



SPOTLIGHT ON EDUCATORS' VIEWS ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF TEACHING COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGES

Fadhil Abdulzahra Tarad

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Al-Qasim Green University, College of Physical Education and Sport Sciences

fadhilaboalzahratarrad1@gmail.com

Article history:	Abstract:
<p>Received: June 14th 2023 Accepted: July 11th 2023 Published: August 20th 2023</p>	<p>The ideas underlying the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) methodology include how students learn a language most effectively, the kind of activities that aid in the learning process, and the responsibilities of both teachers and students. The primary goal is to help students improve their communicative skills, which include speaking and listening, writing, and reading. This review aims to report EFL teachers' views and practices about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), explore the motivations for these beliefs and practices, and identify any discrepancies that may exist. It was found that while most educators held favorable views of CLT's guiding principles, they struggled to implement them in their classrooms. There was a minor discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and their pedagogical methods. This review article highlights teachers' perspectives on CLT to help English instructors, students, and curriculum designers</p>

Keywords:

INTRODUCTION

Ansary (2012) lists several approaches to teaching and learning a second language, including the Grammar Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Audio-Lingual Method, Situational Language Teaching, and Communicative Language Teaching. They were all dealing with unique issues. Students at ALM have grown weary of having to mimic their teachers. Traditional teacher and student roles are maintained in GTM. There is limited student-to-student interaction, and the instructor is seen as the authority figure (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). There were also flaws in other alternative approaches, so it's impossible to say with certainty which one is superior or more realistic in practice. Communicative language education (Richards, 2006) has been suggested as one of the most appealing and effective strategies among teachers and students.

CLT was developed because some educators felt dissatisfied with conventional approaches. English language educators often turn to the communicative approach, which bases lessons on real-world scenarios pupils will encounter. The primary goal is to help students acquire the linguistic information and communicative skills necessary to function effectively in a second language learning environment. Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) have been urged in recent decades to use CLT to equip their students better to use English effectively in various settings (Chang, 2011).

Since teachers play such a pivotal role in the classroom, they should be the ones to decide how they would apply CLT concepts and put them into practice. While teachers may say one thing, that doesn't mean they must live by it (Mowlaie & Rahimi, 2010).

Only some research, both in Iran and elsewhere, have zeroed in on the opinions of EFL teachers about CLT. According to Karavas-Doukas (1996), instructors may only examine their attitudes if there is a discrepancy between their own beliefs and the concepts of CLT. This discrepancy can be uncovered by collecting teachers' reports of their perspectives.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Grammatical proficiency was emphasized heavily. They thought grammar could be taught systematically if only the right approach were taken. Grammar lessons were conducted using both deductive and inductive methods. In the deductive method, students are first introduced to grammatical principles and then given enough opportunity to put those principles into practice. The inductive approach encouraged pupils to deduce a grammar rule from a set of instances. It was thought that learning a language entailed accumulating a vast bank of grammatical phrases and patterns to create them automatically when called for (Richards, 2006).

The 1970s saw the start of a backlash against conventional wisdom, ultimately leading to its decline in popularity. It was stated that communicative competence was far more critical than grammatical competence when learning and teaching a language (Richards, 2006), so the importance of grammar was called into doubt. Hymes "proposed the concept of communicative competence," arguing that studying human language should situate humans in a social context (Chang, 2011). Effective communication involves knowing what to say and how to respond to a given context, audience, role, and focus. During the 1970s and 1980s, when CLT was initially introduced as a novel method, educators worldwide took notice. They promptly began to reevaluate their practices and the resources they used in the classroom. Planning language courses using a CLT method does not start with grammar (Richards, 2006).

Educators and linguists dissatisfied with the status quo may be credited with creating the communicative approach. They believed students lacked the social skills to communicate effectively through speech, body language, and facial expressions (Galloway, 1993). They thought communication skills were more important than language skills.

