Addis Ababa University

Institute of Language Studies

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

(Graduate Programme)

An Exploration into Perceptions of Junior Secondary School English Teachers towards Communicative Language Teaching and Their Actual Classroom Practices: Grade 8 in Focus

Daniel Debebe

June 2010

Addis Ababa

An Exploration into Perceptions of Junior Secondary School English Teachers towards Communicative Language Teaching and Their Actual Classroom Practices: Grade 8 in Focus

Daniel Debebe

A Master's Thesis Presented to the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

(Graduate Programme)

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)

June 2010

Addis Ababa

Addis Ababa University

Institute of Language Studies

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

(Graduate Programme)

An Exploration into Perceptions of Junior Secondary School English Teachers towards Communicative Language Teaching and Their Actual Classroom Practices: Grade 8 in Focus

Daniel Debebe

Approved by Examining Board:

_____

Advisor

_____

Signature

_____

Examiner

_____

Signature

List of Tables

Symbols and Abbreviations

CLT ➜ Communicative Language Teaching

EFL ➜ English as a Foreign Language

A ➜ Agree

* ➜ Unfavourable items

SA ➜ Strongly Agree

SD ➜ Strongly Disagree

U ➜ Undecided

DA ➜ Disagree

F ➜ Frequency

% ➜ Percentage

X ➜ Mean

A ➜ Always

O ➜ Often

ST ➜ Sometimes

R ➜ Rarely

N ➜ Never

Acknowledgements

Let me, at the outset, express my never-ending gratitude to the Almighty God for everything. And I feel excited when I say that God is Great.

Now to my advisor, Dr. Italo Beriso. Honestly speaking, my advisor deserves extraordinary thanks. His wonderful advices and impressive comments, his thoughtfulness, his intelligence and most of all, his welcoming approach have been a great source of inspiration for me throughout the study. His meticulous readings on each chapter of my paper together with his wise guidance had also a critical significance in moving me forward. What is more, his promptness, his practicality, his liberalness and his courtesy are amongst his many best qualities that remain in me. Simply put, I was lucky to have him as an advisor. I will always thank you, Sir.

My lovely family: My mother, wro. Asmarech Taffere, my brother Bewketu Debebe, my sister Ehitaferaw Debebe, my aunt Adanech Taffere and my cousin Agernesh Mekuriaw and other members of my family unquestionably deserve my deepest thanks for they have been encouraging me morally by saying, "አይዞህ፤ በርታ፤ ከጎንህ ነን" and materially by providing me with whatever I needed for the study.

It would definitely be unethical to finish the acknowledgement part without expressing my heartfelt thanks to my friend, Demis Kassa, for his moral and material supports during the study from abroad, Johannesburg, South Africa. Thank you so much, Demis.

Thank you all.

Abstract

Researches reveal that teachers' perceptions play an influential role in determining their professional behavior: the way they plan their lessons, the kinds of decisions they make, the way they react towards different methodologies and the specific method they apply in their classrooms. This study has, therefore, tried to present perceptions of junior secondary school teachers towards communicative language teaching (CLT) and their actual classroom practices with a special reference to Grade 8 English teachers.

Both quantitative and qualitative methods of research have been used for the study. And the required data have been collected from twenty English teachers working in three different elementary schools using the three research tools: questionnaires, observations and interviews. Descriptive statistics such as mean, percentage and frequency have been utilized in analyzing the data obtained through the questionnaires while the observations and interviews were analyzed qualitatively in words.

As a result, it has been found out that the aforementioned teachers have, in fact, a strong perception towards CLT in principle, but when it comes to practice, almost all of them have been found to fail in holding their strong perceptions towards the same. In other words, a clear mismatch has been noticed between teachers' perception towards CLT and their actual classroom practices. And this is attributed to the multidimensional problems pointed out in the conclusion part of the paper.

Mindful of the identified problems, therefore, an earnest and persistent supervision of the schools with regard to the implementation of CLT by the concerned government and non-government bodies is forwarded as a major recommendation at the end of the day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents   **Pages**

Chapter One: Introduction

Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature

Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology

Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Discussion

Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Key Terms

Perception - attitude, view, opinion, insight, interpretation or understanding on something

Practice – exercise, custom, habit, repetition, usual pattern of action: an established way of doing something, especially one that has developed through experience and knowledge

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkins, J., Hailom, B. and Nuru, M. (1995). **Skills Development Methodology; Part One:** Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Belilew Molla (2006). **Learning to Teach English Communicatively in Pre-service teacher education**: A Methodological Perspective with Reference to Nelson Mandella College. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Birhanu Haile (1999). **An Evaluation of the Implementation of Current ELT Syllabus for Grade 9 in terms of the Communicative Language Teaching Methodology.** MA Thesis (Unpublished). AAU.

Brumfit, C.J. 1979.**Communicative Language Teaching: an Educational Perspective**.

Bygate, M. (1987).**Speaking**. Oxford; OUP.

Canale, M., & M. Swain. 1980. **Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing**. Applied Linguistics 1/1: 1-47.

Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1965). **Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.** Cambridge: MIT Press.

Ellis, Rod. (1999).*Understanding Second Language Acquisition* **[M]**. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Finocchiaro, M., and C. Brumfit. 1983. **The Functional-Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice.** New York: Oxford University Press.

Fotos, S.S. (1994). **Integrating Grammar Instruction and Communicative Language Use Through Grammar Consciousness Raising Task.** In TESOL Quarterly, Vol.28/2: 323-343.

Hailemichael Abera (1984). **The communicative versus the traditional approach to the teaching of English reading comprehension at AAU Freshman level.** (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Hailom Banteyirga (1982). English Conditional Sentences: A Comparative analysis of Structural and Communicative Approach in Teaching to Non- Native Speakers. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Haregewoin Abate (1993). The feasibility and Value of Using Role Play to improve Communicative Skills in Ethiopian Senior Secondary Schools. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Harmer, J. (1991). **The Practice of English Language Teaching**. London: Longman.

Hawkey, R.(2006). **Teachers and Learners Perception of Language Learning Activity**. ELT Journal. 60/3: 242-252.

Haycroft, J. (1998). **An introduction to English Language Teaching.** New York: Longman.

Hedge, T. (2000). **Teaching and learning in the language classroom**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). **Communicative Competence**. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), Sociolinguistics, p.269-93. Harmondswortth: Penguin.

Internet (online) : http // www.wikipedia.com. Retrieved on April 2010.

Internet (online):http//languageteaching.com. Retrieved on March 2010

Internet (online):http//www.wictionary.com. Retrieved on April 2010

Johnson, K. and Morrow, K. (1981). **Communication in the Classroom.** Longman Group: UK limited.

Karavas, D.E. 1996. **Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach**. ELT Journal 50/3: 187-198.

Kim, M. (1999). Teacher Perceptual Comparison Towards Two Specific Communicative and Whole Language Dimensions in ESL instruction. The Internet TESL Journal. 5/7: 1-8 http://iteslj.org/Article/Kim-Comparison.html.

Koul, L. (1984). **Methodology of Educational Research**. 3rd ed. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Ltd.

Krashen, S. (1982). **Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition**. London: Pergamon.

Lakachew Mulat (2003). **Teachers' Attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching and Practical Problems in its Implementation.** (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). **Techniques and principles in Language Teaching.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, W. (1981). **Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Medgyes, P. (1986). Queries from a Communicative Teacher. ELT Journal. 40/2: 107-112.

Melaku Negash (2007). **An Assessment of the Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Methodology at Grade 9 Secondary Schools of Gondar.** (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Nunan, D. (1987). **Communicative Language Teaching: making it work."** ELT Journal 41/2: 136-145.

Prabhu, N.S. (1987). **Second Language Pedagogy**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Raimes, A. (1983). **Techniques in Teaching Writing**. Oxford: OUP.

Richards and Rodgers, J.C. & T.S. Rodgers (1986). **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.** Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Richards, J. and T. Rodgers (2001). **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching** (16th edition). Delhi: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W.M. (1981). **Teaching Foreign Language Skills**. 2nd ed.

Sahu, B. K. (2004). **Principles of Teaching English**. Ludhiana: Kalyani Publishers.

Sandra J. S. (2002). *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching. London: Yale University Press.*

Sandra J. Savignon (2002).**Linguistic Theory and Classroom Practice**.

Savignon, S. 1983. **Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice.** Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley publishing company.

Selinger, H. W., and E. Shohamy. (1989). **Second Language Research Methods**.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheldon, L. (1988). **Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials**. ELT Journal 42 (4), 237-246.

Thompson, G. (1996). **Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching**. ELT Journal 50/1: 9-15.

 Widdowson, H.G. (1972). **The Teaching of English as Communication.** ELT Journal 27/7: 15-19.

Yalden, J. (1983). **The Communicative Syllabus: Evolution, Design and Implementation.** Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Yonas Adaye (2003).**Primary School Teachers' Perceived difficulties in Implementing the Innovative ELT methodologies in the Ethiopian context**. Institute of Educational Research (IER) IER Flambeau.11/1:23-55.

Zewge Abate (2001). **A Study on the Practice of the Communicative Teaching of Writing in Grade 9 Menelik II and higher 12 high schools in AA**. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Appendix A

Questionnaire for Teachers

Dear Teacher,

This questionnaire is designed with an objective of finding out some perceptions of junior secondary School English teachers towards **communicative language teaching (CLT)** and their actual classroom practices. It is one of the instruments which the researcher uses to collect the required data for his MA Thesis in the teaching of English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).

Therefore, I kindly request you to give a genuine reply to each question asked as your contribution plays a very important role for the success of this study. The researcher would also like to make sure that all your responses will be kept confidential and used only for the research purpose. As a further assurance, you don't need to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation,

The researcher.

Part I : Conceptual Aspect of CLT

Direction 1: Please read each statement in this unit and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement by putting a tick (✓) mark against your choice. For these questions the following five alternatives are prepared. And these are:

Strongly agree = 5pts.   Undecided = 3pts.

Agree = 4pts.   Disagree = 2pts.   Strongly Disagree = 1pt.

No	Conceptual wise Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Good English teaching can be expressed in communicative language teaching (CLT) method.					
2	The communicative language teaching gives equal consideration to the four language skills rather than attention only to productive skills.					
3	CLT lets learners take responsibility of their own learning process more than teacher centered method does.					
4	CLT focuses much on the teaching of speaking, pair-work and group-work while neglecting grammar teaching.					

	Students' Learning Perspective	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	Students' mastery of English proficiency is most effective in the context of a communicative approach.					
6	Students become more capable of problem solving in communicative English classes.					
7	The communicative approach to language teaching produces fluent but inaccurate students.					
	Statements on Instructional Activities					
8	In EFL programs, content learning is best accomplished with a communicative method of teaching.					
9	Writing process steps of pre-writing; drafting, revising, and editing are most effectively handled in a communicative approach.					
10	**Group work activities have little use as it is very challenging for the teacher to supervise the students' performance and prevent them from using their first language.**					

	Grammar Oriented statements				
11	Knowing the rules of a language does not necessarily guarantee the capability to use the language.				
12	Language performance should be judged based only on grammatical correctness.				
13	Grammar should be taught merely as a means to an end and not as an end in itself.				
	Statements on Error Correction and Assessments				
14	Students should give correction to each other's errors in pair or group.				
15	Good evaluation is done when the emphasis of the evaluation is on accuracy (grammatical correctness).				
16	All the grammatical errors students make should be corrected by the teacher. If errors are ignored, this will result in unsatisfactory learning.				

17	Much correction is wastage of time since errors are normal part of learning.					
	Perspective on Teachers' Role					
18	The function of the teacher should be imparting knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing and giving examples.					
19	The teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students.					
20	The teacher should act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group.					

Part II: **Practical Aspect.**

Direction 2: The following questions are presented to find out *teachers' actual classroom practice* **in English lessons. Please read the following items carefully and put a tick (✓) mark showing the most appropriate alternative for each of the given items based on your classroom practice.**

No.	*Statements on classroom practice*	Nearly Always (5pts).	Often (4pts)	Some Times (3pts)	Rarely (2pts.)	Never (1pt.)
21	Give only Lectures on new grammatical terms or forms and rules to learners					
22	Engage learners in conversation and discussion on some issues.					
23	Let learners participate in role play, simulation or any kind of drama.					
24	Use teacher–directed classroom discussion					
25	Present the new language item in context and show the use and meaning of the new language and let the learners try to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language.					
26	Make the learners exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc. cooperatively.					

27	Use audiovisual materials to supplement the lesson.					
28	Use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of structures					
29	Give correction to errors of learners during their learning.					
30	Assess students' progress based on paper and pencil test rather than on their day to day communicative performance (e.g. after making dialogue).					

Appendix B

Classroom Observation Checklist

School _____ Teacher's code No. _____

Date _____ lesson topic _____ time _____

1. Does the classroom teacher introduce the daily lesson?
   A. Always   B. Often   C. Sometimes   D. Rarely   E. Never

2. Do the activities presented by the teacher include communicative tasks such as group discussions, role plays, simulation, drama, games etc?

   A. Always   B. Often   C. Sometimes   D. Rarely   E. Never

3. Does the teacher supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks in order to improve the proficiency of students ?
   A. Always   B. Often   C. Sometimes   D. Rarely   E. Never

4. Are the seating arrangements and the class size comfortable for doing communicative activities ?
   A. Very comfortable   B. Comfortable   C. Medium   D. Uncomfortable   E. Very Uncomfortable

5. How often does the teacher use teacher–directed method of teaching ?
   A. Always   B. Often   C. Sometimes   D. Rarely   E. Never

6. How does the teacher deal with correction to students' errors ?
   A. The teacher him/herself gives correction always.
   B. Lets the students to give correction to each other always
   C. Sometimes the teacher and sometimes leaves it for the students to do it.
   D. Gives no correction at all

7. What does the interest of students to participate in the class look like ?
   A. Highly interested
   B. interested
   C. less interested
   D. not interested at all
8. How does the teacher assess the performance of his/her students ?
   A. Only on form-focused test
   B. Only on communication-focused test
   C. Both on form and communication-focused tests
   D. Communication focused form test
   E. Form-focused communication test

9. How often does the teacher communicate in English with his or her students ?
   A. Always
   B. Sometimes
   C. Rarely
   D. Never

10. What is the effort of the school administration in helping students improve their language proficiency ?
    A. Very significant
    B. Significant
    C. Not Bad
    D. Insignificant
    E. Very insignificant

Declaration

I, the undersigned, graduate student hereby declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of information used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Daniel Debebe

Signature: _____

Place: Addis Ababa University

Date of Submission: June 2010

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a University advisor.

Advisor: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Chapter One

Introduction

I. Background

It was in the 1960s that communicative language teaching started in Britain. It actually started as an extension of the former structural and situational language teaching methodologies which had been widely used in Britain for teaching English as a foreign language. Situational language teaching lays its focus on teaching basic structures of the language in meaningful activities based on situations. Nevertheless, the discontent with these methodologies led British applied linguists to shift their attention on to the communicative aspect of the language.

As a result, they provided a lot of contributions to the emergence of the current communicative method of teaching. The council of Europe had also played its own influential role in bringing CLT into existence. As there was an increasing interdependence among European countries, the council of Europe analyzed the need for teaching the major European languages to adults in a new approach (Richards and Rodgers, 2001:156).

