand of the organisers of the training was, that only educated psychologists, psychiatrists or educators would take part in it. That secured the necessary theoretical knowledge and practical experience, that the facilitators needed for successful "planting" of the Rogerian ideas. The entire training takes three and a half years. Most of the time, the trainees study by themselves, but every year there are two *intensive week meetings* where all the participants meet with their facilitators, and every half a year there are two *weekend meetings*, which are organised by the participants themselves and usually are attended only by few of the participants and one facilitator. All that was said about the training in the preceding paragraphs concerns only the intensive weeks, which I attended as the interpreter. I do not want to claim that the weekend meetings are significantly different, but since I have never experienced one, I do not feel entitled to write about them.

But let us return to the intensive week. The participants meet every day, and they themselves agree on the time they start and finish. There are two kinds of the sessions. There can be either the *community meeting* or *small groups*. The community meeting, of course, involves the whole group of participants and it often emerges so that these meetings are devoted to some general discussions, dealing with the organisation, theoretical problems, lectures etc. The small groups are formed naturally, it means that the facilitators simply announce in which room they will be, and the participants themselves decide whom they are going to join. Themes dealt with in these groups are naturally more intimate or personal. What seems to be the most valuable feature of the training is, in my opinion, its authenticity. From the very first moment the participants encounter the Rogerian ideas. For example, the first session usually ends up in a long silence, because the trainees expect some kind of introduction, some instructions etc., but instead, the facilitators introduce themselves and leave the rest to the participants. As we shall see in the chapter devoted to the Rogerian psychotherapy, the trainees find themselves in a situation very similar to the one of a client, who came for the first time to a Rogerian therapist. This parallel between the client and the participant of the training is

the main source of the authenticity of the training. Furthermore, there are some practical exercises, simulating the therapeutic situation, such as the *empathy labs* or the *therapeutic answers*. An empathy lab is a practice of the client-therapist relationship, where one trainee takes up the role of the client, one of the therapist, and one functions as an *observer* and later provides the feedback for the therapist. The therapeutic answers should serve the trainees to realise the importance of non-verbal communication, to practice the use of metaphors (which is very important in the therapist-client communication), in other words, it should help the trainees to develop their own style of responding to the client. These activities show not only the authenticity of the training, but also point out the most important feature of the whole learning process: the communication. As is clear from the description of the activities and the training, the participants actually learn through encounters with each other and with the facilitators, which means that all the participants constantly communicate with each other, either verbally or non-verbally, but the communication is imminent. Even if some trainees do not contribute to the discussions in the groups, their communication is secured by the above mentioned activities. Also the necessity of the feedback shows, how important communication is (not only in the learning process). By getting feedback from their “mock-clients”, the trainees learn to expect and be able to accept feedback, positive or negative, from their real clients. Thus, I tried to describe the training of new Rogerian therapists in all its aspects, having a closer look at the role of the facilitator, participant and the actual process of the training.

The lengthy description of the Rogerian course does not actually provide a clear explanation of my reasons for putting Rogerian psychotherapy in connection with Communicative methodology. Thus I will add a bit more to clarify my intentions. The key moment for my decision to work more with the ideas of Carl Rogers came when I took part in the Teacher Training organised by the English department in Brno, and started to realise the similarities between the way of teaching, which was presented to us during the Teacher Training (and which I feel is to some extent inspired by Communicative Language Teaching), and Rogerian therapy as I knew it from the Rogerian training. Thus I became more interested in the whole matter, and decided to work on it in my dissertation.

I feel I have one more debt to pay off, and that is the explanation why Community Language Learning, which is an approaching teaching usually directly linked to Rogerian psychology, is not the subject of my work instead of Communicative Language Teaching. I can justify my choice quite easily. One of the most important reasons is, that I have personal experience with Communicative Language Teaching which is, in my opinion, for a work of major importance most valuable. Not only have I experienced the above mentioned Teacher Training based on Communicative methodology (which implies that my own teaching practice and experience has been strongly influenced by it), but I also believe that Communicative Language Teaching is a quite commonly used approach in English teaching, and I have actually had a chance to observe several lessons taught by TEFL-(Teaching English as a Foreign Language) qualified teachers in the “spirit” of Communicative Language Teaching. The Community Language Learning on the other hand, I know only from literature, where I very briefly encountered its basics.

Community Language Learning is a method developed by Charles A. Curran who applied the techniques of psychological counselling to learning (Counselling-Learning). Many of the primary ideas and actual procedures are derived from Rogerian psychotherapy. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:115) The theory of language underlying the method was presented by P.G. La Forge. The theory built on *basic sound and grammatical patterns* is further developed by viewing the language as a *social process*:

The speaker is at the same time both subject and object of his own message . . . communication involves not just the unidirectional transfer of information to the other, but the very constitution of the speaking subject in relation to its other. . . . Communication is an exchange which is incomplete without a feedback reaction from the destinee of the message. (La Forge 1983; 3)

Richards, Rodgers, 1991: 116

Another view of language important in Community Language Learning is the *interactional* view stressing the importance of contact and response of the speakers. The interaction between the learners contribute to growing *intimacy* (defined as *desire to avoid isolation*) and consequently the class becomes the community of learners. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:116) The interaction between the learner and knower is dependent in the beginning (the learner tells the knower what s/he wants to say in the target language and the knower gives advice how to say it) but develops toward independence during the process of learning. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:116) Thus, both the learners and the teacher are members of community who share their feelings and function as counsellors to each other. The learning progress is seen as an achievement of the whole community. The learning process is divided into five developmental stages which can be compared to the development of the child (the stages progress from the "birth stage" where the feelings of security are established through the stages of gaining more and more independence to the stage of "adulthood" where the learner knows everything the teacher does). (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:117) The role of teacher is very close to the role of counsellor. S/He should be empathetic with the position of the learner, should be familiar with the role of therapist in psychotherapy and should resist all temptation to teach in the traditional sense of the word. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:126)

By no means would I want to claim that Community Language Learning is a method which is not used or that it is used less than Communicative Language Teaching /I have no research materials or facts to prove it/, but I tend to prefer my own experience, especially when it concerns a major work. Furthermore, I feel that the connection between Communicative Language Teaching, Rogeri strong. It should become clear from than psychotherapy and Rogers's ideas about teaching and learning is very following pages, that in certain points, for example the role of the teacher, student, or in some of the procedures, the different concepts virtually "speak the same language". The similar features, or the possible influence of one concept on the other should hopefully also become clear from the succeeding pages.

In the next chapters I would like to dwell on the basic ideas and features of the Rogerian psychotherapy, how the client usually feels in the beginning of the therapy, how this feeling and client's view of him/herself change in the course of the

therapy, what the position of the therapist is and how s/he may secure the successful therapy. This chapter will be followed by an analysis of the examined concepts where I will present my own thoughts concerning the reflection of Rogers's ideas in Communicative Language Teaching. As a next step I decided to include the research carried out not only in order to support the main idea of the whole work, but also to prove that the ideas of Carl Rogers and the basics of the communicative methodology are known and used in practice. The conclusion should revise again the main ideas of the work and summarise the supportive arguments, in other words, the conclusion should show, whether my attempt to analyse the common points of the two concepts had been successful.

THE OUTLINE OF THE ROGERIAN APPROACH

Even though the Rogerian approach is rather a significant concept and is well-known among psychologists, its basics may be rather troublesome or even completely unknown to people from other fields. Therefore, I decided to include this chapter, in which some of the probable hesitations will be hopefully cleared, and the necessary background provided.

I would suggest to begin with the roots of the whole idea of the Client-centred Approach, in other words, I will try to present the actual development of this concept. Speaking of Rogerian psychotherapy I should say a few words about the originator of this therapy, Carl Rogers. After finishing his studies he started working as psychologist in the Child Study Department of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, where he already started to formulate his own views deriving from his working experience. Later he became involved in social work when he helped the establishment of the Guidance Center in Rochester, New York. In 1940 he accepted a position at Ohio State University and during the following years he gathered his ideas and views and prepared them for publishing. Later he worked at the universities in Chicago and Wisconsin. Furthermore, he was active in the practice of psychotherapy for more than thirty years. (Rogers, 1996:11-13) If we look into any book written by Carl Rogers, we must notice that behind all his claims, ideas and theories there are years of practice as a proof of the validity of the claims, ideas and theories. And after reading a few more pages, we realise that Rogers puts these years of experience much higher than the professional background, the facts learnt during his studies. His own experience and the experience of his colleagues at the Counselling Center provides *enough material for continual learning*, and Rogers himself sees it as a *source of the effective means of working with people in distress*. (Rogers, 1996:32)

One of the most important clues in examining the development of the Client-centered Therapy is the shift in the expectations of the therapist, as suggested by Carl Rogers' remembering his own experience. What he claims the stereotypical question the therapist asks /and the client expects the therapist to ask/ is: *How can I treat, or cure, or change this person?*. (Rogers, 1996:32) Which suggests that the therapist will observe and examine the client, state a diagnosis and will try to cure the client accordingly. All this, as we shall see later, has no place in Rogerian therapy. The question Rogers came to, and which eve-

ry Rogerian therapist should ask instead of the above mentioned one, is: *How can I provide a relationship which this person may use for his own personal growth?* (Rogers, 1996:32) From the formulation of this question we certainly feel how different are the things stressed here. Rather than the therapist and his diagnostic skills, it is the crucial role of the client-therapist relationship which is emphasised in addition to the active role of the client. Thus, such methods which are trying to help the client by means of some intellectual or training procedures are bound to fail, because something taught, but not accepted by the client necessarily has only temporary effect, which does yet more harm to the client, because the failure of the therapy only deepens the negative feelings of the client. (Rogers, 1996:53) It is the power of his/her own experience, which allows the client to recognise the necessity of change. And once again we are led back to the client-therapist relationship, which should provide the safe, positive environment where such experience can occur, and where the possible changes may take place. What are the necessary conditions of such relationship will yet be discussed.

