

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURE
(GRADUATE PROGRAM)

**PERCEPTION AND CLASSROOM PRACTICE OF
COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING BY HIGH
SCHOOL EFL TEACHERS AND LEARNERS: THE CASE OF
SOME SELECTED HIGH SCHOOLS IN ADDIS ABABA.**

BY:
BEYENE GEBRU

JUNE, 2008
ADDIS ABABA

**PERCEPTION AND CLASSROOM PRACTICE OF
COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING BY HIGH
SCHOOL EFL TEACHERS AND LEARNERS: THE CASE OF
SOME SELECTED HIGH SCHOOLS IN ADDIS ABABA.**

BY:

BEYENE GEBRU

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
(GRADUATE PROGRAM)**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A
FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)**

**JUNE, 2008
ADDIS ABABA**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURE

**PERCEPTION AND CLASSROOM PRACTICE OF
COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING BY HIGH
SCHOOL EFL TEACHERS AND LEARNERS: THE CASE OF
SOME SELECTED HIGH SCHOOLS IN ADDIS ABABA.**

BY:
BEYENE GEBRU

APPROVED BY EXAMINING BOARD

ADVISOR

SIGNATURE

EXAMINER

SIGNATURE

EXAMINER

SIGNATURE

JUNE, 2008
ADDIS ABABA

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned graduate student, hereby declare that this thesis is my original work, and that all sources of the materials used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Beyene Gebru

Signature _____

Advisor: Ato Amanuel Gebru (Ass.Prof)

Place:- Institute of Language Studies

Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa

Date of Submission: 09/06/2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and for most, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Ato Amanuel Gebru, for his invaluable and constructive comments, suggestions and feedback. Without his constructive comments and suggestions, this study would not have been successful. I am very much indebted to the kindness, patience, and warm-welcome he has shown me in the course of time.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my beloved wife, Hirut Philipos, for being such a dedicated person in providing all her support and love during the course of my studies despite a number of prevailing challenges. With out her it would have been much tougher task to achieve the goals I set out for my self.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the school's principals I am working in, my colleagues who offered their support in one way or the other and those participants in the questionnaires, classroom observations and interviews who contributed a lot for the success of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS	PAGES
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	II
LIST OF TABLES	V
LIST OF APPENDICES	VI
ABSTRACT	VII

CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3 Objectives of the Study	4
1.4 Significance of the Study	5
1.5 Scope of the Study	5
1.6 Limitations of the Study.....	6
1.7 Abbreviations Used.....	6

CHAPTER TWO- REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Trends in Language Teaching Methods.....	7
2.2. Communicative Language Teaching	8
2.2.1 Theoretical Tenets of Communicative Language Teaching.....	9
2.2.2 Communicative Competence	11
2.2.2.1 Grammatical Competence.....	12
2.2.2.2 Sociolinguistic Competence.....	12
2.2.2.3 Discourse Competence	13
2.2.2.4 Strategic Competence	13

2.2.3 Principles of Communicative Language Teaching	14
2.3 Perception and Classroom Practice	15
2.3.1 Teachers' Perception of Communicative Language Teaching	15
2.3.2 Learners' Perception of Communicative Language Teaching	16
2.3.3 Classroom Practice in Communicative Language Teaching	17
2.3.4 Classroom Activities in Communicative Language Teaching	19
2.3.4.1 Functional communicative Activities	19
2.3.4.2 Social Interaction Activities	20
2.3.5 Ways of Effecting Communicative Classroom Activities	21
2.3.5.1 Group Work	22
2.3.5.2 Pair Work	22
2.4 Teachers and Learners in CLT	23
2.4.1 The Role of the Teacher	24
2.4.2 The Role of the Learner	25

CHAPTER THREE- METHODS OF THE STUDY

3.1 Participants	26
3.2 Sampling Design	26
3.3 Development of Research Instruments	27
3.3.1 Questionnaire	27
3.3.2 Classroom Observation	28
3.3.3 Interview	29
3.4 Data Collection Procedure	29
3.5 Methods of Data Analysis	30

CHAPTER FOUR- PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

4.1 Analysis of Teachers' Perception of CLT	33
4.1.1 Analysis of Conceptual Perspective	34
4.1.2 Analysis of Students' Learning Perspective	36
4.1.3 Analysis of Instructional Perspective	38
4.1.4 Analysis of Perspective on the Importance of Grammar	40
4.1.5 Analysis of Perspective on Error Correction and Assessment	42
4.1.6 Analysis of Perspective on Teachers' Role	44
4.1.7 Analysis of Perspective on learners' Role	46
4.2 Analysis of Teachers' Responses for Classroom Practice	48
4.3 Analysis of Learners' Perception of CLT.....	51
4.4 Analysis of Learners' Response for Classroom Practice.....	57
4.5 Analysis of Classroom Observations and Interviews	60

CHAPTER FIVE- CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions	66
5.2 Recommendations	68

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	71
APPENDIX-A.....	74
APPENDIX- B.....	82
APPENDIX- C	88
APPENDIX- D	89
APPENDIX- E.....	90

LIST OF TABLES

PAGES

Table 4.1.1: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Conceptual Perspective	35
Table 4.1.2: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Students' Learning Perspective	37
Table 4.1.3: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Instructional Perspective	39
Table 4.1.4: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for the Importance of Grammar	41
Table 4.1.5: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Error Correction and Assessment	43
Table 4.1.6: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Teachers' Role	45
Table 4.1.7: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Learners' Role	47
Table 4.2: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Classroom Practice.....	49
Table 4.3: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Students' Questionnaire	52
Table 4.4: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Learners' Responses for Classroom Practice	58
Table 4.5.1: Time Framework for Labeling Scales for Classroom Observation	61
Table 4.5.2: Descriptive Statistics of Classroom Observation (Frequency, Percentage and Mean).....	62

LIST OF APPENDICES

PAGES

Appendix-A: Teachers' Questionnaire	74
Appendix- B: Students' Questionnaire.....	82
Appendix- C: Classroom Activities Observation Checklist	88
Appendix- D: Interview Guide for Teachers.....	89
Appendix- E: Interview Guide for Learners	90

ABSTRACT

The main purposes of this study were to explore high school EFL teachers' and learners' perception of CLT and to examine the degree they practice the CLT principles in their entire classes in Ethiopian High School context.

The data were collected through questionnaires (for both teacher and learner), classroom observation, and interviews (for both teachers and learners). A questionnaire (consisting of seven thematic groups) of 75 items for 26 teachers and of 47 items for 100 learners (who were randomly selected from three government high schools); classroom observations on 10 teachers and interview with 10 teachers and 15 learners(out of the whole subjects of the questionnaires) were administered in March and April 2008 .

The overall findings of this study showed that the majority of teachers (80.41 %) and more than half (62.33 %) of learners under the study had mildly high levels of perception about CLT tenets. However, the study conversely reveals that there is a clear mismatch between what teachers and learners perceive about CLT and what they actually practice in EFL context.

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The teaching of English as a foreign language in Ethiopian educational settings can be associated with the introduction of modern education in the country. In Ethiopia modern education was introduced at the turn of the 20th century and it officially commenced in 1908 with the opening of Menelik II School in Addis Ababa, after a long history of church education in the country (Diribsa, et al 1999). The history of foreign language teaching, therefore, is traced back to early 20th century.

It was French that was first taught as a foreign language by native teachers. During the Italian occupation, the Italian government had attempted to introduce its own education system and Italian was taught for a short period of time. Later on after the Italians left the country in 1942, the British teachers started the school and English had come to the floor (Ibid).

English is now a language that students learn in all levels of Ethiopian schools- from elementary to university levels. It seems for this reason that ‘English’ is delivered as a distinctive discipline in all levels of the schools and it is a medium of other subjects like biology, physics, chemistry and the like in all secondary and tertiary levels and in some regions of the country at elementary level. In addition to being a service language, it is the language for international trade, commerce and communication, international and some national organization.

Considering the amount English language contributes, “The present Ethiopian government has placed teaching and learning of the English language high on the agenda to ensure that Ethiopia will play active and important role in the world political and economic activities” (Yonas, 2003:23). In addition, greater consideration is being given

to English language teachers so as to qualify and make them efficient enough with regard to the implementation of communicative language teaching principles. Therefore, different types of training (pre-service and in service), seminars and workshops are being given in the country. The fact this attention is given is that communicative language teaching (CLT) is an effective approach to the second/foreign language instruction (Kim 1999).

However, when we see the teaching of English as a foreign language in Ethiopian educational settings we can observe many problems. These problems could be related to applying the principles of CLT (Hailom 1982) by teachers or lack of training and retraining in CLT or misconceptions about CLT (Yonas 2003). Or it could be related, as many teachers complain, to learners' incompetence to communicate in English. Therefore, it is important to study the perception and classroom practice of CLT by EFL teachers and students to address the problems and to recommend possible solution.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Language teaching has undergone a number of phases in using different approaches and methods as a result of continuous development and change of knowledge in the world. Among the many methods, CLT- whose origins are supposed to be found in the changes that took place in the British language teaching tradition from the late 1960s, has expanded throughout the world since the mid 1970s in a wider scope (Richards and Rodgers 1986). Ethiopia is a country not out side this scope.

In recent years, global consideration is being given to teacher preparation on CLT in the belief that the key to success (to respond to the needs for language teaching that is appropriate for the communicative needs of the learners) is the education of classroom teachers, and teachers of English in many countries have been encouraged to adopt an approach known as CLT (Savignon, 2002). This is also true in Ethiopia and it seems for this reason that teaching materials are meant to be designed on the principle of CLT. This due attention is given because of the fact that CLT is a currently recognized approach that

is a generally accepted norm in the field (Brown 1994:77). However, since the concept of CLT is a western idea and method, there might be a possibility for 'CLT' to be ill-suited to Ethiopian contexts for some reasons- e.g. large class size, students' incompetence to communicate with the language. A lot about CLT and the problems seen in implementing it has also been said by scholars particularly in educational contexts where English is a foreign language (Widdowson 1979, Brumfit and Johnson 1979, Larsen-Freeman 1986, Byrne 1986). It should, therefore, be investigated if these ill-suited circumstances prevail in Ethiopian schools in line with the perception and practice of EFL teachers and students of CLT. To address this problem, Hailom (1982) reveals that there exist a number of problems in teaching English as a foreign language in applying the principles of CLT in the actual classroom situation in Ethiopia. Furthermore, it is many teachers' complaint that many Ethiopian students are incapable of communicating in English in 'language teaching classrooms' even at the higher level of education. But do these problems exist by now? And what are some major causes of these problems (if they exist)? To find answers for these and other related questions, certain investigations should be made.

In addition to Hailom (1982), certain other local studies were conducted on CLT and related concepts. For example Yemane (2007), Berhanu (1999) and Lakachew (2003) can be mentioned. Their studies focused either on English language teachers' perception and classroom practice of CLT or on areas related to teachers' attitude and practice of communicative language teaching or areas related to investigating the implementation of CLT in the current ELT materials which none of them tried to incorporate learners aspect which must not be neglected. However, Nunan (1986:1) argues that attention to learners and their perceptions of learning process is of paramount importance in effecting an educational innovation and says, "It is only through sensitivity to the learners and their perception of the learning process along a willingness to consult and negotiate, that curriculum innovations are likely to be effective."

Studying only teachers' perception and classroom practice based on the notion of CLT principles is, therefore, not much enough to say some about the implementation of CLT. This is because the concept of teaching and learning and the practice of teachers and

learners are inseparable and two faces of a coin. In addition, the learners desire to communicate something is a matter in their activities/practices (Harmer 2001:85). Therefore, this study tries to investigate both teachers' and learners' perceptions about CLT and their practical application CLT principles in EFL classroom with particular reference to three government high schools in Addis Ababa namely Ginbot 20 Secondary School, Lafto Secondary School and Firehiwot Secondary School –all of which practice EFL teaching with out plasma television which in turn is convenient to observe the direct teachers' and learners' classroom practice and interaction.

Therefore, the following research questions are posed.

1. How do high school EFL teachers and learners perceive CLT and its principles?
2. Do high school EFL teachers and students practice CLT in EFL classrooms in the selected high schools?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This study investigates the extent to which CLT and its main principles are welcomed by high school English language teachers and learners and the degree they materialize the principles in real classroom practice in Ethiopian context.

The objectives of the present study, therefore, are three-fold. Accordingly:-

1. It investigates the overall high school EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions of CLT.
2. It examines how often they practice the CLT principles in their entire classes.
3. It tries to identify what gaps there might exist between CLT principles and actual classroom practices employed by teachers and learners.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study are expected to have the following significance:

1. Most importantly, this study is expected to provide methodological insights and information to EFL teachers which are helpful for them to implement the principles of communicative language teaching appropriately.
2. In addition, it is expected to provide pedagogical contributions and serve those who wish to develop curriculum and design ELT materials as a reference to incorporate CLT principles with the actual classroom practices.
3. It will also stimulate the possible other researchers to conduct similar or further studies and serve as an initial work.

1.5 Scope of the Study

This study, as stated earlier, was delimited to address the perception and classroom practice of CLT by high school EFL teachers and learners. Its conceptual scope was, therefore, confined to assessing what kind of perception teachers and learners have about CLT as an instructional method and if so how often they try to materialize the CLT principles in their actual EFL classes. It is felt that demonstrating all aspects of CLT method could not be carried out within a short period of time so the study is delimited to raise only some features of the communicative approach to language teaching

1.6 Limitations of the Study

This study is believed to have certain constraints. Primarily, it is worth keeping in mind that the sample size of the study was limited to only 26 teachers and 100 students selected from three schools. This could often create danger on the generalizability of the study. It would have been better and more effective if a good number of schools and participants were included in the study to gather sufficient information to obtain better results. Moreover, being observed or investigated could be a stressful situation. In this regard, the teachers as well as the students in each class are closely observed and recorded. Hence the presence of the observer could cause a certain amount of limitation to the study. The researcher also felt that demonstrating all aspects of CLT method could not be carried out within a short period of time and would require an intensive investigation to reflect all aspects of CLT. Therefore, the instruments that were used to gather data were limited to raise only some features of the communicative approach to language teaching.

1.7 Abbreviations Used

CLT- Communicative Language Teaching

CLL- Communicative Language Learning

EFL- English as a Foreign Language

ESL- English as a Second Language

ELT- English Language Teaching

NOE-National Organization for Examination

MOE-Ministry of Education

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Trends in Language Teaching Methods

It is inevitably convincing that, among the many factors that can influence language learning/teaching, teaching methods play a significant role. The methods language teachers employ have some effect on motivation towards the learning of a particular language (Harmer 1991:5).

It is to suit the students need, motivation or overall learners' language learning process that language educators have been in a great toil and agony to solve the problems of language teaching by giving due attention to teaching methods (Stern 1983:452). To that end, confirming the developmental change taking place in language teaching methods, he states:

During the sixties and seventies several developments indicate a shift in language pedagogy away from a single method concept as the main approach to language teaching. These developments deserve our attention because they indicate a valuable new direction of thought in language pedagogy: to overcome the narrowness, rigidity, and imbalance which have resulted from conceptualizing language teaching purely or mainly through the concept of method. The scope of the developments to consider is varied (pp.477).

Regarding the changes language teaching has seen in line with ideas about syllabus design and methodology in the past 50 years, Richards (ND: 6) groups trends in to three phases as:

- ❖ Phase 1: *Traditional approach (up to 1960s)*
- ❖ Phase 2: *Classical communicative language teaching (1970-1990)*
- ❖ Phase 3: *Current communicative language teaching (late 19s to present)*

In harmony with Richards (ND), Gatbonton and Segalowitz (2005) categorize the history of language teaching in to two trends: the first trend sees grammatical rules (the

underlying language system) as primary, and the other sees utterances and texts as primary. The very changes that happened in language teaching methods in the history of language teaching are seen as a reflection of recognition of the kind of proficiency learners need to develop (Richards and Rodgers, 1986).

Scholars like Harmer (1995) and Kumaravadivelu (1991) show that recent trends in second language pedagogy lay greater emphasis on learners and shifting authority away from the teacher and handing it to the students- which is the concern of communicative language teaching (CLT).

2.2. Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative language teaching (CLT) has served the language teaching profession for many years since 1970 (Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Bax, 2003). However, despite the wide use of CLT in schools for the last three decades, claims are still being made that CLT method is not finding its full expression in schools (Richards, ND; Bax, 2003; Thompson, 1996) in that practitioners perceive CLT in different ways.

Does CLT mean teaching conversation, neglecting the teaching of grammar or paying much attention on open-ended discussion activities as the main feature of a course? This question is posed because many language teachers consider CLT as if it were a method that focuses only on speaking, role play, or drama and that neglects grammar; thus they are uncertain about what CLT is and are unsure about how to implement it in language classrooms (Thompson, 1996; Gatbonton and Segalowitz, 2005).

As the name implies, any versions of CLT possess that ‘meaning’ is primary and that teaching should center on communicative function rather than mere linguistic knowledge and structural patterns (Brown, 1994; Widdowson, 1979). In other words, social, cultural and pragmatic features of the language should be taught alongside linguistic structures; and knowledge of the target linguistic system must be matched by a practical ability to use the linguistic resources to achieve communicative purpose. This is what is termed as

communicative competence (i.e. the acquisition of both knowledge and the ability for language use) as a goal of language teaching which in turn the current understanding and the central theoretical motto of CLT is (Richards and Rodgers, 2001; Savignon, 2002; Alright, 1979).

