USING COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING TO TEACH ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

Oishi Azad[1]

Affiliations:

[1]Department of English, BRAC University

Corresponding Author's Email:

[1]oishi.azad25@gmail.com

Abstract

The study of language acquisition and instruction is not new to academics, but it never fails to excite linguists and teachers. The goal of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is to help students develop their communication skills so that they can effectively communicate in a target language. Since its start in the 1970s, when the need for language learners to improve their communication skills was rising, this approach has received worldwide reputation. But since many educators still reject this method, many worries remain. According to Chomsky (1957), the four main aspects of language acquisition lexis, syntax, phonology, and morphology are focused on linguistic competence. Hymes (1971) argues that pragmatic, sociolinguistic, semantic, and grammatical considerations are more important. When it comes to teaching second languages, the theories put forward by researchers, have been game-changers for communicative language instruction. The communicative language teaching (CLT) technique places an emphasis on students' active participation in second language classroom activities and provides more opportunities for students to improve their communication skills compared to the grammar-translation method. Other traditional methods of instruction do not typically use this component. In the context of ESL instruction, this article delves deeply into the ideas and methods of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). In particular, it compares and contrasts conventional methods of instruction with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and gives a brief summary of its advantages and disadvantages. In addition, the article delves into the latest advancements in CLT and the difficulties encountered while applying CLT in an academic environment. After that, the post helps educators understand Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) better. Furthermore, it suggests possible outcomes, such as creating classroom activities and encouraging student motivation, of utilizing CLT to teach English in a university context.

Keywords: Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), university students, advantages and disadvantages of CLT, CLT classroom activities

Introduction

English is the fourth most widely spoken language and is the most commonly used language for international communication. Hence, the instruction and acquisition of the English language is consistently a matter of importance for educators and researchers on a global scale, particularly when it comes to instructing university students who will be entering the professional sphere immediately upon completing their studies. There is a belief held by some individuals that university students are expected to possess a high level of proficiency in the English language due to the extensive period of time they have dedicated to its study, ranging from seven to over 10 years. Globalization has led to an increasing demand for English language skills worldwide, particularly in non-native English-speaking countries. This has resulted in the need for trained spoken English teachers who can effectively teach English as a second language to non-native speakers (Swalmeh & Dey, 2023). However, in Vietnam and other Asian nations, the English proficiency of university students varies due to differences in their educational background and abilities. Originating from diverse locations such as urban areas, rural regions, or even remote mountain villages, the majority of individuals perceive English as one of the most formidable subjects, despite their desire to excel in it for the purpose of securing improved employment opportunities. Overall, the academic performance of pupils in Vietnam is comparatively poor, as indicated by studies conducted by Abahussain (2016), Al-Nasser (2015), Alsalmi (2014), and Batawi (2007) in other countries. Additional factors contributing to the subpar academic performance of university students in second language acquisition include the proficiency and effectiveness of teachers, as well as the limited opportunities for authentic communication with native English speakers. This assertion is substantiated by the findings of Souriyavongsa et al. (2013) at the National University of Laos. Hence, in order to enhance the caliber of English education at the university level, it is important to carefully evaluate and implement various modifications across several domains. It is important to have a specific discussion on teaching approaches because teachers typically serve as instructors and directly impact the learning process in the classroom.

English educators require effective instructional strategies to actively involve and inspire their students in order to enhance their proficiency in the English language. Regarding teaching methodology, the majority of English teachers are acquainted with conventional approaches such as the Grammar-Translation technique, Direct method, Audio-lingual method, Community Language Learning, (De) Suggestopedia, Silent Way, or Total Physical Response. When traditional methods are insufficient to fulfill the demands of communication and interaction outcomes (Dos Santos, 2019), contemporary teaching methods have been implemented to address the requirements of current English learning and teaching. These methods include CLT (Communicative Language Teaching), CBI (Content-Based Instruction), and TBI (Task-Based Instruction). Computer-assisted language learning (CALL), which necessitates oral production, is demonstrating its efficacy in fulfilling learners' requirement for communicative proficiency. However, CLT is not widely embraced, particularly in the context of higher education.

Research Questions

The author aims to ascertain the answers to three primary inquiries by amalgamating studies on CLT. Queries for investigation:

1. What are the benefits of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the instruction and acquisition of English as a second language?
2. What are the drawbacks of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the context of teaching and learning English as a second language for university students?

3. What are the most effective strategies for using the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) in the context of teaching English as a second language at a university?

Literature Review

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), has emerged as a response to the growing need for English language learning and instruction. Grammar-Translation method (GTM) has exerted significant influence prior to the implementation of CLT. Several linguists assert that adopting natural approaches enhances the effectiveness of language acquisition. Richards and Rogers (2001) stated that proponents of the Natural Method believed that a foreign language could be taught without relying on translation or the learner's native language. Instead, they contended that meaning could be effectively conveyed by direct display and action. Language acquisition is optimized when learners are provided with many opportunities to immerse themselves in the language and engage in authentic conversations (Manna, Amelia, & Herawati, 2023). This process is not that different from learning their home tongue. Thus, the conventional approaches that prioritize grammatical elements and translation appear to be ineffective in fostering a natural and spontaneous learning environment for students. CLT, or Communicative Language Teaching, is an innovative approach to language instruction that promotes and motivates learners to utilize their overall knowledge and linguistic skills to solve authentic tasks such as engaging in conversation, negotiating, persuading, and making decisions. This methodology is endorsed by Riggenbach and Lazaraton (1991, p.125), who highlight that CLT involves real-life activities and interactions among groups, such as negotiation and interaction. By engaging in authentic and realistic practice, learners enhance their proficiency in English and develop the confidence to effectively engage with others in the language. Introduced in the 1970s, CLT has gained recognition and acceptance in numerous nations (Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; Kachru, 1992).