I have suggested that the goal of the therapy is a change. But what kind of a change and why? Carl Rogers himself said that the problems the clients consider important at the beginning of the therapy change very quickly. The client, within the safe environment of a helpful therapeutic relationship, begins to venture deeper and deeper into the unknown layers of the self and actually begins to experience his/her own self. And that is the goal of the client-centred therapy: to produce a person able to be himself/herself.

Thus, we can see that the roots of the Rogerian approach do not lay in any theoretical study, but rather emerged from years of counselling experience. Personal experience is also the key moment in the client's move towards the successful therapy. Such experience is only possible in a helpful and safe relationship. These ideas are important not only for the client-therapist relationship, but for all human relationships:

It is for this reason that I feel it is possible that the learnings which have had meaning for me in my experience may have some meaning for you in your experience, since all of us are involved in human relationships.

Rogers, 1996:32

Finally, I would like to speak of the core idea concerning the Rogerian view of personality. Rogers claims, that his experience led him to believe that human nature is positive in its roots:

One of the most revolutionary concepts to grow out of our clinical experience is the growing recognition that the innermost core of man's nature, the deepest layers of his personality, the base of his 'animal nature', is positive in its nature - is basically socialised, forward-moving, rational and realistic.

Rogers, 1996:91

The reason why this idea seemed so revolutionary to Rogers, becomes obvious if we take into account the tendencies in our society. The strong religious tradition in Europe as much as in America leads us more towards the view of human nature as sinful and naturally inclined toward the negative. The same can be perceived in some of the other psychological concepts, for example the Freu-

dian school. Freud introduced the idea of *the id, the unconscious*, formed mainly by instincts which, if permitted to be revealed, would result in murder, incest etc. (Rogers, 1996:91) This idea is widely shared not only by the laymen, but also by many of the therapists. It is partly understandable if we bear in mind how negative, hostile and anti-social feelings are being uncovered during the therapy. Yet, Carl Rogers, inspired for example by A. Maslow or A. Montagu, considers these views false and misleading. (Rogers, 1996:91) Human organism in its deepest layers is positive, and Rogers has many years of experience to prove it. We can see it ourselves if we examine more closely the experience of the client and the way s/he changes through the course of the therapy. But first, it would be useful to mention the conditions necessary for a successful Rogerian therapy.

Let us remind ourselves once again of the crucial fact: if I can provide a certain type of relationship, the other person *will discover within himself the capacity to use that relationship for growth, and change and personal development will occur.* (Rogers, 1996:33) The task now is to specify the type of the relationship in which these changes occur. Rogers himself stresses that there is no description of "how to do it", but rather a suggestion of what proved to be helpful or not.

The first thing which appears in the characteristics of a helpful client-therapist relationship is the reality of the therapist. This means that the therapist should be at every moment aware of his own feelings and accept them. This awareness is also referred to as *congruence*. (Rogers, 1996:16,51) It seems to do more harm than good to act as though the therapist is something s/he really is not, and there are several reasons for that: first of all, how can one expect the client to be real, if the therapist is "wearing a mask". Secondly, it is usually not very difficult to recognise that one is wearing a mask, and Rogers gives a nice example of it:

One of the things which offends us about radio and TV commercials is that it is often perfectly evident from the tone of the voice that the announcer is 'putting on', playing a role, saying something he doesn't feel.

Rogers, 1996:61

Once the client sees the therapist is acting this way, then s/he also hides behind his/her own "facade". Furthermore, if a therapist is trying to behave acceptingly and positively to the client, yet there is something negative going on inside, then the client feels both and in fact receives a confused message. Rogers sees this as one of the greatest challenges in the process of creating a helpful relationship, but on the other hand, he claims, that by being able to recognise his/her own feelings and accept them, the therapist can allow some growth for his/her own internal world.

The second necessary condition of a successful client therapist relationship is so-called *unconditional positive regard*. This means a completely non-judgemental approach of the therapist to the client. (Rogers, 1996:34) It shows the client that the therapist cares and is concerned about him/her, yet does not judge or evaluate anything that the client reveals from his/her internal world. This is one of the key steps towards building an atmosphere of trust and freedom. Most of the client's problems usually have their roots in the negative self-evaluation, or the negative evaluation by the others. There is usually something hidden deep inside that the

client considers to be very “bad”. It is only through the constant positive acceptance of the therapist that the client feels encouraged to venture even deeper down:

...now I've shared with him some of this bad side of me, he despises me. I'm sure of it, but it's strange I can find little evidence of it. Do you suppose that what I've told him isn't so bad? . . . Is it possible that I needn't be ashamed of this part of me? . . . It makes me feel I want to go further, exploring me, perhaps, expressing more of myself.

Rogers, 1996:67

It is important though to remember to be non-judgemental, which means not to evaluate at all, since the positive evaluation can do as much harm as the negative one. If I tell somebody that s/he is good, it implies I also have the right to tell him/her that s/he is bad. (Rogers, 1996:55) Furthermore, such evaluation puts pressure on people, because it expresses certain expectations, it sets up standards, it compares etc. Even though we are virtually brought up with them /school, often family, work and other institutions/ these aspects have no place in a helpful therapeutic relationship, and thus, the unconditional positive regard is the crucial condition securing the atmosphere of trust and freedom.

The third of the conditions is the ability and constant willingness to understand the client, which Rogers calls *empathetic understanding*, or simply *empathy*. (Rogers, 1996:53) It is very important for the client to feel free to explore him/herself without the threat of evaluation, it is very important for him/her to feel accepted, yet it would not have much sense without understanding.

To understand the client fully is, on the other hand, only possible without the limits set by one's own evaluation. The client mostly sees it as yet another sign of trust and freedom established in the relationship. It is, of course, highly probable that at times therapist will lose the thread of the client's utterance /which can often be very confused and inconsistent, the more it is emotional/, but that is no tragedy, if the therapist still shows the willingness to grasp the meaning, if the attention and the “full presence” of the therapist is still there. In addition to this, the therapist's attempts to formulate sensitively and carefully what the client had attempted to express is also very helpful, it gives him/her a sense of being fully understood when the therapist can clearly formulate what s/he could only clumsily express. It is crucial to remember that the therapist should be able to stretch his/her empathy without limits. (Rogers, 1996:53) From the following quote we will be able to feel the danger of only partial understanding, as suggested by one of the clients:

Whenever I find someone who understands a part of me at the time, then it never fails that a point is reached where I know they're not understanding me again. . .

Rogers, 1996:53

These are the three conditions necessary for the establishment of a helpful therapeutic relationship. They are equally important and with only one of them unfulfilled, the relationship would be incomplete. They are also closely connected, entwined with each other. But there are more aspects of the relationship to be mentioned. It is important though to explore them from the point of view of both the therapist, and the client.

After describing the necessary conditions of a successful therapeutic relationship, it is still not clear, why does this relationship evoke the changes in the client. Rogers answers to this, that client's reactions are reciprocal to the attitudes of the therapist. (Rogers, 1996:63) It means that once the client sees the therapist accepting positively the client's attitudes, then the client also starts to accept his/her own attitudes more positively. This reminder of the unconditional positive regard leads us again to the comparison of the therapist's and the client's experience of the helpful therapeutic relationship.

The first of the conditions mentioned was congruence, in other words the therapist's ability to recognise and accept his/her own feelings. There are several aspects of this condition. First of all, when the therapist is transparently real, than the client tends to be the same. Furthermore, the messages given to the client are clear, and that helps the atmosphere of trust. The therapist can support his trustworthiness also by keeping certain external conditions, such as punctuality, keeping the time set for the session etc. Once the therapist succeeds in creating the atmosphere of trust, the client feels inclined to be congruent to himself/herself and is not worried about communicating his/her feelings to the therapist. (Rogers, 1996:50) Another aspect of congruence is the "problem" of the positive feelings toward the client. In order to be congruent the therapist must allow himself/herself to feel positively about the client. (Rogers, 1996:52) For us, laymen, this may not seem as a problem at all, but according to Rogers, the tendencies in psychotherapy until recently considered the positive attitudes towards clients as threatening. It was claimed that if the therapist feels positively about the client, he is then trapped by this positive attitude. That gave rise to something called the "professional relationship", in other words impersonal, restricted and often authoritarian relationship of "the judge" and the one being "judged". We must feel that such relationships do not appear only in psychotherapy, we know them very well from work, school, offices etc., they seem to be a part of our lives from our early childhood. In client-centred therapy though, such relationship would not be helpful at all. Rogers claims, that once the therapist is strong enough to be himself/herself, to be congruent with his own feelings without the threat of losing them, then s/he can see the client as a separate being, as a person with his/her own feeling reactions attitudes. Then the therapist can go deeper in understanding the client, and positive feeling about the client is no obstacle, on the contrary, is only natural. (Rogers, 1996:52)

The second condition securing the helpful therapeutic relationship was empathetic understanding. Since the client takes the risk of "opening up", exploring the hidden, unknown nooks of his/her own self (which, as we shall see, is sometimes very frightening, yet enriching experience), s/he needs an understanding companion. The therapist must be able to see the client's world as s/he does. There is no place for the therapist's own opinions, evaluations or judgments. If the therapist is able to forget about his/her own ideas, and enter the world of the client without stumbling on the client's own fragile experience of his/her own self, that s/he gives the client freedom to *be* his/her own self. (Rogers, 1996:53) Even though, as seems to be the experience of many psychotherapists, the client often comes asking for advice, the therapist should never even feel inclined to give it. Such advice would only "stuff" the client into yet another

form, pose which would not be natural for him/her. But since the goal of client-centred therapy is a person able to recognise, accept and *be* his/her own self, such solution would not be helpful. On the other hand, if the client is understood without the limits of the therapist's own judgement, then s/he has the freedom to become oneself.