It should, therefore, be clear that CLT is not only concerned with oral communication or speaking tasks; rather it is based on the notion of amalgamating the knowledge and use of language as mentioned earlier (or it is accuracy plus fluency to yield appropriacy). Therefore, CLT does not neglect the teaching of grammar; nor has it the notion of excluding language form. Accordingly, Savignon (2002) argues that attention to ‘form’ is necessarily required while its involvement in communicative events is seen as central to language development; and to make meaning clear (Widdowson, 1979); language items are presented in classrooms and practiced as formal structures to sustain the interests of the learners and to establish the structures in the learners’ memory. So we should be clear that communication can not take place without the involvement of grammar or language forms; and grammar teaching has an important place in CLT. Supporting this idea, Savignon (2002:7) says, “Communication can not take place in the absence of structure, or grammar, a set of shared assumptions about how language works, along with willingness of participants to cooperate in the negotiation of meanings.” Therefore, CLT puts balanced treatment and pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language.

2.2.1 Theoretical Tenets of Communicative Language Teaching

The central theoretical concept, as many scholars (Hiep, 2007; Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Savignon, 2002) agree, can be traced back to Hymes (1972) who proposed that knowing a language involves more than knowing a set of grammatical, lexical, and phonological rules. Rather it requires the development of communicative competence. In order to use the language effectively, learners need to develop communicative competence- the ability to use the language appropriately in a given social context. This can mean, as Savignon (2002) explains, that communicative language learning involves

the ability of classroom language learners to interact with other speakers to make meanings as different from their ability to recite dialogues or excel on discrete point test of grammatical knowledge. Besides, Richards and Rodgers (1986:71) describe communicative language teaching as having rich and eclectic theoretical base at the level of language theory. Accordingly, some of the characteristics of the communicative views of language are:

- *Language is a system of expression of meaning.*
- *The primary function of language is for interaction and communication.*
- *The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses.*
- *The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse.*

Regarding the theory of learning, Richards and Rodgers (1986:72) report that little has been written. However, they forward some elements of underlying learning theories which can be revealed in CLT practice. These elements, therefore, are:

- *Activities that involve real communication promote learning.*
- *Activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning (Johnson 1982).*
- *Language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process.*

In line with the ideas raised above, Richards (ND: 23-24) in his work entitled 'Communicative Language Teaching Today' has mentioned several points as language learning principles which are also associated with classroom practice in CLT. The core assumptions are:

- *Second language teaching is facilitated when learners are engaged in interaction and meaningful communication.*
- *Effective classroom learning tasks and exercises provide opportunities for students to negotiate meaning, expand their language resources, notice how language is used, and take part in meaningful intrapersonal exchange.*
- *Meaningful communication results from students processing content that is relevant, purposeful, interesting and engaging.*
- *Communication is a holistic process that often calls upon the use of several language skills or modalities.*
- *Language learning is facilitated both by activities that involve inductive or discovery learning of underlying rules of language use and organization, as well as by those involving language analysis and reflection.*
- *Language learning is a gradual process that involves creative use of language and trial and error. Although errors are a normal product of learning, the ultimate goal of learning is to be able to use the new language both accurately and fluently.*

- *Learners develop their own routes to language learning, progress at different rates, and have different needs and motivations for language learning.*
- *Successful language learning involves the use of effective learning and communication strategies.*
- *The role of the teacher in the language classroom is that of a facilitator, who creates a classroom climate conducive to language learning and provides opportunities for students to use and practice the language and to reflect on language use and language learning.*
- *The classroom is a community where learners learn through collaboration and sharing.*

From all what we have seen so far, CLT is framed by communicative theory of language and language learning which in turn is based on the belief that language learning/teaching should be based on real communication rather than simply learning the vocabulary, grammar and structure of the language- which means the development of communicative competence.

2.2.2 Communicative Competence

Communicative competence according to Hornburger (1989:127-8) is a concept that “...describes the knowledge and ability of individuals for appropriate language use in the communicative events...” which Spolsky(1989) and Romaine (1994) elaborate as specific and varied language related functions i.e. the acquisition of language competence as to when to speak and when not; and as to what to talk and about with whom; when and where, in what manner- what Harmer(1991) termed it as ‘appropriacy’.

By appropriacy, Romaine (1994) explains that though anyone is grammatically competent enough (knowing the underlying rules of grammar), he uses not all grammatical sentences in the same situations. In different circumstances, he may say _ ‘Close the window’, ‘Would you mind closing the window, please?’, ‘Do you think it is cold here?’. Though these sentences are grammatical and convey similar meaning, they differ in their appropriateness for use of particular situation. This is what the concept of ‘communicative competence’ basically is.

Concerning ‘appropriacy’ Harmer (1991:15), when explaining it based on some of governing features, puts the following variables. These are:-

- A. **Setting-** *Where are we when we use language? What situation we are in?*
- B. **Participants-** *Who is taking part in the language exchange?*
- C. **Purpose-** *What is the purpose of the speaker or writer? Is it to invite or to complain? To apologies or to disagree? To explain or to demand?*
- D. **Channel-** *Is the communication face to face or does it take place over the telephone?*
- E. **Topic-** *What are the words? A wedding or particle physics? A child birth or the latest film?*

All these variables of ‘appropriacy’ in turn are some of the elements of communicative competence which influence the communicators in their choice of words. Furthermore, all the variables (factors) discussed so far would lay their references to the key components of communicative competence (grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence) as shall be discussed as follows.

2.2.2.1 Grammatical Competence

It is the aspect of communicative competence which is concerned with a mastery of grammatically correct language (Legutke and Thomas ,1991) or that encompasses knowledge of lexical items and rules of morphology, syntax, sentence grammar semantics, and phonology or a competence with a mastery of linguistic code of language (Brown,1994) .

2.2.2.2 Sociolinguistic Competence

The knowledge of socio-cultural rules of language and of discourse that requires an understanding of social context in which the language is used is termed as ‘socio-linguistic competence’ (Brown, 1994). It is relatively more functional aspect of communication requiring the learners to know the role of the participants, the information they share and the function of the interaction. Furthermore, Brown (1994) explains such a competency as a mastery of speech act conversations, norms of stylistic appropriateness, and the use of language to establish and maintain social relation. The mastery of speech

acts may entail, for example, encoding apology, gratitude, refusal, complement and by far sensitivity to norms associated with turn-taking in conversational interaction, the ability to use appropriate register of the language or the use of language variants to indicate social group membership (pp.88). All these reflections of sociolinguistic competence, according to Brown (1994) suggest that any approach or method the teacher employs should aim at socio-linguistic competence that must then be integrative in nature which the goal of language teaching is to sensitize learners to the social diversity of language rather than to teach them long lists of discrete sentences.

2.2.2.3 Discourse Competence

Discourse competence is a mastery of how to combine grammatical forms and meanings/ encoding and decoding acts/to achieve coherent written and spoken texts in different genres (Legutke and Thomas, 1991; Hornberger, 1989). Describing as a complement of grammatical competence, Brown(1994) explains it as ‘the ability we have to connect sentences in a stretch of discourse and to form a meaningful whole out of a series of utterances’, and by discourse we mean everything from simpler spoken conversation to lengthy written texts(articles, books and the like). In short discourse competence is concerned with inter-sentential relationship while grammatical competence focuses on sentence level grammar.

2.2.2.4 Strategic Competence

The verbal and non-verbal communication strategy, as described by Canale and Swain(1980:30) cited in Brown (1994),is that which can be put in to action when needed to compensate for breakdown at the time of communication caused by performance variable or due to insufficient competence; or it is paraphrased by Savignon (1983:40) in Brown (1994) as “The strategy that one uses to compensate for imperfect knowledge of rules or limiting factors in their application such as fatigue, distraction, and inattention.” Generally, strategic competence is kept as “the competence underlying our ability to make repairs, to cope with, imperfect knowledge, and sustain communication through

‘paraphrase, circumlocution, repetition, hesitation, avoidance and guessing as well as a shift register and style’ ” (Ibid). It is not only ‘compensatory function’ that strategic competence has, according to Brown (1994), but is used to enhance the effectiveness of communication.

2.2.3 Principles of Communicative Language Teaching

It is all agreeable that among the various variables language teachers should know, in order to make curriculum innovation effective, is principles of certain methods. The pedagogical principles of a communicative approach to language teaching are all related in some ways to the theories of language learning as alluded by Richards and Rodgers (1986:72). The summary of the underlying principles of CLT provided by Berns (1990:104) cited in Savignon (2002:6) is listed below.

1. *Language teaching is based on a view of language as communication. That is, language is seen as a social tool that speakers use to make meaning; speakers communicate about something to someone for some purpose, either orally or in writing.*
2. *Diversity is recognized and accepted as part of language development and use in second language learners and users, as it is with first language users.*
3. *A learner’s competence is considered in relative, not in absolute, terms.*
4. *More than one variety of a language is recognized as a viable model for learning and teaching.*
5. *Culture is recognized as instrumental in shaping speakers’ communicative competence, in both their first and subsequent languages.*
6. *No single methodology or fixed set of techniques is prescribed.*
7. *Language use is recognized as serving ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions and is related to the development of learners’ competence in each.*
8. *It is essential that learners be engaged in doing things with language-that is, that they use language for a variety of purposes in all phases of learning.*

In addition to Berns(1990:104), Finocchario and Brumfit’s (1983: 91-3) detailed discussion summarized by Beale (2002:15) is presented as follows:

1. *Teaching is learner-centered and responsive to learners’ need and interests.*
2. *The target language is acquired through interactive communicative use that encourages the negotiation of meaning.*
3. *Genuinely meaningful language use is emphasized, along with unpredictability, risk – taking, and choice-making.*
4. *There is exposure to examples of authentic language from the target language community.*

5. *The formal properties of language are never treated in isolation from use; language forms are always addressed within a communicative context.*
6. *Learners are encouraged to discover the forms and structures of language for themselves.*
7. *There is a whole- language approach in which the four traditional language skills (speaking, listening, reading and writing) are integrated.*

From all the above points, we can summarize that CLT puts much on the learners and language learning (acquisition) is an unpredictable developmental process requiring a communicatively interactive and cooperative negotiation of meanings on the part of the learners.

2.3 Perception and Classroom Practice

Better understanding of a certain teaching method will lead to a kind of teaching/ learning process shaped by that perceived and known method. The contemporary teaching method, thus, widely accepted by many scholars, language teachers, curriculum developers; and still working world wide is CLT (Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Thompson, 1996; Nunan, 1986). Whatever the case is, different kinds of perceptions inevitably prevail among different practitioners –language teachers, educators, material developers etc. In spite of the existing wide acceptance, the varieties of interpretations of CLT can be attributed to the fact that those practitioners who identify with CLT are from different educational and traditional backgrounds (Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Nunan, 1986).

2.3.1 Teachers' Perception of Communicative Language Teaching

Coming towards the reality of different understandings of communicative language teaching method by teachers, different studies reveal different outcomes. Mangubhai, et al. (2007:1) claim that CLT approach is not finding its full expression in elementary and secondary classrooms and that many teachers remain uncertain about what CLT is and are unsure about how to implement it in the classroom. In addition, Thompson (1996:913) reveals that certain disparate misconception about CLT still continues to

exist, and a large number of teachers he has spoken to were seen to criticize and reject CLT for some reasons. He says that these teachers perceive CLT means not teaching grammar which means teaching only speaking; CLT means pair work which means role play and it means expecting too much from the teacher. It is also expressed by Medgyes(1988) that language teaching professionals who are working where English is a foreign(not a second) language most of the time complain that it is difficult or inappropriate to teach the language communicatively.

Contrarily essence, Nunan(1986:18) in his study reveals that teachers have been influenced by the current trends of teaching method- particularly the principles of communicative language teaching/learning. In addition to Nunan, Hiep(2007:197) in his study forwards that "... teachers highlighted the potential usefulness of CLT, stressing that CLT primarily meant teaching students the language meaningfully for their future life and helping to improve the classroom atmosphere." Kim (2008), based on his study, also agrees that teachers' perception about the communicative approach is positive.

Generally, we can see from the above points that language teaching practitioners do possess perceptual differences towards communicative language teaching, though a number of language specialists advocate the implementation of CLT in EFL classrooms.

2.3.2 Learners' Perception of Communicative Language Teaching

It is not only the teachers' view about some teaching methods but the learners' perception about it that affects the teaching/learning process. So far we have seen that different scholars reveal that teachers' perception about CLT method differs based on a number of reasons. It could hold true for students that they could bear different kinds of perceptions about CLT and they might disparate from teachers in views they have. In line with this idea, Nunan(1986) claims that there exist a clear mismatch between teachers' and learners' perception of the current teaching method-CLT in that learners tend to adhere to traditional views, while teachers are influenced by it. In addition, Peacock (1998) and Nunan(1989) cited in Hewkey(2006) reveal that learners tend to appreciate and

concentrate on the formal language learning or they perceive that language learning is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules.

2.3.3 Classroom Practice in Communicative Language Teaching

We may hear from language teachers that they are following a communicative approach to their EFL teaching. However, scholars like Savignon (2002) and Gathbonton and Segalowitz (2005) point the fact that there is a low correlation between what teachers state (say) and their actual classroom practices (specially referring to CLT). The paradoxical disparities that exist between what teachers believe and profess and what they actually practise in the EFL classroom is noted by many scholars. Among them, Karavas- Doukas (1996: 187) says:

Despite the widespread adoption of communicative approach by textbooks and curricula around the world, research suggests that CLT principles in classrooms are rare, with most teachers professing commitment to the communicative approach but following more structural approach in classrooms.

In addition, Hiep (2007) criticizing the suggestion made by Bax (2003) - which favors the potential teachers' utilization of CLT principles in language classes; says,

However, when it comes to the level of practice, teachers often encounter many difficulties. Their desire to implement CLT which is manifest through efforts to promote common western CLT practice such as pair work and group work conflicts with many contextual factors .

In general, a growing body of classroom based researches of actual communicative language practices can lead to some inclined conclusion that there are few opportunities for genuine communicative language use in foreign language classrooms and even those teachers who are committed to communicative language teaching (CLT) fail to create genuine communication in their classrooms (Kumaravadivelu, 1993; Seedhouse, 1990; Nunan, 1987). We can mention a number of factors for CLT not to be practical or hard to practice such as traditional examination, large class size, cultural constraints characterized by beliefs about teachers' and students' role and classroom relationship, personal constrain such as students' low motivation and unequal ability to take part in independent active learning practices and even teachers' limited expertise in creating

communicative activities like group work(Hiep,2003; Jin, Singh and Li, 2005; Bax, 2003; Widdowson, 1979, Medgyes,1988)

However, scholars in the field especially those advocates of CLT recommend that teachers should know what communicative tasks to use and their role in teaching and learning. In line with this idea, Hedge (2000:57) says, “The communicative approach to language teaching is premised on the belief that, if the development of communicative language ability is the call of classroom learning, then communicative practices must be part of the process.” Communicative language practices are important because of their contribution to ‘natural’ way of language learning. To that end, Littlewood (1981:17-18) explains the effects communicative classroom activities have on language learning and are summarized as follows:

- *They provide whole task practices (practice in the part skill of which the performance is composed, and practice in the total skill) to suit the learners’ level of ability.*
- *They improve motivation.*
- *They allow natural language learning when the learners are involved in using the language for communication.*
- *They create a context which supports learning by providing opportunities for positive relationship to develop among learners, between learners and teachers.*

As has been discussed so far, CLT theory proposes a focus on learning holding the ground that learning is likely to occur when classroom practices are made real and meaningful to the learners. To facilitate learning and to make it meaningful, Brown (1994) suggests that a significant amount of pair work and group work should be conducted, authentic language input in real life context should be provided and students must be encouraged to produce language for genuine, meaningful communication as some of the activities to be used in the communicative language classroom proceed.

Foreign language learning/teaching, as we have so far seen, is best fostered through natural or genuine communicative activities. The language learning/teaching process has made a paradigm shift and the focus on mastery of grammatical competence, mechanical habit formation and rote memorization of dialogue and performing drills has left a place to a more communicative language learning which embeds creating meaningful and

purposeful interaction, collaborative work, interaction between the learners, and the like. To put the purpose of language teaching (i.e. communicative competence) in to effect, what language teachers should know is likely to implement some important classroom activities in CLT which help learners to make genuine interaction. Possibly, the types of classroom activities in CLT are numerous which enable learners to achieve the objective of the curriculum by engaging them in real communication, and by making them use communicative process as information sharing, negotiation of meanings and interaction (Richards and Rodgers, 1986).

2.3.4 Classroom Activities in Communicative Language Teaching

Littlewood (1981:20-36) classifies the types of communicative activities into two major categories as ‘Functional Communicative activities’ and ‘Social Interaction Activities’. The functional aspect of communication includes activities like problem solving tasks as identifying pictures (comparison of similarities and differences), discovering sequences or locations, discovering missing information or feature, discovering secrete, following direction etc. The social interaction aspect includes activities like dialogue, role plays, conversation and discussion, simulation, improvisation and debates. Most of the activities mentioned above are discussed in detail by Littlewood(1981:22-36) and are summarized as follows.