When we have a look at the history of English language teaching methodology in the context of our country, needless to say, it has been aimed at the sole mastery of the grammar rules. An explicit grammar rules used to be taught and learners were expected to develop only structural accuracy on the language. Simply put, traditional method of teaching used to be a dominant method of delivering English lessons up until the introduction of CLT into our country. Consequently, students were found to be good at grammar while shivering when it comes to usage of the language for communication. Now more than a decade has already elapsed since the introduction of communicative language teaching (CLT hereafter) in to our country.

Although the prime concern of communicative language teaching (CLT) is communicative competence, it does not mean that the structure is disregarded. But rather, it means, as stated in Littlewood (1981), teaching functional and the structural aspect of the language in a balanced fashion by drawing attention of the learners more of towards communication. In other words, it aims at teaching the structure through communication as the saying goes, "…two birds with a stone".

The Ministry of Education, in cognizant of the advantages of CLT, has been using communicative method of teaching by preparing new textbooks mainly at the elementary and high school levels. However, as pointed out in Birhanu (1999), the relatively newly designed communicative language teaching method did not result in the desired outcome due to several factors of which this paper attempts to find out.

As stated at the beginning, even though communicative language teaching method started in Britain and moved later on to other countries, it should not be seen as a British, US, or European phenomenon, but rather an endeavour of the international community in response to the needs of the contemporary language learners in various learning contexts (Savignon, 1991:261).

II. Statement of the Problem

The term communicative has been very familiar in second language teaching. No matter which area of specialization one is involved in, be it in theory and research, language instruction, textbook development and publishing, or technological advancements, it is understood, if not explicitly stated, that modern language teaching refers to communicative language teaching. Ever since Hymes (1971) discussed the idea of communicative competence and Canal and Swain (1980) considered its implication for language teaching, communicative language teaching has gained tremendous importance.

Various scholars promote CLT by exploring its meaning and advantage in the classroom. Writers consider various aspects and changes of CLT, providing valuable classification of its elements. Conference papers, articles, and books that support and promote CLT are usually released.

Regardless of the above fact, scant attention seems to be given by practitioners with regard to its interpretation and implementation. Practices and perceptions of some teachers towards CLT seem to be erroneous. The teachers' perceptions and actual practices need to be reviewed with the intention of having a better understanding as to how CLT is perceived and practiced by Junior Secondary School teachers. Perceptions play a significant role in defining tasks and selecting a cognitive tool with which teachers interpret, plan, and make decisions regarding such tasks. Teachers' perceptions strongly affect their action, the teaching. As Richardson (1994) pointed out, one should focus on teachers' perceptions and practices in order to understand how teachers make sense of teaching and learning.

Some studies reveal that there are teachers who still have a tendency to rely on their pre conceived perceptions-depending on traditional method of teaching at the expense of CLT. A few studies of others show little change in teachers' perceptions and practices, while other studies reveal a possibility for change. Still other studies disclose that there are teachers who are totally in favour of communicative language teaching.

At this juncture, a question what is the current scenario towards CLT comes to mind. What are the current practices and perceptions of Junior Secondary School teachers towards communicative language teaching? Why junior secondary school students are not able to use the language if it has been properly practised? Is there any mismatch between teachers' perception and their practice? If there is any, what is/are the cause(s) for the gap? And it is with these questions in mind that the researcher developed a passionate interest to conduct a research in the area.

The researcher selected three junior secondary schools: Menelik (government), Jerusalem (public) and Radical (private) because of their nearness which helps to have an exhaustive observation and interview in addition to freely distributing the questionnaires to the subjects under study.

III Objectives of the Study

1. General Objective

➔ The main objective of this study is to explore the current practices as well as perceptions of junior secondary school teachers towards communicative language teaching vis-à-vis the underlying principles of the same.

2. Specific Objectives

The study specifically aims to find out:

➔ how teachers actually deal with CLT in the classroom,

➔ the relevance of teachers' perceptions towards CLT,

➔ Cause(s) of the mismatch, if any, between practices and perceptions of teachers towards CLT (factor(s) that hinder the implementation of CLT).

IV. Significance of the Study

It is an undeniable fact that we are living in a fast changing world. As time goes on, different aspects of life get changed. Living styles change, instruments with which we carry out duties change, learning materials change, the way we think changes. Generally, it is a natural phenomenon to aspire for change in almost all aspects of life. In a similar fashion, methods of teaching change.

When we think of change in terms of teaching methodology, it is expected to comprise of change in both perceptions and practices as the sole change of one devoid of the other may lead to the state of superficiality. And teachers play a significant role in putting an end to the old method of teaching and welcoming the new one so long as it is perceived to be the best. The perception of teachers is a central variable in the implementation of change with regard to methods and materials. The introduction of new methods of teaching necessitates to be supplemented with perceptual change of teachers so as to come up with best practices.

The findings of this research are, therefore, expected primarily to uncover the current practices and perceptions of junior secondary school teachers towards CLT. It is the researcher's firm belief that the findings of this study would also be of vital significance in providing education officers with a meaningful insight as to how fruitful CLT has been so far in our context. Moreover, it provides valuable information on the contribution of CLT to the students' communicative competence.

V.   Scope of the Study

The focus of this study is on three selected government, public and private junior secondary school English teachers of Addis Ababa wherein the researcher is doing his MA in TEFL. The study confined itself only to three junior secondary school English teachers which could be taken as the major limitation of the study due to shortage of time and finance. The researcher is very much aware of the fact that the reliability and acceptance of the research findings would have been maximized had it increased the number of schools under study and incorporated students.

VI. Previous Works on CLT

Since its inception, various foreign researchers have tried to study Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in respective to their country's context. In addition, local researches on CLT have been produced at different times. And what comes hereunder is a glimpse of the different works on CLT.

1. External Works

Various external researchers have conducted a research on CLT. For instance, Littlewood (1981): Communicative Language Teaching, Sheils, J. (1986) entitled Implications of the communicative approach for the role of the teacher, Savignon & Berns (1984): Initiatives in communicative language teaching.

In addition, Andrewes and Simon (2005) have also conducted a research on the CLT Police: Questioning the communicative approach while Nunan (1989) produced a work on Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. Rao (2002) has also managed to work on Chinese Students' Perceptions of Communicative and Non-Communicative Activities in EFL Classroom while Thompson (1996) dealt with characteristics of CLT.

The other works on CLT come from Brumfit (1984): Communicative methodology in language teaching, Jacobs, George and Tom Farrell (2003) on Understanding and implementing the CLT paradigm (journal), Littlewood (1981) on Communicative language teaching, Richards (2006) on Communicative language teaching today, Savignon (1991) on Communicative language teaching: state of the art.

The above mentioned works mainly focus on a holistic approach of CLT. But some of them have also tried to look at some specific elements of CLT as in Sheils' implications of the CLT approach for the role of the teacher and Rao's

Chinese students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom.

2. Local Works

When we come to our country, including Hailom (1982) and Haregewoin (1993) different Local researchers such as Birhanu (1999), Lakachew (2003), Belilew (2006), Hailemichael (1984), Yemane (2007), Melaku (2007), Zewge (2001) have conducted a research on different facets of CLT at different parts of the country in different grade levels. They have made an attempt to have a look at different issues of CLT. To start with, Hailom has done a research on the comparison between communicative vs. structural approach to language teaching while Haregewoin did on the use of role play in improving communicative skills.

The other local researcher, Birhanu treated implementation of ELT syllabus in terms of CLT methodology whereas Lakachew looked at teachers' attitude towards CLT and practical problems in its implementation. Still other local researchers such as Belilew, Melaku and Zewge and Hailemichael have carried out studies on learning to teach English communicatively in pre-service teacher education, Assessment of the Implementation of CLT at Grade 9 Secondary Schools of Gondar, the practice of the communicative teaching of writing and the communicative versus the traditional approach to the teaching of English reading comprehension at AAU Freshman level respectively.

And especially, those researches made on Perception of teachers towards CLT focused only on different high schools most of which are located out of the city of Addis and above all, no research, as to the knowledge of the researcher, has been done on Perceptions of second cycle primary school teachers towards CLT and their actual classroom practices focusing on government, private and public schools in Addis.

Chapter Two

2. Review of Related Literature

2.0 Communicative Language Teaching

2.1 What is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)?

Different scholars in the area have defined CLT in different ways. According to Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia, communicative language teaching (CLT) is an approach to the teaching of second and foreign languages that emphasizes communication or interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of learning a language. It is also referred to as communicative approach to the teaching of foreign languages or simply the communicative approach.

In addition, Richards and Rodgers (1986) state that CLT starts with a theory of language as communication and its goal is to develop learners' communicative competence. Communicative Language Teaching is best considered as an approach rather than a method. It refers to a diverse set of principles that reflect a communicative view of language and language learning and that can be used to support a wide variety of classroom procedures. Communicative language teaching involves being able to use the language appropriately in a given social context whereas communicative competence refers to the ability to use a language appropriately in different circumstances (ibid).

And the other definition comes from William Littlewood (1981). He says that communicative language teaching means a systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of a language, combining these into a more fully communicative view. Communicative language teaching means that the emphasis is on language in use rather than language as a structure. It focuses basically on the spoken form of English. Even though speaking is an important part, reading, writing and listening skills are also given attention to. Practice of pronunciation, stress and intonation are vital components; language is based

on real life situations. Hence, the objective is not linguistic competence, but rather, the communicative competence of students (http://www.languageteaching.com).

Besides, CLT makes use of real-life situations which necessitate communication. The teacher sets up a situation that students are likely to encounter in their real life. Unlike the audio-lingual method of language teaching, which relies on repetition and drills, the Communicative approach can leave students in suspense as to the outcome of a class exercise which will vary according to their reactions and responses. The real-life simulations change from day to day. Students' motivation to learn comes from their desire to communicate in meaningful ways about meaningful topics (ibid).

From the above definitions, therefore, it can be said that CLT means teaching a language in such a way that learners would be able to use the target language in a bid to communicate with people around them. It puts the ultimate purpose of learning a language at the forefront as a means to find a short cut to arrive at mastery of a language with in the shortest possible time. It should also be noticed that it does not give attention only to speaking and writing ignoring the other skills, but rather it is a kind of 'all in one' style of learning and teaching a language; considering all the skills with a slight more inclination towards speaking skill that comes out by default.

2.2 Syllabus of CLT

As expressed in wiktionary.com, syllabus is a summary of topics which will be covered during an academic course, or a text or lecture. Syllabus plays an important role in all methods. Similarly, the syllabus of CLT also plays a vital role as it includes due dates for exams and papers, assigned readings, special requirements, grading system, attendance policy and a brief description of the course. The syllabus is also a basic structure of every course and offers an outline and summary of what should be completed by the time the course gets

over. Usually, a notional-functional syllabus is used in CLT. In this type of syllabus, instruction is organized not in terms of grammatical structure, but in terms of "notions" and "functions". Yet different scholars such as Yalden (1983) suggest that the following syllabus types could be used. So, the type of syllabus could be :

1. Structures plus functions,

2. Structural, functional and instrumental,

3. Interactional,

4. Task-based,

5. Learner generated.

2.3 Theory of Language in Communicative Approach

As pointed out by Hymes, et al (1971), the underlying theory of language teaching in a communicative method of teaching is the functional view. Therefore, the goal of language in this method is the development of communicative competence. The term communicative competence was first formulated by Hymes (1971) with a view of challenging Chomsky's (1965) distinction between competence and performance.

The basic difference between competence and performance, as stated by Chomsky (1965), is that language competence refers to the native speaker's knowledge of the rules and forms of the language while language performance deals with how native speakers use that knowledge to comprehend and generate different utterances. The Chomsky's competence or performance model was, however, found to be insufficient as it failed to give an explicit position for socio-cultural features of human communication. Hence, in reacting against the perceived inadequacy of Chomsky's distinction, Hymes (1971) attached the word 'communicative' to the term 'competence' to apply to the ability to use the language appropriately in different social contexts.

A lot of researchers such as Sahu (2004), Canal and Swain (1980), Hedge (2000) have described that communicative competence involves different crucial components. And some of these are: linguistic competence, pragmatic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence, and fluency. According to the Canal and Swains'(1980) analysis of communicative competence as cited in Richards and Rodgers (2001), has been found to be a more influential and common one in which the following four components are identified.

1) **Grammatical competence**-refers to what is called linguistic competence by Chomsky…it is the domain of grammatical and lexical capacity.

2) **Socio-linguistic competence**-is about an understanding of the social context in which communication takes place, inclusive of role relationships, the shared information of the participants, and the communicative purpose of their interaction.

3) **Discourse competence**- refers to the interpretation of individual message elements in terms of their interrelation and of how meaning is represented in relation to the entire discourse or text.

4) **Strategic competence**- is concerned with coping up strategies that is employed by communicators with the idea of initiating, terminating, maintaining, repairing, and redirecting communication.

As clearly expressed by Sahu, et al (2004), the term 'communicative competence' has now become a very familiar word in second or foreign language teaching and it has also become broadly accepted that communicative competence should be the goal of language education. Thus, students' learning will not only be the linguistic structures and grammatical rules of the language, but rather they have got to use the language in different social contexts appropriately. Taking this point in to account, CLT pays due attention to the functional and structural aspects of the language as well.

2.4 Features and Principles of CLT

2.4.1 Features of CLT

In communicative language teaching, a significant attention is attached to encouraging students so that they use the target language in various contexts to be encountered by students in their real life situations. Despite its broader approach to language teaching, Nunan (1991:279) has provided us with the following list of summarized and most recognized general features of communicative language teaching (CLT).

1) An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language

2) The introduction of authentic texts in to the learning situation

3) The provision of opportunities for learners to focus not only on language but also on the learning process itself.

4) An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning

5) An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom.

Having reviewed the works of various researchers (Larson Freeman, 1986; Widdowson, 1996; Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Savignon, 1991, etc., Yonas (2003) has on his part summarised the main characteristics of CLT as follows.

➢ It focuses on communicative functions,

➢ Gives attention to meaningful tasks rather than on language per se(e.g., grammar or vocabulary study),

➢ Makes an effort to make tasks and language appropriate to a target group of learners through an analysis of genuine, and realistic materials,

➢ Uses group activities; and attempts to create a secured and non-threatening atmosphere.

The other scholar, Nunan (1988), by citing other sources, has also put some of the features which differentiate CLT from traditional method of teaching in a table shown here under.

Traditional Approach	Communicative Approach
1. Emphasis is on the language as a structural system of grammatical patterns.	Emphasis is on communication
2. Language items are selected only on the basis of linguistic criteria.	Language items are selected on the basis of the need of learners that helps them to get things done.
3. Language items are sequenced based on linguistic grounds	Language items are sequenced based on content, meaning and interest
4. The aim is to cover the 'whole picture' of language structure by systematic linear progression	The aim is to cover, in any particular phase, only what the needs and see as important.
5. A language is seen as a unified entity with fixed grammatical patterns and a core of basic words.	The variety of language is accepted, and seen as determined by the character of particular communicative contexts.
6. High tendency to use formal and bookish language.	Genuine every day language is emphasized.
7. Having students who are able to produce formally correct sentences is	Having students who are able to communicate effectively and in a manner

regarded as a criterion of success.	appropriate to the context they are working in is regarded as a criterion of success
8.Reading and writing skills are emphasized	Spoken interactions are regarded as at least as important as reading and writing.
9.Uses teacher-centred method	Uses student-centred
10. Incorrect utterances are seen as deviations from the norms of standard grammar.	Partially correct and incomplete utterances are seen as such rather than just 'wrong'.
11. Reverse the natural language learning process by concentrating on the form of utterance rather than on the content.	Resembles the natural language learning process in that the content of the utterance is emphasized rather than the form.