Finally, the third aspect was the unconditional positive regard. It is actually quite clear from the above paragraph, that the therapist's non-judgemental attitude secures freedom of the client. Every therapist who is able to perceive the client as a separate human being, must respect his/her qualities, attitudes, opinions etc. Under such conditions the client begins to realise that the responsibility lies within himself/herself, and that the categories, generalisations, expectations etc. set upon him/her by the others have only little (if any) meaning. That is also the reason why there is no diagnosis in client-centred psychology. It is crucial for the therapist to see the client as a process, as a developing human being, not as a fixed "case". (Rogers, 1996:55)

Thus we had chance to see an outline of what the therapeutic relationship and its conditions mean for the therapist. The next step will be to examine the impact of these aspects on the client. What are his/her experiences and how does the client change in the course of successful therapy.

Carl Rogers himself claims that the problems the clients present at the beginning of their therapy as the most pressing tend to show as not so important. As the client dives deeper and deeper into his/her self, other issues appear which become much more important for the client than the original problem. As was suggested in the preceding paragraphs, one of the goals of the therapy is to "produce" a person who is able to experience or to be his/her own self. The authentic reaction of one of the clients only proves the validity of such statement: *I came here to solve problems and now I find myself just experiencing myself.* (Rogers, 1996:80) As the client experiences the relationship of trust, s/he ventures even deeper into the hidden layers of one's self. When the client sees that all the feared evaluation is simply not going to come, and that the therapist still approaches him/her positively and acceptingly, then s/he experiences something Rogers calls *liking one's self.* (Rogers, 1996:87) The negative feelings should decrease in a successful therapy and the client should develop more positive feelings concerning his/her own self. The client then can function as a person better, if s/he is able to accept and even value him/herself. These theoretical statements are, in my opinion, best illustrated by the authentically recorded utterances of the clients in therapy. (Rogers often uses parts of interviews with Mrs. Oak because as a client, she was extremely co-operative and verbally expressed quite clearly what she felt.)

One thing worries me . . . a feeling that occasionally I can't turn out. Feeling of being quite pleased with myself. . . . Every once in a while a sort of pleased feeling, nothing superior, but just - I don't know, sort of pleased. . . . We don't object when children feel pleased with themselves. It's - I mean, there really isn't anything vain. It's - maybe that's how people should feel.

Rogers,
1996:87-88

Apart from the pleasant feeling of *joie de vivre*, as Rogers calls it, the client soon realises that it is easier to let his/her feelings flow naturally instead of trying to

hold them together behind a facade. (Rogers, 1996:113) And so, after the original confused search, after the client's discovery of things hidden deep inside so that it made him/her ask *'Who am I really?'*, there slowly builds an ability to experience one's feeling so fully, that one actually **becomes** the feeling. In other words, the client discovers himself/herself through experience. (Rogers, 1996:114)

Once the clients allow themselves to experience the positive feeling about their own self, then it becomes easier for them to accept the positive feelings of others. That makes it less difficult for the therapist to express the positive feelings for the client. The client in return becomes to appreciate even more the trusting and still more intimate relationship between them:

Well, I made a very remarkable discovery. I know it's - (laughs) I found out that you actually care how this thing goes. . . . It was a - well, the closest I can come to it is a kind of relaxation, a - not a letting down, but a - (pause) more of a straightening out without tension if that means anything. . . . Rogers, 1996:81

It becomes clear that the client realises the good things about "having somebody" who cares how things go with him/her.

What is the result of the therapy then, what kind of person is likely to emerge from the successful therapeutic relationship? From what was written we can deduce that this person will certainly be able to feel and understand things happening in him/her which s/he could not feel or understand before, because they were repressed. Being able to see him/herself realistically, s/he becomes more aware of the reality **outside** and is more realistic in his/her relationships, in dealing with other people. It means mainly that s/he is more understanding to others and also more acceptant of them. As a personality s/he is much closer to the person s/he would like to be and that implies his/her greater self-confidence. (Rogers, 1996:38) The defensiveness so built up at the beginning of the therapy is now replaced by openness to new experience. And last but not least, the client is able to see him/herself as a process. Instead of trying to reach some fixed point as in the beginning of the therapy, s/he is experiencing the constant change, the *stream of becoming* (Rogers, 1996:123):

This whole train of experiencing, and the meaning that I have thus far discovered in it, seem to have launched me on a process which is both fascinating and at times a little frightening. It seems to mean letting my experiences carry me on, in a direction which appears to be forward, toward goals that I can but dimly define, as I try to understand at least the current meaning of that experience. The sensation is that of floating with complex stream of experience, with the fascinating possibility of trying to comprehend its ever-changing complexity.

Rogers, 1996:123

To conclude this chapter I would like to present a brief summary of the main points characterising the Rogerian approach in psychotherapy. Carl Rogers put together ideas gathered by him or his colleagues throughout years of experience. He said that in a successful therapeutic relationship a client can change and become a person fully aware of his/her own experience. The conditions of the successful therapeutic relationship are: empathy, i.e. the therapist's constant willingness to understand the client's world, to see it through the eyes of the cli-

ent; congruence, i.e. the therapist's ability to recognise, understand and accept the aspects of his/her own internal world; and unconditional positive regard, i.e. the constant positive attitude the therapist shows to the client, the non-judgemental quality of the relationship. These three conditions secure the ideal therapeutic relationship. Then the client can undergo the described changes, and ideally becomes the fully functioning being as was described. The process of the therapy though is long and winding, and certainly not all the clients get to the final stage. On the other hand, many researches had been carried out to prove the value of the Client-centred approach.

The outline of the Rogerian approach will be followed by the analysis of the common features of the two concepts: Rogerian psychotherapy and Communicative Language Teaching.

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

The goal of this chapter is to remind the reader of the basic ideas of Communicative Language Teaching in a similar way as the outline of Rogerian psychotherapy was presented in the previous chapter. It seems to be quite logical to start again with the roots of the approach and to continue with deeper analysis of its different aspects stressing the points valuable for the following chapter presenting the reflection of Client-centred approach in Communicative Language Teaching. Before I proceed to the basics of Communicative Language Teaching, I would like to explain that I based this chapter mostly on William Littlewood's book *Communicative Language Teaching*. I decided to do so not only because I found the book extremely helpful, but also because of Littlewood's ability to present his ideas clearly, to communicate his views efficiently.

The roots of the Communicative approach to language teaching can be found in the late 1960's and the changes which started to appear in the official language teaching policies in Britain. Let me remind ourselves of the approach which was approved of and used in Britain previous to the changes in the 1960's. The acknowledged official approach was the Situational Language Teaching. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:64) This method was developed by British applied linguists, most often associated with names like Harold Palmer or A.S. Hornby, and it was widely used since the 1930's. The approach put great stress on vocabulary, also reading skills were considered to be very important. The language was perceived as a system of structures which were taught and the learner's knowledge of these structures had to be linked to situations in which they could be used. The fact that structure was the means through which the four basic skills were approached implies that the accuracy in both pronunciation and grammar was crucial. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:35-6) If we examine the teaching materials we find basically a list of structures, so-called *structural syllabus*, and a word list, which are presented to the learners. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:37) The actual presentation of new structures is well described in the following quote:

The form of new words and sentence patterns is demonstrated with examples and not through grammatical explanation or description. The meaning of new words and sentence patterns is not conveyed through translation. It is made

clear visually (with objects, pictures, action and mime). Wherever possible model sentences are related and taken from a single situation. (Davies, Roberts and Ros-sner 1975: 3)

Richards, Rodgers, 1991:38

The activities practising the introduced structures were usually drill-based and consisted of *guided repetition and substitution activities, including chorus repetition, dictation, drills and controlled oral-based reading and writing tasks*. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:38) From the description of the presentation and the activities we can deduce that the role of the learner is rather passive, especially in the first stages of the learning process, the learner participates mainly by repeating after the teacher or responding to his/her questions. Even though the role of the learner becomes slightly more active as his/her command of the language improves, the whole process of learning remains predominantly teacher-controlled. Accordingly, the role of the teacher is the one of a *model* in the presentation stage of the lesson, and a *skilful manipulator* in the practical stage. Thus, . . . *the teacher 'becomes more like the skilful conductor of an orchestra, drawing the music out of the performers'. . . (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:38)*

In Great Britain is Situational Language Teaching, the basics of which were outlined in the previous paragraphs, seen as one of the paths leading to the Communicative Language Teaching (this process will yet be described in greater detail). It is quite common though that some of the *practically oriented teachers* still use the described Situational Language Teaching (SLT). (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:42) Some features of SLT can be found also in Czech teaching tradition although, the "traditional" method dominating our country was probably the Grammar-Translation Method (which recognises translation as a way of studying, reading and writing are the major focus and student's native language is the medium of instruction). (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:3-4)

The criticism of the Situational Language Teaching in the 1960's was based on linguistics. The first impulse seems to have been Noam Chomsky's book *Syntactic Structures* (1957) in which he criticised the structural linguistic theory. He pointed out that the strict application of the structural theories denies *the creativity and uniqueness of individual sentences*. This idea as if inspired British applied linguists, e.g. Christopher Candlin and Henry Widdowson, British functional linguists, e.g. John Firth or M. A. K. Halliday, and American sociolinguists, e.g. Dell Hymes, helps to develop a completely new view of language. This view recognised the importance of *the communicative and functional potential of language* and as a reflection of this view, the language teaching should aim at the communicative abilities rather than practice of individual structures. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:64) But the need to reform the language teaching did not arise only from the change of the linguistic view of language. Another impulse came from the social changes in the contemporary Europe. The idea of the "common Europe" became more and more acknowledged and that implied a need of more effective teaching of the major European languages. Thus, the Council of Europe, described as *a regional organisation for cultural and educational co-operation*, recognised the reform of language teaching as one of its major activities. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:65) As a foundation of this reform the experts took several studies, the most important of which was a document of a British linguist D. A. Wilkins

(1972), which proposed a functional or communicative definition of language that could serve as a basis for developing communicative syllabuses for language teaching. His main achievement was the description of the systems of meaning underlying the use of language as the means of communication and dividing them into *notional categories* (meaning such concepts as time, quantity, frequency, location etc.) and *categories of communicative functions* (such as requests, offers, complaints etc.). These ideas were even more developed in his rather influential book *Notional Syllabuses* (1976). (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:65)

All these materials were used as a theoretical basis of the approach which became known as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and which began to be used not only in Britain, but world-wide. That may be the reason why there are several branches existing within the approach and no single "textbook" stating the features of Communicative Language Teaching. One of the streams within the approach can be characterised by William Littlewood's statement:

One of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language.