2.3.4.1 Functional communicative Activities

- **Identifying Pictures:** Learner **A** has a set of five or six pictures which are very similar in content, but contain a number of distinguishing features. Learner **B** has a duplicate of just one of these pictures. Learner **A** must find out which of the pictures learner **B** is holding, by asking him questions about it.
- **Discovering Identical Pairs:** a similar set of, say, four pictures is now distributed among four learners, who thus have one picture each. A fifth learner in the group holds a duplicate of one of the pictures. He must question the others in order to discover which learner has the picture identical to his own.
- **Discovering Sequences or Location:** Learner **A** has a set of, say, six pictures or patterns. These are arranged in to a sequence from one to six (either in advance or by **A** himself). Learner **B** has the set of pictures, but these are not in sequence. Learner **B** must discover the sequence of **A**’s picture and arrange his own in the same way.

- **Discovering Missing Features:** Learner *A* has a picture, for example, a street or a country scene. Learner *B* has the same picture, except that various items have been deleted from it. Learner *A* (i.e. the partner with a complete picture) must take the initiative in asking questions. He must find out which details have not been reproduced in *B*'s version of the picture.
- **Discovering Secretes:** One learner has a piece of 'secret' information, which the other in his class or group must discover by asking appropriate questions. The questions must be restricted to a certain kind, such as Yes/No questions, in order to prevent the discoverer from simply asking directly for a piece of information.
- **Discovering Differences:** Learner *A* and learner *B* each have a picture (or a map, pattern etc.). The pictures are identical except for a number of details. For example, two street scenes may be identical except that one of the people is in a different position, one car is in a different color and there is a different number of clouds in the sky. The learners must discuss the picture in order to discover what the differences are.
- **Following direction:** Learner *A* and learner *B* have identical maps. Only *A* knows the exact location of some building or other feature (e.g. a 'hidden treasure'). He must direct *B* to the correct spot.
- **Reconstructing Story- sequence:** A picture-strip story (without dialogue) is cut up into its separate pictures. One picture is handed to each member of a group. Without seeing each other's pictures, the learners in the group must decide on the original sequence and reconstruct the story.

In addition to Littlewood's discussion, Richards (ND: 20) mentions and discusses some important CLT classroom activities and are presented below.

- ❖ **Task Completion activities:** Puzzles, games, map-reading and other kinds of classroom tasks in which the focus was on using one's language resources to complete tasks.
- ❖ **Information Gathering Activities:** Students conduct a survey, interview and search in which students were required to use their linguistic resources to collect information.
- ❖ **Opinion-Sharing Activities:** Activities where students compare values, opinions, beliefs such as a ranking task in which students list six qualities in order of importance which they might consider in choosing a date or spouse.
- ❖ **Information- Transfer activities:** These activities require learner to take information that is presented in one form, and represent it in a different form. For example they may read instructions on how to get from A to B, and they may read information about a subject and then represent it as a graph.
- ❖ **Reasoning- Gap Activities:** These activities involve deriving some new information from given information through the process of inference, practical reasoning etc. For example, working out a teacher's timetable on the bases of a given class timetable.

2.3.4.2 Social Interaction Activities

- ❖ **Simulation and Role play:** Students pretend the real life situation in the classroom e.g. we might ask them to pretend that they are at the airport. We might ask them to take part as themselves (simulate) or to pretend to be someone else (role play) – (Harmer, 1991).

- ❖ **Conversation and discussion:** Students are given conversational proposition and are then put into groups which have to prepare arguments either in favor of the proposition or against it (Harmer, 1991).
- ❖ **Drama:** Activities like role play, simulation and mime are taken as part of the drama (Byrne, 1986).
- ❖ **Dialogue:** For some advantages as argued by Byrne (1986:22-23) dialogue can be practiced at the early stage of the language program. The reason why dialogue is advantageous, as Byrne discusses;
 - A. *They present the spoken language directly in situation in which it is most commonly used.*
 - B. *They help learners to practice language in a similar way.*
 - C. *They promote active participation in the class.*

In addition to Byrne (1986), Porter and Roberts (1981) discuss that in the typical ELT dialogue, both speakers say approximately equal amount and neither say very much.

Most of the above activities are oral communicative activities. However, communication does not only rely on oral but also on written activities, and the oral activities can go in harmony with written ones. Relaying instruction (i.e. one student gives instruction and the other writes it), exchanging letters, writing reports and advertisements, cooperative writings are some of the activities considered to incorporate oral and/or written activities. It should be clear that the activities mentioned in this section are meant to be practiced in pair or small group (Harmer, 1991; Richards, ND).

2.3.5 Ways of Effecting Communicative Classroom Activities

It is important for the learner to be able to produce the language naturally and freely, as we have already discussed in the previous sections, and the language teacher should consider the needs to communicate and be able to provide situation and stimuli that will get all the students to make active participation in communicative classrooms. Particularly at the stage of freer production since there must be automatically less teacher control and more learner- centeredness in any communicative tasks, communicative activities are best practiced in pair or small groups (Harmer, 1991; Richards, ND; Broughton, et al, 1978).

2.3.5.1 Group Work

The classrooms as a social context puts paramount importance for second language learning and hence group work which is the manifestation (a miniature) of and the way to maintain certain social context, and enable learners to play social roles, is of great benefit. As far as CLT puts the focus on the learners (Savignon, 2002) group work gives far more chances for them to communicate in English (Doff, 1988). In addition, the varieties of interaction and participation that provides for the students within a typical lesson framework (Lier, 1988) are accounts of group work.

Breaking the class into smaller units (groups) will have some advantages for foreign language teaching. To that end, Broughton, et al (1978:180) and (Harmer, 1991:245) forward the following points which are summarized as follows.

- *It is much easier to develop the necessary confidence in a comparatively private situation than in the public gaze of the full class.*
- *The group provides much more intensive opportunities for practice than any full class situation can and they are potentially much more flexible.*
- *People can learn from each other.*
- *It increases in the amount of student talking time.*
- *Gives students opportunity really to use the language to communicate with each other.*
- *Students will be teaching and learning in the group exhibiting a degree of self reliance.*
- *In some ways group work is more dynamic than pair work, there are more people to react with and against in a group (than pair work) and therefore there is a great possibility of discussion.*
- *There is a great chance at least one member of the group will be able to solve a problem when it arises.*
- *Working in group is potentially more relaxing than in pair.*

2.3.5.2 Pair Work

Pair work is one of the ways in which we teach language or help learners practice different language learning activities. In fact pair work is described as integral part of group work (Doff, 1988), and it holds its own distinctive as well as overlapping

importance to second language learning. Some of the possible advantages of pair work described by Harmer (1991:244) and Byrne (1987:31) are summarized as follows.

- *It immediately increases the amount students practice.*
- *A number of students (e.g. 20 out of 40 students) are talking at once instead of one.*
- *Encourage students' cooperation which is important for the atmosphere of the class and the motivation it gives to learning with others.*
- *Students can practice language use and joint learning.*
- *Students can face and talk directly to one another.*
- *The learners get chances to work independently.*
- *Pair work provides some variety during the lesson.*

In general, through pair work and group work, students can work together and help each other to solve problems, prepare a presentation and make up a story, do different kinds of exercises. They can also learn knowledge and skills from each other which will lead them to greater success by undertaking different tasks.

2.4 Teachers and Learners in CLT

Perhaps the role teachers and learners are supposed to play in language classrooms is determined by the type and the nature of learning activities (Harmer, 1991:235) which are in turn dependent up on the method the language teacher employ. To that end, the role teachers and learners play in communicative classrooms are also dependent up on the types of classroom activities proposed in CLT, and according to Richards (ND) new roles are implied by activities in CLT.

2.4.1 The Role of the Teacher

The role the language teacher plays is of great importance as to help the learners master the necessary skills and develop communicative competence. The teacher plays a variety of roles which, Harmer (2001:57) claims may change from one activity to another or from one stage of activity to another. However, Harmer (1991:235) classifies the variety of roles that a language teacher plays in EFL classes into two categories: as controller and

as facilitator. However, when defining the role language teachers play in communicative classrooms, Larsen- Freeman (1986) says that teachers would find themselves talking less, listening more and becoming active facilitator of their students. In addition, Breen and Candlin(1980:99) cited in Richards and Rodgers(1986:77) describe the roles language teachers play as follows.

The teacher has two main roles: the first role is to facilitate the communication process between all participants in the classroom, and between these participants and the various activities and texts. The second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group. The learner role is closely related to the objectives of the first role and arises from it. These roles imply a set of secondary roles for the teacher; first, as an *organizer* of resources and a resource himself, second as a guide within the classroom procedures and activities.... A third role for the teacher is that of researcher and learner, with much to contribute in terms of appropriate knowledge and abilities, actual and observed experiences of the nature of learning and organizational capacities.

In addition to the above explanation or in other ways round, scholars like Littlewood (1981:19), Gatbonton and Segalowitz (2005: 340), Harmer (1991:235-242), Richards and Rodgers (1986:77-78) have put the role the language teacher plays in communicative classrooms as summarized as follows.

- ***Need analyst-*** take the responsibility for determining and responding to the learners language needs.
- ***Counselor-*** exemplifies an effective communicator seeking to maximize matching of speaker's intention and hearer's interpretation through the use of paraphrase, confirmation and feedback.
- ***Group process manager-*** organizes the classroom as setting for communication and communicative activity.
- ***Resource (knowledge provider)*** - offers help if it is needed (when the learners are missing and they wish help).

Generally, we can see from the points raised about teacher's role that teachers do not have direct teaching role in the CLT activities i.e. teachers are not dominant as they could be in the traditional (teacher-centered) classes. However, they would rather carry a burden of very important roles of creating conducive learning environment and enhancing learning by doing at least some of the above mentioned roles.

2.4.2 The Role of the Learner

It is inevitably true that learners are not empty vessels when coming to language classrooms and are expected to play a number of roles in communicative language classes. Legutke and Thomas (1991:267) confirming this idea state;

The learner does not come in to the project classroom knowing nothing. Rather he brings with him a range of previous learning experiences, of values, views and expectations ... not only have rather fixed idea about which activities are most appropriate for them , but also how the teacher should go about her teaching....

Learners are not merely passive listeners and Aston (1993) stresses that learners are not limited to the consumption of services provided by the teacher. However, they can become animator and creators of the self-access facilities, taking greater control of their own learning. Breen and Candlin(1980:110) cited in Richards and Rodgers(1986:77) describe the learners' role in CLT as follows.

The role of the learner as negotiator- between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning-emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedure and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an interdependent way.

To achieve the goal of foreign language learning/teaching i.e. the development of potential communicative competence by learners (as far as learners are pivot), learners should have positive attitude and motivation towards the learning activities triggered by the teacher's facilitative role in the class. If so, the students would hopefully conduct the activities needed in the communicative classroom either in group or in pair. It is, therefore, very important for the teachers to identify their roles, to integrate with that of the learners, and to help the learners know their distinctive roles CLT puts on and work in collaboration.

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODS OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of this study, as mentioned in chapter one, is to investigate teachers' and learners' perception and classroom practice of CLT in EFL context. This chapter describes the research methods that were employed to achieve the main objective of the study. It, therefore, discusses the participants of the study, the data collection instruments, the development of research instruments, the data collection procedure and methods of data analysis used in the entire study.

3.1 Participants

The participants of the formal questionnaire were 26 high school English teachers (all male) and 100 randomly selected students (45 male and 55 female) from three government high schools (Ginbot 20, Lafto and Firehowot Secondary Schools) which are located in Nefas Silk Lafto Sub City in Addis Ababa. The 26 participant teachers' experience in the teaching of English as a foreign language ranged from one to thirty-three years where the majority of the teachers took courses and seminars related to CLT method. The student participants were selected from grade 9 and 10 with some equal proportion. As was reported by the students, their age ranged from 14-18. Because it was difficult and inconvenient to observe all the classes and interview all the participants, 10 selected teachers out of the 26 participants were subject to the observation and the interview while 15 selected students were the participants in the interview.

3.2 Sampling Design

The study took all English language teachers found in the mentioned three schools as subjects for the questionnaire. However, students from these schools with equal proportion (i.e. about 33 % of students from each school) were selected randomly as subjects for the questionnaire since random sampling, according to Bailey (1994),

delivers chances for everyone to be a member of the sample. Out of the 100 students selected for the questionnaire, fifteen students were randomly chosen for the interview giving equal proportion for each school. Of all the teachers involved in the questionnaire, ten randomly selected teachers from each school were selected as subjects for the observation and interview since it is believed that this much sample size could be enough holding the idea forwarded by scholars that the sample size is determined by the purpose of the study and the nature of the population (Cohen and Manion, 1994). Thus, since the nature of the population is attributed to homogenous group, it is also believed that the existing sample size is sufficient (Abebeyehu, et al, 1999).

3.3 Development of Research Instruments

The research instruments used in this study include:- questionnaire(for both teachers and students), classroom observation and interview (for both teachers and students).

3.3.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire for teachers including the major principles of communicative language teaching (i.e. aspects of conceptual perspective, students learning perspective, perspective on instructional activities, the importance of grammar, error correction and assessment, the role of the teacher and the role and contribution of students) served as the major instrument of the study. The questionnaire adapted from Karavas-Doukas(1996) and Kim(1999) was composed of 75 Likert-type close-ended items. The questionnaire was divided in to three sections. They are:

- 1. Personal information section-served to provide accurate description of the respondents.*
- 2. Communicative language teaching (CLT) dimension(aspects of perception) section designed to measure the EFL teachers' conditional perceptions regarding knowledge of CLT in line with the principles of CLT and*
- 3. CLT practical aspect- which is designed to measure the degree EFL teachers practice CLT principles.*

The questionnaire was developed primarily to meet the objectives of the study; and the items were designed in line with the literature review- which deals with CLT principles. Apart from adapting the questionnaire from scholars, the drafted items were given to two TEFL graduate students and three high school experienced English teachers holding BA degree in English in order that they could comment on the appropriateness of the items if they are fit to measure the target objective of the study. Furthermore, after receiving their comments and suggestions and after the advisor's rigorous comment on the items, the researcher reshaped the instrument. Eventually, some items were modified and some were changed. Furthermore, to develop appropriate instrument for the study, in March 2008, the researcher administered a pilot study at Sedil Le Ethiopia Secondary School to six English teachers who are teaching in grade 9 and 10. Based on the data gathered, the reliability (which was computed using split-half method) was found to be 0.7724.

The learners' questionnaire was developed by adapting the teachers' questionnaire and modifying it so that it would fit the learners' level of understanding. To minimize the potential misunderstanding, the students' questionnaire was prepared in Amharic language (supposing that almost all the learners would understand it). Similarly, the learners' questionnaire was developed to meet the objectives of the study and was designed in line with the literature. Almost all of the statements were translated from the teachers' questionnaire and adapted to fit the learners' level of cognition. A pilot study for the learners' questionnaire, in March 2008, was also administered at Sedil Le Ethiopia Secondary School to 40 grade 9 and 10 students and the reliability was found to be 0.768.

3.3.2 Classroom Observation

The classroom observation was conducted in order to check whether teachers and students practiced the principles of CLT (beside what they professed in the responses to the questionnaires) in EFL classroom while the actual class lesson was going on. The observation was made based on a checklist which focused on 'classroom instructional activities or techniques employed by teachers', the role teachers and learners played and instructional materials used in the teaching learning process. The observation checklist

was adapted from Yemane(2007) and Razmajoo and Riazi(2000). To avoid the potential personal bias that might occur in the meaning to be given to what was being observed, the observations were conducted by the researcher and an EFL teacher as a co-observer.

2.3.3 Interview

The purpose of the interview was to substantiate the results obtained from the questionnaire and classroom observation and to obtain a greater depth of information, free and flexible responses and to get information concerning feeling, attitude or emotion to certain questions which is not possible through questionnaire and classroom observation(Koul, 1984 and Selinger and Shohamy,1988). The interview questions were prepared based on CLT principles in a similar fashion with that of the questionnaire: - one for the teachers and one for the learners. The interview for the learners was prepared in Amharic for the same reason mentioned in the students' questionnaire. The interview for both teachers and students comprised of both structured and unstructured types. Structured interview was prepared so that the same types of questions can be presented in the same order and manner to every interviewee while unstructured type of interview was prepared to get chances of flexibility to rephrase the questions, modify them and add some new questions to the list on conditions (Koul, 1984).

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The data collection session were arranged at times suggested by the high schools' permission and the willingness of the participants. It took over two months period beginning with administering the questionnaire, followed by the classroom observation of lessons each about two sections(a total of 90 minutes) duration and then by interview. All participants were encouraged to ask questions so that they did not have any problems with respect to the content, the language, and the ways to deal with the questionnaire.

Therefore, a questionnaire (see Appendix- B) was distributed to 100 students (with the presence of the researcher at the normal class time) and all were returned. During the

administration of the questionnaire, students who needed explanations about the questions or the way they should make their answers were given clarifications. Another questionnaire (see appendix-A) was distributed to 33 EFL teachers and 26 were returned.

Concerning classroom observation, the researcher prepared a checklist (see Appendix-C). Then the frequencies of the observed list of behavior were tabulated and prepared for the analysis. Then interviews for both teachers (see Appendix-D) and the learners (see Appendix-E) were conducted for the observed classes on the basis of random selection.

3.5 Methods of Data Analysis

To see the extent EFL teachers and learners understand CLT principles and the frequency they practice it in EFL contexts, the data gathered through questionnaire, classroom observation and interview were analyzed using the following procedures.