2.4.2 Principles of CLT

With regard to principles of CLT, Brumfit (1986:92-93) has listed the following most detailed principles of CLT which are in consistent with the features listed above. The principles are:

1) Learners learn both consciously and with effort and unconsciously without effort. The textbook would need to offer scope for both kinds of learning.

2) Teaching can be accuracy or fluency –focused.........[However], fluency (in which the emphasis is on open ended communication activities taking place in real time) is more likely to promote learning than accuracy.

3) Error is a normal part of language learning. Much correction is wasteful of time and unproductive to boot.

4) Language processing proceeds from top-down not from bottom-up. Meanings are first apprehended as 'wholes' and only later analysed in to parts of necessary.

5) The tasks were not to be designed to with a particular structure or functional category in mind. Rather, they would be chosen for their communicational relevance in the frame work of the whole activity.

6) Communicative tasks were superior to linguistic exercises in promoting learning.

7) To mirror real communication, we would need to integrate the major language skills. Listening, speaking, etc would not therefore be taught in watertight compartments. Instead, they would be integral to any given task.

8) The greater responsibility given to learners, the more effective their learning would be. We, therefore, left much scope for independent work, in a frame work of a supporting peer group.

9) Motivation would be increased through problem solving activities which would engage both the cognitive and the effective resources of the learners.

10) Both analytical and creative thinking should be given scope in the activities and tasks.

11. Language used in the classroom should be immediately relevant and inherent in the task, rather than learnt for some eventual and hypothetical later use (often referred to as transfer).

By the same token, Richards and Rodgers (2001) have identified five general principles of communicative language teaching in the following way.

- ♣ Learners learn a language through using it to communicate,

- ♣ Authentic and meaningful communication should be the goal of classroom activities,

- ♣ Fluency is an important dimension of communication,

- ♣ Communication involves the integration of different language skills and

- ♣ Learning is a process of creative construction and involves trial and error

In a communicative language teaching, therefore, the target language should be introduced as it is used in the real life context and students should also be provided with opportunities to express their ideas and opinions.

2.5 Perceptions of Teachers towards CLT

As explained by Thompson (1996), communicative language teaching is welcomed by many linguists and language teachers as an effective approach and is perceived to be the dominant theoretical model in ELT no matter what the situation of teaching might be. Attempts have been made to pay attention to CLT and to identify its characteristic features (Richards and Rodgers, 1986). In addition, Harmer (1991) shows that teachers' education and the principles of CLT are largely treated as clearly understood and accepted.

However, it has been realized that certain misconceptions about CLT are still in existence. To this end, Thompson (1996) summarizes the following four misconceptions that are frequently voiced.

2.5.1 About Grammar

There has been a strong argument from the side of some applied linguists that grammar teaching should be minimized. One line of argument is that, grammar teaching is impossible for the knowledge used in a language by a speaker is too

complex (Prabhu 1987). Another line is that grammar teaching is unnecessary as knowledge is a kind that cannot be passed on with rules, but can only be acquired unconsciously through exposure to the language (Krashen 1988).

The effect could be recognized by teachers through practices in teaching. As scholars in the area claim, CLT does never reject grammar teaching. Some linguists and teachers always stress that grammar is necessary for communication, but at the same time others put stress on pair work. However, it is an issue about how to learn grammar. Perhaps the view is too simplistic that grammar is impossible to teach as it is too complex.

What so ever the case may be, as clearly put by Thompson (1996), the focus should be on the learners' discovering grammar not teachers covering grammar. Learners should most of the time talk under the guidance of teachers about knowledge of the language. This is due to the fact that if students have no idea of the new knowledge, they won't be able to put them in words. Students will learn more effectively if they participate in communicative activities actively about what they are learning. In connection with this, Ellis (1992) suggests that looking at grammar explicitly may not immediately lead to learning, but rather it will facilitate learning at a later stage when the learner is ready to internalize the new information about the language.

2.5.2 About Speaking

He further explains that the focus on communicative activities caused to the misconception that CLT means teaching only speaking. For many teachers and students, the main purpose of learning a foreign language is to speak the language. So they put the stress on speaking and listening skills. Another reason for this misconception is that, there is a belief that learners need adequate and proper practice in the process of learning a foreign language. And often it is interpreted into the fact that teacher talking time is to be reduced

and student talking time is to be maximized. Learners should communicate not only through speaking the language but also through reading. The point, however, is that speaking takes place in the presence of at least two persons while in reading a text, communication with the other person happens through words in the absence of the writer.

There is a complaint that CLT often ignores written language. Learners talk more in CLT classes than in grammar-translation ones. But college English textbooks provide students and teachers with many activities in class and outside of classes as well. Teachers can organize different activities according to students' variety of language learning needs at different stages of learning English. In a classroom students can not only speak English, but also think, read and write in English.

2.5.3 About Pair-work

This misconception emerges from the idea that pair work means role play. In fact, role play is one of the manifestations of CLT and useful in developing students' communicative competence in addition to serving as one way to practicing meaningful language in an authentic context.

However, pair work and group work are more flexible and useful techniques than role play. Role play especially at a very simple level, such as conversation between a doctor and a patient; a teacher and a student or a customer and shopkeeper, may not be used as much as pair work or group work. Through pair work and group work, students can work together and help each other to solve a problem, analyze a passage, prepare a presentation, make up a story, design a questionnaire and do exercises. They can also learn knowledge and skills from each other which will lead them to greater success by undertaking tasks.

2.5.4 About Teachers

Some scholars argue that CLT demands too much on teachers more than Grammar-translation approaches and lessons tend to be less predictable; teachers have to interact with students in a natural way to the extent possible; they have to be skilful with wider range of management than in the traditional teacher-centered classroom. There are a lot unpredictable in class which is an encouragement and also a challenge for them. But teachers are not supermen and it is far more difficult to use CLT method. Students shouldn't expect too much from their teachers as they are only enlighteners, organizers and helpers.

2.6 Types of Communicative Activities/Tasks

A communicative task is an activity or goal that is carried out using language such as finding a solution to a puzzle, reading a map and giving directions, making a telephone call, writing a letter etc. (Richards and Rodgers,2001). Nunan (2004) has also defined a communicative task as :

> *A piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right with a beginning, middle and an end.*

The above definition clearly dictates that communicative tasks involve the use of the language in a situation of which the concentration of the user is focused on meaning rather than on form. However, this does not imply that grammatical form should be overlooked. But rather, the point here is that, the learners' focus on rules and regulations of the language should be minimized.

Communicative activities/tasks, enabling learners attain the communicative objectives; can be classified in various forms. Richards (2001), for instance,

categorizes communicative tasks in to real-world tasks and pedagogical tasks. Accordingly, real-world tasks, as the name implies, refer to those that demand the use of language in the world beyond the classroom whereas pedagogical tasks are activities that occur in the classroom. Then, Richards further sub-divides the pedagogical tasks in to five categories. These are:

2.6.1 Jigsaw tasks- these kinds of tasks involve learners in combining different pieces of information to form a whole (e.g. three individuals or groups may have three different parts of a story and have to piece the story together),

2.6.2 Information-gap tasks: these are tasks in which one student or group of students has one set of information and another student or group has a complementary set of information. Then, they negotiate and find out the other party's information in order to complete an activity.

2.6.3 Problem-solving tasks: Students are given a problem and a set of information. Then they try to find out a solution to the problem. There is usually a single solution.

2.6.4 Decision-making tasks: Students are given a problem for which there are a number of possible outcomes and they must choose one through negotiation and discussion.

2.6.5 Opinion-exchange tasks: Learners engage in discussion and exchange of ideas. They do not need to reach at an agreement.

The other classification of communicative activities comes from Littlewood (1981). This scholar, at first, designed two major categories of communicative activities: pre-communicative and communicative activities out of which four sub-categories are further subdivided as seen in the figure below.

Pre-Communicative Activities   **Communicative Activities**

-Structural activities   -Functional communicative activities

-Quasi-structural activities   - Social interactional activities

Now, let us have a look at each one of them in detail. The first one, Pre-communicative activity, as the name suggests, prepares the learner for communication to happen later on. And under this we have:

1. **Structural activities**-the focus of these exercises is on the grammatical system and on ways in which linguistic items can be combined.

2. **Quasi-communicative activities**- These kinds of activities comprise of one or more typical conversation exchanges. Some are like drills, but others are almost dialogues. Drills and dialogues can be combined in order to bridge the gap between formal exercise and communicative use.

The second major type, according to Littlewood, communicative activity, is also sub-divided in to two. And the explanation of each follows hereunder.

A. **Functional communicative activities**- examples of these types of tasks can be as noting similarities and differences on a given set of pictures; working out a likely sequence of events in a set of pictures; following directions and so on. In such kinds of activities, learners are expected to look for a specific solution to a problem.

B. **Social interaction activities**-these include conversation and discussion sessions, dialogues and role plays, simulations, improvisations and debates. Here teachers prepare learners for the varied social contexts in which they will need to perform outside the classroom using different social interactional activities.

In spite of the above explanations, there is no clear demarcation between these two types of communicative activities. The degree of emphasis that learners give to social factors or functional values of a language during the activity is the only source of difference between the two. In addition, communicative activities which are useful for developing interactive skills are divided in to four types by some other scholars. These are information-gap activities, communication games, simulations and project-based interactional activities.

One can draw a lesson from the above explanation that communicative activities can be classified in various ways from a different point of view. And they are designed primarily with an objective of developing the communication skill of learners.

2.7 The 'Four Skills' in CLT

Even though the main emphasis lies on speaking and listening skills, reading and writing also get a considerate attention in CLT. As Thompson (1996) put it, communication does not only take place through speech and that it is not only the speaker (or writer) who is communicating. Communication through language happens in both the written and spoken medium. Thus, CLT does not mean teaching only speaking. Likewise, Larson Freeman (1986:134) explains the interactive nature of reading and writing as: "Just as oral communication is seen to take place through negotiation between speaker and listener, so is meaning thought to be derived from the written word through an interaction between the reader and the writer". Therefore, learners reading a text silently to them are taking part in communication just as much as if they were talking to their friends. Now let us see each skill one by one.

2.7.1 Speaking

Traditional classroom speaking practice often takes the form of drills in which one person asks a question and another gives an answer. The question and the answer are structured and predictable, and often there is only one correct predetermined answer. The purpose of asking and answering the question is to demonstrate the ability to ask and answer the question. However, this is not true in real communication and in communicative approach (Bygate, et al 1987).

They further explain that the purpose of real communication is to accomplish a task such as conveying a telephone message, obtaining information, or

expressing an opinion. In real communication, participants must manage uncertainty about what the other person will say. Authentic communication involves an information gap; each participant has information that the other does not have (Ibid).

Therefore, to create effective classroom speaking activities that will develop communicative competence, teachers need to incorporate a purpose and an information-gap and allow for different forms of expression. However, quantity alone will not necessarily produce competent speakers.

2.7.2 Listening

In a communicative approach, listening is an active skill which demands the active involvement from the hearer. According to Littlewood (1981:66), "in order to reconstruct the message the speaker intends, the hearer must actively contribute knowledge from both linguistic and non-linguistic sources". This active nature of listening leads hearers to have a communicative purpose. Atkins et al (1995:106) describes this as "effective listening involves listening for a purpose. That is, we do not listen merely to practice language skills-we listen for social purposes or to transfer or exchange information". Similarly, Brumfit et al. (1994) states teachers should direct their students' attention to the purpose of the listening task in order to provide them suitable framework for accessing the spoken message.

Regarding the types of listening activities, Littlewood (1981:68) identifies three groups according to the kind of response that the learner must produce. These are:

1. Performing physical tasks (e.g. selecting pictures)
2. Transferring information (e.g. into tabular form)
3. Reformulating and evaluating information

2.7.3 Reading

Reading is the most important activity in any language class, not only as a source of information and a pleasurable activity, but also as a means of consolidating and extending one's knowledge of the language (Rivers 1981). Efficient reading involves understanding how language operates in communication and learners should have a purpose for reading the written text. Johnson and Morrow eds. (1981) state as:

> *Reading is carried out for a purpose other than reading the language is self. Just as we read message in order to be able to do something else, so too the students who are learning a foreign language should be less concerned with the language than with the message it is used to communicate. That is, his interest will be in use rather than usage, with function rather than form. He wishes to do something with the language other than simply learn it.*

According to Rivers (1987), reading should be linked with purposeful communication so as to integrate reading experiences with developing language control. In doing this, the teacher should:

a. provide students with meaningful tasks associated with reading,

b. develop activities that encourage students to communicate without making graphic or oral demands beyond their competence in the new language,

c. give students freedom to experiment with the language they possess and

d. create a classroom environment in which students feel free to express the ideas that have been stimulated by their reading.

2.7.4 Writing

Writing for the purpose of communication is a better way to develop one's writing ability. In a communicative writing practice the focus is on the information content being transferred. Hence, this practical writing has both a

clear purpose and a specific audience (Raimes 1983). According to Raimes (1983:83-92) the types of writing activities that involve in real-life communication include: message, forms, invitations, letters and instructions.

Johnson and Morrow (1981) also suggest two principles of teaching writing. These principles are information-gap and jigsaw principles. According to Johnson and Morrow, we can create information-gap in the classroom by giving student 'A' with the information that we hide it from student 'B'. Then, communication as the bridging of this gap takes place when student 'A' passes this information in a written text to student 'B' The second principle, jigsaw principle, allows all students to be both senders and receivers of information. Here, we give student 'A' some information and student 'B' another information. Then, in order to compute the jigsaw, student 'A' for student 'B' and vice versa.

In general, it is worth treating the four language skills interactively rather than separately in order to develop the students' communicative competence. For example, students who are practicing the language in one topic/context in a speaking class may later develop it by writing. Hence, they get the language practice more contextual.

2.8 The Place of Grammar in CLT

According to the information obtained on the internet, most of the early days of grammar teaching was prescriptive. The grammarian's duty was to prescribe what people should say. Later, grammar teaching shifted to analyzing of sentences (labeling the parts with their names and giving rules that explain words how they may be combined). This is often called the traditional grammar teaching.

In traditional grammar teaching, the rules of the language were taught explicitly. However, a number of applied linguists (e.g. Prabhu 1987, Krashen

1988) have been arguing that grammar should not be taught explicitly. Their arguments were: first, grammar rules are too complex to be taught explicitly. Second, language is acquired unconsciously not by learning the language rules explicitly. The effects of these ideas have been clearly visible in the early days of CLT. Hence, in the late 1960s and the 1970s, textbooks included no explicit teaching of grammar (Thompson 1996). However, in the current communicative approach; grammar has got some place in the view of language teaching. Thompson (1996) describes this as:

> *It is now fully accepted that an appropriate amount of class time should be devoted to grammar but this does not mean a simple return to a traditional treatment of grammar rules. The view that grammar is too complex to be taught in that over-simplifying way has had an influence, and the focus has now moved away from the teacher covering grammar to the learners discovering grammar.*

In order to involve learners in discovering grammar rules, task-based teaching is appropriate. According to Fotos (1994), using a task type grammar instruction provides EFL learners with grammar problems to be solved interactively. Fotos calls these tasks grammar consciousness-raising tasks. Although the students focus on the form of the grammar structure, they are also engaged in meaning-focused use of the target language as they solve the grammar problem. Hence, they develop grammatical knowledge while they are communicating. Concerning the tasks that should be used in teaching grammar, Atkins et al. (1995:85) advise EFL teachers the following points:

A. Presentations of particular language items in context, in which students' attention is drawn to the meanings and forms of the items, followed by opportunities for students to practice the language items in context in order to help them discover how the grammar works,

B. Grammar-for-communication tasks, which

- Should involve students in working out the solutions other than the teacher explaining them,

- Should be awareness-raising. They should assist learners in developing awareness of grammatical choice, i.e. how grammar works to convey meaningful communication,
- Should provide students with the capacity to make appropriate choices in given contexts…

C. Tasks involving students in real language use, formulating their own meanings in contexts over which they have considerable control, and in so doing, drawing on grammar as an ongoing resource.

