



Communicative Language Teaching and Constraints encountering its implementation

Salem Ettaher Mustafa Abu Talag

Received 28 March, 2019; Accepted 08 April, 2019 © the Author(S) 2019.

Published With Open Access At www.Questjournals.Org

I. INTRODUCTION:

Definition of Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative Approach or Communicative Language Teaching is defined “an approach to foreign or second language teaching which emphasizes that the goal of language learning is Communicative Competence” (Richards et al., 1985). In accordance the approach which has been developed by British applied linguists as a response clear of grammar-based methods.

It initiates from a theory of language as communication, and the objective of language teaching is to build up “communicative competence.”

The theory of communication is Halliday’s useful account of language application. He outlined seven basic functions that language carries out for children learning their first language, and learning a second language was likewise judged as doing various types of functions.

Different notions regarding communication are proposed as dimensions of Communicative competence (Richards & Rodgers, 1986:71).

In a nutshell “it is therefore a unified but broadly-based theoretical position about the nature of language and of language learning and teaching” (Brown, 1994).

On the same subject, Richards and Rodgers maintain that “at the level of language theory, Communicative Language Teaching has a rich, if somewhat eclectic, theoretical base. Some of the features of this communicative view of language follow. 1) Language is a system of the articulation of meaning 2) The main task of language is for relationships and communication 3) The organization of language shows its practical and communicative use 4) The primary units of language are not simply its grammatical and structural aspects, however categories of practical and communicative implication as depicted in conversation. (Richards & Rodgers, 1986:71).

As regards theory of learning, little has been found in literature; nevertheless there are some characteristics fundamental to the Communicative Language Teaching Practices. In accordance with Morrow, actions that are really communicative should have three characteristics (cited in Larsen Freeman, 1986:132) namely:

Information gap: In the communication some knowledge exchange should happen. Scrivener states that people by and large communicate when one has knowledge that another does not have, which is known as an “information gap” (1994:62).

Choice: In communication, the narrator should have the option of what to say and how to say.

Feedback: True communication is focused. Speaker can assess whether or not his purpose has been realized rooted on the knowledge he gets from his listener.

If the listener does not have an occasion to offer the speaker with such response, then the exchange is not in fact communicative.

Second element is the task principle. Activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning. Harmer (1991) states that there has been an accord that rather than pure rote learning or de-contextualized practice, language has to be realized due to some deeper experience than the focus on a grammar point,

Third aspect is the meaningful principle. In accordance with this principle, language that is significant to the learner supports the learning process.

Constraints in Using Communicative Language Teaching:

This is the principal part of the assignment. Some important facts about it before pondering into the suitability and problems of Communicative Language Teaching.

Grammar:

Grammar is one of the principal factors in language learning and teaching which is disregarded in this method.

Spoken Language:

There is over-stress on spoken language in Communicative Language Teaching. It states the more one speaks in real life situations the more he/she learns. Generally speaking it does not support communication with self or communication through reading and writing etc. it emphasizes more on output than on input.

Cultural Differences:

Widdowson observes that "Communicative function is cultural specific the same way as linguistic forms are language specific" (Cited in Stratton 1977:130).

Communicative Language Teaching Places Heavy Demands on Teacher:

Communicative Language Teaching puts high stress on the teacher than other approaches. Since teacher cannot envisage everything clearly, he/she has to be ready to listen to not only what learners say however also how they say. In addition, the teachers have to interact with the learners in natural way as possible. These require non-native teacher higher-level language skill.

"The communicative classroom requires a teacher of extraordinary abilities: a multi-dimensional, high-tech. Wizard of Oz like person yet of flesh and blood. He or she must be confident without being conceited, judicious without being judgmental, ingenious without being unbridled, technically skilled without being pedantic, far sighted without being far-fetched, down-to-earth without being earth-bound inquiring without being inquisitive – the list is endless" (Medgyes, 14).

CLT in Secondary Schools in Libya:

This study points to teachers' uptake of a new communicative English curriculum in secondary schools in Libya. Following are the salient points:

Curriculum innovation and teacher training:

The new curriculum requires not only on teachers' pedagogical skill however it also challenges their own communicative ability in English. English language teachers in Libya usually graduate from university with immature spoken communication skills in English. The new curriculum, although, try to develop students' oral communication skills and teachers' own deficiencies are consequently challenging. Similar divergence between the curriculum and teachers' capabilities has been reported by many analysts (e.g. Al-Hazmi, 341–344; Li, 149–166). Nunan (2003:606) also observed that "poor English skills on the part of teachers as well as inadequate teacher preparation make it very difficult, if not impossible for many teachers to implement CLT in their classrooms". This would apply to Libya too.

Curriculum innovation and established practices:

Secondary school students in Libya would have followed for many years rules which endorse the authority of the teacher and consider them as the basis of the knowledge students need to get. In this framework, classroom control is also judged one characteristics of a good teacher.