The data obtained from the questionnaires (of both teachers and learners) were first tallied and tabulated and were registered as frequency that could show the number of respondents for each item. The data analysis procedure consisted of Likert –type item analysis. The Likert-type items, which were designed to identify teachers’ and learners’ understandings of CLT concepts and their views on CLT classroom implementation, were given numerical scores (e.g. ‘Strongly Agree’ =5; ‘Agree’ = 4; ‘Undecided’ =3; ‘Disagree’ =2 and ‘Strongly Disagree’ =1) As stated by Taylor (1973) cited in Lakachew (2003), Likert assigned numerical values to responses and the numerical representation(the coding) of the items went through the following two ways:-

The favorable items (statements which directly address/consonant with/ the communicative language teaching principles) were coded as: ‘Strongly Agree’(SA) =5; ‘Agree’ (A)= 4; ‘Undecided’(U) =3; ‘Disagree’(D) =2 and ‘Strongly Disagree’ (SD)=1. The unfavorable items(those which are designed to crosscheck the teachers view and address non-communicative aspects)were coded in the reverse manner as:- ‘Strongly Agree’ =1; ‘Agree’ = 2; ‘Undecided’ =3; ‘Disagree’ =4 and ‘Strongly Disagree’ =5.

Similarly, the items of the questionnaire for ‘classroom practice’ were coded as:- ‘ Nearly Always’(NA) =5; ‘Often’(O) =4; ‘Sometimes’(ST) =3; ‘Rarely’(R)=2 and ‘Never’(N) =1 for favorable items; and the reverse ‘ Nearly Always’(NA) =1; ‘Often’(O) =2; ‘Sometimes’(ST) =3; ‘Rarely’(R)=4 and ‘Never’(N) =5 for unfavorable statements.

Meanwhile, the mean score of each item was computed in line with the coding numerals. For instance, if the frequencies of 20 respondents for favorable item no.1 and unfavorable item no. 2 were as:-

<i>Items</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Mean</i>
1.	8	5	2	3	2	74	3.7
2.	2	3	1	7	7	74	3.7

The mean for favorable items was computed as:-

$$\begin{aligned}
 x &= (8 \times 5) + (5 \times 4) + (2 \times 3) + (3 \times 2) + (2 \times 1) \\
 &= 40 + 20 + 6 + 6 + 2 \\
 &= \frac{74}{20} \\
 &= 3.7
 \end{aligned}$$

and

The mean for unfavorable item was computed as:-

$$\begin{aligned}
 x &= (2 \times 1) + (3 \times 2) + (1 \times 3) + (7 \times 4) + (7 \times 5) \\
 &= 2 + 6 + 3 + 28 + 35 \\
 &= \frac{74}{20} \\
 &= 3.7
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, a higher mean score indicates the respondents’ high perception or frequent classroom practices (Karavas-Doukas, 1996) and vice-versa. Therefore, the analysis was done relating the computed percentage and mean values and the results ranged between mean scores 5 to 1.

To make the discussion easier, the items of the questionnaire were categorized in to seven (7) thematic units as follow:-

1. Conceptual Perspective (8 items)
2. Students' Learning Perspective (8 items)
3. Perspectives on Instructional activities (11 items)
4. Perspectives on the Importance of Grammar (7 items)
5. Perspectives on Error corrections and Assessments (8 items)
6. Perspectives on the Teachers' Role (6 items)
7. Perspectives on the Learners' Role (4 items)

The data gathered by the observation scheme were analyzed descriptively determining the amount of importance placed on to each principle of the communicative language teaching. Similar to the analysis made for the questionnaire, the results obtained through classroom observation with the help of observation checklist (see Appendix-C) were categorized in to two domains- favorable and unfavorable. The coding of the items on the scale was as:- Very Much(VM)=5, Much(M)=4, Average(A)=3, A Little(AL)=2, and Very Little(VL)=1 for favorable statements and the reverse 5=1, 4=2, 3=3, 2=4 and 1=5 for unfavorable statements. The descriptive statistics was done in the light of the observation checklist which is fully explained in section 4.5.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

As noted earlier, the main purposes of this study are

1. to investigate the overall high school English teachers' and learners' perception of CLT,
2. to examine how often they practice CLT in their EFL classes and
3. to identify what gaps there might exist between CLT principles and the teachers' and learners' perception about CLT and actual classroom practice employed by them.

The data, therefore, are discussed in the light of the objectives mentioned.

In this section, the collected data are presented, analyzed and discussed. This chapter generally consists of presentation of the statistical results obtained, illustrated tables, discussions of the results obtained from questionnaires, observations and interviews of both teachers and learners.

4.1 Analysis of Teachers' Perception of CLT

To make the analysis easier, the items of the teachers' questionnaire, as mentioned in the previous chapter, are categorized in to seven thematic units as follows:

1. Conceptual perspective
2. Students' learning perspective
3. Perspective on instructional activities
4. Perspective on the importance of grammar
5. Perspective on error correction and assessment
6. Perspective on teachers' role and
7. Perspective on learners' role.

In line with the above thematic categories, the highest possible score that can be obtained in the scale to measure the most favorable (the strongest) perception towards CLT principles (either for the whole thematic category or individual item) is a mean value of five (5) and the lowest mean value is one (1) which indicates the weakest perception in the scale. In addition, since the questionnaire consists of favorable and unfavorable items, the coding of the data was done as discussed in 3.5

Therefore, based on the results obtained from teachers' questionnaire, teachers' perception of CLT on conceptual, students' learning, instructional activities, the importance of grammar, error correction and assessment, teachers' role and learners' role perspectives is discussed with reference to 'Tables 4.1.1-4.1.7'. A brief description followed by detailed presentation of each perspective (thematic category) will be made as to meet the objectives of the study.

4.1.1 Analysis of Conceptual Perspective

Teachers' perception towards CLT with regard to conceptual perspective was briefly analyzed using descriptive statistics based on 'Table 4.1.1'. In this area, 8 items (6 favorable and 2 unfavorable) were analyzed and it was found that a great majority of the respondent teachers with a total mean value of 4.10 have favorable view (perception) of CLT. Table 4.1.1 below presents teachers' responses for the items on conceptual perspective.

Table 4.1.1: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Conceptual Perspective

Scale Value			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
Items	Statements	fr&%							
1	Good EFL instruction is virtually synonymous with communicative language teaching (CLT) method.	f %	7 26.9	14 53.8	3 11.5	2 7.7	0 0	26 100	4
2	A communicative perspective represents a very powerful view of EFL curriculum.	f %	6 23.1	16 61.5	3 11.5	1 3.8	0 0	26 100	4.04
3	A Communicative perspective is the most progressive instructional approach in the field of EFL.	f %	10 38.8	15 57.7	1 3.8	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.34
4	The communicative approach gives equal attention to all language skills rather than attention only to productive skills.	f %	4 15.4	12 46.2	1 3.8	9 34.6	0 0	26 100	3.42
5	CLT help learners to take responsibility of their learning process more than teacher centered approaches.	f %	18 69.2	8 30.8	0 0	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.69
6*	The focus of CLT is much on the teaching of speaking, pair –work and group-work and neglects grammar teaching.	f %	1 3.8	4 15.4	1 3.8	17 65.4	3 11.5	26 100	3.65
7	The learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential.	F %	19 73.1	5 19.2	0 0	2 7.7	0 0	26 100	4.57
8*	It is difficult to teach EFL communicatively where English is only a school language.	F %	3 11.5	5 19.2	0 0	14 53.8	4 15.4	26 100	4.12
	Average fr. and % for favorable items	f %	10.7 41.2	11.7 45	1.3 5	2.3 8.8	0 0	26 100	4.18
	Average fr. and % for Unfavorable items *	f %	2 7.7	4.5 17.3	0.5 1.9	15.5 59.6	3.5 13.5	26 100	3.89
	Average f and % for All	f %	6.35 24.4	8.1 31.2	0.9 3.5	8.9 34.2	1.75 6.7	26 100	4.10

**= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values*

As can be seen from Table 4.1.1 above, with regard to the issue of “synonymy of good EFL instruction with CLT”, a total of 87.7 % (with 26.9% ‘strongly agree’ and 53.8% ‘agree’ points) teachers agree and appreciate the principle of CLT. When this is described

in terms of mean, the mean value of the responses for this item is 4.0 which is on the point of agree with regard to the scale. When we look at the average percentage of responses for positive (favorable) items, 41.2 % of the respondents are on 'strongly agree' point and 45 % of them are on 'agree' point. A total score 86.2 % i.e. with a mean value of 4.18 shows that a great majority of the teachers have high perception or view of CLT. In addition, for the negative (unfavorable) items 6 and 7, 59.6 % and 13.5 % of the respondents are on the 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' points. This means a total of 73.1 % (with a mean value of 3.89) of the respondents rejected or disagreed the idea 'the focus of CLT is on speaking and neglects grammar', and 'the difficulty of teaching EFL communicatively'.

From the above points, we can generalize that respondent teachers have positive degree of perception of CLT in line with conceptual understanding of CLT.

4.1.2 Analysis of Students' Learning Perspective

In the area of students' learning perspective (see Table 4.1.2 below), the total score of the responses illustrate that significantly high percent of the respondents testified that they have positive degree of perception on the concept of students' learning with regard to CLT. In this area, seven favorable and one unfavorable item were computed as shown in Table 4.1.2 below and analyzed.

Table 4.1.2: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Students' Learning Perspective

Scale Value			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
Items	Statements	fr&%							
1	Students' achievement of English literacy is most productive in the context of a communicative approach.	f %	11 42.3	12 46.2	2 7.7	1 3.8	0 0	26 100	4.08
2	Students' involvement is best promoted in communicative EFL classroom.	f %	14 53.8	10 38.5	1 3.8	1 3.8	0 0	26 100	4.42
3	Students' social development is best promoted in a communicative EFL classroom.	f %	13 50	10 38.5	0 0	3 11.5	0 0	26 100	4.27
4	Students' responsibility to learn is best promoted in a communicative EFL classroom.	f %	10 38.5	11 42.3	1 3.8	4 15.4	0 0	26 100	4.04
5	Students' power to persuade is best promoted in a communicative EFL classroom.	f %	19 73.1	6 23.1	1 3.8	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.69
6	Students are more willing to take risk in communicative EFL classes than teacher fronted (lockstep) classes.	f %	8 30.8	15 57.69	2 7.7	1 3.8	0 0	26 100	4.15
7	Students become more proficient in problem solving in communicative EFL classes.	F %	16 61.5	8 30.8	2 7.7	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.54
8*	The communicative approach to language teaching produces fluent but inaccurate learners.	F %	6 23.1	8 30.8	4 15.4	6 23.1	2 7.7	26 100	2.62
	Average fr. and % for favorable items	f %	13 50	10.3 39.6	1.3 5	1.4 5.4	0 0	26 100	4.31
	Average fr. and % for Unfavorable items *	f %	6 23.1	8 30.8	4 15.4	6 23.1	2 7.7	26 100	2.62
	Average f and % for All	f %	9.5 36.5	9.15 35.2	2.65 10.2	3.7 14.2	1 3.85	26 100	4.10

***= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values**

The teachers' responses in Table 4.1.2 above depict that a great number 89.6 % (i.e. 50 % and 39.6 % being on 'strongly agree' and 'agree' points respectively) of the teachers show their agreement to the positive statement with regard to students' learning perspective of CLT. Only 5.4% of the teachers are on the point of 'disagree' and 5 % of them are on 'undecided' point. This shows that the sum percentage of 'strongly agree'

and ‘agree’ (89.6 %) is greater than the sum percentage of ‘undecided’ and ‘disagree’ (10.4 %).

However, when we look at item number 8, i.e. ‘The communicative approach to language teaching produces fluent but inaccurate learners’, some considerable number respondents –with 23.1 % strong agreement and 30.8 % agreement yielded that a total of 53.8 % of the teachers showed favorable view for the statement. The result of item 8 (with a mean value 2.62) in this thematic group exceptionally shows that considerable number of respondent teachers have some misconception of the effect of CLT which scholars like Richards and Rodgers(1986) forward that CLT gives equal attention for both accuracy and fluency.

In general, the above figures and statements imply that a great majority of the teachers (with a total mean value of 4.10) have high perception of CLT with regard to the concepts of students’ learning in CLT while a small minority of them have weak view of the concept.

4.1.3 Analysis of Instructional Perspective

Table 4.1.3 presents the aspects of teachers’ position towards implementing CLT in their language classrooms. As we can see from the table, a great majority of the teachers, with mean value of 4.23, favorably agree with principles of CLT in line with its classroom instructional activities

Table 4.1.3: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Instructional Perspective

Scale Value			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
Items	Statements	fr&%							
1	Cooperative learning, discussion groups, and functional activities are easier to promote in a communicative EFL classroom.	f %	18 69.2	8 30.8	0 0	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.69
2	In EFL programs, content learning is best accomplished with a communicative approach.	f %	1 3.8	16 61.5	5 19.2	3 11.5	1 3.8	26 100	3.5
3	Writing process steps of pre-writing; drafting, revising, and editing are most productively handled in a communicative classroom.	f %	4 15.4	10 38.5	4 15.4	7 26.9	1 3.8	26 100	3.35
4	English speaking proficiency is more easily achieved in a communicative class.	f %	19 73.1	7 26.9	0 0	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.73
5	Learning skills are best developed in a communicative EFL classroom.	f %	10 38.5	13 50	1 3.8	2 7.7	0 0	26 100	4.19
6	Group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students	f %	21 80.8	5 19.2	0 0	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.81
7	Group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning. It is therefore an invaluable means of organizing classroom experiences.	F %	15 57.7	6 23.1	4 15.4	0 0	1 3.8	26 100	4.31
8*	Group work activities take too long to organize and waste a lot of valuable teaching time.	F %	2 7.7	6 23.1	5 19.2	8 30.78	5 19.2	26 100	3.31
9*	Students do their best when taught as a whole class by their teacher.	f %	0 0	2 7.7	2 7.7	12 46.15	10 38.5	26 100	4.15
10*	Group work activities have little use since it is very difficult for the teacher to monitor the students' performance and prevent them from using their mother tongue.	f %	0 0	3 11.5	2 7.7	15 57.69	6 23.1	26 100	3.92
11*	Small group work may occasionally be useful to vary the routine, but it can never replace sound formal instruction by a competent teacher.	f %	1 3.8	7 26.9	4 15.4	8 30.8	6 23.1	26 100	3.42
	Average fr. and % for favorable items	F %	12.6 48.5	9.3 35.8	2 7.7	1.7 6.5	0.4 1.5	26 100	4.23
	Average fr. and % for Unfavorable items *	f %	0.8 3.0	4.5 17.3	3.2 12.3	10.8 41.5	6.8 26.1	26 100	3.70
	Average f and % for All	f %	6.7 25.77	6.9 36.53	2.6 10	6.25 24.04	3.45 13.27	26 100	4.03

*= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values

In response to items 1-7,(which all are positive statements), when the total mean value is analyzed in terms of percentage, 48.5 % and 35.8 % of the respondents are on the point of ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ scales. These results are summed up to yield 84.3 % which in turn shows that those respondents with ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ are greater than those with ‘undecided’, ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ with a total of 15.7 %. Meanwhile, the mean value of the favorable statements (Items1-7) 4.23 depicts that the majority of the teachers are between ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’ points which in turn implies that that a great majority of teachers have high level of understanding of CLT with respect to the entire perspective.

In addition to the favorable items, 41.5 % and 36.1 % of the teachers are on ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ points for unfavorable statements. This much percent of the response produces a mean value of 3.70 which reveals that the teachers’ response lies between ‘undecided’ and ‘disagree’ continuum. This implies that 77.6 % of the respondents have positive perception about CLT with regards to those negative statements especially in comparison with those of the positive statements respondents.

However, in spite of the fact that respondents for some statements reveal their favorable view on average(less than the mean value of 4) e.g. Item no. 2, 3, 8, 10, 11; the cumulative result mean value 4.03 imply that the majority of the respondent teachers have high level of understanding about implementing CLT principles in EFL classroom practices with regard to different ways and activities.

4.1.4 Analysis of Perspective on the Importance of Grammar

For the group of items dealing with the importance of grammar, there were seven statements –four of which (Item no. 1, 3, 4, 6) are favorable and three of them (Item no. 2, 5, 7) are unfavorable. The total score obtained (i.e. mean value 3.91) shows that a great many of the teachers favorably agreed with the principle of CLT in line with the role and

the importance of grammar. Table 4.1.4 below thus reports that those respondents are in between the scale points agree (4) and undecided (3).