Thus, good grammar teaching probably requires both grammatical explanation of form and meaning by the teacher and task focusing on getting students to work out by themselves how grammar is used for communication.

2.9 Students' Roles in CLT

According to Nunan, et al (2004), in a communicative approach to language learning, students are negotiators and interactors. Unlike the traditional approach, in CLT, every student should contribute as much as he/she gains in the interaction. However, it is impossible to say that learners will always play the same roles whenever they enter into the classroom. In describing the roles of learners in a task-based language teaching, Richards and Rodgers (2001:235) list three general roles which overlap with the roles assumed for learners in CLT. These are:

2.9.1 Students as group participants

Many communicative tasks are done in pairs and small groups. Hence, students are participants in such tasks.

2.9.2 Students as monitors

Learners need to attend not only to the message in the task work but also to the form in which such messages come packed. Thus, students are considered as managers of the communicative task.

2.9.3 Students as Risk-takers and Innovators

Many communicative tasks make learners create and interpret messages and this is the main objective of such tasks. The skills of guessing meaning from linguistic and contextual clues, asking for clarification and consulting with other learners need to be developed. Littlewood (1981:18) also states, "The teacher creates a situation and sets an activity in motion, but it is the learners themselves who are responsible for conducting the interaction to its conclusion". Therefore, learners are the main interactors in the language learning process.

2.10 Teachers' Role in CLT

CLT, by its nature, requires much of the work to be done by the learners themselves. However, this does not mean that the teacher does not have any significant role to play in the language teaching and learning process. There are various roles to be played by teachers in order to facilitate the language learning process. According to Hedge (2000:63), a communicative classroom involves the teacher in "setting up activities, organizing material resources, guiding students in group works, engaging contributions, monitoring activities, and diagnosing the further needs of students". Richards and Rodgers (2001) also describe the roles of the teacher as: needs analyst, counselor and group process manager.

Similarly, Harmer (1991) as cited in Nunan et al (1996) describes the roles of the teacher as: controller, assessor, prompter, participant, resource, tutor, and investigator. Of all these roles, Nunan and Lamb suggest that it is the teacher as organizer that is the most important and difficult from the perspective of classroom management. In addition, they suggest that the important point is that teachers do not have to act on behalf of their learners but with their learners. Attention needs to be given to students' ways of learning and their preferences and unless teachers are aware of those preferences they cannot consider them in their teaching activities and classroom practices.

In order to perform all these roles effectively, teachers should be competent enough in all aspects of language teaching. In line with this, Hedge (2000:67) states, "Teachers need to build competence and confidence in fulfilling these various roles and in-service training is necessary with in institutions to ensure that, in any moves towards implementing communicative approaches in the classroom, teachers are properly supported."

2.11 The Role of Instructional Materials in CLT

Various instructional materials can be used in a communicative classroom. However, most often, supporters of the communicative approach advocate the use of authentic materials (Larson Freeman 1986, Nunan 1988, and Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001:252), authentic materials refer to "the use in teaching of texts, photographs, video selections, and other teaching resources that were not specially prepared for pedagogical purposes". And after giving the above definitions about authentic materials, they list their uses as follows.

- They have a positive effect on learner motivation,
- They provide authentic cultural information about the target culture,
- They provide exposure to real language rather than the artificial texts found in created materials,
- They relate more closely to learners' needs and hence provide a link between the classroom and students' needs in the real world and
- They support a more creative approach to teaching.

In supporting this, Nunan (1988) also states as:

> As the focus will be on assisting learners to do in class what they will need to be able to do outside, the materials should reflect the outside world. In other words, they should have a degree of authenticity. This authenticity should relate to the text sources as well as to student activities and tasks.

Concerning the kinds of current CLT instructional materials, Richards and Rodgers (2001:169-70) list three categories: text-based, task-based, and realia.

2.11.1 Text-based Materials

Several textbooks have been designed with an objective of directing and supporting communicative language teaching. Their tables of contents sometimes suggest a kind of grading and sequencing of language practice not unlike these found in structurally organized texts.

2.11.2 Task-based Materials

A variety of games, role plays, simulations and task-based communication activities have been prepared to support CLT classes. These typically are in the form of one-of-a-kind items: exercise handbooks, cue cards, activity cards, pair-communication practice materials and student-interaction practice booklets.

2.11.3 Realia

Numerous supporters of communicative language teaching have advocated the use of authentic or real life materials in the classroom. These might include language based realia such as signs, magazines, advertisements and newspapers or graphic and visual sources around which communicative activities such as maps, pictures, symbols, graphs and charts can be built. Different kinds of objects such as a plastic model to assemble from directions can be used to support communicative exercises.

Even though there are various instructional materials, it is important to consider the learners' interest, background knowledge, proficiency level and socio-cultural context in selecting and using the materials (Nunan 1988).

2.12 What CLT Is Not

Disappointment with both grammar-translation and audiolingual methods for their inability to prepare learners for the interpretation, expression, and negotiation of meaning, along with enthusiasm for an array of activities on increasingly labeled communication has resulted in no little uncertainty over what constitutes the essential features of CLT. Thus, a summary description would be incomplete without the mention of what CLT is not.

The concern of CLT is not exclusively with face-to-face oral communication. The principles apply equally to reading and writing activities that involve readers and writers in the interpretation, expression and negotiation of meaning. Communicative language teaching requires work in groups or pairs as group tasks have been found helpful in many contexts as a way of increasing the opportunity and motivation for communication. Classroom work in groups or pairs should not, however, be considered an essential feature and may well be inappropriate in some contexts.

Communicative language teaching need not entail complete rejection of familiar materials. Materials designed to promote communicative competence can be used as aids to memorization, repetition, and translation or for grammar exercises. Similarly, a teacher who has only a grammar-translation manual can certainly teach for communicative competence. What matters is the teacher's understanding of what language learning is and how it happens.

The basic principle is that learners should engage with texts and meaning through the process of use and discovery. Finally, CLT does not exclude a focus on metalinguistic awareness or knowledge of rules of syntax, discourse, and social appropriateness. Focus on form can be a familiar and welcome component in a learning environment that provides rich opportunity for focus on meaning; but focus on form cannot replace practice in communication. The

essence of CLT is the engagement of learners in communication to allow them to develop their communicative competence.

Terms sometimes used to refer to features of CLT are: "task-based", "content based", "process-oriented", "interactive", "inductive" and "discovery oriented". CLT cannot be found in any textbook or set of curricular materials. Strict adherence to a given text is not likely to be true to the processes and goals of CLT. In keeping with the notion of context of situation, CLT is properly seen as an approach, grounded in a theory of intercultural communicative competence that can be used to develop materials and methods appropriate to a given context of learning. No less than the means and norms of communication they are designed to reflect, communicative language teaching methods will continue to be explored and adapted (*Savignon, 2002).*

Chapter Three

3. Research Design and Methodology

This chapter deals with the research methods used in the study. Accordingly, both quantitative and qualitative research methods have been made use of. Quantitative because measures of descriptive statistics such as mean, percentage and frequency have been used in order to analyse the data collected from the participants of the study and qualitative because some of the information obtained are not expressed in numerical forms, but rather in words.

And the above research methods have been employed for the study as it is believed to enable the researcher collect the relevant information with in the given period of time and amount of budget. This chapter, therefore, discusses the selection of subjects of the study, the data collection tools, sources of the data, the data collection procedures and methods of data analysis used in the entire study.

3.1 Selection of Subjects

The subjects of this study were junior secondary school English teachers taken from three schools in Addis Ababa. Nobody denies the fact that education given at the elementary level is considered as a springboard on the basis of which students get in to the analysis and interpretation of different subject matters in general and English language elements in particular that are to be given in the forthcoming grade levels.

Elementary level education is believed to contribute a great deal as to how they understand language issues and generally, what kind of student they are going to be in high school. Simply put, it paves the way so that they understand English in a better way and enrich their communicative competence thereby facilitating their mastery of the language.

So, the points stated above dictate that the previous studies on CLT should have embraced the perceptions and classroom practices of junior secondary school English teachers. And it is with the intention of filling in this gap or enhancing the comprehensiveness of the previous studies that junior secondary school English teachers were selected as subjects for the study.

3.2 Selection of Schools

The selected schools are: Menelik II primary school (Government), Radical Academy (Private) and Jerusalem primary school (Public). And these schools are selected in view of the fact that I have a very good acquaintance with some of the English teachers working there as a result of which I was encouraged to have a free and frequent communication with them while administering the tools. My being familiar to them has also helped me a lot in getting real and sufficient information for the study. In addition, proximity of the schools from the researcher's living place and study centre had some role during the selection of the schools. In other words, Purposive sampling has been used during the selection process. And so, the selected schools were found to be in harmony with the given time and budget as well.

Table 3.1 Number of schools, Owners, Their types, Locations and Number of English Language Teachers.

No.	Name of the Schools	Owned by	Type	Location	No. of Teachers
1	Menelik Primary School	Government	Academic	Arada Sub-city	5
2	Radical Academy	Private	Academic	Arada Sub-city	8
3	Jerusalem Primary school	Public	Academic	Gullele Sub-city	7
				Total	**20**

3.3 Research Tools

Now let's have a deeper look at the three research tools used: questionnaires, observations and interviews one by one in relation to the study conducted.

3.3.1 Questionnaires

A questionnaire is one of the widely used research tools to elicit information about certain conditions and practices, especially to collect data on different phenomena which are not easily observed such as attitudes and self concepts (Selinger and Sahomy, 1989). The researcher has also some understanding from experience that questionnaires help to reach all the subjects in a time saving fashion. Besides, it can be used to obtain background information about the research subjects (Koul, 1984).

A number of techniques are used to gather data through questionnaires. And one of this is the Likert Scale. The likert scale allows individuals to respond to different statements between the extremes on the continuum that represent their attitude, i.e., providing responses to scales from strongly agree to strongly disagree to each statement. This offers the respondents a reasonable range of answers to choose from as it is composed of a variety of answers: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree.

Accordingly, a questionnaire which is adapted from Karavas-Doukas (1996) and Kim (1999) and composed of 30 Likert-type close-ended items was prepared for the study. And the questionnaire was divided into three major sections. These are:

1. Personal Information Section-used to get an accurate self description of the respondents,

2. Communicative Language Teaching Dimension-designed to measure the English Teachers' Perceptions towards CLT in relation to its principles and

3. CLT practical aspect-which is designed to measure the extent to which English teachers practice CLT principles.

The questionnaire was designed mainly to meet the objective of the study and the items were developed in consistence with the literature review which mainly deals with principles of CLT. On top of adapting the questionnaire from scholars, the outlined items were given to three friends of mine who graduated in TEFL with MA and two highly experienced junior secondary school English teachers so that they could comment on the clarity of the questions.

A pilot study was also conducted on three teachers of other similar school so as to check that the instructions are clear and the questions are not ambiguous. Moreover, the advisor has given his remarkable comments and suggestions guided with helpful corrections. As a result, some items were left out while some others made to be adjusted. And, at the end of the day, we came up with 30 refined and defined questions. Then a total of 20 questionnaires have been distributed out of which all of them have been properly filled in and returned back.

3.3.2 Classroom Observations

It is obvious that observation has always been considered as a major data collection tool in second language acquisition researches as it allows the study of a phenomenon at a close range with many of the contextual variables present (Selinger and Sahomy 1989, Koul 1984). So, the researcher used observation as a research tool with an objective of looking closely at how the teacher actually deals with CLT in the classroom thereby comparing their perception towards CLT and their actual classroom practices.

The observation checklist was prepared with a five point scale to identify the presence or absence of some selected variables. Three voluntary English teachers' classrooms from each sample school have been observed for five periods for each teacher's classroom. And the sections that have been observed

were selected on a random basis. The observations were conducted by the researcher and an English teacher as a co-observer in a bid to avoid the potential personal bias that could occur in the meaning to be given to what was being observed. In all the observations made, I have tried my best to make my presence not disturb the class. The observation has strengthened the data gathered through the interview and questionnaires.

3.3.3 Interviews

The other research tool that has been used for this study is interview. Interviews have been used so as to get in-depth information to specific questions especially concerning feelings, attitudes or emotions which are not possible to find out through questionnaires and classroom observations. In addition, it is believed to substantiate the information obtained from the questionnaires and classroom observations (Selinger and Sahomy, 1989). To this end, an interview comprised of ten specific and defined questions was used.

As pointed out by Koul (1984), Volunteer sampling technique is used to collect information from the samples that are conveniently available and willing to co-operate for providing information. Accordingly, twelve voluntary teachers, who filled in the questionnaire, were selected and made to participate in the interview. But prior to conducting the interview, the researcher has informed the subjects about the purpose of the interview and arranged appropriate time and place. The issues about which interview was conducted are related to their understanding about CLT, problems teachers face during the practice of English language teaching in a communicative way and other affairs of the same. The interview which has taken place in a face to face manner, lasted for 10-15 minutes for each interviewee and the responses were noted down by the researcher. The interview helped me to get the necessary information on CLT in general and the problems teachers face during the practice of the same in particular.

3.4 Sources of Data

The primary sources of data were all Grade eight English teachers of Menilik II, Radical Academy and Jerusalem which are government, private and public junior secondary schools respectively. Moreover, some additional data were gathered from the above mentioned schools' principals. An attempt has been also made to exchange words with a few students as to how often communicative language teaching is used in the classroom.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

The data collection process has been arranged and carried out as per the schools' permission and an absolute willingness of the participants. The procedure started with administration of the questionnaires followed by classroom observations and then interview. During the collection process, an attempt has been made in encouraging the subjects to ask questions in case there is any ambiguity with regard to the content, language and ways of dealing with the questionnaire and interview.

Accordingly, some minor elaboration on the questionnaire and the interview has been made to those who were in need of. And during the observations, the researcher has paid due attention to what was happening in the classroom and took points on the basis of the checklist. Generally, more than two months of time have been utilized from the inception up to the completion of the collection process.

3.6 Methods of Data Analysis

This is a research that requires both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis. Thus, the questionnaires have been analysed quantitatively using frequency, percentage and mean values while the observations and interviews have been analysed qualitatively in words. First, the raw data collected through the questionnaires, interviews and observations were tallied,

tabulated and then frequency that shows the number of respondents for each one of the items were made to be read.