Richards, Rodgers, 1991: 66

Which means that some see CLT simply as a combination of teaching grammar and teaching its use for communication. Another stream sees CLT as an approach where the learners by means of pair- or group-work use the language they have mastered for problem-solving tasks. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:66) In other words, the crucial point here is the **interaction** between the learners. Rather important is also the distinction between the **strong** and the **weak** version of Communicative Language Teaching.

The "freedom" of the approach, the fact that it offers a number of possible interpretations, may be one of the reasons why it was so well accepted and why it is widely used till today. The basic theory of language teaching though, is shared by all of the versions. Central to this theory is the idea of language as a means of communication. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:69)

Communicative Language Teaching has very rich theoretical foundations concerning the language. It will be useful to mention some of the research areas connected with this topic, because the understanding of language and its role can explain a lot about the design or the teaching and learning activities. At this point I have to mention again the name of Noam Chomsky and his linguistic theory in which the term **competence** is mainly concerned with the speaker's ability to produce grammatically correct sentences. This idea inspired D. Hymes to formulate his definition of **communicative competence** as the knowledge necessary for the speaker *to be communicatively competent in speech community*. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:70) Hymes's theory became rather influential in the world of language teaching, especially CLT. His ideas were later reconsidered and further developed by M. Canale and M. Swain, who divided the term *communicative competence* into four different terms describing the aspects of the original communicative competence: grammatical competence (grammatical and lexical capacity), sociolinguistic competence (understanding the social context in which communication takes place), discourse competence (representation of the meaning in the discourse or text) and strategic competence (coping strategies

necessary for communicators). Another widely known theory was *the functional account of the language use*, in other words the distinction among seven functions of language, whose author is M. A. K. Halliday. He, in fact, compared learning of the second language to the acquisition of language experienced by small children.

And last, but not least, I would like to mention H. Widdowson and his view. He paid special attention to the processes enabling the speaker to use the language for different purposes. I would like to stress his distinction between **language usage** and **language use**. The former refers to *citation of words and sentences as manifestations of the language system* while the latter represents the use of this system for communicative purposes. (Richards, Rodgers, 1990:18) The above mentioned theories had a great impact on the development of the Communicative approach and reveal a lot about the changes not only in understanding the language, but also in understanding the purpose of language teaching. With the help of the theoretical background we can now proceed to the actual procedure, to the way of teaching, the teaching and learning activities employed in Communicative Language Teaching.

The background concerning the theory of learning is not nearly as rich as the one concerning the theory of language, but still several principles can be derived from the common CLT practice. The first, so-called **communication** principle stresses the importance of communication for learning. The **task** principle points out the importance of using the language to fulfil meaningful tasks. And the **meaningfulness** principle which emphasises the positive qualities of using language which is meaningful to the learner. (Richards, Rodgers, 1990:72)

Before we will venture into the description of the actual way of teaching, I feel it necessary to summarise the above presented ideas by stressing the “golden rule” of Communicative Language Teaching. It is the constantly stressed necessity to combine the structure and its function, the impossibility to concentrate only on producing grammatically correct utterances without paying attention to their communicative value. It certainly does not mean that the *structural view* which concentrates predominantly on language usage would be of no importance, but it is simply insufficient on its own. It cannot show or explain the communicative functions of language, it does not take into account the fact that many linguistic forms have more than one communicative function and vice versa, one communicative function can be expressed by several linguistic forms. (Littlewood, 1990:2) Thus we can see that the learner does not need only strict grammar practice, but also possibilities to encounter language as it is used in authentic situations. That will enable the learner not only to produce grammatically correct language, but also to produce language which is appropriate for particular situation. In other words, the learner will be able to grasp the **social meaning**, to analyse the social aspects of the situation in which the communication actually happens. We probably feel the importance of the social meaning, since we can realise how the social situation strongly influences the selection of particular language items, and similarly, the use of specific language determines the concrete situation. (Littlewood, 1990:4) All these facts imply that **the interaction** is one of the most important aspects of CLT. The interconnectedness of the structural and functional view of language teaching reminds us of the equal importance of language usage and the language use. Thus, according to Littlewood, the learners with

only elementary knowledge of the target language are not expected to interact communicatively. The level of the social interaction in learning increases together with the learner's grammatical competence. Once the learner has achieved grammatical competence, the communicative competence should be introduced in all its aspects, which means that the learner not only uses the language spontaneously, but pays attention also to the communicative use of the mastered linguistic systems, next the learner should apply specific language to specific situations and finally, the learner should be able to use the language to convey social meanings.

The positions of the teacher and the learners are also very important in the view of the comparison with the Rogerian psychotherapy which will follow in the next chapter. Thus, I would like to present the next few paragraphs especially clearly and carefully.

There are several roles which the teacher takes up in Communicative Language Teaching. Most of them are determined by one of the basic features of CLT, the fact that this approach is *learner-centred*. (Richards, Rodgers, 1990:69) It means that the syllabus, the contents of the course are designed according to the students' needs. From this we can see that one of the roles of the teacher is to recognise and analyse the needs of the learners in order to be able to prepare relevant and helpful materials. The role of the **needs analyst** does not concern only the preparation and consideration of the course contents. Even during the learning process the teacher should monitor the situation, for example while the learners are engaged in some free practice (role-plays etc.) the teacher should pay attention also to the structures which may cause problems to the learners and instead of correcting their mistakes immediately use these observations as an impulse for further practice of the problematic structures. There is yet another aspect of this role of the teacher. This concerns the actual design of the activities. The teacher should be aware of the learners' interests and thus s/he should be able to make the activities entertaining and motivating for them. It is, of course, very difficult to recognise students' needs especially at the beginning of the course when the personal relationships within the class are only beginning to develop, but there are certain devices that the teacher can use to find out more about "his/her" students. One of these devices is a **needs assessment**, which can be for example a questionnaire examining the learners' reasons for learning the language, participating in the course, expectations of the course etc. (Richards, Rodgers, 1990:78) The teacher should simply trust the processes happening inside the learner, because the learner always tends to follow his/her own **internal syllabus** and the teacher should never hesitate to subordinate his/her own behaviour to the needs of the learner. This implies that the "traditional" role of the teacher as an authority or instructor is completely absent here, instead the teacher functions as *the facilitator of learning*. (Littlewood, 1990:91)

Another role the teacher is assumed to fulfil is the role of the class or group manager. This involves the practical management of the class work in terms of dividing the learners into groups, timing, organising the setting for various activities and in fact, organising the whole course into meaningful and helpful lessons. This role also involves the teachers decision on which role s/he will play in various activities. This may vary from **co-communicating**, which means that the teacher actually participates in the activity, to monitoring where the teacher ob-

serves carefully the learners' work and collects points for feedback. The feedback, or better the way of giving feedback is also a very important aspect of Communicative Language Teaching. The teacher should make clear to the learners what the goal of each particular activity is, fluency or accuracy, and that should determine the nature of the feedback. If the activity was aimed at practising accuracy, the feedback should be **structural**. If the activity was aimed at fluency, the feedback should be **communicative**. These aspects should not be mixed and it means that the teacher actually has to make a choice which errors s/he will correct and which s/he will not. (Littlewood, 1990:90) Also the way in which the feedback is presented to the learners is very important. The teacher should realise that constant error correction is rather off-putting for the learners and certainly does not encourage communication. The learner should not be made to feel as somebody who "does not know" and needs to be instructed and corrected all the time. Errors should be *regarded with greater tolerance, as a completely normal phenomenon in the development of communicative skills*. (Littlewood, 1990:94)

Finally, I would like to mention the other roles which are necessary to be fulfilled by CLT teacher. One of them is the role of the language instructor which means that the teacher introduces new language structures and evaluates the learners' language performance. S/He is also the counsellor, providing help where necessary, securing the effective communication, the advisor filling the language gaps where the communication would be impossible. In other words, the teacher should be available and ready to help the learners without making them feel less capable.

Thus, we had an opportunity to examine the various roles the teacher should take up in Communicative Language Teaching. All of them secure the psychological environment supporting learning. Such environment provides the learners with motivation and opportunity to express themselves, to express their individualities and accordingly, it supports the development of interpersonal relationships not only among the learners, but also between the learners and the teacher. The teacher has a less dominant position than in the "traditional" classroom, which means that the usual barriers between the teacher and the learners are broken down and the teacher can act and feel as a *"human among humans"*. (Littlewood, 1990:94)

The last aspect to be discussed is the role and position of the learners. The learner-centred character of Communicative Language Teaching suggests that this aspect will be one of the most important. It was pointed out several times in the chapter that one of the stressed features of CLT is the importance of communication. Even though the correct usage of grammatical structures is also important, it is mostly the communicative function of language which is emphasised. Thus, the learners are expected and encouraged to communicate as much as possible by means of free communicative activities. The fact that the learners usually work in groups or pairs implies that the co-operation or rather the ability to cooperate is one of the necessities of a successful learning group. A part of this co-operative atmosphere of the learning process is also the shared responsibility. If the communication fails it is not a fault of one individual learner, it is a responsibility of the whole group. This helps to create an atmosphere of safety, because the learner does not have to fear negative feedback either from the teacher or from his/her colleagues. Such environment makes it easier for the learner

to join in the conversation, to contribute to the discussion etc. The role of the learner was well described by M. Breen and C.N. Candlin:

The role of 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 in an interdependent way.

Littlewood, 1990: 77

In other words, it is the learner who determines the learning by his/her attitudes, character etc. And the teacher should reflect upon these features and design the teaching materials and procedures accordingly.