According to Thompson (1996), CLT serves as a substitute for the conventional teaching approach known as GTM. This is because CLT emphasizes meaningful communication and necessitates both communicative input and consequence. When students learn using traditional techniques, they may excel in grammar and vocabulary, but they lack confidence in communicating with English speakers due to limited opportunities to use their English knowledge in actual conversations. English is a linguistic medium, and if learners do not frequently employ it, it becomes challenging for them to retain vocabulary. Without opportunities to practice in real-life scenarios, their English proficiency remains limited to an academic context rather than a practical means of communication. According to Widdowson (1990, p.159), CLT is an instructional method that enables learners to utilize language for practical purposes. This means that tasks are viewed as concepts, conceptions, and meaningful actions, rather than focusing on specific grammar rules or isolated language abilities.

Nunan (1991) outlines five primary characteristics of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): (1) Focusing on acquiring proficiency in the target language. (2) Employing genuine texts in educational exercises. (3) Offering learners the chance to enhance their language skills and improve their learning process. (4) Promoting personal experience as a crucial component for classroom activities. (5) Striving to establish a connection between academic assignments and extracurricular activities. Canale and Swain (1980, p. 4) identify four components of communicative competence in CLT: 'grammatical competence', 'sociolinguistic competence', 'discourse competence', and 'strategic competence'. In contrast, Bachman (1990) categorizes it as 'organizational competence' and 'pragmatic competence'.

Communicative Language Teaching pertains to the capacity to effectively comprehend and express oneself in language within authentic contexts (Kiato & Kiato, 1996). Computer-assisted language learning (CALL) seeks to leverage diverse knowledge, encompassing both general and linguistic knowledge, to engage learners in meaningful tasks and activities that replicate real-life situations. The goal is to enhance various language aspects of learners, such as sustaining conversations despite limited language proficiency, utilizing language for different purposes and functions, comprehending and producing different types of texts, and employing appropriate language in various settings, including formal and informal situations (Richard, 2006). The CLT method is an effective approach to enhance learners' overall knowledge. As mentioned by Doughty and Long (2003), incorporating new information into long-term memory is more effective when it is connected to real-world events and activities. Authentic resources, rich in cultural insights and spanning several domains from science to everyday life, offer learners invaluable and up-to-date information essential for achieving success in both their professional and personal endeavors.

In a traditional classroom, the teacher typically assumes the position of a controller, which is sometimes referred to as teacher-centered. In that particular educational setting, students exhibit less engagement and adaptability compared to a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) class, where students are empowered to take a central role in the teaching and learning process. In CLT classes, students acquire agency in classroom activities as their level of effort directly correlates with the benefits they receive. This assertion is reinforced by Kennedy (2002), who argues that CLT provides teachers and students with ample opportunities and flexibility to engage in a diverse array of activities. Teachers assume the task of overseeing and facilitating classroom activities to actively involve students and provide support when necessary, with the aim of motivating their active participation in these activities. Furthermore, CLT emphasizes the student's central participation in the learning process. However, in practice, the implementation of CLT in the specific context of universities across different countries encounters numerous problems that require thorough discussion in order to identify answers. It is common for a new method to encounter challenges and resistance.

Teachers are aware of the efficacy of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), but they lack the knowledge of its proper implementation in their classrooms (Dos Santos, 2016, 2017). In addition, Tomlimson (2001) provides further evidence supporting the less prevalent aspect of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which is the dominance of instructional materials. Not all the elements in the textbook adhere to the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as they encompass a diverse array of collaborative activities, some of which are not directly relevant to the lesson's context. In order to incorporate Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) into their classes, teachers require supplementary materials beyond the textbook. Consequently, adhering strictly to textbook activities makes it exceedingly difficult for teachers to transform a regular class into a communicative language teaching (CLT) class. Conversely, if teachers do not rely on the textbook's material, they may face criticism from their supervisors. Ozsevik (2010) highlights that teachers who are burdened with excessive workloads and are not adequately compensated do not implement Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in their instruction. The impediment also arises from students, as evidenced by Walia's (2012) research. Students exhibit reluctance towards engaging in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities. The limitations in terms of time and budget allocated for CLT activities further exacerbate the drawbacks associated with the implementation of the CLT method (Walia, 2012). West (2016) highlights that the complexity and training of vocabulary present challenges for CLT exercises.

Regarding the fluency and precision of language, there is a debate that suggests that CLT prioritizes fluency over accuracy. Consequently, even pupils with strong communicative skills may still commit fundamental grammar mistakes. Nunan (1989) asserts that this phenomenon occurs because learners prioritize the comprehension of meaning over the analysis of linguistic structure. When using CLT in real-life situations, each individual context has its own challenges. In Asian countries, the majority of challenges arise from the contextual environment. In Vietnam, Pham (2007) and Iwashita and Ngoc (2012) discuss conflicts that impact the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), specifically referring to the presence of numerous pupils in a language class. In Thailand, Saengboon (2002) also notes that the classrooms are excessively crowded and the students' proficiency levels vary, making it challenging to carry out Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities. Jung and Norton (2002) propose that the majority of resources created for big class sizes in South Korea are unsuitable for activities using Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL). In Taiwan, Huang and Yang (2018) attribute the failure of CLT in this country to social cultures. Despite its presence in the United States of America, the concept of CLT continues to encounter challenges.