With regard to the questionnaire, the data analysis procedure was done based on Likert-type item analysis. The Likert-type items which were designed to find out teachers' understanding of CLT concepts and their actual classroom practices were given numerical scores. Accordingly, for favourable items (statements directly related to principles of communicative language teaching) were coded as: strongly agree= 5, Agree= 4, Undecided=3, disagree=2 and strongly disagree=1. But the unfavourable items (those which are designed to crosscheck the teachers' view and address non-communicative aspects), were coded conversely as: strongly agree=1, Agree=2, Undecided=3, disagree=4 and strongly disagree=5

In the same way, the items of the questionnaire for classroom practice were coded as : always (A)= 5, Often (O) = 4, Sometimes (ST)=3, Rarely (R)=2 and Never(N)=1 for favourable items whereas the unfavourable items took the opposite coding: always (A)=1, Often(O)=2, Sometimes(ST)=3, Rarely(R)=4 and Never(N)=5

On the other hand, the mean score of each item was calculated in accordance with the coding numerals. Let's say, the frequencies of 20 respondents for favourable item no. 1 and unfavourable item no. 2 are as follows.

Items	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total	Mean
Point	5	4	3	2	1		
1.	7	6	3	1	3	20	3.65
2.	1	4	2	5	8	20	3.75

Mean = x

So, the computation of mean would be as follows.

X= (7x5) + (6x4) + (3x3) + (1x2) + (3x1)

=35+24+9+2+3

=73/20

=3.65

And the mean for unfavourable item (2) was calculated as follows.

X = (1x1) + (4x2) + (2x3) + (5x4) + (8x5)

= 1 + 8 + 6 + 20 + 40

= 75

= 75/20

= 3.75

And according to Karavas-Doukas (1996), a higher mean score implies the respondents' high perception or frequent classroom practices of CLT whereas lower mean value indicates weaker perception or less CLT practice in the classroom. Therefore, the analysis of the questionnaire was carried out by comparing the calculated percentage, mean values and frequencies.

Furthermore, the data gathered through observations and interviews were analysed and interpreted using qualitative method. The qualitative approach to research is typically used to answer questions about the nature of phenomena with the purpose of describing and understanding them from the participants' point of view.

It is also an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problems based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants and conducted in a natural setting. Qualitative research is multi-method in focus; involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter.

In other words, qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. So, interviews and observations following the questionnaire were used to clarify and fill in possible gaps in the completed questionnaires (http//www.ask.com).

Chapter Four

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

The Purpose of this chapter is to analyse and discuss the data collected using the three research tools: questionnaires, classroom observations and interviews and see their implications vis-à-vis teachers' perception towards CLT. In the process of questionnaire analysis frequency, percentage and mean values have been employed. Accordingly, the maximum possible score that can be obtained in the scale to measure the most favourable perception towards CLT principles either for the total thematic category or single item is a mean value of five (5), the average mean value is 3.0 and the lowest mean value is one (1) which indicates the weakest perception in the scale.

In addition, the data gathered through the observations and interviews have been treated on the basis of the checklist and interview questions respectively using qualitative methods in words. For the purpose of discussion, the questions in the questionnaire are classified into six categories as: conceptual perspective, students' learning perspective, statements on instructional activities, grammar oriented statements, statements on error correction and assessments, perspective on teachers' role and finally, questions on teachers' practice in the classroom. And so, the analysis starts with conceptual Perspective as follows.

4.1 Analysis of Conceptual Perspective

The perception of teachers towards CLT with regard to conceptual perspective has been analysed using descriptive statistics as shown in table 1. In this category, 4 items (three favourable and 1 unfavourable) were analysed and it has been found out that a large number of respondent teachers with a total mean value of 4.32 have shown an affirmative perception towards CLT. Table 1 illustrated hereunder shows responses of teachers for the items on conceptual perspective.

Table 1: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Conceptual Perspective

		Scale Value	SA	A	U	DA	SD		
			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
No	Statements	Frequency & Percent	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
1	Good English teaching can be expressed in communicative language teaching (CLT) method.	F	10	7	2	1	0	20	4.07
		%	50	35	10	5	0	100	
2	The communicative language teaching gives equal consideration to the four language skills rather than attention only to productive skills.	F	6	8	3	3	0	20	3.85
		%	30	40	15	15	0	100	
3	CLT lets learners take responsibility of their own learning process more than teacher centered method does.	F	10	7	3	0	0	20	4.35
		%	50	35	15	0	0	100	
4*	CLT focuses much on the teaching of speaking, pair-work and group-work while neglecting grammar teaching.	F	1	2	1	8	8	20	4.0
		%	5	10	5	40	40	100	
	Average frequency & % for favorable items	F	8.7	7.33	2.7	1.33	0	20	4.17
		%	43.3	36.7	13.33	6.7	0	100	
	Average frequency & % for unfavorable items (*)	F	1	2	1	8	8	20	4.00
		%	5	10	5	40	40	100	
	Average frequency & % for all items (1-4)	F	6.77	6.0	2.25	3.0	2.0	20	4.08
		%	33.75	30.0	11.25	15.0	10.0	100	

As can be seen in the table above, in almost all the items a positive reaction has been recorded. Concerning the relationship between good English teaching and CLT, for instance, even though 10% remained undecided and 5% disagreed with no one strongly disagreed, a large number of teachers, 85%, (50% strongly

agree and 35% agree) with a mean value of 4.07 have shown that they are in line with CLT principles. And when the percentage value is expressed in terms of frequency measures, out of the twenty teachers, ten of them have strongly agreed, seven of them agreed, two of them remained undecided while one and zero respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

Although the reactions of teachers towards CLT depends on their own preparation and personal experiences, their actual responses demonstrate how much enthusiastic they are about communicative language teaching. In this regard, teachers have shown quite positive attitude towards CLT as they agreed, in principle, with the idea that CLT is a manifestation of good English teaching.

The next item, no.2, deals with the balance of attention regarding the four language skills. Accordingly, 70% (30% strongly agree, 40% agree) of the total respondents have described that they are in agreement with the idea that CLT gives equal consideration to the four language skills which in turn puts them in agreement with what Richards and Rodgers pointed out under the five general principles of communicative language teaching that Communication involves the integration of different language skills (2001).

When communicative language teaching is raised as a point of discussion, continuity and balance in teaching the four skills are emphasized and the *Information Gap* activity plays an important role in this regard. This is because it helps to practice listening and speaking, reading and writing at the same time, i.e., students skim and scan (reading skills) for missing information, exchange information (listening and speaking) and jot down the missing information (writing) and use thinking skills in the process (http://www. ask.com).

Meanwhile, out of the total respondents, 15% have chosen the disagreement position showing that there still exist some teachers who believe that CLT does

not give equal attention to the skills and this in turn may lead teachers to have a negative attitude towards CLT while 15% remained undecided but no one was found to be in a strongly disagreement position to the statement.

Moreover, when we see its distribution (frequency) we find 14 persons (6 strongly agree, 8 Agree) in agreement position while three of them took undecided position with three and zero persons recorded to be disagreed and strongly disagreed correspondingly. Generally, with an average mean value of 3.85, teachers' perception towards CLT with regard to balancing the skills is found to be positive.

Moving on to the third question, we find an item asking for the relationship between CLT and learners autonomy. And in response to this, a great number of the respondents, 85% (50% strongly agree, 35% agree) have stated that they are consonant with the idea that CLT allows learners to take responsibility of their own learning process more than teacher centered method does. And this point agrees with what Brumfit (1986:92-93) put it as saying that the higher responsibility given to learners, the more effective their learning would be.

Jacobs and Farrell (1982) also suggest that the CLT paradigm shift has led to eight major changes in approaches to language teaching out of which learner autonomy is the one. It is about giving learners greater choice over their own learning, both in terms of the content of learning as well as processes they might employ. The use of small groups and self-assessments are examples of this. But, at the same time, the item shows 15% of the respondents who couldn't show their stand, depicting no one in both disagreement and strong disagreement positions.

Again when we look at its frequency, seventeen teachers (10 strongly agree, 7 agree) have expressed their agreement while three teachers were found to be neutral but no one was found under disagreement and strong disagreement

columns. In general, teachers have disclosed their very positive attitude towards CLT with an average mean value of the item, 4.35.

The last (no.4) item, which is unfavourable, depicts a similar picture as a total of 80 % (40% strongly disagree, 40% disagree) of the respondents with a mean value of 4.0 have rejected the claim that CLT neglects grammar which puts them in line with what Littlewood (1981) expressed that CLT pays due attention to the functional as well as structural aspects of the language.

Nevertheless, 15 % (5% strongly agree, 10% agree) of them have stood against the idea while 5% remained neutral. And the frequency reads as: one teacher-strongly agree, two teachers-agree, one-undecided and 8 teachers each for disagree and strongly disagree positions which implies that the majority of teachers disagree with the idea: CLT neglects grammar teaching.

Discussions of CLT frequently lead to questions of grammatical or formal accuracy. The perceived displacement of attention towards morphosyntactical features in learners' expression in favor of a focus on meaning has led in some cases to the impression that grammar is not important or that proponents of CLT favor learners' ability to express themselves without regard to form. While involvement in communicative events is seen as central to language development, this involvement necessarily requires attention to form (language teaching.com)

Communication cannot take place in the absence of structure or grammar, a set of shared assumptions about how language works along with a willingness of participants to cooperate in the negotiation of meaning. In their carefully researched and widely cited paper proposing components of communicative competence, Canale and Swain (1980) did not suggest that grammar was unimportant. They sought rather to situate grammatical competence within a more broadly defined communicative competence.

Similarly, the findings of the Savignon (1971) study did not suggest that teachers forsake grammar instruction. Rather, the replacement of structure drills in a language laboratory with self-expression focused on meaning was found to be a more effective way to develop communicative ability with no loss of morphosyntactical accuracy.

Generally, when we look at the average percentage of responses for the positive (favourable) items, 43.3% and 36.7% of the respondents are on strongly agree and agree points respectively. Hence, a total score of 80% with a cumulative mean value of 4.17 reveals that quite a large number of teachers are in agreement with CLT principles.

4.2 Analysis of Students' Learning Perspective

Students' Learning Perspective is meant for which method of English teaching should be used in schools so that students will react positively and be successful in their learning.

As it has been stated in the literature section of this paper, CLT has flourished as a result of dissatisfaction with the structure based language teaching methodology. What do students come up with at the end of the teaching–learning process? Will they be inclined towards accuracy? Will they be totally absorbed in fluency ? Or will they go with both of them in a balanced fashion ? And specifically what do teachers say about the effect of CLT on their students with a special reference to aspects of fluency and accuracy.

And this is what the following table, comprising two favourable and an unfavourable item, tries to give a picture of.

Table 2: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Students' Learning Perspective

		Scale Value	SA 5	A 4	U 3	DA 2	SD 1	Total	Mean
No.	Statements	Frequency & Percent	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
5	Students' mastery of English proficiency is most effective in the context of a communicative approach.	F	8	10	0	2	0	20	3.70
		%	40	50	0	10	0	100	
6	Students become more capable of problem solving in communicative English classes.	F	9	9	0	1	1	20	4.20
		%	45	45	0	5	5	100	
7*	The communicative approach to language teaching produces fluent but inaccurate students.	F	6	5	0	5	4	20	2.80
		%	30	25	0	25	20	100	
	Average frequency. & % for favorable items	F	8.50	9.50	0	1.50	0.50	20	4.20
		%	42.50	47.50	0	7.50	2.50	100	
	Average frequency & % for unfavorable items(*)	F	6	5	0	5	4	20	2.80
		%	30	25	0	25	25	100	
	Average frequency & % for all items	F	7.25	7.25	0	3.25	2.25	20	3.50
		%	36.25	36.25	0	16.25	13.75	100	

As can be seen above, the first item deals with a question of mastery of English proficiency. So, a lion's share, 90% (40% strongly agree, 50% agree) of the respondents have testified that CLT facilitates mastery of the English Language while 10% of the total subjects look at the idea with suspicion (disagreed), but

no one was present in the lists of undecided and strongly disagreed positions as well.

And when this is expressed in terms of frequency, eighteen teachers (8-strongly agree, 10-agree) have disclosed their agreement while two teachers disagreed, but no one was found to have undecided and strongly disagreed. Anyhow, its aggregate mean value, 3.70, indicates that the respondents think that CLT facilitates mastery of English language.

Again, With regard to students' capacity of problem solving, 90% of the total population (45% each for strongly agree and agree positions), with a mean value of 4.20, have stated that CLT boosts problem solving capacity of students whereas those who disagree comprise 10 % (with 5% each for disagree and strongly disagree) of the total with no one in the undecided position conforming, with no doubt, that teachers are in favour of CLT. And the frequency is read as: nine students each for strongly agree and agree positions, no one-undecided position and a single person each for disagree and strongly disagree positions.

However, question number 7 which is concerned with the effect of CLT on fluency and accuracy has something to dictate. That is, more than half (55%) of the respondents have pointed out that CLT produces fluent but inaccurate learners. Its mean value, 2.80, clearly shows teachers' misconception towards the effect of CLT on aspects of fluency and accuracy due to the fact that it is against what different scholars such as Richards and Rodgers (1986) suggest that CLT gives equal consideration to both accuracy and fluency. The frequency is: strongly agree-six, agree-five, undecided-zero, disagree-five and strongly disagree-four.

On the whole, the above figures indicate that teachers with an overall mean value of 3.50 have witnessed that students' learning will be effective when they are taught by using CLT which is an indicator of having a good attitude towards the effect of CLT on accuracy and fluency despite the appearance of a

significant number of teachers arguing that CLT enhances fluency at the expense of accuracy.

4.3 Analysis of Instructional Activities

This section of the analysis part tries to look at different pedagogical activities in relation to CLT. The place of CLT in teaching the four major skills of English language and the reaction of teachers towards group work will be dealt with.

As can be read from the table below, the item that comes first is the relationship between content learning and CLT. And for this item, many teachers totalling 80% (30% strongly agree and 50% agree) are recorded to have agreed that content learning is best accomplished with communicative method of teaching while 15% (10% disagree, and 5% strongly disagree) disagree with the idea that CLT improves content learning.

In addition, as the table illustrates the distribution of respondents for the same item is read as strongly agree-seven times, agree-ten times, undecided-zero times, disagree-two times and strongly disagree-once. All in all, the collective mean of the item, 4.0, for sure shows strong perceptions of teachers that success of content learning can easily be achieved through communicative language teaching.

In response to the relation between CLT and writing skill activities, the concern of Question.no.9, several respondents, 85% (35 % strongly agree, 50% agree) are reported to have been listed under agreement position while 15% (10% disagree, 5% strongly disagree) have refused the contribution of CLT in developing writing skills while 5% of them have selected the undecided position.

And regarding the frequency, we have strongly agree-seven times, agree-nine times, undecided-0 times, disagree and strongly disagree-twice each. However, the total per cent of the respondents who are in agreement position (80%) with an average mean value of 3.92 obviously surpasses those who are in a disagreement position (20%) with a mean value of 3.65. And so, this implies that the greater part of teachers is in favour of CLT from the point of enhancing content and writing skill learning processes.

Table 3. Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Statements on Instructional Activities

		Scale Value	SA	A	U	DA	SD		
			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
No.	Statements	Frequency & Percent	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
8	In EFL programs, content learning is best accomplished with a communicative method of teaching.	F	7	10	0	2	1	20	4.0
		%	35	50	0	10	5	100	
9	Writing process steps of pre-writing; drafting, revising, and editing are most effectively handled in a communicative approach.	F	7	9	0	2	2	20	3.85
		%	35	45	0	10	10	100	
10*	Group work activities have little use as it is very challenging for the teacher to supervise the students' performance and prevent them from using their first language.	F	3	5	0	7	5	20	3.30
		%	15	25	0	35	25	100	
	Average frequency & % for favorable items	F	7	9.50	0	2.0	1.50	20	3.92
		%	32.5	47.5	2.5	10.0	7.50	100	
	Average frequency & % for unfavorable items (*)	F	3	5	0	7	5	20	3.30
		%	15	25	0	35	25	100	
	Average frequency & % for all items	F	5.0	7.25	0	4.50	3.25	20	3.61
		%	23.75	36.25	0	22.50	16.25	100	

When we come to the last unfavourable one (item no.10 in the table above), questioning about the importance of group work activities, even if 60% (35% disagree, 25% strongly disagree) of the respondents are in agreement with group work activities in the classroom, we find that a substantial number (40%) of the total have been found to testifying that group work is not as such important. And the frequency is read as: strongly agree-three times, agree-five times, undecided-0 times, disagree-seven times, strongly disagree-five times.