In this chapter I tried to outline the basic features of Communicative Language Teaching. In the beginning the roots of the approach were explored, mainly the linguistic theoretical background, because it is the theory of language which influences to a great extent the whole approach to language teaching. This theoretical part was followed by more specific examples of teaching procedures and finally, the roles of teacher and learners were examined from the psychological point of view. These features were presented in quite great detail, because they will be valuable for our later examination of the reflection of Rogerian psychotherapy in language teaching.

THE RESEARCH

The preceding chapters dealt with the theme of the reflection of Rogerian psychotherapy in language teaching rather theoretically. We had an opportunity to explore the background and the basic features and ideas of the two main concepts mentioned in this work (Rogerian psychotherapy and Communicative Language Teaching), we had an opportunity to examine the features which these two concepts share and finally, I would like to present research which would show how the so far presented ideas and theories function in practice.

Before I will proceed to the detailed description of the actual research, I would like to stress the hypothesis. The preceding chapter dealt with the reflection of Rogerian psychotherapy in CLT. I tried to examine this theme from different perspectives, different points of view. My conclusion was that the reflection of Rogerian psychotherapy in CLT is significant concerning the procedure, the roles of both the learner and the teacher. And that is, in fact, the hypothesis of this research. I would like to refer to the preceding chapter as to a more detailed version of the hypothesis, the research should prove if the analysis presented in the preceding chapter is valid also in practice.

The first important information describing the background of “my” research concerns the research area, in other words the area where the data were collected. My final choice were private language schools preparing the learners for either the state exams or the Cambridge exams of all levels. There were several reasons leading me to this choice. The first of them was, that I actually have personal ex-

perience from this type of school, because I have been teaching in the Univerzum private language school for three years. Another, equally important, reason was the special atmosphere of the learning groups in this type of schools which is probably caused by several things: the variety of age of the learners (since there is virtually no limit as to the age of the participants), the "enthusiasm" (the courses are voluntary, so the participants come because of their interest or because they themselves feel the need to learn the language), and last but not least the fact that the teachers are not bound by the national curriculum as the teachers from the state schools (which together with the previous point implies that the purpose of the language teaching and learning is different from the state schools). I have included in my research five different private language schools. Most of them do not specify the teaching methods used in their courses, but one (known as *Kursy dr. Jílka*) employs an original way of teaching (based mostly on drills and aimed at quick acquisition of the language).

The previous paragraph implies that the subjects of the research were private language school teachers and learners. In the view of the representativeness of the research I welcomed the participation of the native as well as non-native speakers and I also did not investigate their training or experience. The research was anonymous and voluntary. At this point I have to mention the problems I have encountered while carrying out the research. The only drawback of the private language schools is that they usually do not employ a large staff and thus, the number of participating teachers was very limited. This was further complicated by the fact that nearly all of the teachers kindly agreed to participate, but fewer were able to turn in the distributed research materials. That is the reason why the final number of participating teachers was fourteen. Even though this number is not very high, the participating teachers formed a varied and representative research group consisting of both native and non-native speakers, qualified and unqualified, experienced and inexperienced teachers. Furthermore, since the research is qualitative, the number of participants is not the most important criterion.

After describing the research area and the subjects it is now time to approach the aim of the research. It is, of course closely connected to the theme of this whole work, which examines the reflection of Rogerian psychotherapy and the ideas of Carl Rogers in language teaching, especially Communicative Language Teaching. The research should particularly show the actual aspects of the teacher-learner relationship as the teachers see them, it should reveal not only their view of the learner and his/her role in the classroom, but also their opinion about the role of themselves in the learning process, and furthermore, their idea of a successful and helpful teacher-learner relationship. The aim of the research is to examine to what extent does the theoretical part of the whole issue discussed in this work correspond with the actual ideas, opinions and, of course, experience of the teachers.

Finally, the last aspects of the research to be discussed are the materials and the actual procedure used in the research. After a long consideration I decided to use a questionnaire as a basis of my research. It seemed to me that it would give the teachers enough time to think about the rather complicated issues brought up by the questionnaire. To specify the materials even further I would like to say that I chose an open-ended questionnaire (which means that there was no limited choice of responses), because the discussed issues are so subjective that no

multiple-choice questionnaire would contain all the possible responses. I designed the questionnaire myself. It consisted of ten following questions:

1. *What do you think is the most important in language learning?*
2. *What do you think are the most important features of a teacher?*
3. *What do you think are the most important features of a student?*
4. *What, in your opinion, makes a successful lesson?*
5. *What types of materials do you find most useful?*
6. *What types of activities?*
7. *What role do you think should a student play in the lesson?*
8. *Can you describe the role of a teacher?*
9. *In what way do you think your own way of teaching is successful?*
10. *What are the crucial features of a successful teacher-student relationship?*

The teachers were given the questionnaire and asked to answer the questions according to their experience and opinions. The questionnaires were anonymous and there was no time limit as well as no limit concerning the length of the answers. The questionnaires were usually collected after a week, but more time was given to anybody who needed it. Thus, I can conclude the description of the materials and the procedure of the research and we can proceed to the actual evaluation of the collected data, the qualitative analysis of the teachers' responses as they expressed them in the questionnaires. The first question concerned the most important features of language learning in general. The teachers involved in the research provided a wide variety of answers which, after a closer examination could be divided into several groups. The first group of answers is somehow concerned with language. Several teachers stressed the importance of communication, the need to use the language actively, plus the need of the connection with reality. Let me remind you of the chapter concerned with the basics of Communicative Language Teaching, the importance of communicative functions of language recognised and stressed by this approach was actually one of its distinctive features. Especially the communicative activities were aimed at the development of the communicative abilities of the learners, and the authenticity, in other words the connection with reality, was one of its most important aspects. Other few answers belonging into this group stressed the importance of combining all aspects of language. This point I found also very valuable, because the knowledge of language usage is not underestimated in CLT by any means. If we recall the pre-communicative activities, we realise, that their function is to practise the grammatical structures as well as prepare the learners for the further communicative practice, but it is mainly the controlled practice (often involving drill-based practice) which should provide the learners with sufficient knowledge of grammar. Only those learners who mastered the structures of the target language can continue to develop their communicative skills. The second group of answers concerned more the attitudes. They stressed several features of the well-working teacher-student relationship (as one of the participants in the research named it). There was motivation, stimulation and creative atmosphere which is in my opinion more connected with the role of the teacher, since it is his/her responsibility to keep the students motivated, to stimulate their work and progress and to provoke the creative atmosphere. The will to work and interest are, on the other hand, the important and even necessary as-

pects of the learner. Both learners and teachers should share the following mentioned features: patience and enthusiasm. These very valuable features are closely related to the role of the teacher and the student. We can recall either the basic features of the client-therapist relationship according to Carl Rogers, or the role of the teacher in the CLT classroom and we will find something very similar: the importance of co-operation, understanding and trust. The teacher's ability to keep his/her students motivated is very much dependent on his/her ability to understand their needs, which the learners can express if they are interested and willing to work.

The second question dealt with the crucial features of the teacher. Similarly to the previous question, the responses here could be divided into several groups. The first group of responses stressed the competence of the teacher. It seems to me certainly one of the important features of a teacher. It is only logical that someone who wants to facilitate learning should have mastered the subject his/her students want to learn. But there are other aspects of teacher's competence. Some of the responses to this particular question stressed the importance of the teacher's responsibility which is, at least in my opinion, also connected to the teacher's competence. It is a matter of responsibility to provide the learners with the best materials, reliable information, to be well prepared and thus, secure well structured and helpful sessions. Another feature mentioned in some of the questionnaires was teacher's confidence. This feature stems from the competence too. Common knowledge is that the learners can sense when the teacher is not sure of what s/he is doing and that certainly has a negative impact on the process of learning, because it disturbs the atmosphere of trust. But when the teacher is competent and the students do not have to examine the validity of each provided piece of information, then the lessons are meaningful and the process of learning is not interrupted. The second type of responses concerns the teacher's attitude to the learners. Here belongs the teacher's ability to be unbiased and tolerant. And again, we can look back to the important factors of successful therapeutic relationship as described by Carl Rogers. One of them was the unconditional positive regard in other words, the therapist's ability to be non-judgemental. Such a quality certainly has its place in the classroom as well, because the teacher should be able to provide the learners with a fair and unbiased feedback. Another feature stressed in connection with the teacher's attitude to his/her learners was communication and understanding. All through this work the importance of communication is constantly stressed, and understanding is a vital condition of a meaningful communication. Understanding, or empathy, is also stressed by Carl Rogers as another crucial condition of a successful therapy. Only by careful listening and constant will to understand can the therapist or the teacher discover the needs of the client or the learner. Another feature derives from the teacher's ability to understand and it is flexibility. Once the teacher knows of the students' needs s/he should adjust the course, the materials, procedures, activities etc. to these needs. The teacher should be able to adjust not only the course, but often even him/herself to the needs of the learners. Empathy and understanding also enables the teacher to be patient with the learners, which is according to several participants in the research very important. The last two features mentioned in connection with the teacher's attitude were enthusiasm and creativity. These two are, among others, necessary for the motivation of the learner.

ners and the lively and pleasant flow of the course, because all activities can be modified according to the needs of the learners, their level etc. and with enthusiasm and creativity it is more enjoyable for both the teacher and the learners. The third question enquired about the important features of the student. It was interesting to find out that only one of the fourteen teachers participating in the research considered **the mental capacity and talent** of the learners important. In the light of what has been said about the non-judgemental and unbiased attitude I feel rather hesitant about this feature. Who is there to judge the learner's mental capacity? Should those who are not gifted to learn a language easily be discouraged? I personally feel that once a person decides to learn a language s/he must have had reasons for such a decision and the rest is more a question of attitude. That is also a view of all the remaining participants of the research. **Will to learn, to use the language in real communication, to accept information, persistence, responsibility, enthusiasm and motivation** seem to be the most important aspects of the learner's attitude. It is true, that when these are lacking, the learning process may be seriously disturbed. The teacher can and should, of course, keep the students motivated and most of the teachers would probably agree that the lack of will to learn on part of the student can prevent the process of learning completely. The nourishing of the learner's interest is a matter of communication between the teacher and the learner, the teacher's ability to establish a relationship of trust and understanding. The last two responses to the third question concern features which can be actually developed in the process of learning and their development can be greatly helped by the teacher's attitude, they are **self-confidence and ability to employ logic and self-expression**.