International students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds exhibit a reluctance to participate in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities due to their steadfast adherence to traditional methods of language learning, wherein vocabulary and grammar are considered the primary focus (Dos Santos, 2020; Ahn & Kang, 2017; Lee & Lee, 2019). The mindset of teachers and students is another influential aspect in the adoption of CLT. The beliefs held by teachers are of great significance as they directly influence their teaching methods and the content they deliver. Borg (2017) asserts that individuals' beliefs can be influenced by various elements, such as their personal characteristics, learning experiences, and underlying assumptions. Many teachers encountered the GTM throughout their training at pedagogical schools. Due to their varying qualities and levels of expertise, teachers continue to encounter challenges when using the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in their classrooms.

It is a documented observation that a limited number of teachers have undergone training in the field of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Abrejo et al., 2019). Instead of taking an official training session, they have the option to independently update their teaching methods, which has delayed their use of CLT in their class. The majority of studies on the implementation of CLT primarily focus on the perspective of teachers (Li, 1998), with just a small number of academics examining it from the viewpoint of students, such as Schulz (1996) and Natividad and Batang (2018). Natividad and Batang (2018) assert that university students might optimize their learning by engaging in collaborative activities and utilizing oral communication in real-life situations. Hence, students support the use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as it provides them with the opportunity to engage in meaningful discussion, acquiring English through contextual usage rather than rote memorization of grammar rules. Additionally, they can enhance their social skills by collaborating with peers in group settings. Moreover, the conduct of learners plays a significant role in determining the success or failure of implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). According to Dos Santos (2020), East Asian students exhibit lower levels of motivation and engagement compared to their Western counterparts, which can hinder their participation in some communicative language teaching (CLT) activities such as discussions and debates aimed at reaching a consensus. The spaciousness of the classroom also poses a drawback for implementing CLT.

Typically, in a university setting, the student population is substantial, usually consisting of approximately 50 students. Consequently, it is challenging for all of them to engage and exchange

information with one another within a restricted timeframe, and the professors are unable to manage all the conversations among students in order to provide suitable assistance or feedback to each individual student (Weiner, 2012; Weiner & Jerome, 2016).There is a debate on the extent to which English is utilized in CLT classes. According to Brandl and Bauer (2002), in beginning language classes, students tend to prefer their teachers to use more of their first language (L1) when giving directions and confirming understanding, even when the teachers are trying to maximize the use of the second language (L2). However, when teachers use more of the second language (L2), students would like them to use more of their first language (L1).

Furthermore, educators often encounter numerous misconceptions throughout the implementation of CLT. According to Thompson (1996), CLT involves not teaching grammar and considers pair work to be equivalent to role-playing. Additionally, CLT places significant burden on teachers as they must handle unforeseen situations and possess strong debating skills. Thompson elucidates that CLT permits the implicit instruction of language by means of alternative activities, rather than wholly disregarding linguistic elements such as grammar. In discussing role play, Thompson differentiates between pair work and role plays at a more basic level. Pair work involves participants repeating pre-determined samples, while role play involves genuine interaction and decision-making among the participants. However, the researcher does not possess a definitive response for the final misconception, given the design of CLT is attributed to native speakers and caters to their instructional needs. While it may be a factor in rejecting the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, it also serves as an effective method for teachers to increase their teaching skills and strengthen their beliefs and practices. Additionally, he cites another factor contributing to this misinterpretation: educators who are resistant to altering their existing instructional approach. Computer-assisted language teaching (CALT) is a very efficient approach to teaching and learning a second language. It offers learners the chance to enhance their conversational skills in both educational and real-world contexts, so improving their overall language proficiency. While not yet widely applied in university campuses, teachers and students hold a favorable outlook on this strategy due to its advantages. The actual implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in university settings has revealed both benefits and challenges, both within and beyond the confines of the classroom. Hence, educators must carefully assess the actual circumstances inside their school in order to successfully execute Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) classes.

Methodology

Despite being introduced and deployed since the 1970s, the implementation of CLT has not been widespread in Vietnam and other Asian nations, particularly at the tertiary level. Hence, conducting both quantitative and qualitative research at a certain university poses significant challenges. This article aims to analyze the implications of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the university context. It gathers information from over fifty articles and research studies on CLT in teaching English as a second or foreign language in Asian universities. These research contexts are chosen for their similarity to Vietnam, making the analysis and suggestions more practical and valuable for the future implementation of CLT in English language teaching for university students in Vietnam. The paper seeks to examine three key concerns outlined in the introduction by evaluating the merits and drawbacks of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the context of English language instruction for non-native speakers. Subsequently, the author provides recommendations for the successful implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in English instruction at the college level.

Results

The comprehensive literature analysis examines CLT from several perspectives, offering evidence for the author to address three primary inquiries.