So, one can draw a conclusion from the above 40% respondents that some teachers dislike group work for the following reasons. On the one hand, the task of going round and supervising the groups as to what each group is actually doing could be perceived to be boring and tiresome.

On the other hand, some teachers may think that it invites students to go out of the topic and chat their own personal issues using their first language. And those teachers who are in favour of group work covering 60% may be because of the fact that they find it as a means to escape teaching as it frees the teacher. Given this fact, with a total mean value of 3.61 teachers have shown that they have a fairly positive perception towards instructional activities.

Having put the above points in mind, the writer of this paper strongly believes that group work could result in successful learning of the different language elements as it lets the students help, share ideas and learn with/from each other. But this will come true if it is properly handled.

4.4 Analysis of Grammar-oriented Statements

Grammatical issues will be the concern of this section. How do teachers view grammar in relation to CLT ? Does knowledge of the rules of a language guarantee the ability to use the language ? Do teachers teach grammar as an end or a means to an end ? Let's see what the table below tells us focusing on how teachers view grammar teaching.

Table 4: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Grammar oriented Statements

		Scale Value	SA	A	U	DA	SD		
			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
No.	Statements	Frequency & Percent	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
11	Knowing the rules of a language does not necessarily guarantee the capability to use the language.	F	8	9	1	1	1	20	4.25
		%	40	45	5	5	5	100	
12*	Language performance should be judged based only on grammatical correctness.	F	2	1	0	10	7	20	3.95
		%	20	25	0	30	25	100	
13	Grammar should be taught merely as a means to an end and not as an end in itself.	F	7	10	0	1	2	20	4.05
		%	35	50	0	5	10	100	
	Average frequency & % for favorable items.	F	7.5	9.5	0.5	1	1.5	20	4.025
		%	37.5	47.5	2.5	5	7.5	100	
	Average frequency & % for unfavorable items (*).	F	2	1	0	10	7	20	3.95
		%	20	25	0	30	25	100	
	Average frequency & % for all items.	F	4.75	5.25	0.25	5.5	4.25	20	4.08
		%	28.75	36.25	1.25	17.5	16.25	100	

The first item in the above table (no.11) tries to find out teachers' view towards the relationship between knowing the rules of a language and usage of a language. Accordingly, ample number of respondents, 85% (40% strongly agree and 45% agree) have reacted that mastery of the rules of a language does not always mean mastery of usage of the language, but 10% of the total have said that mastery of rules of a language also means being able to use the language

while 5% of them abstained and 10% (5% each for disagree and strongly disagree) have expressed their disagreement. Its distribution is: strongly agree-8, agree-9, undecided-1, disagree-1, strongly disagree-1.

And the implication of the above figure is that there are people, even now, that adhere to the structural competence to measure one's proficiency of the language. And the total mean value for the item is recorded to be 4.25. Its connotation is, therefore, that lots of teachers believe that structural competence does not necessarily mean communicative competence. And this coincides with what all of us know from experience that there are, obvious enough, students who are even learning at higher academic institutes and most surprisingly, specializing in English, but could be poor in communicative competence the proof of which is knowing the structure doesn't always mean being able to communicate effectively.

On the other hand, the unfavourable item (no.12) which deals with method of language performance assessment, 45 % out of which 20% strongly agree and 25% agree positions have said that language performance should be assessed only on grammatical correctness whereas 55 % (30% disagree and 25% strongly disagree) are found to be against the idea. In any case, the mean value of this item is recorded to be 3.95 which shows the attitude of most teachers that mere grammatical correctness doesn't assess language performance of learners. And the frequency is read as: strongly agree-2, agree-1, undecided-0, disagree-10, strongly disagree-7.

The last item, according to the above table, deals with the basic justification of teaching grammar. Thus, a large number, covering 85% (35% strongly agree, 50% agree) have explained that grammar should be taught as a means to an end while 15 % (5% disagree, 10% strongly disagree) took the position of disagreement with a mean value of the item, 4.05. The frequency is shown as: strongly agree-7, agree-10, undecided-0, disagree-1, strongly disagree-2. And this shows that many teachers have understood the point that teaching

grammar should be regarded as a basement to construction of a new building; grammar should be taught in such a way that it builds up the communicative competence of the learners.

To conclude, the above responses given to grammar oriented questions are more or less in harmony with how grammar should be treated in CLT, but it should not be like the teacher-centred or traditional method of teaching where the students are considered to be passive recipients, but rather in a way as Thompson (1996) put it: "From the teacher covering grammar to the learners discovering grammar" where students learn grammar while communicating.

So, it appears appropriate to make an inference from the above data that plenty of teachers with a total mean value of 4.08 have a strong perception towards teaching grammar communicatively, but at the same time, those who are not comfortable with teaching grammar communicatively, as item 12 in the table above indicates, are not small in number (45%). These kinds of teachers, according to the writer's belief, may be very much keen on the structural approach of teaching which most probably negatively affects the communicative skill of their learners.

4.5. Analysis of Error Correction and Assessments

In connection with the system of error correction and assessments, teachers have similarly forwarded their views on the bases of four (two favourable and two unfavourable) questions as shown hereunder.

In reference to the table below, the mean value of both favourable and unfavourable items is 3.54, which is bigger than the average mean value of 3.0. This clearly proves that junior secondary school English teachers are passionate about communicative ways of error correction and assessments.

Table 5: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Error correction and Assessments

		Scale Value	SA 5	A 4	U 3	DA 2	SD 1	Total	Mean
No	Statements	Frequency & Percent	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
14	Students should give correction to each other's errors in pair or group.	F	8	9	0	2	1	20	4.10
		%	40	45	0	10	5	100	
15*	Good evaluation is done when the emphasis of the evaluation is on accuracy (grammatical correctness).	F	2	3	0	10	5	20	3.65
		%	10	15	0	50	25	100	
16*	All the grammatical errors students make should be corrected by the teacher. If errors are ignored, this will result in unsatisfactory learning.	F	4	3	1	7	5	20	3.30
		%	20	15	5	35	25	100	
17	Much correction is wastage of time since errors are normal part of learning.	F	5	6	1	4	4	20	3.20
		%	25	30	5	20	20	100	
	Average frequency & % for favorable items.	F	6.50	7.50	0.5	3.0	2.50	20	3.62
		%	32.5	37.5	2.5	15	12.50	100	
	Average frequency & % for unfavorable items (*).	F	3	3	0.5	8.5	5	20	3.47
		%	15	15	2.5	42.5	25	100	
	Average frequency & % for all items.	F	4.75	5.25	0.5	5.75	3.75	20	3.54
		%	23.75	26.25	2.5	28.75	18.75	100	

In reaction to item no.14, for instance, the majority of the population, 85% (40% strongly agree, 45% agree) have taken the position of agreement with the idea of students giving correction to each other's errors in pairs or groups while

15% (10% disagree, 5% strongly disagree) have selected the position of disagreement resulting in a mean value of 4.10. The frequency is: strongly agree-8, agree-9, undecided-0, disagree-2, strongly disagree-1. This again indicates that peer correction has been warmly accepted as a good way of learning by the majority of teachers.

Moving on to the next question, we find the idea of error correction and assessments compared with fluency and accuracy. Accordingly, only 25 %, with 10% strongly agree and 15% agree positions have pointed out that for a good evaluation to take place the focus should be on grammatical correctness, but 75% (50% disagree and 25% agree) of them have opposed this with no one in neutral position and leaving a mean value of 3.65.

Its frequency is read as: strongly agree-2, agree-3, undecided-0, disagree-10, strongly disagree-5. And the implication of this is that most teachers are in agreement with the fact that not only grammatical correctness but also other language aspects such as pronunciation, fluency, etc should be taken into account for a sound evaluation to happen.

Proceeding to the next, we come across a query dealing with the role of teachers in corrections and assessments. And so, 35% of which 20% strongly agree, 15% agree of the total population have claimed that all the grammatical errors students make should be corrected by the teacher so as to result in satisfactory learning whereas 60% (35% disagree, 25% strongly disagree) of the total have been reported to be against this idea while 5% of them remained neutral, bringing about mean value for the item, 3.30.

When we look at its frequency we find: strongly agree-4, agree-3, undecided-1, disagree-7 and strongly disagree-5. This also indicates how much teachers are eager to communicative language teaching as they realised that if only they themselves give correction to every error committed then it will be going back to the traditional approach of teaching.

The last point talks about the relation between correction and time management. Hence, 55% (25% strongly agree,30% agree) of the total are reported to have said that much correction is wastage of time as errors are normal part of learning which is in consistence with what Brumfit (1986) pointed out in his principles of CLT that errors are normal part of language learning.

And so, much correction is considered as wastage of time and unproductive to boot. Besides, Finocchiaro (1983) strengthens this idea by saying that language is made through frequent trials and errors". Anyhow, the frequency of this item is recorded to be: strongly agree-5, agree-6, undecided-1and 4 each for disagree and strongly disagree.

Meanwhile, 40 % out of which 20% each for disagree and strongly disagree positions of the total, are found to have insisted on the existence of correction whenever necessary regardless of its repetition while 5% of the total remained indifferent resulting in mean value of the item, 3.20.

And this is an indication of the fact that there are teachers who still believe that correction should be taken to every single mistake committed for a proper learning to take place. Even if correcting errors is something good, it shouldn't be done to the extent that it hampers communication or to the extent that teachers to be considered as authoritarian.

4.6. Analysis of Perspective on Teachers' Role

Table 6: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Teachers' role

No.	Statements	Scale Value / Frequency & Percent	SA 5 1*	Ag 4 2*	Un 3 3*	DA 2 4*	SD 1 5*	Total	Mean
18 *	The function of the teacher should be imparting knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing and giving examples.	F	1	2	1	8	8	20	4.0
		%	5	10	5	40	40	100	
19	The teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students.	F	12	6	0	1	1	20	4.35
		%	60	30	0	5	5	100	
20	The teacher should act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group.	F	7	10	1	1	1	20	4.05
		%	35	50	5	5	5	100	
	Average frequency & % for favorable items.	F	9.5	8.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	20	4.20
		%	47.5	40.0	2.5	5.0	5	100	
	Average frequency & % for unfavorable items (*).	F	1	2	1	8	8	20	3.60
		%	5	10	5	40	40	100	
	Average frequency & % for all items.	F	5.25	5.0	0.75	4.50	4.50	20	4.13
		%	26.25	25.0	3.75	22.50	22.5	100	

With regard to teachers' role in the classroom, some people believe that the teacher should act as organizer or facilitator of the teaching-learning process in the classroom while others retain the traditional view which puts the teacher as authority, instructor and sole provider of knowledge although various studies reveal that the teacher has a lot of roles to play in a language classroom. To this end, Hedge (2000) mentions the teachers' role as:

> ....it is possible to identify the teacher in a number of roles in his lesson: as a controller in eliciting nationality words; as assessor of accuracy as students try to pronounce the words; as corrector of pronunciation; as organizer in giving instructions for the pair work; initiating and monitoring it, and organizing feedback; as promoter while students are working together; and as a source if students need help with words and structures during the pair work.

This study has, therefore, tried to incorporate the perceptions of teachers towards their own role in the teaching-learning process. Accordingly, for the first item (according to the table above) that says, "The function of the teacher should be imparting knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing and giving examples", 15% (5% strongly agree and 10% agree) have expressed their agreement but the greater part, 80% (40% each for disagree and strongly disagree) witnessed their disagreement to the statement while 5% kept neutral bringing about 4.0 as a mean value for the item. And the frequency is read as: strongly agree-1, agree-2, undecided-1 and 8 each for disagree and strongly disagree. This clearly signifies the fact that the vast majority of teachers think that language teaching should base on communication so as to come up with best learning.

The second item (no.19, in the table above), discusses supplementing the textbook with other materials. And, the lion's share of the respondents, 90% (60% strongly agree, 30% agree) have said that the teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students whereas 10% (5% each for disagree and strongly

disagree) have revealed that other reference materials are not per se important effecting a mean value for the item, 4.35. And its frequency is read as: strongly agree-12, agree-6, undecided-0 and 1 each for disagree and strongly disagree.

By implication, CLT involves different authentic materials such as magazines, newspapers and different activities like games, role plays, and simulations as they support a more creative and communicative approach to teaching. And in this regard, teachers with a total mean value of 4.35 are found to have a high tendency towards using supplementary materials reflecting positive attitude towards CLT.

The last item deals with participation of teachers within the learning-teaching group. Yet again, this item has pictured a total of 85 % (35% strongly agree , 50% agree) have pointed out their agreement by saying that teachers should act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group whereas 10% and 5% of the total goes to disagreement and indifferent positions respectively resulting in a mean value of 4.05. Looking at its frequency we read: strongly agree-7, agree-10 and 1 each for undecided, disagree and strongly disagree positions. This reaffirms the idea that there is a strong belief on teachers' side that teaching should be interactive which in turn puts them by the side of communicative language teaching. Learning was very much seen as under the control of the teacher in the former times, but since the introduction of CLT, teachers' role changed into facilitation of learning and taking part in the teaching-learning process.

From the above data, therefore, we can understand that in spite of the fact that there are a small portion of teachers found to have poor perception towards their own role, the vast majority of teacher respondents with a total mean value of 4.05 have made clear that there are a variety of roles teachers should play in a communicative classroom in a bid to meet the varying needs of learners.

Having seen this much about the part of the questionnaire that revolves around the theoretical views of teachers towards CLT, the next portion will be devoted to the analysis of teachers' responses to the classroom practice.

4.7. Analysis of Teachers' Responses to the Classroom Practice

Questions that come here under are presented with a view of finding out *teachers' actual classroom practice* in English lessons. And just like the previous sections the items in this part are classified into communicative and non-communicative. Accordingly, there are ten questions of which 7 are communicative and 3 are non-communicative. The scale values for this section have been rated as: Always (5) Often (4) Sometimes (3) Rarely (2) Never (1) for favourable items and Always (1) Often (2) Sometimes (3) rarely (4) Never (5) for unfavourable items and the calculation has been done the way it has been done in the preceding chapters.