The fourth question examined the features of a successful lesson. There were two types of responses. The first concerned the teacher's "handling" of the lesson mostly stemming from his/her **preparation** of the lesson which was by several teachers recognised as especially important. The other mentioned features related to the teacher's preparation are **clear aim, flow, balance and variety of activities, timing, students' participation, effectiveness, active co-operation and atmosphere**. All these features of a successful lesson can be secured by the teacher's careful analysis of the learners' needs followed by thoughtful preparation of the whole lesson, which the teacher should be ready to adjust any time in order to maintain the lively and active atmosphere and motivation. The second type of responses was related more to the outcome of the lesson. For one of the participants a lesson is successful when the students **grasp an idea**, for another success is when the students **gain confidence**. Both of these seem to me valuable points and I see them as a direct result of the above mentioned features of a successful lesson. In other words, a carefully prepared lesson adjusted to the current needs of the learners should result in the learners' grasping a new idea or gaining confidence (perhaps through a practice of some problematic grammatical structure).

The fifth question dealt with the materials considered most useful by the participants of the research. I was pleased to find out that several teachers prefer most the materials **appropriate for the students**. These teachers certainly feel that the needs of the learners are one of the most important factors forming the lesson or course. One of the teachers even admitted his/her preference for a course book (as something to "hold onto") accompanied by extra materials chosen *according to the needs of the students*. Another two responses saying that the ma-

materials should be **realistic** and **provoking communication** are also very valuable. The importance of realistic practice was stressed several times in the chapter concerning the Communicative Language Teaching, mostly in the motto in the beginning of the whole chapter. The use of realistic materials is helpful not only because they secure an authentic and useful practice, but also because they liven up and motivate the learners who can relate to such materials better. The importance of communication has also been stressed many times therefore activities which help the teacher enhance the students' motivation to communicate are extremely useful. The last two mentioned responses are closely connected with each other: the teacher should make an **informed choice** of materials which **combine all skills**. The choice of activities is, of course, a very important aspect. It was suggested in connection with the preparation of the lesson that the needs of the learners are the crucial factor the teacher should bear in mind when considering the materials. To choose materials which would be varied and would combine all language skills is necessary in order to maintain a colourful lesson and students' interest.

The sixth question was aimed at the type of activities the participants find most useful. It was a thrilling experience to find out that most of the participating teachers consider the **communicative activities** to be the most helpful. Seven of the fourteen teachers participating in the research actually used the term "communicative" plus one of them also included the **pre-communicative** activities. This shows that the teachers must have in some way encountered the approach of Communicative Language Teaching, because they know its terminology and their awareness of the advantages of the above mentioned types of activities implies that they also use the strategies and procedures of CLT in practice. Two of the participants mentioned another valuable feature of helpful activities, according to them the most useful activities are the ones **as close to the reality as possible**. The importance of connection of the language teaching with reality was stressed many times throughout this work. Not only was it mentioned in connection with the most useful materials in question five of the questionnaire, but the chapter devoted to Communicative Language Teaching pointed out the importance of realistic practice, communication acts as close to the authentic language interactions as possible, and stressed its meaning not only for the motivation of the learners, but also its importance for the preparation of the learners for the "real" communication. In connection with the motivation of the learners I would like to mention two other features of helpful activities suggested by some of the participating teachers, they feel that the activities should be **creative** and **varied**. I think that we would all agree that the creative activities as well as creative materials are vitally important for maintaining the learners' interest and motivation. Another participant of the research specified this even more by stressing the **game-form** of the activities. Furthermore, by giving the learners freedom to employ their own creativity, the teacher can find out more about their personalities as the learners express their taste, opinions, characters etc. The variety of activities, as we all probably feel, is equally important in terms of the students' motivation, but it is also crucial to provide the learners with balanced practice of all aspects of language.

The seventh question inquired about the teachers' ideas concerning the role of the student. Once again I was pleased to read that nine of the participating teachers see the role of the learner as **active**. Some specified this response even further: the learner should not be **afraid**, but should act as an **interested participant**

who can **feel the assistance and guidance if needed**. This reminds me a lot of the “Rogerian way”, i.e. the teacher/therapist is there for the learner/client as an understanding listener, providing help and guidance if required, in other words as a facilitator of learning or growth. There is not any significant difference between a client learning how to be himself/herself or a student learning a language, because such learning involves also a great deal of self-discovery, as Carl Rogers says:

The only man who is educated is the man who has learned how to learn; the man who has learned how to adapt and change, the man who has realised that no knowledge is secure, that only the process of seeking knowledge gives basis for security.

Rogers, 1983:120

In other words, the learner must take an active role in his/her own learning in order to discover the way of learning most suitable for him/her and in order to maintain and deepen the knowledge. One of the participants also stressed the importance of the learners' ability to **accept information**. That is certainly a valuable point. In the atmosphere of mutual trust the learner does not have to hesitate to accept the information provided by the teacher, and on the contrary, s/he does not have to hesitate to question the information provided by the teacher. In the environment of mutual trust both the teacher and the learners can be themselves.

The last two remaining responses are closely connected. One of these participants feels that the role of the student is **the most important one**, the second one states that s/he is trying to employ the **student-centred approach**. These answers are, in my opinion, another proof of how many teachers have already encountered Communicative Language Teaching (or some other learner-centred approach) or in some other way realised that the learner and his/her needs are central to language teaching.

The eighth question was especially interesting because the teachers were expected to describe their own role in the teaching process. Several of the teachers themselves characterised their role using the term **facilitator**. Others characterised the qualities a teacher should have; all of them are very valuable for the role of the facilitator: **motivating, co-operating, flexible, encouraging, informing, objective, aware of things, leading dialogue with the students not making them feel inferior**.

We all probably feel how important all of the mentioned roles are and how closely they are related to all I have tried to point out in my work. In the chapter devoted to the Communicative Language Teaching I presented the role of the teacher as co-operator or co-communicator, the importance of teacher's flexibility, ability to react immediately to the learners' needs. The importance of not acting as authority and giving students feedback in a way which would not make them feel inferior or discouraged was also stressed. In the chapter concerning Rogerian psychotherapy we could read about the necessary conditions of a successful therapeutic relationship (which are also relevant for a successful teacher-student relationship) and one of them was empathy, in other words “being aware of things”. Unconditional positive regard was another such condition and again it is reflected in those responses which stressed the importance of the teacher's objectivity. In other responses the role of the teacher was described as the one of **ad-**

visor, supervisor and stimulator. Also these roles are among those which the teacher assumes in the classroom, but it is important to remember that all of these roles are inspired by the learners and their needs.

The ninth question asked the teachers to evaluate their own success in teaching/learning. I have originally expected a wide variety of answers, but to my surprise, many participants pointed out similar things. Three participants felt that their greatest success is **communication** with the students. For the whole learning/teaching process this quality is very important, because it enables the teacher to find out about the learners' needs, through communication the teacher and the learners can get to know each other, the feedback is provided through communication etc. The importance of communication has been stressed many times throughout this work. Four participants see their strongest point in creating **comfortable** and **relaxed** atmosphere, using **humour** and providing lots of **space for the students**. All of these points are extremely valuable and the students certainly are grateful for such qualities of the classroom atmosphere. Two teachers saw their success in their ability to **motivate** the learners. Again, I have to refer to the previous chapters where the role of motivation was mentioned several times. It is important that the students' motivation is constantly preserved. In order to do that the teacher must know his/her students very well, be aware of their interests, characters, needs etc. Very closely related to this point is **variety**, which was a positive quality of one of the participants. Another teacher appreciated his/her ability to provide the learners with **realistic** practice and thus, prepare them well for the authentic communicative situations they may expect later in "real" life. The **ability to relate** to the students and **ability to acknowledge own mistakes** are, in my opinion other closely related points. They are both connected with congruence, the third necessary condition of a successful therapeutic or teaching relationship according to Carl Rogers. In order to relate to the students one first needs to be aware of oneself, to be able to relate to oneself. When this condition is fulfilled, the teacher can be real in the lessons and the learners feel that s/he is able to relate to them. Under such conditions the teacher can afford to acknowledge his/her own mistakes without the fear of losing the learners' trust because they can accept the teacher's mistake as much as s/he accepts theirs.

Finally, the tenth question asked about the crucial features of a successful teacher-student relationship. After examining the participants' responses I realised that they can be divided into three groups according to the three necessary conditions of the teaching/therapeutic relationship as presented by Carl Rogers. Four of the participants used the term **empathy** to describe the most important feature of the teacher-student relationship. Four teachers used the term **understanding**, which is nearly a synonym to empathy. Some used other terms which were in their meaning very close or closely related to empathy, these were: **sensitivity, motivation, and encouragement**. The relationship of these terms and empathy may not be obvious at first sight, so I will attempt to clarify it. Only by being empathetic, by seeing the world through the learner's eyes, can the teacher discover the learner's needs, find out about his/her interests, character, troubles, strong and weak points etc. This is the way the teacher can get to know his/her students, find out what is relevant and important for them. On the basis of this knowledge, gained through empathy, the teacher can enhance the students'

motivation. Similarly, the teacher must be empathetic and feel when and how the learner needs to be encouraged. The second condition is congruence and even though none of the participating teachers used this term explicitly, the terms used by them were very close in meaning. Four teachers stressed the importance of **trust**, which is a direct result of congruence. When the teacher is congruent, real, acts as himself/herself and does not put on a mask in the classroom, the students will also show their real selves and the basis for a trustful teacher-student relationship is established. One teacher participating in the research felt that despite all the freedom, the learners sometimes need “**certain rules**”. The establishment of some structure is certainly helpful if the learners require so and if there is trust between the teacher and the learners. Under such condition the rules can be suggested and agreed on by both sides and thus easily accepted. The third condition of successful teaching or a therapeutic relationship is the unconditional positive regard. In the participants’ responses I could feel this condition present especially in **respect** and **tolerance**. The importance of these is rather obvious. Only teacher who respects his/her students can hope to establish a relationship of trust. Only teacher who is respectful and tolerant can expect to receive respect and tolerance back from his/her students. Only a respectful and tolerant teacher can provide unbiased feedback and facilitate the process of learning.