Benefits of CLT in the instruction and acquisition of English as a second language:

The concept of CLT was first introduced in the 1970s and has since undergone three distinct stages of development to demonstrate its innovative capabilities in meeting the demands of each era. For an extended duration, GTM has been extensively utilized in the pedagogy of English language instruction. However, the drawbacks of this approach surpass its advantages, prompting the establishment of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). CLT is often regarded as the most effective method for enhancing learners' communicative competence. Nunan (1991) identifies five key characteristics of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) based on its principles. Canale and Swain (1980) and Bachman (1990) present the concept of communicative competence in the context of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). CLT prioritizes the use of authentic materials and encourages conversation between learners. It incorporates both general information and language knowledge, fostering connections between the classroom and the real world through realistic scenarios.

In addition, in order to actively participate in CLT activities, learners must utilize and enhance their sociolinguistic, discourse, strategic, and grammatical competence, as well as their organizational and pragmatic competence. Consequently, learners effectively acquire the target language through both implicit and explicit means. One additional benefit of the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach is that learners are actively engaged in classroom activities. In conventional classrooms, learners acquire knowledge passively, primarily from their lecturers and prescribed textbooks. It implies that proficient students (who adhere to instructors and complete all grammar and vocabulary activities with concentration) may not possess the ability to effectively communicate in English in real-life situations. They lack familiarity with practical scenarios and lack opportunities for interpersonal communication, such as organizing, discussing, negotiating, expressing dissatisfaction, or making decisions with others.

Nevertheless, CLT activities offer numerous possibilities for individuals to engage in English conversation and transform their communication experiences into valuable skills for future interactions. Indeed, in CLT classes, learners assume the role of participants and are at the core of the teaching and learning process. Hence, participating in classroom activities entails acquiring linguistic skills and enhancing language proficiency rather than only completing assigned tasks. As a result, learners are more motivated to acquire language. CLT has an indisputable advantage in improving and expanding learners' overall knowledge and linguistic proficiency, irrespective of their language proficiency levels. Both proficient English students and those with lower proficiency levels can benefit from CLT classes, as Richard (2006) asserts that CLT activities offer meaningful tasks and authentic situations to enhance various language skills, including facilitating conversation for learners with limited language abilities.

Eventually, educators also derive advantages from Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities. In order to develop CLT activities, educators must allocate time to the creation of instructional materials and appropriate tasks. In classroom activities, teachers assume the roles of both participants and facilitators, actively engaging in activities to enhance their teaching profession and expand their knowledge through the use of real resources. Overall, the implementation of CLT in university-level English lessons offers significant advantages for both students and instructors. Each question becomes a paintbrush, dipped in the colors of your memory. Was it a symphony of delight, a concerto of satisfaction? Or did it leave you

with the sour notes of disappointment, a dissonant chorus of frustration? With every tick, every star, every word you write, you paint a picture, not just for others, but for yourself. It's a chance to relive the echoes of the experience, to trace the lines of your satisfaction, or to mend the cracks of disappointment. It's a way to say "Thank you" when something touched you, or to whisper "Beware" when it fell short. Your voice, in these simple lines, becomes a beacon, guiding others towards light or leading them away from shadows.

Therefore, it is highly recommended to introduce and extensively utilize CLT in order to better prepare students for their transition into professional life and the workforce.

Drawbacks of using CLT in the instruction and acquisition of English as a second language for university students

Computer-assisted language teaching (CALT) was initially developed by native speakers and mostly utilized for native teachers. However, when extensively employed for teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) to university students in other nations, particularly in Asian countries such as Vietnam, Thailand, China, South Korea, Bangladesh, etc., it has revealed several drawbacks. In addition to the advantages that CLT offers, certain challenges have been identified in the implementation of this approach. Firstly, the prevalence of conflicts in Asian countries hinders the widespread implementation of CLT. Written examinations delay the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in actual teaching and learning, as stated by Dos Santos (2020), Ahn and Kang (2017), and Lee and Lee (2019). Asian education systems continue to heavily emphasize written exams, prioritizing exam success over the development of effective communication skills for both teachers and students.

Thus, initially, the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) may not appear to be highly appropriate for teaching English as a mandatory subject in Asian schools. However, when considering the primary objective of second language acquisition, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) aligns with its principles by fulfilling students' communicative output demands and motivating them to actively participate in CLT activities. The tensions arising from the disparity between the efficacy of CLT and its practical application are responsible for its failure and delayed implementation. Furthermore, despite the awareness among both educators and learners regarding the efficacy of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), there exists a lack of confidence in its practical implementation. There are several reasons for this, including a lack of knowledge about CLT (Dos Santos, 2016, 2017; Abrejo et al., 2019), insufficient incentives for teachers (Ozsevik, 2010), a scarcity of authentic materials (Tomlimson, 2001), students' hesitations and time limitations (Walia, 2012), the language and cultural backgrounds of learners (Dos Santos, 2020), and the large class sizes (Weiner, 2012; Weiner & Jerome, 2016).

The introduction of something novel invariably faces challenges stemming from various facets. Specifically, students in Asian countries, particularly those with a rich cultural heritage, tend to purposefully delay participating in CLT activities more than learners from Western countries. The attitude is a crucial determinant in the successful implementation of CLT. While both educators and learners exhibit a favorable disposition towards Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), its actual execution encounters various challenges in diverse contexts. One would see it as admiring a stunning outfit, although it need alterations to properly conform to her physique. In Western countries, students engage in activities such as visiting factories, conversing with company presidents, and participating in real-life conversations to enhance their language skills and acquire knowledge.