Many studies have explored CLT principles such as these to assess educators' perspectives on communicative language instruction:

1. Grammar's Role and Importance
2. Correction of errors in small groups/pair work: quality and quantity
3. The place of the educator in the classroom
4. Learners' participation and requirements

Finocchiar and Brunfit, in light of their understanding of CLT, looked at the following other key features:

1. It's all about the meaning.
2. In cases where dialogue is employed, it serves primarily communicative purposes and is not typically memorized.
3. Putting things in their proper context is a must.
4. The goal is clear and concise communication. Minor drilling might occur, but only on the outskirts.
5. The goal is understandable pronunciation.
6. Learners can use whichever aids work best for them, considering their age, interests, etc.
7. Possible early encouragement of communication attempts.
8. Using one's native tongue is tolerated, provided it is used judiciously.
9. In cases where pupils would benefit from or require translation, it may be used.
10. If you choose, reading and writing can begin on day one.
- 11.** The struggle is the best teacher, and it's through work that you'll learn the target language.

Although knowing grammar is crucial, CLT classes begin with a focus on something other than grammar. Teachers can learn grammar rules from pictures and other visual aids in the classroom environment. To save time, students should go over the necessary explanation of grammar only once as a class (Saricoban & Tilfarlioglu, 1999). Indirect methods of grammar instruction were preferred.

In CLT classes, educators play two distinct but interrelated responsibilities. The first is to improve communication and understanding between types, styles, and the various learning activities. The second is functioning as a critical observer of one's education (Ansary, 2012). In CLT classes, teachers are encouraged to speak less and listen more. Students can contextualize them through exercises like explaining, writing, and providing examples. "We must admit that the teachers will take none of these roles if they do not believe in them" (Mowlaie & Rahimi, 2010). Teachers' attitudes regarding CLT should also be taken into account. Many scholars have established multiple definitions of belief: Beliefs are like little theories to Hosenfeld. As noted in Mowlaie and Rahimi (2010), Omaggio defines belief as knowledge about something, but Clark defines belief as implicit theories. According to Richards, educators base their convictions on "(a) their own experience,(b) personality factor,(c) their experience of what works best,(d) established practice,(e) principles derived from approaches or methods, and(f) insight based on the research-based principle" (Mowlaie & Rahimi, 2010).

Those classes tend to have more engaged students. As they go around the room to finish assignments, even group discussions are disrupted. They bargain with one another over how and what they should learn. They need to find their methods of learning. "(Ansary, 2012)

Those who tried to use CLT in the classroom or research it found it challenging. CLT's weak and strong forms are differentiated from one another. In the more diluted form, which has been used for the past decade, teachers create opportunities for their students to use English in a communicative context and then attempt to incorporate these lessons into a more extensive curriculum. The powerful variant can be acquired through interaction, but it involves more than just turning on and being alive; it also requires reviving dormant subconscious information and imitating linguistic improvement. Learning how to use English is the weak version while learning English is the strong one (Hotwatt, as stated in Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

"(a) lack of administrative support, (b) lack of resources, (c) lack of sufficient English language knowledge, (d) wider curriculum, (e) large class size, (f) discrepancy between CLT syllabus and nationally administered exams, (g) teachers clinging to traditional methods, and (h) lack of authentic learning materials," as cited by Jamali et al. (2014).

Researchers in Iran and elsewhere have probed educators' views on CLT. Teacher attitudes toward all five CLT principles were found to be moderate in Australia (Chang, 2011), with the learner role part receiving the highest

score. Teachers in Razmjoo and Riazi's study had favorable views on CLT principles concerning the roles of grammar and the teacher. Teachers in Italy had a favorable impression of CLT when it came to pair work activities, citing its beneficial effects on students' language development and motivation to learn. Liao assessed the views of Chinese English teachers on CLT in secondary schools. According to the findings (Razmjoo, Riazi, & Liao, reported in Chang, 2011), educators have a generally positive impression of CLT. The results of this study demonstrate that many EFL educators have favorable views of CLT. Nonetheless, some reports have highlighted teachers' worries regarding CLT (Chang, 2011). Hawkey mentioned that Italian English instructors think it's important to correct their students' grammar. According to Li's findings, teachers believe they need to provide students with feedback when they use the target language in a meaningful context (Hawkey & Li, as cited by Chang, 2011).