Table 4.1.4: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for the Importance of Grammar

Scale Value			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
Items	Statements	fr&%							
1	Grammar is best taught in a communicative EFL class.	f %	2 7.7	6 23.1	4 15.4	9 34.62	5 19.23	26 100	2.65
2*	Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.	f %	0 0	4 15.4	2 7.7	14 53.8	6 23.1	26 100	3.85
3	Grammar should be taught only as a means to an end and not as an end in itself.	f %	16 61.5	8 30.8	2 7.7	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.54
4	Knowledge of the rules of a language does not guarantee the ability to use the language.	f %	11 42.3	11 42.3	2 7.7	2 7.7	0 0	26 100	4.19
5*	Knowledge of the rules of a language does not guarantee the ability to use the language.	f %	0 0	1 3.8	5 19.23	14 53.8	6 23.1	26 100	3.96
6	For most students language is acquired most effectively when it is used as a vehicle for doing something else and not when it is studied in a direct or explicit way.	f %	11 42.3	11 42.3	2 7.7	2 7.7	0 0	26 100	4.19
7*	Direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.	F %	2 7.7	8 30.8	3 11.5	7 26.9	6 23.1	26 100	3.27
	Average fr. and % for favorable items	f %	10 38.5	9 34.6	2.5 9.6	3.3 12.7	1.3 3	26 100	3.89
	Average fr. and % for Unfavorable items *	f %	0.7 2.7	4.3 16.5	3.3 12.7	11.7 45	6 23.1	26 100	3.94
	Average f and % for All	f %	5.35 20.58	6.65 25.58	2.9 11.15	7.5 28.85	3.65 14.04	26 100	3.91

**= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values*

Meanwhile, in response to item 1 which raises the issue “ Grammar is best taught in a communicative EFL classes”, 34.6% and 19.2% of the teachers are on ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ points . The sum totals 53.8% of the respondents (with mean value of 2.65) show their negative view of the statement. This shows that those respondents have weak view of the teaching of grammar communicatively and it may mean that they prefer the traditional method of grammar teaching. However, contrary to the above essence, considerable number of teachers’ responses (with mean value 3.94), imply that they do

have strong perception of grammar teaching communicatively and its role in language literacy with regard to those ‘negative’ statements. To this end, for the statement dealing with ‘grammatical correctness as the most important criterion for language performance’ (Item 2), 53.8 % and 23.1 % of the respondents showed their ‘disagreement’ and ‘strong disagreement’ which yields a mean of 3.85. This shows that the respondents have high degree of understanding of CLT principle in line with the importance of grammar in communication. Similarly, for the unfavorable statements (Items 5 & 7), the result reports mean value 3.96 and 3.27 which means that respondents are in position above the average mean value 3 and implies that the more than half(63.45 %) of the respondents have strong perception about the teaching of grammar in line with the communicative principles of grammar teaching.

Generally, concerning the importance and role of grammar in language teaching, the teachers’ responses demonstrate that the average mean value of their response is 3.91; and this implies that the majority of the respondent teachers (70.6 %) have strong perception of the communicative teaching of grammar and its importance in language teaching; hence they are aware that they may potentially employ the teaching of grammar communicatively.

4.1.5 Analysis of Perspective on Error Correction and Assessment

In response to aspects of error correction and assessment, the teachers’ response to the positive statements (Items 1,5,6,8) reports a mean value of 4.08; and 3.61 for the negative statements(Items 2,3,4,7) – which gives a total mean value of 3.84 as shown in Table 4.1.5 below.

Table 4.1.5: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Error Correction and Assessment

Scale Value			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
Items	Statements	fr&%							
1	Students should correct each other's errors in pair or group.	f %	11 42.3	12 46.2	1 3.8	2 7.7	0 0	26 100	4.31
2*	Paper and pencil test is a very effective way of evaluating students' achievement in EFL literacy.	f %	1 3.8	1 3.8	4 15.4	14 53.8	6 23.1	26 100	3.88
3*	Teachers are not likely to use communicative tests because it is difficult to construct and administer communicative tests.	f %	2 7.7	8 30.8	2 7.7	12 46.2	2 7.7	26 100	3.15
4*	Good evaluation is carried out when the focus of the evaluation is on accuracy (grammatical correctness).	f %	0 0	4 15.4	4 15.4	12 46.2	6 23.1	26 100	3.77
5	Evaluation of students' progress in language literacy should be carried out on the basis of their day to day classroom communicative performance (e.g. role play).	f %	12 46.2	12 46.2	1 3.8	1 3.8	0 0	26 100	4.35
6	For students to become effective communicators in the foreign language, the teacher's feedback must be focused on the appropriateness and not on the linguistic form of the students' responses.	f %	6 23.1	13 50	3 11.5	4 15.4	0 0	26 100	3.92
7*	The teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make. If errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning.	f %	0 0	6 23.1	4 15.4	10 38.5	6 23.1	26 100	3.62
8	Since errors are normal (natural) part of learning, much correction is wasteful of time.	f %	7 26.9	14 53.8	2 7.7	2 7.7	1 3.8	26 100	3.92
	Average fr. and % for favorable items	f %	9 34.6	12.8 49.2	1.8 6.9	2.3 8.8	0.3 1.2	26 100	4.08
	Average fr. and % for Unfavorable items *	f %	0.8 3.0	4.8 18.5	3.5 13.5	12 46.2	5 19.2	26 100	3.61
	Average f and % for All	f %	4.9 18.85	8.4 32.3	2.65 10.19	7.5 28.85	2.65 10.19	26 100	3.84

*= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values

As can be seen from Table 4.1.5 above, the mean value of all the favorable and unfavorable statements is above 3.15 which is greater than the average mean value 3. This implies that the respondent teachers generally have strong perception about error correction and evaluation procedures. In response to Item no. 1 which states "students' each other's error correction in pair/ group", 42.3 % and 46.2 % of the respondents were on the point of 'strongly agree' and 'agree'. This shows that a total of 88.5 % of

respondents have strong view of correcting errors communicatively. In addition to the favorable statement, the teachers' response to those counter parts (unfavorable) statements also show that error correction and assessment should be made communicatively. In response to Item 2 which raises the issue of 'effectiveness of paper and pencil test in evaluating students' achievement in EFL literacy', for instance, a sum total of 76.9 % of respondents rejected the idea with 53.8% of them disagreeing and 23.1% strongly disagreeing. Only a small portion of the teachers (3.8% strongly agree and 3.8 agree) showed their agreement to the issue. This implies that the teachers perceive that paper and pencil test is not an effective way evaluating students' achievement in EFL literacy and they preferred a communicative way of evaluating students' progress on the basis of their day to day performance (communicative classroom activities) as can be seen from the responses given for item no. 5. Furthermore, as the result of Item no. 3 (i.e. 'Teachers are not likely to use communicative tests since it is difficult to construct and administer communicative tests') depicts that the respondent teachers professed that they are able to construct and administer communicative tests with a result 46.2 % and 7.7 % of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree with the mentioned idea. However, about 38.5 % of the respondents believed that they could not construct and administer communicative tests.

In general, in spite of the fact that there were some portion of the respondents who misunderstood the concept of error correction and assessment employed through communicative process (see Table 4.1.5) more than half of the respondents with mean value of 3.84 reflected that they had good perception of CLT principles with regard to error correction and assessment based on the eight items.

3.1.6 Analysis of Perspective on Teachers' Role

Table 4.1.6 below presents results of responses for items which deal with the role of the teacher and portrays Items 1, 3, 5, 6 as favorable (positive) and Items 2 and 4 as unfavorable (negative) statements. The result of the items regarding the teachers' role (as

organizer of the teaching so as to fit the needs of the learner or as facilitator) reveal nearly common feature as can be seen from Table 4.1.6 below.

Table 4.1.6: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Teachers' Role

Scale Value			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
Items	Statements	fr&%							
1	The teacher as 'authority' and 'instructor' is no longer adequate to describe the teacher's role in the language classroom.	f %	6 23.1	7 26.9	5 19.2	5 19.2	3 11.5	26 100	3.31
2*	Organizing the teaching so as to suit the needs of all is impossible.	f %	6 23.1	6 23.1	2 7.7	6 23.1	6 23.1	26 100	3.00
3	The teacher as transmitter of knowledge is only one of the many different roles he/she must perform during the course of a lesson.	f %	6 23.1	13 50	3 11.5	3 11.5	1 3.8	26 100	3.77
4*	The role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart (demonstrate) knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing and giving examples.	f %	5 19.2	4 15.4	1 3.8	16 61.5	0 0	26 100	3.08
5	The teacher should act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group.	f %	5 19.2	9 34.6	2 7.7	8 30.8	2 7.7	26 100	3.27
6	A textbook alone is not able to cater for all the needs and interests of the students. The teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students.	f %	21 80.8	5 19.2	0 0	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.81
	Average fr. and % for favorable items	f %	9.5 36.5	8.5 32.7	2.5 9.6	4 15.4	1.5 5.8	26 100	3.79
	Average fr. and % for Unfavorable items *	f %	5.5 21.2	5 19.2	1.5 5.8	11 42.3	3 11.5	26 100	3.04
	Average f and % for All	f %	7.5 28.85	6.75 25.96	2 7.69	7.5 28.85	2.25 8.65	26 100	3.54

***= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values**

The results obtained from the responses of all items depict that more than half of the teachers (69.2 % with agreement for positive statements and 53.8 % with disagreement for negative statements) believed that EFL teachers have a variety of roles in

communicative language classes (as facilitator and organizer of the teaching). The finding of Items 1 and 3 (which explored the inadequacy of the role of the teacher as authority, instructor, transmitter of knowledge) indicate that 50 % of the teachers believed that the teacher as an ‘authority’ and ‘instructor’ is no longer adequate and 83.1 % of them believed that the teacher as a transmitter of knowledge is only one of the many roles the teacher has to play to describe the role of the teacher in EFL classes. However, significant number of teachers (30.7 %) also showed their disagreement for Item 1. This result shows that about 66.55 % of the teachers have favorable view and strong perception about the role EFL teachers have in language classes in line with the mentioned statements. However, a few (30.7 %) of them still resisted the idea that addresses the inadequacy of the role of the teacher as authority, instructor, and transmitter of knowledge; and insisted on favoring the traditional view of language teaching which puts the teacher as authority, instructor and sole provider of knowledge although literature suggests that the teacher has a number of roles to play in a language classroom. To that end, Hedge(2000: 26-27) mentions the teachers’ role and says :

..... it is possible to identify the teacher in a number of roles in his lesson: as 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 it monitoring it, and organizing feed back; as promoter while students are working together; and as resource if students need help with words and structures during the pair work.

In general, even though a small portion of the respondents revealed their misconception or weak perception about the teachers’ role in communicative EFL classes, more than half of the respondents (with mean value of 3.54) testified that they have strong belief and high level of understanding about what role the teacher should play in EFL classes.

3.1.7 Analysis of Perspective on Learners’ Role

The analysis for the learners’ role perspective is based on table 4.1.7 which contains 4 items (2 favorable-Items 1&2 and 2 unfavorable-Items 3&4).

Table 4.1.7: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Perspective on Learners' Role

Sca le Val ue			5	4	3	2	1	Tot al	Mea n
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
It e m s	Statements	fr & %							
1*	Since the learner comes to the language classroom with little or no knowledge of the language, he/she is in no position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for him/her.	f %	1 3.8	2 7.7	4 15.4	12 46.2	7 26.9	26 100	3.85
2*	Training learners to take responsibility for their own learning is futile since learners are not used to such an approach.	f %	3 11.5	5 19.2	5 19.2	7 26.9	6 23.1	26 100	3.31
3	Learners as negotiator between the self, the learning process and the object of learning can learn independently.	f %	6 23.1	14 53.8	0 0	5 19.2	1 3.8	26 100	3.73
4	Learners should interact primarily with each other rather than with the teacher in EFL classroom.	f %	8 30.8	12 46.2	3 11.5	3 11.5	0 0	26 100	3.96
	Average fr. and % for favorable items	f %	7 26.9	13 50	1.5 5.8	4 15.4	0.5 1.9	26 100	3.85
	Average fr. and % for Unfavorable items *	f %	2 7.7	3.5 13.5	4.5 17.3	9.5 36.5	6.5 25	26 100	3.58
	Average f and % for All	f %	4.5 17.3	8.25 31.73	3 11.54	6.75 25.96	3.5 13.46	26 100	3.71

*=*Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values*

The teachers' response for aspects of learners' role in Table 4.1.7 above shows that a total of 73.1 % (with 46.2% disagreement and 26.9% strong disagreement) respondents showed their disagreement for the point that states "learners come to class with little or no knowledge and have no position to suggest any thing about the learning", while the remaining 11.5 % agreed for the idea. This result, with a mean value of 3.85 shows that more than half of the respondents have strong view of CLT with regard to the role learners play in communicative EFL classes. As we can see from Table 4.1.7, all the results of the responses depict somewhat similar mean value i.e. 3.85, 3.31, 3.73, and 3.96 for Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively. This shows that the respondent teachers have more or less similar understanding on the issue or for all statements under learners' role perspective, more than half of the respondents have strong perception about each

perspective (idea) raised. In general, regarding learners' role, the majority of teachers with a cumulative mean value of 3.7, proved that they have strong perception of CLT. However, some portion of the respondents (16.3%) still resisted the fact related to learners' role and still insisted on the prevalence of the role of the teacher as a sole provider of knowledge, the only responsible body of the learning and the main actor of the classroom activities.

In general, the responses obtained from the whole CLT perspectives reveal a mean value 3.89. This computed mean value indicates that the majority of the respondents (77.8 %) have strong view of communicative language teaching with regard to the principles of CLT stated. Therefore, the result implies that it is possible to assume that teachers can put CLT principles in to in their entire EFL classes in Ethiopian high school contexts.

4.2 Analysis of Teachers' Responses to Classroom Practice

Table 4.2 below presents the results of teachers' responses to aspects of frequencies of their classroom practices with regard to CLT principles based on the results of the teachers' questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of 23 items. The items are categorized in to communicative activities (Items 6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,19,&22) and non-communicative activities (Items 1,2,3,4,5,20,21,23). In addition, similar to the questionnaire for perception, the coding of the data followed a pattern:-

- A. 5, 4, 3, 2, 1- for favorable (positive) items i.e. for communicative activities representing scales Nearly Always(NA), Often(O), Sometimes(ST), Rarely(R), and Never(N) respectively.
- B. 1, 2, 3, 4 &5- for unfavorable (negative) items i.e. for non-communicative activities representing scales Nearly Always(NA), Often(O), Sometimes(ST), Rarely(R), and Never(N) respectively.

Table 4.2: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Classroom Practice

Scale Value	Statements		5	4	3	2	1	Tot	Mea
			1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
1*	Explain new grammatical terminologies or forms and patterns (rules) and let the learners be engaged in doing exercises	f %	8 30.8	14 53.8	4 15.4	0 0	0 0	26 100	1.85
2*	Explain new words and phrases and let the learners do the exercises in the textbook.	f %	9 34.6	10 38.5	6 23.1	1 3.8	0 0	26 100	1.89
3*	Use teacher led - classroom discussion.	f %	6 23.1	14 53.8	3 11.5	3 11.5	0 0	26 100	1.89
4*	Give students explanation of rules with model sentences to illustrate them.	f %	13 50	7 26.9	6 23.1	0 0	0 0	26 100	1.73
5*	Use individual –seat work.	f %	6 23.1	8 30.8	8 30.8	4 15.4	0 0	26 100	2.38
6	Introduce the new language item in context and demonstrate the use and meaning of the new language and let the learners try to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language.	f %	14 53.8	6 23.1	6 23.1	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.31
7	Involve students in questioning and answering activities.	f %	18 69.2	8 30.8	0 0	0 0	0 0	26 100	4.69
8	Involve learners in role play, simulation or any kind of drama.	f %	7 26.9	6 23.1	3 11.5	7 26.9	3 11.5	26 100	3.27
9	Involve learners in problem- solving activities.	f %	6 23.1	9 34.6	5 19.2	6 23.1	0 0	26 100	3.58
10	Involve learners in activities as identifying similarities and differences of pictures in group.	f %	2 7.7	4 15.4	8 30.8	12 46.2	0 0	26 100	2.85
11	Involve learners in conversation and discussion on some issues.	f %	7 26.9	8 30.8	8 30.8	3 11.5	0 0	26 100	3.73
12	Use different kinds of language games e.g. word dominoes.	f %	0 0	2 7.7	9 34.6	13 50	2 7.7	26 100	2.42
13	Make learners relay instructions (one learner gives instruction and the other writes it).	f %	1 3.8	1 3.8	4 15.4	16 61.5	4 15.4	26 100	2.19
14	Make the learners exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc. cooperatively.	f %	1 3.8	3 11.5	6 23.1	12 46.2	4 15.4	26 100	2.42
15	Use audiovisual materials to support your lesson.	f %	0 0	1 3.8	1 3.8	4 15.4	20 76.9	26 100	1.35
16	Use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of structure.	f %	3 11.5	4 15.4	5 19.2	8 30.8	6 23.1	26 100	2.62
17	Use pair work in which two students work on a given task	f %	7 26.9	10 38.5	7 26.9	2 7.7	1 3.8	26 100	3.77
18	Use group work in which more than two students work on a given task	f %	6 23.1	10 38.5	7 26.9	2 7.7	1 3.8	26 100	3.69
19	Help learners correct their error in their pair and group discussion.	f %	4 15.4	8 30.8	7 26.9	4 15.4	3 11.5	26 100	3.08
20*	Evaluate students in paper and pencil test (on terms or semesters).	f %	8 30.8	16 61.5	1 3.8	1 3.8	0 0	26 100	1.73
21*	Let learners do assignments at home and give feedback on other days for the whole class.	f %	14 53.8	7 26.9	3 11.5	2 7.7	0 0	26 100	1.73
22	Evaluate students' progress on the basis of their day to day communicative performance (e.g. after making dialogue).	f %	3 11.5	6 23.1	4 15.4	11 42.3	2 7.7	26 100	2.88
23*	Correct learners' error in controlled practice activities like question and answer.	f %	6 23.1	12 46.2	4 15.4	3 11.5	1 3.8	26 100	1.88
	Average fr. and % for favorable items	f %	5.27 20.27	5.73 22.04	5.2 20	6.8 26.15	3.0 11.54	26 100	3.12
	Average fr. and % for Unfavorable items *	f %	8.75 33.65	11 42.3	4.38 16.8	1.75 6.73	0.13 0.5	26 100	1.88
	Average f and % for All	f %	7 26.92	8.37 32.19	4.79 18.4	4.28 16.46	1.56 6	26 100	2.69

**= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values*

As can be seen from the table, we can deduce that teachers tend to practice more of non-communicative activities than the communicative ones. The responses for Items 1 and 4, for instance, depict that 40.4 % and 40.35 % of the respondents testified that they employ “explanation of new grammatical terms, forms and rules” ‘nearly always’ and ‘often’ respectively. The result percentages are computed and yield an aggregate mean value 1.79 which is between ‘nearly always’ and ‘often’. This implies that a great majority of the teachers employ non- communicative or traditional ways of grammar teaching. Similarly, the result for Item no. 2, which states “explanation of new words or phrases”, show that among the respondents, 34.6 % ‘nearly always’, 38.5 % ‘often’ and 23.1 % ‘sometimes’ practice it. This means, about 73.1 % of the respondents believed that they use ‘explanation of new words or phrases’ ‘nearly always’ and ‘often’ which gives a mean value of 1.89. This result also indicates that great majority of teachers practice non-communicative way of vocabulary teaching.