However, in Eastern countries, these opportunities for real-world experiences are limited and more challenging to arrange within educational institutions. There is a greater emphasis on researching the

teacher's perspective rather than analyzing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) from the learners' viewpoint. As a result, there is a shortage of knowledge to determine which teaching approach is best suitable for the students. Natividad and Batang (2018) highlight that learners exhibit enhanced learning outcomes when engaged in collaborative tasks and spoken exercises that involve practical application.

Nevertheless, educators lacking a comprehensive understanding and expertise in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are unable to effectively utilize the benefits of the CLT approach. Furthermore, there exists opposition towards CLT. According to their assertion, the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach prioritizes fluency over accuracy, which is considered unfavorable for language learning. This is supported by Nunan (1989), who notes that learners tend to focus more on understanding the meaning rather than the grammatical structures. The majority of university students have prior experience in studying grammar, vocabulary, and isolated skills during their secondary education (Dey, 2021). Consequently, when exposed to new teaching techniques that prioritize communication, they may become disoriented and lose motivation. Another contributing component to the difficulty is the choice of materials. The majority of materials in universities lack the contemporary CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) approach, which poses challenges for professors when creating CLT activities. Authentic materials provide learners with advantages, while the absence of suitable materials can impact the efficiency of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Obtaining consent from the authorities and making adjustments to the curriculum are necessary steps in transitioning to CLT teaching material, which is a challenging process.

In Western countries, the availability of real materials is more abundant compared to Eastern countries. Therefore, in order to align with Eastern culture, teachers must carefully and astutely choose relevant materials. In addition to improper content, teachers who are well-versed in traditional teaching approaches such as Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) lack confidence in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) due to a lack of training in CLT courses. Some individuals refuse to adopt the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach because they are resistant to altering their traditional teaching methods. Meanwhile, a small number argue that inadequate compensation does not provide sufficient motivation for teachers to implement new teaching approaches such as CLT in their practice. The extent to which the target language is another concerning issue is uncertain. Teachers have challenges when attempting to exclusively employ English in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities, particularly in large classes with significant level disparities. This approach might potentially de-motivate lower-level students, while excessive usage of the students' native language (L1) may result in boredom among higher-level students.

Consequently, teachers must exercise caution while planning and organizing exercises prior to a task, ensuring that they provide suitable tasks that promote students' ability to communicate effectively. The disadvantages of implementing CLT can be attributed to various factors, which have a negative impact. These factors include large classroom size (Saengboon, 2002; Iwashita & Ngoc, 2012; Weiner, 2012; Weiner & Jerome, 2016), the beliefs of teachers and students, low motivation (Iwashita & Ngoc, 2012; Pham, 2007; Dos Santos, 2020), english pragmatics in applied linguistics (Dey, 2023), examination format (Zhang, 2006), materials (Jung & Norton, 2002; Tomlimson, 2001), time limitations (Walia, 2012), cultural background (Huang & Yang, 2018), and a lack of CLT knowledge (Dos Santos, 2016, 2017; Abrejo et al., 2019).

Recommendation for effectively utilizing the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) in the instruction of English as a second language within a university setting

According to the study provided, the author proposes some implications of CLT in the university setting, taking into account its advantages and shortcomings.

First and foremost, contemporary textbooks incorporate novel pedagogical approaches in their layout and substance. Teachers proficient in CLT can utilize the resources to design interactive classroom activities such as problem-solving tasks, interviews, role-plays, discussions, simulations, or information gap exchanges. Initially, students may encounter numerous challenges, but they will quickly become accustomed to practical application and enhance their ability to communicate effectively. Furthermore, university students, who possess a more extensive range of knowledge compared to other educational levels, are able to readily adjust and make valuable contributions to CLT sessions. Nunan (1989) defines authentic content as any material that has not been purposefully created for the aim of language instruction.

In order to effectively learn a language, it is important to utilize authentic materials that offer genuine information. These materials should be written by native authors and consist of real-life reading and listening material. By doing so, learners will be able to comprehend and apply their linguistic and sociolinguistic abilities in the classroom and in their future professional environments. Due to technological advancements, particularly the internet, educators may readily access genuine resources both online and in the physical world. Gaining an understanding of cultures through genuine materials is vital as it enhances students' knowledge and serves as a valuable preparation for their assimilation into unfamiliar cultural environments they may encounter throughout their travels. Hence, students can derive solace and a sense of familiarity whether venturing to foreign nations or engaging in English-speaking job environments, as the actual circumstances are not markedly dissimilar to what they encounter in their university classes.

Furthermore, teachers can utilize two primary modes of communication, as outlined by Littlewood (1981), depending on the English proficiency of the students. These modes include implementing functional communication activities to enhance specific language skills or functions, as well as organizing social interaction activities to create conversation or discussion tasks that necessitate a deeper understanding of the language. Consequently, teachers have the ability to impart new knowledge through both implicit and explicit methods, fostering a conducive learning environment for their students. This approach makes the teaching and learning process more engaging compared to a traditional teacher-centered approach. Furthermore, regarding the teacher's role in a CLT class, it is imperative for teachers to adaptively use CLT in their classes and concentrate on specific facets of communicative competence at every given moment. It is important for students to acquire a wide range of abilities rather of solely focusing on verbal communication inside the course (Dos Santos, 2020). Hence, educators need to exhibit adaptability in the execution of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach.