Table 7: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses to the Classroom Practice

		Scale Value	Always	Often	Some Times	Rarel y	Never		
			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
No	Statements	Frequen cy & Percent	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
21*	Give only Lectures on new grammatical terms or forms and rules to learners	F	5	4	11	0	0	20	2.3
		%	25	20	55	0	0	100	
22	Engage learners in conversation and discussion on some issues.	F	2	5	10	1	2	20	3.2
		%	10	25	50	5	10	100	
23	Let learners participate in role play, simulation or any kind of drama.	F	4	4	11	1	0	20	3.55
		%	20	20	55	5	0	100	
24*	Use teacher–directed classroom discussion	F	3	3	10	4	0	20	2.75
		%	15	15	50	20	0	100	

No	Item							Total	Mean
25	Present the new language item in context and show the use and meaning of the new language and let the learners try to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language.	F	9	3	8	0	0	20	4.05
		%	45	15	40	0	0	100	
26	Make the learners exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc. cooperatively.	F	1	5	3	9	2	20	2.70
		%	5	25	15	45	10	100	
27	Use audiovisual materials to supplement the lesson.	F	1	1	6	4	8	20	2.15
		%	5	5	30	20	40	100	
28	Use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of structures	F	2	4	8	5	1	20	3.05
		%	10	20	40	25	5	100	
29	Give correction to errors of learners during their learning.	F	7	5	5	1	2	20	3.70
		%	35	25	25	5	10	100	
30 *	Assess students' progress based on paper and pencil test rather than on their day to day communicative performance (e.g. after making dialogue).	F	6	5	7	1	1	20	2.30
		%	30	25	35	5	5	100	
	Average frequency & % for favorable items.	F	3.71	3.85	7.28	3.0	2.14	20	3.19
		%	18.57	19.28	36.42	15	10.71	100	
	Average frequency & % for unfavorable items (*).	F	4.66	4.0	9.33	1.66	0.33	20	2.44
		%	23.33	20.0	46.66	8.33	1.66	100	
	Average frequency & % for all items.	F	4.18	3.92	8.30	2.33	1.23	20	2.81
		%	20.95	19.64	41.54	11.66	6.18	100	

Based on the order in the table above, the first question starts with the status of giving Lecture on new grammatical terms or forms and rules to learners. And in reaction to this, a bit more than half of the population (55%) have witnessed that they sometimes focus only on lecturing while 25% and 20% have taken the positions of always and often respectively, but no one has taken the positions of rarely and never while 2.30 has been registered as the mean value of the item.

As the above numerical data illustrates, the lion's share, 90% of the respondents lie on the continuum between always, often and sometimes. And this obviously implies that quite a large number of teachers are inclined towards the teaching of grammar in a non-communicative or traditional way.

The second item deals with the question of how often teachers engage learners in conversation and discussion on some issues. Hence, the response has been found to be always-10%, often-25%, sometimes-50%, rarely-5% and never-10% effecting a mean value of 3.20.

It is noticeable that there is some kind of improvement with regard to teachers' dealing with communicative activities in the classroom as compared to the first item, but the mean value calculated here is also very close to the midpoint of mean values, 3.0 reflecting less communicative activities. In addition, 15% of them with 5% rare and 10% never positions have disclosed lack of CLT in the classroom activities.

Looking at the third question (Letting learners participate in role play, simulation or any kind of drama), we find that always-20%, often-20%, sometimes-55% while rarely covers 5% ending in a mean value of 3.55.

Here we observe a bit more improvement as almost all the respondents lied on the continuum from always to sometimes with largest portion in the category of sometimes showing that teachers more or less let learners participate in various communicative tasks, but the rare position covering 5% is an

indication of the fact that there are teachers who don't care about CLT in English classes.

The fourth one says, **"Use teacher–directed classroom discussion"**. Again for this item 30 % (15% each for always and often) have answered saying that they use teacher–directed method regularly whereas sometimes and rarely positions covered 50% and 20% respectively with a mean value of 2.75. And this takes us to an inference that a considerable number of teachers, although not all of them, still use teacher-directed classroom discussion which is the foremost indicator of non-CLT.

Question number 25 asks for how often teachers present the new language item in context and show the use and meaning of the new language and let the learners try to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language. Accordingly, 45%, 15%, 40% have replied saying always, often and sometimes respectively with the mean value of this item, 4.05.

This is an item which shows a significant change in responses compared to all questions of this category. Studies reveal that one of the critical communicative activities used is contextualization without which communication and reproduction of sentence patterns get stuck. Meaning (or use) materializes with the help of contexts as contexts not only bring out the speakers' roles but also the time and place in which communication takes place. The teaching of perfect tenses, for example, needs to specify the time line of the present and past.

All the responses (in Q.25) are under always, often and sometimes which totally covers 100% with no rarely and never positions. The mean value is also far from the midpoint confirming that teachers in fact present new language items in context and show the use and meaning of the new language and let learners try to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language.

Continuing to the next number (Q.26), we read a question of CLT that deals with making the learners exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc cooperatively. The replies of this item are read as 5%-always, 25%-often, 15%-sometimes, 45%-rarely and 10%-never. And 2.70 is recorded to be the mean value of this item.

What we observe here, unlike the responses given in the preceding section, is that the mean value has fallen down even from the midpoint. More than half (55%) with rarely-45% and never-10% have testified that they almost never deal with such activities in the classroom. But we see some light of CLT in those respondents falling into one of the continuum: always, often, sometimes, covering all together 45%.

The status of using audio-visual materials to supplement the lesson was another question forwarded to teachers. And in response to this item, 40% are using audio-visual materials out of which 5%-always, 5%-often, 30%-some times positions, but surprisingly enough, 60% (20%-rarely,40%-never) of the total population are not using audio-visual materials with a mean value of 2.15. And this gives the impression that teachers in practice are in an opposite direction to what Richards and Rodgers suggest for authentic materials such as photographs, video selections, and other teaching resources that were not specially prepared for pedagogical purposes to be used in the classroom as they expose learners to real language use rather than the artificial texts.

What comes next is a question on usage of pictures and objects to convey the meaning of a structure. Hence, the responses are read as: 10%-always 20%-Often, 40%-sometimes, 25%- rarely and 5%-never with a mean value, 3.05. Here we see little increment of the mean value showing that a few teachers try to practically use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of a structure.

Still another question raised to teachers was something concerned with ways of error correction. That is, how often do teachers correct errors of learners in their learning? As a result, 85% (35%-always, 25% often, 25%-some times) of

the total have responded that they do it frequently while 15 % (5%-rarely and 10%-never) are found to have almost never done it giving a mean value of 3.70. Here also, there is something to be noticed. That is, the largest part of teachers actually focuses on error correction which may be the source of frustration for learners thereby deterring them from participation in the classroom instructional activities.

The last, but not least, question is concerned with mode of assessment. How many times do teachers assess students' progress based on paper and pencil test rather than on their day to day communicative performance? When we have a look at the responses we find that the lion's share, 90 % (always-30%, often-25%, sometimes-35%) of teachers use paper and pencil test significantly while those covering 10 % (5%-rarely, 5%-never) have pronounced that they almost never use paper and pencil test for evaluating students' progress effecting a mean value of 2.30. This again exposes the fact that a lot of teachers in fact, use paper and pencil kind of test instead of students' communicative abilities which in turn slows down the communicative competence of learners.

To sum up, the analysis of teachers' responses to the classroom practice with an average mean value of 2.81 shows that the majority of teachers, under study, are not indeed using CLT in the classroom. This is proved by the average mean values of most items, with the exception of two items, in this category which are either below or close to the mid-point. And this shows that there is a discrepancy between what teachers understand about CLT and what they actually practice. This in turn makes us think of problems, if any, that bans them from practicing what they have accepted to be sound.

4.8 Analysis of Classroom Observations and Interviews

As mentioned earlier, interviews and classroom observations have been used as an additional data gathering tools with the intention of finding out in-depth information about the issue under study. Accordingly, nine teachers selected

on a random basis were interviewed and carefully observed while teaching. And so, the results of the tools are shown as follows.

4.8.1 Classroom Observations

The researcher has observed three teachers in each school, nine altogether. Each teacher has been observed five times with each class lasting for 40 minutes. So, a sum total of almost 38 hours have been used for observation. And as depicted in the observation checklist, the first point is concerned with the introduction of the daily lesson. Hence, the observation shows that every teacher introduces the lesson that they are going to teach on that specific day. Even before they introduce the daily lesson, they remind the students as to what they have been taught last time with a view of creating motivation and some kind of connection with that particular day's lesson in a bid to enhance their understanding.

Regarding the kind of activities presented by the teacher in the classroom, it has been observed that a large number of teachers do not provide students with a range of communicative tasks such as pair or group discussions, role plays, simulation, drama, games etc. They, rather, follow a kind of teacher-centered approach where they give lectures and explanations like a priest preaching in the church and write notes on the board so that students copy on their exercise books. The only trial of the classroom teachers observed is encouraging students to raise hands and try to answer some questions from the textbook. So, students are mostly engaged in individual work.

But CLT encourages learners to participate in classroom activities based on cooperative rather than individualistic approach to learning. Students are expected to be comfortable with listening to their peers in group work or pair work tasks, rather than depending on the teacher. They are expected to take a greater degree of responsibility for their own learning. And teachers are expected to assume the role of facilitator and monitor, rather than being a

model for correct speech and writing and one with the primary responsibility of making students produce plenty of error free sentences, the teacher had to develop a different view of learners' errors and of her/his own role in facilitating language learning.

Meanwhile, a few teachers have been observed trying to give some communicative tasks like pair and group works. But the problem observed at the same time here is that even though students seem to be serious in their work at the beginning (could be because of the presence of the observer), after they became familiar with the feeling of the presence of the researcher, students have been observed to change the target language into their first language and talk other life matters. Moreover, some of them take the opportunity to make fun of the teacher by imitating the way the teacher speaks, the way the teacher dresses up and things like that.

With regard to instructional materials, most teachers highly depend only on the textbook and are not seen to make use of other supplementary materials such as audiovisuals, magazines, newspapers, pictures, maps, charts, etc. except for some relative improvement in the private school where conversation-focused books are sometimes used in addition to the textbook. One good point observed in all the schools is that some teachers try to communicate with their students in English sometimes; encouraging their learners to use the target language.

As a matter of fact, there are language books in the school libraries, but most teachers don't have the trend to make use of them except covering the lesson plan which is obligatory for them to do so. Students are also not as such interested to utilize the different conversational books available with a slight improvement in the private school where students try to do reading in their school's library. Radical academy, one of the study centers could be mentioned in this regard.

Sahu (2004) has pointed out that the physical condition of a classroom includes size of a classroom, seating arrangement, suitability of furniture,

availability of enough ventilation, etc. Hence, the seating arrangement has been another focal point of observation. And the researcher dares to speak out that no school has been found comfortable for CLT to be implemented. Overcrowded classes with both students and desks have been observed which makes the implementation of CLT unthinkable.

The other point of observation was concerned with teachers' role in the classroom. And truly speaking, in most of the classes, it is only the teachers who finish the period speaking. Little time is given for the students to take part in expressing their ideas. And even if they get the chance, it will be only to forward a word or so in a bid to answer questions from the textbook. Most teachers have been observed not to make the class as interactive or communicative as possible; involving every student to use the language.

However, in connection with error correction, most teachers have been observed to be polite enough in giving feedback and sometimes showing tolerance to some errors. But few teachers have been also observed to be careless no matter what mistake is committed in the teaching-learning process. It seems as if they are in the classroom because they have to be, paying no attention to what they are actually doing. Besides, most of the teachers seem to have the perception that peer correction doesn't result in proper removal of errors as they have the fear that misleading can occur. Consequently, most of the corrections are made by the teachers themselves.

Concerning the class activities of students, it has been observed that almost all the students of the government and public schools are not seen to give attention to what they are learning. Whenever the teacher goes round the class to check whether they have done the homework given, they are found either not to have done the assignments or not to have brought their exercise books. But still some progress is apparent in the private school despite the presence of negligible number of students who are careless even in the private school. They rather seem to have come to the schools for the reason that they like the get

together as it lets them to have fun and even some students feel as if they are in the café. There are also some indications that their parents send them to schools just because they do not want to be disturbed. Generally, most of them come to their respective schools just to spend their time at.

Despite the above fact, few students from both the government and public schools and some from the private school are found to be serious and attentive enough in their lessons.

Regarding the assessments of students' performance, the writer of this paper has tried to have a look at some of the test types given to the students. And so, the researcher does not dare to say that they are of communicative type. The test types are mostly inclined towards form-focused type; giving more emphasis to questions such as subject-verb agreement, tense types, modal auxiliaries. But the writer is not saying that all test types are like that. There are, of course, some improvements in all the schools to make the test types as communicative as possible with high improvement in the private one.

What comes next is usage of the target language for communication both with the teacher and among the students in the school compound. In fact, some teachers in all the schools have been observed trying their best in using the target language with their students for communication but students especially both in government and public schools are found to shy away from doing so; The use of the target language among the students in the aforementioned schools is non-existent. But the scenario gets better when it comes to the private one. Interaction of teachers with students and students to students takes place mostly in English. And this is of great help for students from the point of developing the proficiency of the students thereby boosting their confidence up.

The last point, according to the observation checklist, deals with the effort of the school administration in helping students improve their language proficiency. And hence, the school administration facilitates the situation so

that students can get tutorial classes in a bid to strengthen their understanding in all the subjects including English. Even though the students will be charged for the tutorial class, this could be taken as a smart move from the schools' administration side.

In summarizing the above points, therefore, failure of teachers to provide students with a range of communicative tasks, heavy dependence of most teachers on the textbook, the uncomfortable seating arrangements, the authoritarian role of teachers in the classroom, form-focused assessments of students' performance and teacher-centered error correction imply that teachers are still attached to the traditional or teacher-led method of teaching in spite of the fact that they are found to have a better understanding of CLT principles.

And this is attributed to different problems which different teachers underlined during the interview held with the researcher. On the other hand, the classroom observation dictates that a certain affirmative action should be taken so as to step up the class activities of the students and usage of the target language for communication at least in the school compound while appreciating the effort of the school administration.

4.8.2 Interviews

Interview is a systematic way of talking and listening to people and is an alternative way of collecting data from individuals through conversations. It is used to collect data and gain knowledge from individuals (http://www.languageteaching.com).

And hence, in interviews as in observations, nine teachers from the three schools have been selected and interviewed. And for the purpose of presentation, the teachers are referred to by numbers randomly given as T1, T2, T3…T9. Thus, to the first question that deals with the meaning of CLT teachers, on the whole, have given acceptable definitions of CLT. Some of them

have said that CLT is making students to be involved in pair and group works, creating interaction between teacher and students, students to students.

And some others have forwarded that CLT is involving students in different conversational activities, helping students to use the target language while speaking in the classroom. Still others have explained that CLT deals with encouraging students to be engaged in different language games, teaching English using different dialogues in the classroom, assisting students to speak, write, read and listen using the target language. And this clearly shows that teachers' understanding of CLT seems to be well-defined reassuring that teachers don't have any problem with its theoretical interpretations.

The second question was on feeling of teachers towards CLT. Accordingly, six of them said that they are comfortable with CLT, whereas three teachers expressed their reservations for the fact that CLT is making their students superficial in using the English language which means that students are trying to pretend the way foreigners talk with poor grammar. With this point, in fact, they have unconsciously disclosed that CLT disregards grammar.

Thirdly, the researcher asked the subjects as to how they found out the textbook from the point of promoting communicative language teaching. And in response to this, almost all of them have similarly answered that the current textbook as compared to the previous one is much better from the point of promoting CLT. The writing, speaking, reading and listening activities designed are in line with the CLT principles, they added. Only one teacher reported to have said that he is not happy with the current textbook just because, as he said, it is not in line with the students' understanding capacity. So, almost no problem has been forwarded with regard to the textbook.