To conclude the research I would like to point out that the evaluation and interpretation of the responses of the participating teachers confirms the ideas presented in the hypothesis. Many of the features discussed in connection with the reflection of Rogerian psychotherapy in CLT appeared in the participants’ responses. The teachers in general showed that they share a “student-centred attitude”. The teachers expressed that their main concern is the learner, that the needs of the learner are the main factor forming the course or lesson. The aim of language teaching is to enable the learners to grasp the language in all its aspects in order to be able to communicate because communication is one of the most important aspects of language. The role of the teacher is seen as the role of the facilitator of learning, non-authoritative, but helpful, reliable and co-operating human being whom the learner can trust. Trust, empathy and respect are the most important features of the teacher-student relationship. On the whole, the research proved that the theories presented in this work, Communicative Language Teaching theory and Rogerian psychotherapy not only share many features, but are also used and accepted in practice.

THE REFLECTION OF ROGERIAN PSYCHOTHERAPY IN COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

In the previous chapters the concepts of Rogerian psychotherapy and Communicative Language Teaching were explored. We had a chance to proceed from the roots of both concepts through the procedures used in them all the way to the attitudes necessary for the people involved in the procedures of both concepts. Finally, in each chapter the results or impact of the concepts were examined. It was suggested in the introduction and hopefully, it became obvious in the course of this work, that the Rogerian psychotherapy is somehow reflected in the Communicative

Language Teaching. It is a task of this chapter to examine all the possible aspects and the depth of this reflection. I would like to explain that the ideas presented in this chapter are my own thoughts and views and therefore need to be supported not only by the theoretical background, but also by the research. Thus, I would like to introduce this chapter as a possible hypothesis of the research described in the following chapter. I would like to present the reflection from three different points of view: common features reflected in the procedure, common features of the role of the learner and the teacher. I would like to start with some general comments which Carl Rogers made in his profound book *Freedom To Learn*, because I feel that they are more than relevant for the theme we are exploring.

Carl Rogers in his book *Freedom To Learn* expressed his uncertainty concerning the word "teaching". He feels that for many people teaching means "instructing, imparting knowledge or skill, making to know, showing, guiding or directing". That is for him an unacceptable attitude:

I have a negative reaction to teaching. Why? I think it is because it raises all the wrong questions. ... what shall we teach? What from our superior vantage point, does the other person need to know? ... What shall the course cover?

Rogers, 1983:119 - 120

In other words, the "traditional" teacher makes many important decision without the learner or even instead of the learner. Such teacher assumes the position of the wiser one and from that point the communication with the learners and the teacher-student relationship is distorted, because the teacher sees his/her students as a mass of "material" which needs to be informed and instructed, but the fact that the learners are changing and developing human beings somehow escapes the teacher's mind. A teacher, according to Carl Rogers is a *facilitator of change and learning*. (Rogers, 1983:120) Such a facilitator recognises and appreciates the change, sees the learners as human beings in a process and realises that it is only them who can decide for the direction of that process.

What has been said above suggests that Carl Rogers believes in the learner-centred way of learning. At this point we can actually trace the first features valid also for Communicative Language Teaching and Rogerian psychotherapy. As was stated in the chapter concerning the Rogerian approach, this psychotherapy is also referred to as the client-centred approach. The client is the one who decides about most of the aspects of the therapy. S/he sets the pace, decides about the themes of the individual sessions, takes the risk of exploring his/her own self and decides how far into the self s/he wants to venture. The therapist is there for the client to create an atmosphere of safety and trust, to accompany the clients often long and winding road to being his/her own self, to being a fully functioning person. Under no condition can the therapist take up the role of the leader, advisor or evaluator of the client's state or progress. These characteristics of the client-centred psychotherapy are, in my opinion, strongly present also in Rogers's ideas concerning teaching and learning, and we can trace them also among the basic features of Communicative Language Teaching. CLT is also described as a *learner-centred and experience based* approach. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:69) Looking into the description of the approach we can certainly find many proofs of the learner-centredness of CLT. It has been poin-

ted out several times throughout this work, that it is the learner who determines the lesson or the whole course. The teacher has to design the course after a careful analysis of the learners' needs and still be able to change this design in order to be as helpful to the learners as possible. Thus, we can see that the person-centred character of the Rogerian psychotherapy is reflected in the learner-centredness of Communicative Language Teaching.

Another comment Carl Rogers made about teaching and learning concerned the lecture system. Rogers wholeheartedly opposed this passive way of absorbing information by the learners without any opportunity to express their own opinion and thus without any opportunity to relate to that information. He stressed the idea of the *whole-person learning*, which has a quality of *personal involvement*. It involves not only the left brain hemisphere as the traditional learning (the left brain hemisphere works in logical and linear ways, accepts only sure and clear facts) but also the right hemisphere which, is characterised as intuitive, *grasps the essence before it understands the details, operates in metaphors, is aesthetic rather than logical*. (Rogers, 1983:19-20) This definition can be explained by stressing the importance of the learner's ability to relate to the material s/he needs to learn. Once the interest is evoked, the learner actually wants to learn, it is important to involve the whole person in the process of learning. The experience and its cognitive quality are extremely important in the whole-person learning, because the basis of this learning is the *meaning* to the learner and this meaning is a crucial part of the whole experience. (Rogers, 1983:20) Similar ideas can be found in the features of Rogerian psychotherapy. The client is not helped by any mechanically acquired changes of behaviour, but s/he is assisted to find the meaning in his/her own self. Such therapy also has the quality of personal involvement, since it is the client who initiates the process of change, it is also deeply experience based, and this experience must be meaningful to the client in order to be helpful. The tendencies towards the whole-person learning can be traced also in Communicative Language Teaching, where the close connection of reality and language teaching is stressed. (Littlewood, 1990:94) The meaning is also one of the crucial aspects in CLT, because it is not only the goal of communication: to convey meaning, but the meaningfulness to the learner is the key feature of CLT syllabus. In other words, only such items should be learned, which are meaningful to the learner. The last feature reflected in both Rogerian psychotherapy and Communicative Language Teaching is the importance of communication. In the client-centred therapy, the communication between the client and the therapist is the basis for the successful therapeutic relationship. This communication is secured by the three necessary conditions mentioned earlier: empathy, congruence and unconditional positive regard. Empathy is a necessary feature of communication, because it means that both parties are involved in communicating. The client communicates his/her feelings, emotions, thoughts etc. to the therapist who receives them and tries his/her best to understand them empathetically, to see them through the client's eyes. Congruence is necessary for the communication to be clear, to be rid of all the double messages and confusions, because once the therapist is congruent with himself/herself, once s/he is aware of and accepts his/her own feelings, then the therapist can be "transparently" real in the relationship with the client, who under such conditions will take the risk of being real too. Accordingly, their communication is real and devoid of troublesome misunderstandings. The unconditional

positive regard secures the client's openness. Once the therapist is able to accept the client as a positive entity and the client recognises that s/he is not judged and evaluated, the real freedom to communicate is established. By communicating his/her feelings under these conditions the client experiences the safety of the therapeutic relationship and that experience encourages him/her to continue the process of becoming a fully functioning person.

In Communicative Language Teaching the communication is one of the goals. The learners facilitated by the teacher are striving to achieve the communicative competence, in other words, are progressing towards a state in which they will be able not only to understand the language usage, but they will be able to convey and understand the potential communicative functions of different linguistic forms and will be able to use them appropriately in each specific social situation. This state is achieved also by means of communication initiated by the pre-communicative and the communicative activities. Thus, we can see that the communication is one of the important features which is reflected in both the Rogerian Psychotherapy and Communicative Language Teaching.

Another field in which the reflections of Rogerian client-centred approach can be found in Communicative Language Teaching is the role and position of the learner/client. In the therapeutic relationship the client is seen as a process, constantly changing an entity which is progressing toward his/her personal growth. The therapist has no power over the client's progress, s/he can only assist and accompany this process as best as s/he can. Furthermore, it is the client himself/herself who decides about the pace of the therapy, the themes of the therapeutic sessions. The client decides how much s/he will "open the door" and how far inside the therapist may enter. The therapist should do his/her best to create the necessary conditions of a successful therapeutic relationship, but apart from that, s/he cannot by any means put a pressure on the client to make him/her cooperate according to the therapist's plans. The therapist must simply trust that the client under the conditions of empathy, congruence and unconditional positive regard will feel the urge to grow personally, to become his/her own self. Similar ideas can be found in Carl Rogers's opinions concerning teaching. He stressed the importance of the *responsible freedom* in the classroom. (Rogers, 1983:70) This idea basically views the learner and the teacher as equal participants of the learning/teaching process. In this process, the teacher believes that the learner undergoes the *gradual process of growth*, which is determined by the learner's needs. Only under such conditions can the learner realise the importance of learning "to learn". Knowledge is a process and once the learner realises this s/he will see the course of his/her learning also as a (perhaps never ending) process. The teacher does not impose any syllabus, curriculum or lectures on the students without consulting them about their opinion. The learners are trusted to grow and develop. (Rogers, 1983:70) This we can see strongly reflected in Communicative Language Teaching where the *learner brings pre-conceptions of what learning and teaching should be like*. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:77) In CLT there is no universal syllabus design, because each group of learners is unique and requires a special course designed especially to suit their characters, opinions and needs. Another point which Carl Rogers stresses is the importance of community in learning. The interpersonal relationship bet-

ween the teacher and the learner will be dealt with in greater depth in the following paragraph, but the importance of the relationship among the fellow students should not be underestimated either. The learners and the teacher are all members of one community and it is the responsibility of everybody to keep this community alive, moving in progress. The importance of community is also stressed in CLT where the process of learning is co-operative rather than individualistic. It means that success as well as failure is a matter of the whole community, the *successful as well as failed communication is a matter of all, not just the speaker and the listener*. (Richards, Rodgers, 1991:77) The responsible freedom involving the teacher's/therapist's trust that the learner/client will grow and progress gradually and the importance of co-operation are other features of the Rogerian psychotherapy the reflection of which can be traced in Communicative Language Teaching.