Furthermore, it is crucial to ensure that the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach is tailored appropriately for different classes. For instance, English major classes should have lessons that are specifically designed to enhance particular skills such as listening, speaking, reading, or writing. Additionally, these classes may also incorporate integrated subjects like translation or interpretation, as well as English for specific purposes such as business English or English for engineers. On the other hand, non-major classes should place greater emphasis on developing communicative competence, with a primary focus on enhancing speaking abilities. This is because the desired outcome for these classes prioritizes fluency over accuracy, unlike in major classes. Furthermore, according to Holliday (1994), a method is

considered suitable if it is both responsive and adaptable to any classroom setting. Thus, teachers who possess a sufficient understanding of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) take into account the practical setting, learners' needs, and the prescribed curriculum to select appropriate communicative activities for their courses.

The information gap is a highly favored activity in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as it engages students in authentic scenarios that need them to utilize their language knowledge to exchange desired information. To engage in a fruitful discussion, students utilize their inter-language repertoire, consisting of vocabulary and grammar, as well as communication methods, in order to acquire and convey knowledge to others. Jigsaw is a form of information gap. Additionally, there are various other activities related to the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, including puzzles, games, interviews, surveys, map reading, giving instructions or directions, engaging in discussions to reach a final conclusion, and identifying differences, among others. These activities can be modified by teachers to teach various abilities, rather than solely focusing on speaking from the start. According to many linguists, one of the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is that linguistic proficiency and communicative competence should not be considered as separate components (Savignon, 1997).

According to Brown (2014), all communication-related skills are significant. Furthermore, it is important for teachers to prioritize the study of language form, as students' limited language knowledge hinders their progress and has a detrimental impact on the precision of their language skills (Harley & Swain, 1984; Spada & Lightbown, 1989). Hence, it is imperative to incorporate both implicit and explicit form-focused instruction as well as meaning-focused instruction in order to enhance students' language proficiency and utilization. During the initial stages of CLT's development, several educators mistakenly believed that teaching in the CLT method entailed removing grammar (Thompson, 1996). Thompson further suggests that CLT enables teachers to teach grammar in a distinct manner, where learners analyze the conversation or text initially and comprehend the functioning of grammar. In contemporary times, numerous books incorporate grammatical exercises within reading activities, such as "Life" by National Geographic or "Introduction to English as a Second Language" by Cambridge.

Teachers find it advantageous as these materials incorporate speaking exercises for every subsection of a subject. Teachers have the ability to adapt and create these activities to match the English proficiency levels of their pupils. Moreover, the input must be substantial in size. Teachers need not be concerned that pupils cannot thrive in CLT lessons without ample feedback. Students possessing a developed cognitive capacity and an extensive understanding of the world will readily assimilate into university-level discussions. Initially, they may exhibit shyness and be reluctant to participate, but through explicit guidance and encouragement from teachers, they will gradually become accustomed to this approach and demonstrate noticeable progress in due course. Furthermore, genuine material can be derived from other discourse sources, such as language spoken by teachers, classmates, multimedia, web videos, and other similar sources. Doughty and Long (2003) state that "realistic samples of discourse demonstrate the achievements of both native and non-native speakers in completing specific tasks" (p. 61).Consequently, learners have the ability to enhance their input and develop their language skills naturally through Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) exercises. An issue frequently encountered is that the actual material may not be appropriate for all pupils due to their varying degrees of English proficiency.

In order to address this problem, Brandl (2019) proposes that teachers use their time to "identifying appropriate resources for materials and creating learning tasks that complement the materials and facilitate

the learning process" (p.23). Moreover, it is essential that the information is easily understandable as participants in a conversation may encounter challenges if they are unable to comprehend what their counterparts are expressing. Brandl (2019) proposes the utilization of 'elaborating input', a strategy akin to the techniques mentioned by Doughty and Long (2003), which native speakers employ to adapt discourse in order to effectively connect with non-native speakers. These strategies encompass several techniques such as 'confirmation checks', 'comprehension checks', utilization of body language, employing modified language through visual representations, repeating information, and speaking at a slower pace. Furthermore, it is imperative to optimize the utilization of the English language within the classroom. Allowing students to utilize English to the fullest extent in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) lessons has the potential to yield numerous advantages. However, in a higher level English class, teachers modify their Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities by taking into account certain factors. These factors include providing clear guidelines and instructions, setting a positive example for their students, and establishing rules regarding the use of the native language (L1) in second language (L2) classes.

One such rule is not allowing students to switch back and forth between languages during CLT activities (Brandl, 2019). Prior to engaging in CLT exercises, teachers might furnish students with fundamental vocabulary or grammar that will be beneficial in subsequent activities and enhance clarity. Teachers can utilize their first language (L1) to assess their comprehension. Thorough preparation is essential for pupils to adequately prepare for conversing in imperfect English. Furthermore, contemporary pupils frequently rely on Google translation when they lack the motivation to read or comprehend numerous unfamiliar words. Conversing naturally becomes challenging when pupils are required to engage in translation during the discourse. Consequently, it is vital for both educators and learners to meticulously contemplate pre-task tasks as a means of establishing fundamental groundwork for the primary job. Following the completion of primary tasks, educators can provide feedback and assist students in identifying errors and enhancing their proficiency in the English language. The impact of negative feedback, which involves error correction, and positive feedback, which validates the accuracy of a student's performance, extends to both teachers and learners. Therefore, teachers should approach the act of providing feedback with careful consideration. Lyster and Ranta (1997) identify recasts as a commonly used form of feedback, where teachers accurately repeat their students' errors.