In a similar way, the results of Item 3 (use teacher led classroom discussion), shows that 23.1 % and 53.8 % of the respondents replied that they practiced teacher led classroom discussions ‘nearly always’ and ‘often’. Though there is a little result progress in Item 5, ‘use individual seat work’, with mean value 2.38(which is between some times and often), still 23.1 % and 30.8 % of the teachers employ such activity nearly ‘always’ and ‘often’ respectively.

Coming towards ways of error correction and mode of assessment, the results of Items 20, 21, and 23 illustrate that teachers utilize non- communicative classroom practices. For instance, 30.8 % and 61.5 % of the teachers evaluate students’ language performance using paper and pencil tests- on semesters or terms ‘nearly always’ and ‘often’ respectively.

In general, when we sum up the results of the responses for the non- communicative (unfavorable) items, we can get that 33.6 % and 42.3 % (with a total of 75.9 %) of the respondents believed that they practice the activities ‘nearly always’ and ‘often’.

When we look at the results obtained from the responses for communicative activities, we can have average mean value 3.12. Meanwhile, the higher rate of response is seen for Item no. 7 in which 69.2 % and 30.8 % of the respondent teachers involve students in questioning and answering activities ‘nearly always’ and ‘often’.

However, responses for the majority of items of communicative activities (i.e. Items 10,12 13, 14, 15, 16) show that their mean values are below 3.

This implies that the majority of teachers employ these communicative activities either rarely or never (below sometimes). However, on contrary the teachers’ response for some types of communicative activities(e.g. Items 6,7,8,9,11,17,18,19)demonstrates that more than half of the respondents employ them with the range between ‘sometimes’ and ‘nearly always’ . For instance, concerning involvement of learners in role play and simulation(see Item no.8), about 26.9 %, 23.1 % and 11.5 % of respondents responded that they employ such activities ‘nearly always’, ‘often’ and ‘sometimes’ respectively. Similarly, 76.9 % of the teachers responded that they involved their learners in problem solving activities (Item no. 9) between ‘sometimes’ and ‘nearly always’. With regard to involvement of learners in conversation and discussion 88.5 %; with regard to pair work 76.6 % , with regard to group work 88.5 % and with regard to helping learners to correct their errors in pair or group 73.4 % of the respondent teachers responded that they practiced these classroom activities between ‘sometimes’ and ‘nearly always’.

Generally, as has been said above, the results obtained from the teachers’ response for the classroom activities imply that most teachers tend to favor employing non-communicative (traditional) ways of EFL teaching contrary to what they perceive and believe about the communicative approach to language teaching.

4.3 Analysis of Learners’ Perception of CLT

The learners’ questionnaire consists of 12 favorable (positive) and 12 unfavorable (negative)-a total of 24 statements. The coding of the data was done similar to that of the teachers’ questionnaire. Therefore, based on the results obtained from the students’

questionnaire, the learners' perception of CLT with regard to different principles of communicative language teaching method is discussed with reference under table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Responses for Students' Questionnaire

Scale Values	5		4		3		2		1		Total		mean
	1*		2*		3*		4*		5*				
Items	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	
1	78	78	18	18	1	1	2	2	1	1	100	100	4.70
2	47	47	45	45	4	4	3	3	1	1	100	100	4.34
3	62	62	25	25	4	4	7	7	2	2	100	100	4.38
4*	55	55	29	29	5	5	8	8	3	3	100	100	1.75
5*	21	21	27	27	12	12	19	19	21	21	100	100	2.92
6*	9	9	10	10	8	8	25	25	48	48	100	100	3.93
7*	23	23	23	23	14	14	23	23	17	17	100	100	3.50
8	3	3	9	9	2	2	26	26	60	60	100	100	1.69
9*	46	46	31	31	4	4	13	13	6	6	100	100	2.02
10	13	13	9	9	7	7	24	24	47	47	100	100	2.17
11*	42	42	43	43	2	2	10	10	3	3	100	100	1.89
12	67	67	23	23	5	5	1	1	4	4	100	100	4.48
13*	69	69	16	16	1	1	6	6	8	8	100	100	1.68
14	38	38	24	24	19	19	10	10	9	9	100	100	3.72
15	9	9	17	17	10	10	35	35	29	29	100	100	2.25
16*	53	53	24	24	4	4	12	12	7	7	100	100	1.96
17	12	12	13	13	1	1	22	22	52	52	100	100	2.70
18*	14	14	23	23	6	6	28	28	29	29	100	100	3.35
19*	57	57	25	25	3	3	10	10	5	5	100	100	1.76
20	46	46	28	28	8	8	10	10	8	8	100	100	3.94
21*	10	10	27	27	14	14	25	25	34	34	100	100	3.56
22*	4	4	8	8	10	10	34	34	44	44	100	100	4.06
23	43	43	31	31	5	5	17	17	4	4	100	100	3.92
24	59	59	29	29	2	2	6	6	4	4	100	100	4.33
Av.f.& % for fav. items	39.8	39.8	22.6	22.6	5.66	5.66	13.6	13.6	10.3	10.3	100	100	3.50
Av f.& % for Unfav. items(*)	33.6	33.6	23	23	6.91	6.91	17.8	17.8	18.6	18.6	100	100	2.69
Av.f.&% for All	36.7	36.8	22.8	22.8	6.28	6.28	15.7	15.7	18.6	18.6	100	100	3.09

*= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values

First, in response to Item 1, which deals with “the importance of cooperative learning, discussion group to promote the development of learners’ communicative competence”, 78 % and 18 % of the respondents showed their ‘strong agreement’ and ‘agreement’ respectively. This means, a great majority of the learners i.e. 96 % (4.7 mean value) are between the continuum ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ and implies that almost all of the

learners have strong perception and favorable view of CLT in line with the entire point mentioned. In response to items 2, which deals with ‘the most productivity writing process steps of pre- writing, drafting, revising and editing in communicative language classrooms i.e. writing communicatively’, the result depicts that 47 % of the respondents ‘strongly agree’ and 45 % agree to the point while only a small portion 8 % of the learners are between ‘undecided’ and ‘strongly disagree’ points. Hence we can see that a total of 92 % of learners have strong view of the communicative learning of writing skill favoring the idea of conducting writing activities in communicative EFL classes or cooperatively.

Similarly, the response for Item 3, which deals with ‘the importance of group work as to help learners to solve problems in common’, 87 % of the respondents showed their favorable agreement (62% strongly agree and 25 % agree). This implies that a great majority of learners (with mean of 4.38) held a conviction for the importance of group work in helping the learners to solve their problems with in the group. However, though the learners showed favorable view towards the importance of group work, they believed that ‘working in group means wasting valuable time’ (see Item 4). Thereby, the response to Item 4 (i.e. working in group means wasting valuable time) revealed that 84 % of the respondents favored the idea with 55 % of ‘strong agreement’ and 29 % of ‘agreement’ decision. As can be seen from the table the mean value 1.75 is a signal to show only a very small portion of the respondent learners (i.e.11 %) rejected the idea. This implies that though learners know and perceive that working in group has its distinctive importance, they still consider that group work wastes a lot of valuable learning time. This may further imply that learners tend to prefer working alone (so as to save time) to working in group in spite of their appreciation of its benefits.

The following statements (Items 5, 6, &7) are also dealing with group work in a similar essence to Item no 4 (i.e. they all are negative statements). However, the result shows that the learners showed a little progress in their response regarding the concept they had about group work. Therefore, in response to Item 5 i.e. “Since learners lack the desire and experience to work in group/pair and they give priority to other duties, they prefer to

work individually”, only 48 % of the learners favored the idea. Hence, the remaining 40 % rejected the idea while 12 % of them remained undecided. This shows that still less than half of the respondents rejected the idea. However, in response to Item 6, which deals with the idea that “group work ruins the silence of class” 25 % of the respondents disagreed and 48 % of them strongly disagreed with the idea. This shows that 73 % of the learners rejected the idea and favored group work. This implies that, the majority of learners believe that group work does not ruin the silence of the class if it is systematically handled.

For a similar statement (Item no 7) that states “since learners do not potentially learn in group, it is preferable that the teacher would rather explain/teach the lesson and the learners listen to him/her”, 23 % of the learners ‘strongly agreed’ and 23 % of them ‘agreed’ to the point while 23 % and 17 % of them ‘disagreed’ and ‘strongly disagreed’ respectively. This shows that almost an equal number of respondents favored (46 %) and rejected (40 %) the idea. Nevertheless, a little greater number of respondents were in favor of the mentioned issue. Therefore, with regard to CLT instructional activities (Items 1-7), the learners’ response rate illustrates that on average about 73 % of the learners have strong perception about cooperative learning although there exist some deviating views as in Item no. 1.

Items 8-11 are dealing with the ways of grammar teaching and the role and importance of grammar in the teaching of English as a foreign language. In response to the way grammar should be taught (see Items 8 & 11), the majority of the respondents (85.5 %) preferred the direct explanation of the rules of grammar by the teacher to learning grammar cooperatively. This implies that the learners are still favoring the traditional explicit (deductive) way of grammar teaching and they lack confidence to learn grammar by themselves in cooperative group.

In addition, in response to Items 9 and 10 which state the relationship between the knowledge of grammatical rules and communicative competence, the result depicts that a great many of the respondents viewed ‘the role grammar plays in language’ negatively.

Hence, 77 % of the learners believed that learners with good knowledge of grammar are capable of communicating in English effectively. In a similar way, the response for Item10, which states that ‘the knowledge of grammar does not guarantee good communicative performance’, depicts that 24 % and 47 % of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the notion respectively. This means that a total of 71 % of learners favored that knowledge of grammar guarantees good communication. Therefore, the results obtained from Items 8-11 imply that learners tend to favor the ideas that knowledge of grammar is a base for communicative competence and prefer teachers’ direct grammatical explanation to involving them in communicative tasks.

For error correction and assessment group of items (Items 12-17) there are 6 items -4 favorable (Items 12,14,15&17) and 2 unfavorable(13&16). The highest rate of agreement is seen for Item 12, (students learn best when they correct their errors one another in group/pair), in which 67 % of the learners ‘strongly agreed’ and 23 % of them ‘agreed’ with a total of 90 %. This indicates that learners have a strong view of the benefit of cooperative learning for correcting errors in group. However, with regard to the idea of teachers’ tolerance to errors (see Items 13 &17), a great majority of the respondent learners (85 %) agreed to the point of prominence of teachers’ direct and immediate error correction. In addition, 74 % of the learners showed their disagreement for the statement that states teachers should sometimes tolerate errors since errors are natural (see Item 17). The results obtained from Items 13 and 17, therefore, imply that learners perceive that the teachers should correct errors as soon as the learners commit them and s/he should not tolerate any kinds of errors. However, literature (Richards, ND) suggests that the teacher should be tolerant of learners’ errors as they indicate that the learner is building up his/her competence and language learning involves creative uses of language and trial and error.

In response to Item 14 which deals with ‘assessments on semesters or terms’, more than half (62 %) of the learners believed that assessment should not be conducted on semesters or terms and learners should be assessed or evaluated based on their continuous day to

day performance. This implies that learners have strong perception of the way they should be evaluated although about 19 % of them hesitated to decide.

In reply to Items 15 and 16 which deal with ‘the appropriacy or accuracy, which error correction should deal with, 64 % of the learners agreed that the teachers feedback or error correction should focus on the accuracy(grammatical correctness) and not on the appropriate use of the language(see Item 15);and in the same manner, 77 % of the learners(53 %‘strong agreement’ and 24 % ‘agreement’) showed their agreement to the idea that language teachers should correct every grammatical error that the learners commit(Item 16). The results obtained from Items 15 and 16, therefore, imply that learners have weak perception about the way errors should be corrected and their views do not go in line with the principles of CLT with regard to error correction.

For the group of items dealing with the teachers’ role in communicative EFL classes (see Items 18-21), the result reports that about half of respondent learners possessed strong view about what the role of the language teacher should be. In response to Item number 18 which states the idea that ‘since English language teachers have better knowledge of the language than the learners, the learners should remain listening to their teacher passively when the teacher talks’, 57 % of the learners rejected the idea while 37 % of them agreed up on it. This indicates that about half of the learners believed that the teacher is not a sole provider of knowledge while the remaining portion (37%) still perceive that the language teacher is the main source of knowledge. Item 19 states that the role of the language teacher is imparting the knowledge s/he has. In reply to this statement, 82 % of the respondents showed their favorable agreement which indicates that learners understand that the language teacher is a source of knowledge and should act as an authority or provider of knowledge.

However, with regard to the role the teacher plays as motivator of the learning groups and facilitator of the learning (see Items 20 & 21), the results depict that 74 % of the learners favored the idea that language teachers should interact with the learners being one of the member of the group while only 18 % of them rejected it (Item 20). In addition, 59 % of the learners believed that the language teacher is capable of addressing the needs of all so

as to facilitate the learning. The results obtained imply that learners perceive that the language teacher should play the role of motivator of the learners and facilitator of the learning.

With regard to the role learners should play and contribute to the learning (see Items 22, 23, & 24), the results of the responses indicate that learners have favorable views of the notion (learners' role). Therefore, 78 % of the learners responded that learners are not empty vessels and are able to comment on the learning process and are not passive listeners (Item 22). In addition, 74 % of the respondent learners agreed to the point that learners should interact primarily with each other rather than with the teacher (Item 23). In response to Item 24, 88 % of the learners agreed (59 % strongly agree and 29 % agree) that training learners to take responsibility for their own learning results in productive learning. In general, the results obtained from Items 22-24 (average mean 4.10) depict that 80 % of the respondents have strong perception about the role they should play and they could learn by themselves and feel responsibility provided that orientation about learner centered teaching/learning process is given to them.

4.4 Analysis of Learners' Response to Classroom Practice

Table 4.4 below presents the results of learners' responses for aspects of frequencies of their EFL classroom practices with regard to CLT principles based on the responses of the learners' questionnaire. The learners' questionnaire, with regard to classroom activities, consists of equal number of statements to the teachers' questionnaire. It consists of 23 items that can be classified in to communicative and non-communicative activities as can be seen under table 4.4 below. The coding of the data follows a pattern discussed in 3.5

Table 4.4: Frequency, Percentage and Mean of Learners' Responses for Classroom Practice

Scale Values	5		4		3		2		1		Total		Mean
	1*		2*		3*		4*		5*				
Items	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	
1*	38	38	38	38	10	10	8	8	6	6	100	100	2.06
2*	29	29	29	29	20	20	12	12	10	10	100	100	2.45
3*	6	6	25	25	31	31	32	32	6	6	100	100	3.07
4*	27	27	40	40	10	10	13	13	10	10	100	100	2.39
5*	57	57	27	27	2	2	9	9	5	5	100	100	1.78
6	25	25	30	30	15	15	14	14	16	16	100	100	3.34
7	46	46	18	18	18	18	12	12	6	6	100	100	3.86
8	5	5	10	10	4	4	20	20	61	61	100	100	1.78
9	12	12	12	12	5	5	25	25	46	46	100	100	2.19
10	10	10	13	13	19	19	21	21	37	37	100	100	1.81
11	27	27	17	17	14	14	17	17	25	25	100	100	3.04
12	9	9	19	19	9	9	13	13	50	50	100	100	2.24
13	17	17	11	11	21	21	12	12	39	39	100	100	2.55
14	00	00	15	15	15	15	18	18	42	42	100	100	2.33
15	5	5	2	2	3	3	6	6	84	84	100	100	1.38
16	4	4	7	7	12	12	8	8	69	69	100	100	1.69
17	26	26	21	21	17	17	16	16	20	20	100	100	3.17
18	22	22	22	22	22	22	12	12	22	22	100	100	3.10
19	24	24	22	22	8	8	15	15	31	31	100	100	2.93
20*	36	36	29	29	22	22	7	7	6	6	100	100	2.18
21*	34	34	26	26	17	17	11	11	12	12	100	100	2.41
22	12	12	16	16	15	15	21	21	36	36	100	100	2.47
23*	30	30	23	23	16	16	9	9	22	22	100	100	2.70
Av.f.& % for for	16.9	16.9	15.7	15.7	13.2	13.2	15.3	15.3	38.93	38.9	100	100	2.53
Av f.& % for(items (*)	32.1	32.1	29.6	29.6	16	16	12.6	12.6	9.63	9.63	100	100	2.38
Av.f.&% for All	24.5	24.5	22.7	22.7	14.6	14.6	13.9	13.9	24.3	24.3	100	100	2.46

***= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values**

If we look at Items 1 and 4 that deal with 'the teachers' explanation of grammatical terminologies, rules or forms, a total of 71.5 % of the learners testified that the teachers employed explanation of new grammatical terms, forms and rules 'nearly always' and 'often'. Similarly, in response to Item 2, which states 'teachers' explanation of new words or phrases', the result depicts that more than half (58 %) of their teachers explained new words and phrases and let the learners do the exercises of the text. The results obtained (from Items 1, 2, &4), therefore, imply that the majority of EFL teachers employ non- communicative or traditional ways of grammar and vocabulary teaching and learners are kept away from practicing to learn by them selves cooperatively.