The fourth question which deals with the suitability of the teaching environment/availability of language teaching facilities/ has put all the teachers on one side as all of them answered in one word that the environment is not suitable to implement CLT. And the reason for this could be summarized

as : large class size, poor background knowledge of students, students' lack of interest to be involved in various CLT activities: pair and group work, role play, drama, simulation, unequal ability of students, lack of supplementary materials, teaching overload, uncomfortable arrangement of desks, teachers' poor command of English and a substantial influence of grade 8 national examination which is more of form focused are reported to be creating challenging situations to put CLT into practice. Especially, in relation to imbalanced ability of students, Richards (2001) suggests the following ideas to cope with classes of heterogeneous abilities during communicative activities.

1. **Cooperative work**: Encouraging more able students to help their less able counterparts.

2. **Grouping**: Pair students of different levels but avoid having pairs of extreme types of students or a weak pair.

3. **Project work**: Help learners to work at their individual pace.

4. **Varying learning styles**: Provide tasks that challenge different types of learners.

5. **Instructions**: Ensure that the learners are clear about the activity they are to carry out.

6. **Mother tongue**: Use the native language to clarify and check understanding.

Relatively speaking, the complaint on having large classes is recorded to be much more in the government and public schools than the private one. Especially, one of the teachers (T3) from the government school has said: "look the number of students and arrangement of desks. If I use group work the group should not exceed four or five students, but how can I practice it in a large number like this?" And with regard to students' background another

respondent (T5) from the public school explained: "most of the students have been taught by self-contained teachers till they reach grade 7. And, this will also have its own influence on their interest to take part in different CLT activities." Again another respondent teacher (T6) from the private school explained:

> *I have taught in government, private and public schools. I know what the situation looks like in all of them. So, with regard to the class size, the situation looks better here in the private school, but there are other things that make us similar with those government and public schools such as lack of audio-visual materials, arrangement of chairs (three students sitting closely on a bench). Even though it is a private school, we don't even have a tape-recorder to do listening activities.*

Still another teacher (T8) said that even if we, by any means, try to arrange the chairs so as to make it suitable for the communicative activities, other subject teachers coming into the next class may not feel happy when he/she saw the chairs dispersed in a different way from the normal one. And so, this discourages teachers from using all other alternatives at hand. Another teacher (T9) is also quoted as having said that, "I usually don't like to do CLT because when I tell my students to be in a group of four or five they take it as an opportunity for them to talk their private issues or at least they forget the target language and start using their first language. "

On the other hand, one younger teacher (T3) forwarded a unique idea that the teachers' poor command of English is another source of resistance to CLT which requires a relatively high level of fluency and accuracy. He went on saying that one can find lots of teachers with broken English. "So, how can they teach communicatively?", he asked. This, in fact, seems to be a fair judgment when one bears teachers' actual classroom performance in mind. During the observation and interview sessions, the researcher had also the chance of listening to some laughter provoking pronunciations and discourses with broken subject-verb agreements.

And to the fifth question which says, "How do you evaluate your students' language performance ?", the majority of the teachers have explained that they evaluate their students' performance in a way that helps their students to develop the four major skills. For the writing skill, for instance, they provide their students with different topics on the basis of which they produce writing while they read a passage for their students so that they answer questions out of the passage to evaluate their listening skills. And they give them a topic to be presented in front of their classmates in an attempt to evaluate their speaking skill whereas they give them a passage in order that they read and answer questions out of the passage in order to evaluate their skills. But two young teachers have pointed out that they use communicative type of tests almost all the time while one teacher said that he still uses form-focused type of tests even though he attaches much more attention towards communication based tests.

"What should the role of the teacher be in the language classroom ?" was the sixth question asked to teachers. And so, seven teachers out of nine have clarified that the role of the teacher should be helping learners to understand the subject in a better way, guiding them or showing them the direction of better learning in addition to delivering lectures and having discussions with them whenever necessary. On the contrary, two teachers have indirectly mentioned that the role of the teacher should also incorporate being the reliable and only provider of knowledge.

Still the other question asked was "Do students like the classroom activities ?" And in response to this, again the majority of the interviewees have made clear that the students are more or less happy with the activities but their worry lies on the justification of their liking the activities. Most students like the activities just because CLT, by its nature, lets learners do the activities being in pair or/and in groups and it is mostly because they enjoy this part and not otherwise. But few teachers are also heard having said that a few students

especially the timid ones find it difficult to be happy with CLT as their natural behaviour doesn't allow them to interact easily with their classmates.

The next question raised had something to do with the importance of error correction. And in reaction to this, five teachers said that they do not as such give high attention to correction of every mistake committed while the rest four teachers clarified that they can not overlook any mistake. And their stand emerged from the point that if errors are ignored, the students could be misled; keeping the wrong structure as something right.

What follows next is a question on learning materials used in the language classroom. And almost the same reactions have been forwarded by all the interviewees. That is, all of them heavily depend on the textbook for teaching English. And this is partly because of the poor facility of the schools and other discouraging factors such as students' lack of interest to be involved in participation of the classroom activities and so on.

The last question presented during the interview was, "Do you think that you have got the necessary knowledge and skill in your college/University regarding the teaching methodology in general and CLT in particular?". This question has also entertained different responses. Out of the nine interviewees, three of them reported that they started teaching English having graduated from teachers' training institutes (TTI) with certificate and it is on the job that they earned their diploma. As a result, they, in fact, have taken some courses on teaching methodology in general but not CLT in particular.

The other three teachers also said that they at first graduated in Amharic having English as a secondary course and then totally shifted into English as a major subject and doing their degrees at the moment. And so they said that they have learned CLT at a glance while learning teaching methodology in general stressing that it was not sufficient enough. The rest three teachers, young enough, have said that they have learnt CLT and they know it very well. Therefore, they are trying their best to put it into practice. But they have at the

same time emphasized the presence of countless problems they are facing while maximizing the implementation of the same.

In sum, the observation and interview results imply that even though most of the teachers are more or less found to have a better understanding of CLT principles, they are, in practice, still attached to the traditional or teacher-led method of teaching. And this shows that there is a discrepancy between their understanding of CLT and what they actually practice in the classroom.

But one important point worth mentioning is that the current textbook is designed in such a way that it promotes CLT as it has been among the other points of observation. In addition, except one teacher, the rest of the teachers have said that they are happy with the textbook. And this is, as researches reveal, due to the fact that the textbooks for elementary students and secondary schools of Ethiopia have been replaced by more communicative-oriented ones. Therefore, the problem concerning the syllabus seems to be resolved. But other problems, particularly the teachers' traditional teaching method has continued to be a major hindrance to the implementation of CLT in Ethiopia.

In addition to large class size, failure of learners to use the language outside the classroom and the low proficiency of the learners in the English language, the teaching methodology of teachers have been found to be the most challenging in implementing CLT. It has been found out that the majority of English teachers had limited experiences about CLT and they had used traditional type or teacher centered English teaching methodology.

4.10 Discussion with students

Although the major objective of this paper is to find out the perceptions of junior secondary school teachers towards CLT and their actual classroom practices, some time has been devoted to have discussion with randomly

selected students. And this is done with an objective of gathering additional information and cross checking against what teachers have forwarded.

Accordingly, the first point of discussion raised to students was concerned with their cooperation to participate in different CLT activities. And in reaction to this, they explained that they actually like it but their purpose of liking it is not because CLT helps them to improve their language, but rather because it gives them a chance to get together and have a chat with their classmates.

The second question asked was "Do you actively participate in providing solutions whenever problem solving group activities are given?" Hence, they have replied by saying that they rarely or never participate in problem solving activities.

Again to the question that says, "Do you ask your friends or the classroom teacher whenever you need some information on CLT activities?" And their responses were read to be they rarely or never do so.

"How often do you communicate in English with your classmates and with your teacher in English?" was the fourth question asked. Thus, they responded by saying that they prefer and feel comfortable to use their mother tongue in both the government and public schools, but some students from the private school have been reported to have said that they sometimes use English to communicate in the target language.

As Richards and Rodgers (2001) put it, in communicative activities students are group participants, monitors, risk takers and innovators. However, reactions of some students during the discussion have been found to be against the literature; they are practically not risk takers and active participants. Instead, they are found to be passive to participate in problem solving activities and group works. And generally, the reactions of students show that they are reluctant to participate in CLT activities thereby making the

implementation of CLT, together with other problems mentioned, even more complicated.

4.11 A Glimpse of Grade Eight English Text-Book

Textbooks are often a psychological necessity for students as they allow progress and achievement to be measured in a concrete way. Students often expect to use textbooks and feel that textbooks lend a certain degree of credibility to a course (Haycroft, 1998, Sheldon, 1988). The writer of this paper has, therefore, made an attempt to have a brief look at the English textbook of grade eight. And it was done with a purpose of finding out as to how the textbook is designed from the point of promoting CLT and crosschecking against what the teachers have replied to questions related to the textbook presented during the interview.

Accordingly, the writer dares to speak that the textbook is designed in such a way that it promotes CLT; the exercises presented are aimed at provoking reactions from learners, the pictures used there are very much familiar to them and are up to the level of the students and the exemplars whose stories are used for the passages in different chapters of the text are all native people such as athlete Derartu Tulu, Dr. Aklilu Lemma, and so forth.

Addis Ababa University and the national museum are also some of the familiar organizations about which stories are produced so as to teach some language elements out of them. In addition, the text is found to have incorporated different CLT activities in the classroom such as pair and group works, production of sentences using vocabulary given in the text, listening activities (listening to dialogues of two students-asking and answering) and production of what they have learnt from different listening tasks.

Grammar and writing activities are also apparent in the text. For example, writing about personal information and sharing it with their classmates (speaking). And under grammar the different parts of speech: nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs etc are dealt with. Generally, the textbook is practically found to be in line with CLT principles.

Chapter Five

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter consists of conclusions and recommendations of the research findings. As it has been mentioned earlier, the major objective of this study was to find out perceptions of junior secondary school English teachers towards the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and their actual classroom practices. Hence, three research tools such as questionnaires, classroom observations and interviews have been utilised so as to gather the required data for the study. And on the basis of the results discussed in chapter four, the following conclusions are drawn and recommendations made.

5.1 Conclusions

The overall results of the study have shown that junior secondary school English teachers have a positive perception towards the tenets of communicative language teaching. As clearly illustrated in the preceding chapter, the analysis of conceptual perspective has resulted in a mean value of 4.32 while analysis of students' learning perspective left an aggregate mean value of 3.50. In addition, the analysis of instructional activities brought about a total mean value of 3.70 whereas the analysis of grammar-oriented statements ended in a summative mean value of 4.20.

Again, the analysis of error correction and assessments effected a cumulative mean value of 3.60 while the analysis of perspective on teachers' role resulted in a mean value of 4.13 all of which are found to be far from the mid point showing high perception towards CLT. All the average values range from 3.50-4.32 proving strong perception. And again, the entire mean values listed above altogether result in an average mean value of 4.0, restating teachers' strong perception towards CLT.

Nevertheless, the analysis of teachers' responses to the actual classroom practice and the observation results has portrayed a totally different picture. That is, almost all of the mean values are recorded to be very much below the mid-point of 3.0. The sum total average mean value of all the items is found to be 2.81, clearly reflecting weak actual performance of communicative language teaching. Moreover, the very least average value of an item is recorded here in the responses given to questions on the actual classroom practice. And this obviously unveils that most of the time teachers practically carry out non-communicative method of teaching indicating a visible mismatch between perception and practice of teachers with regard to communicative language teaching.

What is more, the data collected from the classroom observation and interview with teachers reaffirms the existence of discrepancy between teachers' perception towards communicative language teaching and their actual classroom practices. And the failure of teachers to practice communicative language teaching could be attributed to a range of problems that they proposed during the interview.

According to the information obtained from the interview, the prevailing problems that hampered teachers from effecting CLT could be summarized as: large class size, poor background knowledge of students, students' lack of interest to be involved in different communicative activities, unequal ability of students to participate in group work, lack of supplementary materials (audio-visual materials),teaching overload, uncomfortable arrangement of desks, weak effort of students, poor English language command of teachers, perception of students towards English subject (some of them think that it is difficult to understand and speaking English is perceived to be boasting by some others), substantial influence of the national Grade 8 examination which is mostly grammar-based, misconception of some teachers that CLT is wastage of time and students' failure to understand its purpose.

So, it can be easily pointed out as a conclusion that even if junior secondary school English teachers are found to have an affirmative perception towards CLT in principle, they are practically found to be against their perceived principles because of multifaceted problems mentioned above. This again reassures that there is a clear disparity between what teachers have perceived about CLT and what they actually carry out in English classrooms.

5.2 Recommendations

By now, the research findings have been realized. The conclusions have been made based on the findings. As a result, the constraints existing in between teachers' perceptions and their actual classroom practices have been clearly sorted out in the preceding sections. And this prompted the researcher to forward the following recommendations with a view of bridging the gap between perceptions and practices.

☞ In the first place, instructional rooms should accommodate the minimum possible number of students so that the implementation of communicative language teaching would be scaled up. Together with this, the problem of uncomfortable seating arrangement of desks should be solved; single chairs should be provided to students. In addition, the time period of the English classes should increase from 40 minutes to 50 minutes in order that the teacher will have sufficient time to practice CLT activities. The teaching load should also be treated in a way that does not negatively affect the teaching interest of teachers. And the concerned government authorities can play a noteworthy role in this regard.

☞ In the second place, it is clear that the leading objective of learning a language is to be able to communicate successfully. So, communicative language teaching should be started from the very early stage. And by so doing, it would be possible to build up the background knowledge of students, alleviate the challenge created because of unequal ability among students, increase the interest of students to be happily involved in different communicative activities, students can easily understand the purpose of CLT and generally, it would be possible to shape the mindset of students towards the English language.

☞ In the third place, as Hawkey (2006) pointed out, the inconsistency between belief and practice is an important point that should be addressed by teacher educators so that teachers will be equipped in a better way to reconcile beliefs and practices so as to provide more successful instruction which is apparent in the study.

☞ In the fourth place, in addition to the textbook, schools should be provided with the relevant ELT resources or supplementary materials such as reference books, audio-visual materials, pictures, etc to facilitate CLT. The testing or method of assessment both at the national and classroom level should also mainly focus on the use rather than the structure of the language so that the attention of both teachers and students will be geared towards the communicative aspect of the language.

☞ In the fifth place, education faculties at different universities should provide CLT-oriented trainings so that the would be teachers would be able to employ communicative principles in their classrooms appropriately;

training teachers in the areas of classroom activities, language teaching aids and in communicative testing. Currently working teachers should also be provided with an intensive and also, if possible, obligatory in-service CLT orientation in order to eradicate CLT illiteracy and come up with best practices of it.

☞ In conclusion, therefore, the researcher would like to underscore that various stakeholders such as teachers, school administrators, curriculum developers, academic officers, methodologists, the community at large and learners themselves should work hand-in-hand if the maximum benefit out of CLT is to be achieved.

Appendix C

Interview with Teachers

The objective of this interview is to find out teachers' understanding on the various issues of CLT and some problems they face during the practice of communicative language teaching in their classrooms.

1. What do you understand by Communicative Language Teaching ?

2. Are you comfortable with Communicative Language Teaching ?

3. How did you find the textbook from the point of promoting Communicative Language Teaching ?

4. Is the teaching environment (e.g. availability of language teaching facilities) suitable for you to implement CLT ?

5. How do you evaluate your students' language performance ?

6. What should the role of the teacher be in the language classroom ?

7. Do students like the classroom activities ?

8. What is your comment on the importance of error correction ?

9. What learning materials do you use in the language classroom ?

10. Do you think that you have got the necessary knowledge and skill in your college/University regarding the teaching methodology in general and CLT in particular ?