Brandl (2019) suggests that 'direct corrective feedback', which involves teachers providing meta-linguistic clues or clarification requests, is an effective method for students to correct their mistakes. The teacher endeavors to prevent pupils from experiencing disappointment during their initial performance, as it might induce anxiety and lead to the development of a linguistic barrier against English communication. Teachers select appropriate methods of providing feedback to students based on the actual classroom context, aiming to assist students in identifying their errors and fostering a willingness to learn from both their own mistakes and those of their peers. Activities for the CLT class should encompass a diverse range of options.

As stated by Courtney (2020), activities in the classroom can be enjoyable, significant, engaging, and regularly utilized to establish and sustain a communicative culture (p.21). He presents several activities specifically designed for Vietnamese contexts, such as 'Draw a dream house' (which promotes group collaboration and fosters rapport), 'I'm not just a number' (which emphasizes the sequencing of question words and explores classmates' lives), 'Paragraph Pass' (a writing activity that prompts students to add sentences and focuses on grammar structure and idea comprehension), and 'Market Place' (which

encourages students to share their own ideas). The author of the article provides explicit and systematic guidelines, along with the introduction of necessary resources, reasoning, and tasks for each action. Furthermore, the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach can be applied to instruct and acquire various skills, beyond just speaking. This allows educators to employ CLT techniques for reading, such as utilizing jigsaw or gap information activities. Similarly, CLT can be utilized for writing by incorporating additional ideas for a given topic.

Additionally, CLT can be employed for reading and listening by integrating a combination of listening and speaking activities that pertain to a specific situation. Implicitly, grammar can be imparted through the acquisition of other skills. Authorities should prioritize the enhancement of teachers' teaching methods by establishing comprehensive offline and online training programs. Teachers are adept at comprehending the content and acquiring knowledge of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and efficiently designing Language and Communication Technology (LCT) activities. Furthermore, a university education for pedagogic students should incorporate contemporary language teaching methodologies such as the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. In the foreseeable future, teachers who possess expertise in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) have the ability to transform conventional classes into CLT classes, thereby enhancing their students' communicative competency. Consequently, university students' achievements might fulfill the requirement for social and global communication.

Conclusion

As to Larsen-Freeman (2000), it is important to note that methods should not be regarded as strict guidelines for classroom conduct that must be enforced upon teachers. Instead, they should be utilized to enhance a teacher's range of methods and offer a means for professional development (p. x). Hence, this comprehensive analysis of CLT encompasses its various components, challenges in its use, and the perspectives of both educators and students towards it. The objective is to provide a broad perspective and motivate English instructors to incorporate this approach inside their university setting. Every method possesses unique advantages and disadvantages, and its practical implementation may give rise to challenges in specific circumstances. CLT, with its objectives, primary attributes, and fundamental principles, is an effective method for enhancing the communication proficiency of university students. The successful application of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) can provide numerous advantages for both teachers and students.

This approach effectively utilizes various facets of language proficiency and general knowledge to develop sociolinguistic and strategic competence. Throughout the history of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), this approach has encountered numerous challenges stemming from contextual conflicts, divergent beliefs amongst teachers and students, insufficient training in CLT, and various other minor concerns. The author aims to consolidate research on CLT in universities to enhance university teachers' understanding of CLT and encourage them to confidently enroll in training courses focused on devising CLT activities for their classes. These applications of the CLT approach in the university context are proposals that require further investigation to evaluate their efficiency. The essay proposes that future research on CLT should prioritize analyzing it from students' perspectives in order to gain new insights and develop more effective strategies for adopting CLT in ESL programs, especially in the Asian context.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Abahussain, M. O. (2016). *Implementing Communicative Language Teaching Method in Saudi Arabia: Challenges Faced by Formative Year Teachers in State Schools*. (PhD). University of Stirling, Scotland.

Abrejo, B., Sartaj, S., & Memon, S. (2019). English Language Teaching through Communicative Approach: A Qualitative Study of Public Sector Colleges of Hyderabad, Sindh. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *10*(5), 43–49. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.10n.5p.43

Ahn, S. Y., & Kang, H.-S. (2017). South Korean university students' perceptions of different English varieties and their contribution to the learning of English as a foreign language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *38*(8), 712-725. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1242595.

Al-Nasser, A. S. (2015). Problems of English language acquisition in Saudi Arabia: An exploratory-cum-remedial study. *Theory and Practice inLanguage Studies*, *5*(8), 1612- 1619.

Alsalmi, A. A. (2014). *Challenges confronting teachers of English language*. (Master). Taif University, Taif.

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Batawi, G. H. (2007). *Exploring the use of CLT in Saudi Arabia*. (Master). American University of Sharjah, Sharjah.

Borg, S. (2017). Teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. In *The Routledge handbook of language awareness*, (pp. 93-109): Routledge.

Brandl, K. (2019). *Communicative Language Teaching in Action: Putting Principles to Work. Pearson Education, Inc.*

Brandl, K., & Bauer, G. (2002). Students' Perceptions of Novice Teaching Assistants' Use of the Target Language in Beginning Foreign Language Classes: Preliminary Investigation. In W. Davis, J. Smith, & R. Smith (Eds), *Ready To Teach: Graduate Teaching Assistants Prepare for Today and for Tomorrow* (pp.128-138). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press

Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (6th ed.). White Plains, NY Pearson Education.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistic*, *1*(1), 1-47.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. Mouton.