Finally, the last field, in which the two concepts virtually "speak the same language" is the role of the teacher/therapist. In the Rogerian psychotherapy the role of the therapist is the one of a companion. This role has its special features which are determined by the three necessary conditions of the therapeutic relationship. The therapist is empathetic, s/he tries his/her best to understand the client's feelings, thoughts, fears, his/her internal world, in other words, the s/he tries to see the world through the client's eyes. The client perceives his/her being understood as a sign of safety and trust in the relationship. S/He does not have to worry about being evaluated, s/he is simply being understood. This quality is important also for a teacher, as we can see from the characteristics of CLT. Once the teacher is able to see the learning process through the student's eyes, it is much easier for him/her to adapt to the learner's needs and abilities. Carl Rogers points out:

When the teacher has the ability to understand the student's reactions from the inside, has a sensitive awareness of the way the process of education and learning seems to the student, then again the likelihood of significant learning is increased.

Rogers, 1983:125

The second condition of a helpful therapeutic relationship is congruence. The therapist should at every point be aware of his/her own feelings and accept them as part of his/her own self. This is crucial in order to be real in the relationship with the client. Once the therapist is not able to get rid of all the "masks" the use of which is so tempting, s/he cannot expect the client to be real. The therapist as well as the teacher when congruent can enter the relationship with the client or the students as a real person, not as a *sterile tube through which knowledge is passed from one generation to the next*. (Rogers, 1983:122) It is stressed also in the basics of CLT that the teacher should be a "human among humans", which means that the teacher can also express his/her feelings, positive or negative, because s/he is a member of the learning community:

She can be enthusiastic, can be bored, can be interested in the students, can be angry, can be sensitive and sympathetic. Because she accepts these feelings as her own, she has no need to impose them on her students.

Rogers, 1983:122

Thus, we can see that the teacher's congruence means more freedom not only for the learners, but for the teacher himself/herself. In the end I would like to look at the third condition of the Rogerian therapeutic relationship, the unconditional positive regard. In order for the client to feel safe, the therapist must resist all temptation and avoid any kind of evaluation. Many people have given up things just because of evaluation, no matter if negative or positive, because both are equally stressful. In teaching such attitude is also important. Carl Rogers refers to it as *prizing, acceptance, trust*:

I think of it as prizing the learner, prizing her feelings, her opinions, her person. It is a caring for the learner, but a non possessive caring. It is an acceptance of this other individual as a separate person, having worth in her own right. It is a basic trust - a belief that this other person is somehow fundamentally trustworthy.

Freedom To Learn, p. 124

It gives the teacher the possibility to function as an independent participant of the learning group, instead of being the feared evaluator. The importance of the teacher's ability to function as a co-communicator, participant in the activities, part of the learning group is also pointed out in CLT. Furthermore, it is made clear in CLT characteristics that the feedback the learners receive from the teacher should be encouraging for them to continue the process of learning, not to feel discouraged and inferior. All the presented ideas are proving that the necessary conditions of the successful therapeutic relationship and their implication for the role of the therapist in the Rogerian psychotherapy are reflected in Communicative Language Teaching, especially in the role of the teacher.

In the end I would like to summarise the points we could trace in Rogerian psychotherapy as well as in Communicative Language Teaching. From the point of view of the procedure, we could see that the client-centred character of the Rogerian approach in psychotherapy is greatly reflected in the learner-centredness of CLT. Similarly, the recognition of all aspects of the client as presented by the Rogerian approach greatly resonates with the idea of whole-person learning. Furthermore, we could see that both concepts share the crucial importance of communication. As to the role of the learner/client we could see that in both the Rogerian psychotherapy and CLT the learner/client determines the whole process of therapy/learning, while the therapist/teacher functions as a pure facilitator of change. Both the client and the learner are given the responsibility for their development and are trusted to achieve the process of gradual growth. And last, but not least, the role of the therapist/teacher is in both Rogerian psychology and CLT greatly determined by the three conditions of the Rogerian therapeutic relationship: empathy, congruence and unconditional positive regard. Thus, I can conclude by saying, that the Rogerian psychotherapy and Carl Rogers's ideas concerning teaching/learning are to a great extent reflected in the characteristics of Communicative Language Teaching.

Conclusion

At the beginning of this work I stood before a mass of information which all seemed relevant somehow to the theme I wanted to present, but I could only vaguely see any shape of the result. Yet, as I was progressing with the writing, the ideas began to as if naturally fit together. Let us now once again revise the purpose, course and the possible conclusions of this piece of writing.

In the beginning I tried to present the outline of the Rogerian psychotherapy, its roots and main ideas. I wanted to stress the three main conditions of the helpful therapeutic relationship: empathy, congruence and the unconditional positive regard. The relationship under such conditions was explored from the point of view of the therapist and the client. It was stressed that the goal of the therapy is to enable the client to become aware of his/her own feelings to such an extent that s/he actually becomes that feeling. This leads to the clients realisation that s/he is a human being in process of change and that change is seen as positive. The client becomes a fully functioning, self-actualised person.

The goal of the next chapter was to present, in a similar way, Communicative Language Teaching. I tried to proceed from the roots of the approach to its linguistic background and then to the procedures, roles of the learners and the teacher. I pointed out that the linguistic basis of CLT lies in the importance of the communicative functions of the language, not merely in the acquisition of language usage. The importance of the communicative function of language is reflected also in the activities and material used in CLT. The activities were divided basically into more controlled pre-communicative and freer communicative activities. The materials used are also aimed at stimulating communication. It is important that the activities and materials are as authentic as possible, because one of the goals of CLT practice is to be as close to the reality as possible. Because CLT is a learner-centred approach, the whole course is designed with a view of a particular group of learners. The learner and his/her needs are the most important factors in CLT. Co-operation between the learners is stimulated and is one of the important features of the approach. Thus, the learners are not only responsible for their own learning, but also for the functioning of the whole learning group. The teacher has to recognise that the learning process is directed from within each student, which implies that the teacher should be able to adapt in harmony with the learners' development. The teacher is no superior authority and functions as an independent participant of the learning process.

The following chapter attempted to present some of Carl Rogers's ideas concerning teaching and learning. These ideas accompanied an analysis of the possible reflections of the Rogerian approach in psychotherapy in Communicative Language Teaching. I traced some significant impact in the field of the whole nature of the concepts, the person/learner-centredness, the whole-person learning I saw as a reflection of the perception of the client as complete human being who is understood as an entity in the process of change. Another important resemblance was found in the importance of communication in both concepts. In both it is not only a goal to be achieved, but also means of achieving that goal. From the point of view of the role of the learner the reflection of the Rogerian approach in CLT was also very strong. In both, the learner/client is seen as the main factor determining the whole process of either therapy or learning. The

client/learner is trusted to develop, to grow and that gives them the necessary freedom for such a growth to occur. And finally, the probably strongest reflection of the Rogerian approach in CLT I felt in the role of the teacher/therapist. It became clear that the three conditions of the helpful therapeutic relationship, i.e. empathy, congruence and unconditional positive regard, are equally valid for the client-therapist relationship as for the teacher-learner one. Such conditions result in a relationship of mutual trust, understanding and safety for both the client/learner and the therapist/teacher. In both concepts the teacher and the therapist are seen as the facilitators of change, because the change is the ultimate goal of both therapy and learning. In therapy it is a change towards a person being aware and acceptant of his/her own self, in teaching it is a person who realised that not the knowledge, but the process of seeking it is important, a person who learned how to adapt a change. Consequently, I can say that the Rogerian psychotherapy is to a great extent reflected in language teaching, apart from Communicative Language Teaching it is, of course, Community Language Learning which was mentioned in the introduction. This reflection is mainly perceivable in (though not limited to) the aspects of the interpersonal relationship between the learner and the teacher and the understanding their roles and encounters.

The final stage of this work was a proof of these theoretical conclusions in practice by means of research. The research was carried out in the form of questionnaire distributed to the teachers of private language schools. The questions were aimed at their opinions concerning the procedures, purposes of language teaching, teacher and learner roles, materials etc. The qualitative analysis of the teachers' responses showed that the conclusions arrived at in the previous paragraph are valid also in practice, that the learner-centred approach in all its above mentioned aspects seems to be known and used in practice.

Thus, the conclusion is optimistic. The schools and their classrooms may no longer be compared to prisons with very strict discipline, the teachers no longer seem to be the untouchable and distant authorities. Instead, the schools and classrooms became the students' classrooms, places which are safe and where the learners can be free to learn things meaningful for *them*, and where the teacher is a human being with human feelings and that makes him/her a part of the group. Such environment secures freedom to learn for both the learners and the teachers.

Bibliography:

Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson, K. (1987) *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, William. (1990) *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, David. (1992) *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, Jack C. and Rodgers, Theodore S. (1991) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogers, Carl R. (1983) *Freedom To Learn For the 80's*. Merrill, Macmillan Publishing Company.

Rogers, Carl R. (1996) *On Becoming a Person*. London: Constable.

Widdowson, H. G. (1990) *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Resumé:

Tato práce se zabývá odrazem rogeriánské psychoterapie ve výuce jazyků, hlavně v takzvaném komunikativním přístupu. Oba koncepty, rogeriánská psychoterapie i komunikativní přístup ve výuce jazyků, jsou nejprve teoreticky rozebrány, potom následuje analýza odrazu obou konceptů, která je podložena výzkumem.