The learners' response for Item 3, which states "the teachers' use of teacher led classroom discussion", show that only 31 % of the learners replied that their teachers used teacher led classroom discussion nearly always and often; the remaining 38 % of the respondents said that the teachers employed such an activity rarely and never while the rest 3 % said some times .

In response to Items 20, 21, 23 which deal with ways of error correction and mode of assessments, 59.33 % of the respondent learners revealed that their teachers employed non- communicative ways of error correction and mode of assessment 'nearly always' and 'often'. For instance, 65 % of the learners proved that their teachers evaluated them in paper and pencil tests on terms or semesters 'nearly always' and 'often'. In addition, 60 % of the respondents testified that their teachers let them do assignments at home and gave them feed back on other days for the whole class. The results, generally, imply that more than half of EFL teachers employ non- communicative ways of error correction and mode of assessment. Generally, the results obtained from all non- communicative activities depict that 61.75 % of the respondent learners responded that their teachers practiced non- communicative activities 'nearly always' and 'often'.

When we look at learners' responses for statements of communicative activities, we can get an aggregate mean score 2.56 which is below 'sometimes'. However, the result on the contrary rather depicts that the learners' response for some statements (Items 6, 7, 11, 17, & 18- See Appendix-B) displayed mean values greater than 3 (i.e. sometimes) which means that 50.8 % of the learners indicated that their teachers introduced new language in context and let them interact with it (e.g. Item 6); involved learners in questioning and answering activities and conversation and discussion (e.g. Items 7 & 11); and used pair and group works (e.g. Items 17 & 18) 'nearly always' and 'often'. This implies that about half of the teachers employ some aspects of communicative activities (which are mentioned above) 'nearly always' and 'often' while the remaining practiced 'sometimes', 'rarely' and 'never'.

Moreover, the results of the majority of communicative activity statements (Items 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, & 22) depict that their mean values are below 3. This means that the learners in their responses testified that their teachers implemented the mentioned communicative classroom activities between the ranges of ‘sometimes’ to ‘never’ (but below sometimes). For instance 20 % and 61 % (a total of 81 %) of the respondents answered that their teachers involved them in role play, simulation, or any kind of drama (see Item 8) ‘rarely’ and ‘never’ respectively while only 15 % of the learners responded to ‘nearly always’ and ‘often’ . Similarly, the learners’ response for Item 9 which discusses the involvement of learners in problem solving activities, 71 % of the learners replied that their teachers involved them in problem solving activities ‘rarely’ and ‘never’. In general, when we look at the results obtained for all communicative items, we can get an aggregate mean value 2.34(below3) which means the learners response depict that their teachers practiced the mentioned communicative activities between sometimes and rarely.

To conclude, the results of the learners’ response for classroom practice generally reveal that their teachers implemented communicative principles in a very limited ways between the ranges of ‘sometimes’ and ‘rarely’ with a total mean score 2.46. This implies that a mismatch between teachers’ perception about CLT principles and their classroom practices prevails and learners are vulnerable to be involved in teacher fronted or traditional ways of language learning.

4.5 Analysis of Classroom Observations and Interviews

Classroom observations were subjected to the descriptive statistics utilizing frequency, percentage and mean score. To make discussion better, the patterns of different principles in observed domains, the first two alternatives (Very Much and Much) and the last two (A Little and Very Little) were combined in the discussion. In addition, similar to the questionnaires used in this study, the statements used in the observation checklist are categorized in to two domains –favorable and unfavorable items. Items 2.4, 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, and 4.1 are unfavorable while the remaining are favorable statements. The descriptive

statistics was done in the light of the observation checklist (See Appendix C) which is divided in to nine (9) patterns of time interval out of the full fledged period i.e.45 minutes in a way of 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40, and 41-45 minutes.

Therefore, based on this given time interval framework, the scales ‘Very Little’ to ‘Very Much’ are labeled for the classroom activities employed in the form of the following table

Table 4.5.1: Time Framework for Labeling Scales for Classroom Observation

<u><i>Time Used in Minutes</i></u>	<u><i>Percentage</i></u>	<u><i>Scale Value</i></u>
<i>0:00 -9:00</i>	<i>1-20</i>	<i>Very Little</i>
<i>9:01 -18:00</i>	<i>21 -40</i>	<i>A Little</i>
<i>18:01 -27:00</i>	<i>41-60</i>	<i>Average</i>
<i>27:01 -36:00</i>	<i>61 -80</i>	<i>Much</i>
<i>36:01 -45:00</i>	<i>81-100</i>	<i>Very Much</i>

Therefore, based on the above time framework, Table 4.5.2 below presents the amount of importance attached to the features of CLT in the schools observed. The interviews’ results were also discussed in line with the results of the observation.

Table 4.5.2: Descriptive Statistics of Classroom Observation (Frequency, Percentage and Mean)

Scale Value			5	4	3	2	1	Total	Mean
Item	Statements		1*	2*	3*	4*	5*		
1	Instructional Activities								
1.1	Classroom activities maximizing communication opportunity e.g. (role play, drama, dialogue, simulation, problem solving etc.)	f %	=	2 20	4 40	2 20	2 20	10 100	2.6
1.2	Focus on language as a medium of communication	f %	=	2 20	4 40	2 20	2 20	10 100	2.6
1.3	More pupil –oriented	f %	=	=	2 20	1 10	7 70	10 100	1.5
1.4	Tolerating error correction	f %	=	=	1 10	3 30	6 60	10 100	1.5
1.5	More emphasis on group- work and pair- work	f %	=	2 20	3 30	2 20	3 30	10 100	2.4
1.6	Emphasis on meaning	f %	=	1 10	2 20	3 30	4 40	10 100	2.0
1.7	Emphasis on both fluency and accuracy	f %	=	1 10	=	3 30	6 60	10 100	1.6
2	Teacher's Role								
2.1	Independent participation in learners' group	f %	=	=	=	=	10 100	10 100	1.0
2.2	Organizing group –work	f %	=	4 40	2 20	3 30	1 10	10 100	2.9
2.3	Organizing pair-work	f %	=	4 40	2 20	3 30	1 10	10 100	2.9
2.4*	Lecturing /L/	f %	6 60	3 30	1 10	=	=	10 100	1.5
2.5	Facilitating and monitoring class activities	f %	1 10	2 20	5 50	=	=	10 100	3.2
3	Learners' Role								
3.1*	Listening to teacher's explanation	f %	7 70	3 30	=	=	=	10 100	1.3
3.2	Participating in group and pair work	f %	=	1 10	2 20	7 70	=	10 100	2.4
3.3*	Taking note	f %	10 100	=	=	=	=	10 100	1.0
3.4	Asking questions to teachers	f %	=	2 20	2 20	3 30	3 30	10 100	2.9
3.5*	Doing individual work	f %	8 80	=	=	2 20	=	10 100	1.6
4	Instructional Materials Used								
4.1*	Textbook	f %	10 100	=	=	=	=	10 100	1.0
4.2.	Duplicated materials	f %	=	=	=	=	10 100	10 100	1.0
4.3	Audio-visual material	f %	=	=	=	=	10 100	10 100	1.0
4.4	Magazines	f %	=	=	=	=	10 100	10 100	1.0
4.5	Newspaper	f %	=	=	=	=	10 100	10 100	1.0
4.6	Pictures, maps ,charts	f %	=	=	=	=	10 100	10 100	1.0

*= Unfavorable statements and their corresponding scale values

Table 4.5.2 presents the fact that in real practice the teachers attached the least amount of importance to the representative tenets of CLT and gave much focus for the non-communicative activities. When we look at the aggregate mean value of the observation i.e. 1.78, it shows that the majority of teachers practiced the communicative classroom activities a 'little' and 'very little'. For instance, with regard to instructional activities (Items 1.1-1.7), about 65.71 % of the teachers were seen to implement the mentioned CLT activities 'a little' and 'very little'. In addition, the result depicts that about 85 % of the observed teachers based on the points 'more pupil oriented' (Item 1.3) and 'tolerating error correction' (Item 1.4) are on the points 'a little' and 'very little'. The result obtained from instructional activities, generally, implies that the majority of teachers are not giving due attention for communicative activities and rather they focus on teacher based (led) classroom practices. This result again indicates that there exists a discrepancy between what teachers understand about CLT and what they really practice.

With regard to the teachers' role, the result depicts that the observed teachers gave the least amount of importance to the representative CLT tenets, that is 'independent participation in learners' group', 'organizing group and pair work' and 'facilitating and monitoring class activities'. Hence no teacher was seen to act as an independent participant in the learners' group. In addition, only 40 % of the teachers were active enough to organize group and pair work (See 2.2 & 2.3). However, a great majority (90 %) of the teachers were observed to employ lecturing 'very much' and 'much'. In a similar manner we can deduce from the result that learners were devoted to the non-communicative activities and were reluctant to involve in the communicative classroom activities as in participation in group and pair work; rather they were highly devoted to listening to teachers' explanation (100 %), taking notes what teachers had written (100 %) doing individual work (80 %). Therefore, the result concerning teachers' and learners' role indicate that teachers are still reluctant to practice CLT principles in EFL classes and emphasize on the traditional way of teaching and learners on the other hand are tuned to be dictated by the teachers and not to involve in learner centered classroom activities.

The results of the observation about the use of instructional materials indicate that all the teachers were seen to utilize only the student's text book in the language classrooms and did not make use of other supportive materials like audiovisuals, magazines, newspaper, pictures, maps, charts, and other duplicated materials. This implies that still the teachers are in tune with practicing teacher led (traditional) views of classroom activities and neglect the communicative ones despite their relative high degree of perception of CLT principles.

Similar to the above ideas (the results of the observation), the results obtained from the teachers' interview convey similar views. Therefore, the responses for the interview generally indicate that EFL teachers, in the entire contexts, have a number of problems to implement the principles of CLT in EFL classrooms although they are aware of and willing to employ CLT principles. The participants complained that the learners' lack of interest to participate in role play, drama, simulation, group and pair work was the main obstacle to put CLT principles in to effect. Moreover, they pointed out that larger class size, traditional examination (i.e. the negative wash back effect of the classroom as well as the national examination), students' low motivation and unequal ability to take part in cooperative groups, noise, lack of supplementary materials (e.g. audio visuals), the seating arrangements (which are problematic to employ group work in circular or other ways) are those which hinder them from employing the CLT method. One of the participant teachers, for instance, suggested,

"I have taught English for about 17 years. I have taken some courses about CLT. I have read books. I am keen to implement CLT principles. However, there is no conducive environment to practice communicative method. For example, the number of students, which is 70-80 on average, is one problem. We don't have at least tape recorder to employ listening activities."

Another teacher commented,

"By now, I know what roles I should play. However, the principles that are kept in CLT method are impractical in our context. The learners lack potential to communicate in English. They are not interested in cooperative learning i.e. group and pair work, they rather tend to talk about other issues in Amharic. There are a number of students who can not even write their names properly and how can you get them write compositions in group at least the ones which are printed in their text book? They expect every thing from the teacher."

The responses, therefore, imply that there are a number of obstacles that block teachers from implementing principles of CLT despite the fact that they are aware of the importance of teaching EFL communicatively and the fact that they are interested with the notions and principles CLT entails.

In addition to the teachers' complaints, the participating learners suggested that they (the learners) know the importance of cooperative learning so as to foster their communicative competence and share ideas and experiences. However, there are problems to do that. For instance, deficiency to speak and write in English is one of the obstacles. Most teachers often teach them grammar and give less emphasis to (neglect) speaking, writing and listening skills. Some students do not want to cooperate with others in group and pair work.

With regard to the importance of CLT, the majority of learners responded that they believe the principles are important and they wish to employ them if they are not hindered by some contextual factors. Therefore, because of the prevailing obstacles (mentioned earlier) that hinder learners from practicing CLT principles, the learners revealed that prefer they should be taught by their teachers .

To summarize the findings of the study, the responses of the teachers as well as the learner demonstrated that although they have favorable perception of the principles of the communicative approach to language teaching, teaches are overcome by the difficulties(obstacles) they have with in their contexts and students and do not try to adapt CLT principles at least to some of the contexts; and learners are shaped and guided by the dominant teacher led classroom practices although they understand the importance of learning communicatively to some extent.

CHAPTER FIVE

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of the conclusions and recommendations of the research results. After the conclusion, some possible recommendations are given.

The present study, as mentioned in previous chapters, was intended to investigate the overall EFL teachers' and learners' perception and classroom practice of CLT. Therefore, to reach at the overall purposes of the study, three types of data gathering instruments (questionnaire, classroom observation and interview) were used. After a pilot study was conducted, the data were gathered through the aforementioned instruments and were presented, analyzed and discussed in chapter four. Based on the analysis and discussion, the following conclusions and recommendations are made.

5.1 Conclusions

The overall findings of the study revealed that despite EFL teachers' high and learners' moderate understanding about tenets of CLT; many teachers retain some fear of adopting or adapting CLT as an instructional method because of perceived disciplinary problems related to classroom practices. Mean while, the findings revealed that almost all (96.15 %) of the results, in terms of mean score from the teachers' questionnaire about CLT perception ranged from 3- 4.81 and yielded a total mean score of 3.89 while most results from the learners' questionnaire about CLT perception ranged from 3-4.70 with a total mean of 3.09. Therefore, with regard to teachers' perception of CLT, the findings revealed that the total mean score for conceptual perspective yielded 4.1, the students' learning perspective- 4.1, instructional perspective- 4.03, perspective on the importance of grammar- 3.91, perspective on error correction- 3.84, teachers' role perspective- 3.54 and perspective on learners' role- 3.71. Generally, from all the results (which yielded

aggregate mean 3.89); we can conclude that EFL teachers have mildly high level of perception of CLT with regard to its tenets.

The findings also revealed that more than half of the results (54.16 %), in terms of mean score, from the learners' questionnaire about CLT perception ranged from 3.0- 4.70 with a total mean score 3.09. However, the mean value of some (45.83 %) of the results is less than 3 which indicates learners' mild disagreement to the statements. However, the aggregate mean score 3.09 can be an indication of learners average understanding of the communicative approach to language teaching while some portion of learners tend to adhere what might be called 'traditional view'.

Looking at the results about classroom practices (obtained from both teachers' and learners' questionnaires), we can get a total mean score 2.69 for the teachers' and 2.46 for the learners' responses- which means between the scale values sometimes and rarely. In addition, the teachers' response for the unfavorable statements depicting a mean value of 1.88 imply the fact that the majority of teachers tend to implement non-communicative(traditional) ways of language teaching between 'often' 'nearly always'. Similarly, the results obtained from the learners' response depict mean score 2.33 and 2.34 for unfavorable and favorable statements respectively. This implies that teachers are often likely to implement non-communicative (traditional) ways of language teaching and ignore the communicative ones and it shows a clear gap between what teachers as well as learners advocate perceiving about CLT principles and what they practice in real EFL classrooms.

The data obtained from the classroom observations and teachers' and learners' interviews indicate that there is a clear mismatch between what teachers as well as learners perceive about CLT and what they actually practice in EFL classes. As can be seen from the results of the observation (Table 4.5.2), the total mean score 1.78 imply that teachers failed to practice classroom communicative language activities and rather they tend to practice non-communicative ones. This can be associated with a number of reasons that teachers as well as learners proposed. The results obtained from the teachers' interview

revealed that the most common problems that hindered or blocked them from practicing communicative language classroom activities were:- large class size, traditional examination(i.e. the negative wash back effect of the class as well as the national exam), students' low motivation and unequal ability to take part in the cooperative group, noise resulting from the group interaction, lack of supplementary materials (e.g. audiovisuals). The results obtained from the learners' interview response also substantiated the teachers' complaints which state the obstacles that blocked CLT from being practiced in EFL classes. Meanwhile, the respondent learners professed that although they knew that CLT principles are important to develop one's communicative competence and helps to share ideas and experiences, it is difficult to make it effective because it wastes time and it doesn't go in harmony with the examination that they are accustomed to do; and they are incapable of communicating (writing and speaking) in English.