Courtney, D. (2020). Activities to Activate and Maintain a Communicative Classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 58*(1), 10-21.

Dey, M. (2021). Psychological processes in language learning and teaching: Scoping review and future research directions. *Journal of Psychological Perspective*, *3*(2), 105-110.

Dey, M. (2023). The primary characteristics of English pragmatics in Applied Linguistics: Exploring the Key Features of English Pragmatics in Applied Linguistics. *Inverge Journal of Social Sciences*, *2*(2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1022/ijss.v2i2.25

Dey, M., Amelia, R., & Herawati, Y. W. (2023). Challenging the'Native Speaker'Ideal: The Impact of Native Speakerism on Language Education. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, *17*(2), 232-245.

Dos Santos, L. M. (2016). Foreign language teachers' professional development through peer observation programme. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(10), 39-46. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n10p39.

Dos Santos, L. M. (2017). How do teachers make sense of peer observation professional development in an Urban School. *International Education Studies*, *10*(1), 255-265. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v10n1p255.

Dos Santos., L. M. (2019). Science lessons for non-science university undergraduate students: An application of visual-only video teaching strategy. *Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, *14*(1), 308–311. https://doi.org/10.36478/jeasci.2019.308.311.

Dos Santos, L. M. (2020). The Discussion of Communicative Language Teaching Approach in Language Classrooms, Journal of Education and e-Learning Research, 2020. *Journal of Education and E-Learning*, *7*(2), 104-109.

Doughty, C., & Long, M. H. (2003). *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Blackwell Publishing.

Harley, B., & Swain, M. (1984). The interlanguage of immersion and its implications for second language teaching. In A. Davies, C. Criper, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), *Interlanguage* (pp. 291-311). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Huang, S.-H., & Yang, L.-C. (2018). Teachers' Needs in the Advancement of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Taiwan. *TESOL International Journal*, *13*(1), 100-117.

Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1971). *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Iwashita, N., & Ngoc, K. M. (2012). A comparison of learners' and teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching at two universities in Vietnam. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, *7*, 25-49.

Jung, S. K., & Norton, B. (2002). Language planning in Korea: the new elementary English program. In Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 245-265). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Kachru, B. (1992). World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, *25*, 1–14.

Kennedy, P. (2002). Learning cultures and learning styles: Myth-understandings about adult (Hong Kong) Chinese learners. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *21*(5), 430-445. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370210156745.

Kiato, S. K., & Kiato, K. (1996). Testing Communicative Competence. *The TESOL Internet Journal*, *2*(5).

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Lee, J. S., & Lee, K. (2019). Perceptions of English as an international language by Korean English-major and non-English-major students. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *40*(1), 76-89.

Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(4), 677-703.Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. https://doi.org/19.10.1017/S0272263197001034.

Natividad, M. R. A., & Batang, B. L. (2018). Students' Perceptual Learning Styles and Attitudes toward Communicative Language Teaching.

TESOL International Journal, *13*(4), 104-120.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*, 279–295.

Ozsevik, Z. (2010). *The use of communicative language teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL teachers' perceived difficulties in implementing CLT in Turkey*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illiois at Urbana-Champaign, USA.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.

Pham, H. H. (2007). Communicative language teaching: unity within diversity. *ELT Journal*, *61*(3), 193-201.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Riggenbach, H., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). Promoting Oral Communication Skills. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 125-136). Los Angeles: University of California.

Richards, J. C. (2006), *Communicative language teaching today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Savignon, S. J. (1997). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice* (2nd ed.). Sydney, NSW: McGraw-Hill.

Saengboon, S. (2002). *Beliefs of Thai EFL teachers about communicative language teaching*. (Doctoral dissertation). Indiana University Bloomington, USA.

Schulz, R.A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Learners' and teachers' view on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, *29*(3), 333-364.

Sawalmeh, M. H., & Dey, M. (2023). Globalization and the increasing demand for spoken English teachers. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *4*(2).

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1989). Intensive ESL programs in Quebec primary schools. *TESL Canada Journal, 7*, 11-32.

Souriyavongsa, T., Rany, S., Abidin, M. J. Z., & Mei, L. L. (2013). Factors causes students low English language learning: A case study in the National University of Laos. *International Journal of English Language Education*, *1*(1), 179-192.

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

Tomlinson, B. (2001). Humanising the Coursebook. *Humanising Language Teaching*, *3*(5).

Walia, D. N. (2012). Traditional teaching methods vs. CLT: A study. *Frontiers of language and teaching*, *3*(1), 125-131.

Weiner, L. (2012). *The future of our schools: Teachers unions and social justice*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.

Weiner, L., & Jerome, D. (2016). *Urban teaching: The essentials* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

West, A. J. (2016). Adaptation of Communicative Language Teaching Methodology to an English Textbook for English Language Learning of NIDA Students. *PASAA*, *52*, 25-52

Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zhang, J. L. (2006, November 11-13). *The ecology of communicative language teaching: Reflecting on the Singapore experience* [Paper presentation]. Annual CELEA International Conference: Innovating English Teaching: Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Other Approaches, China English Language Education Association (CELEA) and Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China.