Universities in southern Taiwan that use CLT were discovered by Chang (2011)'s research. The research employed a combination of approaches. The study consisted of two parts: first, quantitative data were gathered, and then, qualitative data were gathered to supplement the former. From the many educational institutions, a random sample is taken. Fifty-five college-level educators from Taiwan were randomly selected from the pool of teachers at the designated schools. The first round of interviews took place at two different universities in southern Taiwan, and the second round was meant to provide light on the findings from the first. To gauge how people felt about CLT's tenets, researchers employed a scale created by Karavas-Doukas (1996). The first and second stages were guided by the following research questions: First, how do professors in Taiwan feel about using the Communicative Approach to the Classroom? What are the causes of the educators' bias toward CLT? The reasons for the optimistic views can be summed up as follows, according to the research: 1. CLT takes into account both aesthetics and practicality Second, CLT enhances students' proficiency in the target language. Third, in the process of learning, CLT takes into account emotive aspects. 4. Belief in one's own ability to learn is bolstered by CLT (Chang, 2011).

In recent decades, Vietnam has undergone several transformations, including the widespread adoption of CLT and the requirement for English as a foreign language. Despite significant investments in teacher training, many Vietnamese teachers remain concerned that their students are not receiving an adequate education in English (Mai Ngoc and Iwashita, 2012; Le, Pham, & Sullivan). According to Le, mentioned by Mai Ngoc and Iwashita (2012), two crucial elements motivating teachers to use CLT in Vietnam are government policy support and the positive view of Vietnamese teachers. 2006 a new communicative skills-based curriculum was approved and implemented from sixth through twelfth grade. The fact that most Vietnamese students, even after years of studying English, lack the proficiency to speak with one another using CLT suggests that the method is failing to be appropriately adopted in Vietnam (Pham, as stated in Mai Ngoc and Iwashita, 2012). The academic curriculum, the EFL setting, reduced student motivation, classroom size, teachers' low competency, and tests based on grammar are all factors working against the widespread adoption of CLT in Vietnam (Mai Ngoc and Iwashita, 2012). In addition to these restrictions and hurdles, teachers in Vietnam face more fundamental problems when implementing CLT, such as a mismatch between Western and Vietnamese cultural norms and values (Ellis & Sullivan, as cited in Mai Ngoc and Iwashita, 2012).

According to Thompson, there are four common misunderstandings concerning CLT among ELT professionals: First, grammar is considered in CLT. CLT emphasizes oral communication over written instruction. Third, CLT considers pair and group work via activities like role plays, and fourth, CLT requires too much from teachers in terms of expertise, time, and effort (Thompson, as stated in Mai Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012).

In the study by Mai Ngoc and Iwashita (2012), a questionnaire was given to 38 first-year students and 37 working teachers from two universities in Hanoi, Vietnam. Due to students' limited English proficiency, we allowed them to fill out the survey in either English or Vietnamese. The study's central query was whether or not students and educators have similar feelings about CLT. The results showed that both students and teachers had favorable views of CLT, with teachers holding a better idea of all CLT principles except for group and pair work.

There were several obstacles to implementing CLT in Bangladesh, including the teachers, the students, the educational system, and CLT itself. Teachers are optimistic about the benefits of using CLT in the classroom but pessimistic about its widespread adoption. They believe that only by overcoming these challenges will they be able to use CLT in their English classes fully. First, there was a divergence in how educators viewed their students' interest in acquiring conversational English skills instead of grammatical ones. Teachers reported that children showed little enthusiasm for developing their spoken language skills. The size of the class was the second distinctive feature. Since there were typically more than thirty children in each classroom in public schools, teachers couldn't give each pupil individualized attention. Private school educators, on the other hand, had more time to devote to each pupil. The adoption of CLT appears less challenging in these educational settings. The third issue has to do with insufficient funds and other resources. Teachers in public and private institutions reported access to the computers, multimedia projectors, audio materials, and photocopiers necessary for adopting CLT in English classrooms. The problem of overcrowded classrooms is serious in Bangladesh (Ansary, 2012).