Curriculum innovation & assessment:

The impact of assessment on teaching is deep-rooted and it is obvious that modifications in exams can encourage parallel changes in pedagogic practices. Thus, regardless of a new communicative curriculum, classroom practices continue to be formed by distinct item exams founded on the memorization of grammar and vocabulary. This appears to support the claim by Wedell (1992:338) that "the success or failure of any proposed changes in teaching content and methods depends on whether the examination system is altered to reflect the proposed changes".

Curriculum innovation & teachers' perceptions of students' abilities

The teachers in this study felt there was a clear mismatch between what their students can do and what the curriculum asks them to do. This shows findings by Li (2001:149–166), who concluded that owing to students' imperfect command of English structures, teachers found it hard to do any oral communicative

activities. In fact, caution is needed in accepting face value of teachers' assertions that they cannot teach communicatively since the students are ill-prepared; observations did provide support for such claims however, the limited uptake of the curriculum in the teachers studied was the outcome of quite a lot of interacting aspects of which students' ability in English was poor.

II. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is believed that in many ways the teachers are typical of experienced teachers of English in Libyan secondary schools. Nevertheless it is acknowledged that one cannot make claims regarding the scope to which the practices highlighted persist more generally in secondary ELT classrooms in Libya.

Nevertheless, this extends the understandings of the challenges entailed in applying communicative ELT curricular innovations in the frameworks whose extensive socio-cultural and specific educational practices show principles which communicative language teaching may contradict. Such challenges may exist even where innovations are initiated slowly, sensitively and with suitable support for teachers and students.

Without such steps, the chances that curricular intentions and pedagogical realism will match are least. The experiences of the teachers studied show their responses to a curriculum which supports new approaches they feel ill-prepared to apply, which defy their beliefs and experiences, which endanger their influence, which are in conflict with the instructional practices of teachers of other subjects, which students oppose and cannot cope effectively with, and which are not supported by the evaluation system.

The collective weight of these factors helps to understand the disparity, as shown by the classroom observations, between what the teachers here do and what the curriculum asks them to do.

Recognizing this disparity and the reasons for it is a significant preliminary step in considering how it might be tackled. There are three broad suggestions for doing so. Firstly, national curriculum reform should from its initiation motivate both on the pedagogical approaches it wants to support and the extent to which these are corresponded with teachers' current methods and beliefs. This is not to put forward that new curricula should be intended to match teachers' viewpoints; what is essential, though, is that core curriculum designers evaluate the disparity between what is aimed and the existing situation, and use this analysis to notify the support systems which will be necessary to help curriculum implementation. This causes the second suggestion, which pertains (See Wedell, 2003:439–456) to the need for current systems by which teachers are supported in understand the new curriculum. As well, such support would need to support changes in both instructional practices and teachers' viewpoints. It would also require helping teachers in making the curriculum work within the contextual limitations they experience. The final recommendation is that curriculum innovation necessitates being the motivation of on-going evaluation and regular study. This can entail, amongst other approaches, classroom observations and discussions with teachers and would facilitate inconsistencies between curricular plans and instructional realities, responsive forms of support to be offered, and any crucial adjustments to the curriculum to be done.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Al-Hazmi, S. EFL teacher preparation programs in Saudi Arabia: trends and challenges, 2003:341–344, *TESOL Quarterly* 37 (2).
- [2]. Brown, H.D. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, 1994a, 3rd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- [3]. Harmer, J. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, 1991, 2nd Edn, London: Longman.
- [4]. Larsen-Freeman, D. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, 1986, Oxford University Press, New York.
- [5]. Li, D. Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea, 2001:149–166, In: Hewings, A., Hall, D. (Eds.), *Innovation in English Language Teaching*. Routledge, London.
- [6]. Medgyes, P. 'Queries from a communicative teacher', 1986:107-12, *ELT Journal* 40/2.
- [7]. Nunan, D. The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region, 2003:589–613, *TESOL Quarterly* 37 (4).
- [8]. Richards, Jack, Platt, John & Weber, Heidi. *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*, 1985, London: Longman.
- [9]. Richards, J. C. & Rogers, T. S. *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*, 1986, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [10]. Scrivener, J. *Learning Teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann English Language Teaching, 1994.
- [11]. Stratton, F. S. Putting the communicative syllabus in its place, 1977:131-141, *TESOL Quarterly*, 11.
- [12]. Wedell, M. Pre/in service training of ELT teacher trainers: planning the regional MATEFL project, 1992:337–350, In: Flowerdrew, J., Brock, M., Hsia, S. (Eds.), *Perspectives on Second Language Teacher Education*. City of Polytechnic of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
- [13]. Wedell, M. Giving TESOL change a chance: supporting key players in the curriculum change process, 2003:439–456, *System* 31 (4).

Salem Mustafa " Communicative Language Teaching and Constraints encountering its implementation" *Quest Journals Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science* , vol. 07, no. 3, 2019, pp. 18-20