108 EFL educators were chosen randomly for Zangoie and Derakhshan's (2014) analysis of CLT preferences and attitudes toward corrective feedback. The results showed that educators' preferences in CF varied widely. Teachers with a low CLT score are more likely to utilize translation, recasts, and explicit methods of CF. In contrast, those with a high CLT score are more likely to use Elicitation, Metalinguistic CF, and Repetition.

Ansary (2012) employed a combination of approaches in his investigation. Thirty English instructors from elementary and secondary schools participated. Questionnaires and casual interviews were used to compile the data.

The results suggest that CLT has been challenging to adopt in English teaching classrooms in Bangladesh due to several constraints. According to 80% of respondents, they don't have the time or motivation to do so. Most educators (63%) have complained about a lack of funding. Sixty percent of respondents said that grammar-based tests are given more weight.

Jamali et al. (2014) employed a mixed methodology to probe the beliefs and practices of EFL educators regarding CLT. There were three stages to the design: first, quantitative data, then second, and third, qualitative information. The first involved a survey, while the second involved interviews and close observation. Thirty instructors from Kermanshah's language schools participated. They were all picked at random. The findings suggested that EFL educators viewed CLT concepts favorably and incorporated them into their pedagogical stances and methods.

CONCLUSION

This analysis compared how educators and students in Iran and elsewhere interpret and understand the principles of CLT. When comparing their perspectives on CLT, most educators and students came away optimistic. However, there were challenges in integrating CLT principles in the classroom that teachers should think about. It was discovered that educators favored this method when they grew weary of having students memorize grammar rules. In addition, CLT considers the four modalities of communication—listening, reading, writing, and speaking—as a unit of study. It's an excellent place for students to go if they need to relax before class. The ability to use a language effectively in context is bolstered.

The conventional roles of teacher and student are flipped in CLT. Teachers play the role of neutral observers or arbitrators in the classroom. Learners can take initiative in their education by seeking information and solving problems independently (Chang, 2011).

CLT has its challenges, yet it can be used as a valid approach to language study. CLT uses role-playing, group, and pair work to boost students' self-confidence. Teachers have less control over the classroom than they did in the past. They merely set up a forum where students can interact and pass on their learning. Educators' perspectives on CLT, which have been overlooked by previous research, should be considered. Many educators assert that they use CLT in their classrooms, but in reality, they substitute their values and perspectives. There needs to be more research into the significance of this issue in language education.

REFERENCES

1. Ansary, D., 2012. Communicative language teaching in EFL context: Teachers attitude and perception in Bangladesh. *ASA University Review*, 6(1): 61-78.
2. Chang, M., 2011. EFL teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college. *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*, 53(5): 17-34.
3. Galloway, A., 1993. Communicative language teaching: An introduction and sample activities. ERIC clearinghouse on languages and linguistics. Washington DC: ERIC Digest.
4. Jamali, F., M. Lashgari and N. Yousofi, 2014. Investigating teachers' attitudes toward CLT. *International Journal of Basic Sciences and Applied Research*, 3(3): 160-164.
5. Karavas-Doukas, E., 1996. Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitude to the communicative approach. *ELT Journal*, 50(3): 187-198.
6. Larsen-Freeman, D., 2000. *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. 2nd Edn., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Mai Ngoc, K. and N. Iwashita, 2012. A comparison of learners and teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching at two universities of Vietnam. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 7: 25-49.
8. Mowlaie, B. and A. Rahimi, 2010. The effect of teachers' attitude about communicative language teaching on their practice: Do they practice what they preach? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9: 1524-1528.
9. Richards, J.C., 2006. *Communicative language teaching today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
10. Richards, J.C. and T.D. Rodgers, 2001. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
11. Saricoban, A. and F.Y. Tilfarlioglu, 1999. Attitudes of foreign language teachers to the communicative learner-centered approach. *Hacettepe Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 15(15): 61-65.
12. Zangoie, A. and A. Derakhshan, 2014. The relationship between EFL teachers' preference of corrective feedback and their attitudes towards. CLT. *IJALEL*, 3(5): 82-90.