To conclude, the overall findings of this study indicate that in spite of the fact that teachers mildly have high level of understandings of CLT concepts, in reality they failed to practice them in EFL classes in the entire contexts. Similarly, although learners have somewhat considerable degree of perception of CLT tenets, the traditional types of classroom practice employed are likely challenging for learners to adapt an alternate learner centered learning approach and are forced to devote themselves to teacher led classroom activities due to a number of reasons raised above. This generally indicates that there is a clear mismatch between what teachers and learners perceive about CLT and what they actually practice.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusions drawn above, the following recommendations are made.

- First, Literature (Hawkey, 2006) suggests that incongruence between belief and practice is an issue that should be addressed by teacher educators, so that teachers become better equipped to reconcile beliefs and practices in order to provide more

effective instruction which is evident in this study. With the findings, this study hopes to suggest that teachers can apply the most possible principles of CLT in EFL contexts and it hopes to reveal the possible difficulties that EFL teachers might face. These difficulties might not be the same in different contexts. However, teachers should not hesitate to practice CLT in their career despite the confronting problems facing them since as Nunan(1986) suggests the appropriateness of the different types of communicative activity will depend not only on the purpose for but also on the context of learning. Therefore, work shops and other in-service programs should maximally be delivered to maximize teachers' views of CLT tenets and practical implementations.

- Second, given this research findings that teachers lack practical application knowledge (skill) of CLT principles and techniques, teachers should be given the opportunity to acquire knowledge about CLT related to planning, implementing and assessing. To this end, it is suggested that teacher education programs, which aim at in-depth training about language teaching methodologies, should properly deal with both the strength and weakness of CLT as an instructional method ranging from basic principles to specific techniques.
- Third, although CLT has increased the teaching options available to language teachers, the real potential for them to practice CLT principles is tangible if only learners themselves are convinced of their values (Razmjoo and Riazi, 2006). Therefore, it is advisable that teachers and other concerned bodies ought to deliver sorts of orientations to the learners about CLT principles and their importance to maximize their views prior to trying to implementing the method.
- Fourth, since one of the causes that makes learners lack interest and motivation to involve in communicative classroom activities and adhere to grammar based teaching/learning is the type of traditional (non-communicative) examination they take, the National Organization for Examination (NOE) should at least modify the

style of exam preparation and better try to make it as communicative language test as possible. This will in turn motivate teachers to employ communicative language teaching principles and prepare communicative language tests as well.

- By and large, the research findings should help not only EFL teachers but also the Ministry of Education (MOE) and other concerned bodies to start distancing themselves from primary focus on the teacher fronted language teaching style and it is recommended that teachers should begin implementation of the communicative approach since it may prove to provide the most promising results when it comes to learners' communicative competence.
- Finally, hopefully, the research findings in this paper will encourage an extension of research (as mentioned Section1.4) in to teachers' knowledge and understanding of CLT. A range of conceptualization, rich in detail, is further needed to provide EFL teachers with framework and models that they can follow in their own practical classes. Therefore, this study is not intended to make any generalization, so any concerned and interested body can make use of this study as avenue for further studies and is suggested to contribute a lot.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abebayehu Aemero, et al (1999). "Research in Education: Distance Education Material for In-Service Trainee" (Unpublished Material). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Alright, R. (1979). **Language Learning Through Communicative Principles**. In Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson, K. (Eds.), *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aston, G. (1993). "The Learners Contribution to the Self Access Center." **ELT Journal**. 47/3:219-227
- Bailey, K.D. (1994). **Methods of Social Research**. (4th Ed). New York: The Free Press.
- Bax, S. (2003). "The End of CLT: A Context Approach to Language Teaching." **ELT Journal**. 57/3:278-287
- Beale, J. (2002). "Is Communicative Language Teaching a Thing in the Past?" **TESOL**. 37/1: 12-16
- Berhanu Haile. (1999). "An Evaluation of the Implementation of the Current ELT Syllabus for Grade 9 in Terms of the Communicative Language Teaching Methodology." (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Broughton, et al (1978). **Teaching English as a Foreign Language**. (2nd Ed.). London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). **Principle of Language Learning and Teaching**. (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- _____. (1994). **Teaching by Principle: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy**. Longman: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson, K. (Eds.). (1979). **The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Byrne, D. (1986). **Teaching Oral English**. London: Longman.
- Diribsa, Dufera, et al (1999). "Principles of Curriculum Inquiry. Distance Education Material for In-service Trainee." (Unpublished Material). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Doff, A. (1988). **Teaching English: A Training Course for Teachers**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gatbonton, E. and Segalowitz, N. (2005). "Rethinking Communicative Language Teaching: A Focus on Access Fluency." **The Canadian Modern Language Review**. 61/3:325-353.
- 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.
- Harmer, H.J. (1991). **The Practice of English Language Teaching**. (New Ed). Longman: Longman Group UK Ltd
- _____. (1995). "Taming the big 'I': Teacher Performance and Students Satisfaction." **ELT Journal**. 49/4:337-345
- _____. (2001). **The Practice of English Language Teaching**. (3rd Ed.). Longman: Pearson Edu. Ltd.

- Hawkey, R. (2006). "Teachers and Learners Perception of Language Learning Activity." **ELT Journal**. 60/3: 242-252
- Hedge, T. (2000). **Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hiep, P. H. (2007). "Communicative Language Teaching: Unity with Diversity." **ELT Journal**. 61/3: 193-201
- Hornburger, N. H. (1989). "Tramites and Transportes : The Acquisition of Second Language Communicative Competence for One Speech Event in Puno, Peru." **Applied Linguistics**. 10/2:214-230
- Jin, L.; Singh, M. and Li, L. (2005). "Communicative Language Teaching in China: Misconception, Application and Perceptions." **A paper Presented at AARE' 05 Education Research "Creative Dissent: Constructive Solution"** Sydney: The Australian Association for Research in Education Room EDG79.
- Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). "Using Attitude Scale to Investigate Teachers' Attitude 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 (2nd Ed)**. Delhi: Vikas Publishing Ltd.
- Kumaravadiyevlu, B. (1993). "Maximizing Learning Potential in the Communicative Classroom." **ELT Journal**. 47/1: 12-18
- Lakachew Mulat. (2003). "Teachers' Attitude 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.
- Legutke, M. and Thomas, H. (1991). **Process and Experience in Language Classroom**. Longman: Longman Group
- Littlewood, W. (1981). **Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mangubhai, F., et al. (2007). "Framing Communicative Language Teaching for Better Teacher Understanding." **Issue in Educational Research**. Vol.17.
- Medgyes, P. (1986). "Queries from a Communicative Teacher." **ELT Journal**. 40/2: 107-112
- Nunan, D. (1986). "Communicative Language Teaching: The Learner's View." **Paper Presented at the RELC Regional Seminar**. Singapore, April 1986.
- _____. (1987). "Communicative Language Teaching: Making it Work." **ELT Journal**. 41/2:136-145
- Porter, D. and Robert, J. (1981). "Authentic Listening Activities." **ELT Journal**. 36/1:37-47
- Razmjoo, S.A. and Riazi, A.M. (2000) "Is Communicative Language Teaching in the Expanding Circle? A Case Study of Teachers of Shiraz High School and Institutes." **Journal of Language and Learning**. 4/2:144-171

- Richards, J.C. (N.D.). "Communicative Language Teaching Today." [http://www.professor jack richards. com/pdfs/communicative language teaching today – v2. pdf](http://www.professorjackrichards.com/pdfs/communicative%20language%20teaching%20today%20v2.pdf).
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T.S. (1986). **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2001). **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.(2nd Ed.)** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Romaine, S. (1994). **Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics**. London: Biddles Ltd.
- Savignon, S.J. (2002). **Communicative Language Teaching: Linguistic Theory and Classroom Practice**. In Savignon, S.J. (Ed), *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching*. New Heaven: Yale University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (1996). "Classroom Interaction: Possibilities and Impossibilities." **ELT Journal**. 50 /1:16-24
- Selinger,H,W and Shohamy,E (1989). **Second Language Research Methods**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). **Conditions for Second Language Learning**. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Stern, H.H. (1983). **Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, G. (1996). "Some Misconceptions about Communicative Language Teaching." **ELT Journal**. 50/1: 9-15
- Widdowson, H.G. (1979). **The Teaching of English as Communication**. In Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson, K. (Eds.), *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yemane Debebe (2007). "English Teachers' Perception and Practice of Communicative Language Teaching in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language" (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- 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

APPENDIX-A: TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY GRADUATE PROGRAM INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

Dear Teacher,

This questionnaire is designed to find out the *perception and classroom practice* of English teachers about *communicative language teaching* (CLT) in the teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL). It is one of the instruments which the researcher uses to gather the necessary data for his **MA Thesis** in the teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL).

Thus, I kindly request you to give the required information provided. Your contribution is highly important for the success of this study. The researcher would like to assure you that all the responses you give 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 co-operation.

The researcher

PART 1: Personal Information

Direction 1: Please give information about *yourself* for each of the categories below. Put a tick (✓) mark in the appropriate box where necessary.

1. Name of the school _____
2. Age a) 20-29 ☐ b) 30-39 ☐ c) 40-49 ☐ d) 50 and above ☐
3. Sex a) Male ☐ b) Female ☐
4. Field of study: Major _____ Minor _____
5. Qualification : a) diploma ☐ b) BA ☐ c) MA ☐
d) PhD ☐ e) other (specify) ☐

6. Total years of teaching experience: a) five and less than five years ☐
 b) 6-10 years ☐ c) 11-20 years ☐ d) more than 20 years ☐
7. Your teaching load in periods per week
 a) 10 and less than 10 ☐ b) 11-20 ☐
 c) 21-30 ☐ d) above 30 ☐
8. Average number of students in one class
 a) 30 and less than 30 ☐ b) 31-40 ☐ c) 41-50 ☐ d) 51-60 ☐ e) above 60 ☐

Direction 2: Please read the following items carefully and put a tick (✓) mark in the appropriate box.

1. Have you taken any course concerned with communicative language teaching (CLT) in college/university? a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐
2. If your answer to question No. 1 is 'yes', how useful have you found in your EFL teaching communicatively?
 a) Very useful ☐ b) Moderately useful ☐ c) Useful ☐
 d) Not that much useful ☐ e) Not useful ☐
3. Have you ever participated in any seminar, workshop or orientations concerning CLT? a) Yes ☐ b) No ☐
4. If your answer to question No. 3 is 'yes', how useful have you found them to implement language teaching based on the principles of CLT?
 a) Very useful ☐ b) moderately useful ☐ c) useful ☐
 d) Not that much useful ☐ e) not useful ☐

PART II: CLT Dimension

Direction 3: Please read each statement in this section and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement by putting a tick (✓) mark against your choice.

For this questionnaire, the following five responses are prepared:

- Strongly Agree (SA) = 5 Agree (A) = 4
- Undecided (U) = 3 Disagree (D) = 2 Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1

Item No.	Statements	SA	A	U	D	SD
I	<i>Conceptual Perspective</i>	5	4	3	2	1
1	Good EFL instruction is virtually synonymous with communicative language teaching (CLT) method.					
2	A communicative perspective represents a very powerful view of EFL curriculum.					
3	A Communicative perspective is the most progressive instructional approach in the field of EFL.					
4	The communicative approach gives equal attention to all language skills rather than attention only to productive skills.					
5	CLT help learners to take responsibility of their learning process more than teacher centered approaches.					
6	The focus of CLT is much on the teaching of speaking, pair – work and group-work and neglects grammar teaching.					
7	The learner-centered approach to language teaching encourages responsibility and self-discipline and allows each student to develop his/her full potential.					
8	It is difficult to teach EFL communicatively where English is only a school language.					
II	<i>Students' Learning Perspective</i>					
1	Students' achievement of English literacy is most productive in the context of a communicative approach.					
2	Students' involvement is best promoted in communicative EFL classroom.					
3	Students' social development is best promoted in a communicative EFL classroom.					
4	Students' responsibility to learn is best promoted in a communicative EFL classroom.					

	Statements	SA	A	U	D	SD
5	Students' power to persuade is best promoted in a communicative EFL classroom.					
6	Students are more willing to take risk in communicative EFL classes than teacher fronted (lockstep) classes.					
7	Students become more proficient in problem solving in communicative EFL classes.					
8	The communicative approach to language teaching produces fluent but inaccurate learners.					
III	<i>Perspective on Instructional Activities</i>					
1	Cooperative learning, discussion groups, and functional activities are easier to promote in a communicative EFL classroom.					
2	In EFL programs, content learning is best accomplished with a communicative approach.					
3	Writing process steps of pre-writing; drafting, revising, and editing are most productively handled in a communicative classroom.					
4	English speaking proficiency is more easily achieved in a communicative class.					
5	Learning skills are best developed in a communicative EFL classroom.					
6	Group work activities are essential in providing opportunities for co-operative relationships to emerge and in promoting genuine interaction among students					
7	Group work allows students to explore problems for themselves and thus have some measure of control over their own learning. It is therefore an invaluable means of organizing classroom experiences.					
8	Group work activities take too long to organize and waste a lot of valuable teaching time.					

		SA	A	U	D	SD
9	Students do their best when taught as a whole class by their teacher.					
10	Group work activities have little use since it <i>is very</i> difficult for the teacher to monitor the students' performance and prevent them from using their mother tongue.					
11	Small group work may occasionally be useful to vary the routine, but it can never replace sound formal instruction by a competent teacher.					
IV	<i>Perspective on the Importance of Grammar</i>					
1	Grammar is best taught in a communicative EFL class.					
2	Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.					
3	Grammar should be taught only as a means to an end and not as an end in itself.					
4	Knowledge of the rules of a language does not guarantee the ability to use the language.					
5	Knowledge of the rules of a language does not guarantee the ability to use the language.					
6	For most students language is acquired most effectively when it is used as a vehicle for doing something else and not when it is studied in a direct or explicit way.					
7	Direct instruction in the rules and terminology of grammar is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.					
V	<i>Perspective on Error Correction and Assessments</i>					
1	Students should correct each other's errors in pair or group.					
2	Paper and pencil test is a very effective way of evaluating students' achievement in EFL literacy.					
3	Teachers are not likely to use communicative tests because it is difficult to construct and administer communicative tests.					

		SA	A	U	D	SD
4	Good evaluation is carried out when the focus of the evaluation is on accuracy (grammatical correctness) .					
5	Evaluation of students' progress in language literacy should be carried out on the basis of their day to day classroom communicative performance (e.g. role play).					
6	For students to become effective communicators in the foreign language, the teacher's feedback must be focused on the appropriateness and not on the linguistic form of the students' responses.					
7	The teacher should correct all the grammatical errors students make. If errors are ignored, this will result in imperfect learning					
8	Since errors are normal (natural) part of learning, much correction is wasteful of time.					
VI	<i>Perspective on Teacher's Role</i>					
1	The teacher as 'authority' and 'instructor' is no longer adequate to describe the teacher's role in the language classroom.					
2	Organizing the teaching so as to suit the needs of all is impossible.					
3	The teacher as transmitter of knowledge is only one of the many different roles he/she must perform during the course of a lesson.					
4	The role of the teacher in the language classroom is to impart (demonstrate) knowledge through activities such as explanation, writing and giving examples.					
5	The teacher should act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group.					
6	A textbook alone is not able to cater for all the needs and interests of the students. The teacher must supplement the textbook with other materials and tasks so as to satisfy the widely differing needs of the students.					

VII	<i>Perspective on Learners' Role</i>	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	Since the learner comes to the language classroom with little or no knowledge of the language, he/she is in no position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for him/her.					
2	Training learners to take responsibility for their own learning is futile since learners are not used to such an approach.					
3	Learners as negotiator between the self, the learning process and the object of learning can learn independently.					
4	Learners should interact primarily with each other rather than with the teacher in EFL classroom.					

Direction 4: The following questions are posed to investigate *teachers' classroom practice* in the teaching of English as a foreign language. Please read the following items carefully and put a tick (✓) mark indicating the most appropriate alternative for each of the given items based on your classroom practice.

The following alternatives are delivered as responses:

- Nearly Always(*NA*) =5
- Often (*O*)=4
- Sometimes(*ST*)=3
- Rarely (*R*)=2
- Never(*N*)=1

No	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Alternatives</i>				
		NA	O	ST	R	N
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Explain new grammatical terminologies or forms and patterns (rules) and let the learners be engaged in doing exercises .					
2	Explain new words and phrases and let the learners do the exercises in the textbook.					

3	Use teacher led - classroom discussion.					
4	Give students explanation of rules with model sentences to illustrate them.					
5	Use individual –seat work.					
6	Introduce the new language item in context and demonstrate the use and meaning of the new language and let the learners try to produce, reproduce and communicate with the language.					
7	Involve students in questioning and answering activities.					
8	Involve learners in role play, simulation or any kind of drama.					
9	Involve learners in problem- solving activities.					
10	Involve learners in activities as identifying similarities and differences of pictures in group.					
11	Involve learners in conversation and discussion on some issues.					
12	Use different kinds of language games e.g. word dominoes.					
13	Make learners to relay instructions (one learner gives instruction and the other writes it).					
14	Make the learners exchange letters, write reports, advertisements etc. cooperatively.					
15	Use audiovisual materials to support your lesson.					
16	Use pictures and objects to convey the meaning of structure.					
17	Use pair work in which two students work on a given task.					
18	Use group work in which more than two students work on a given task.					
19	Help learners correct their error in their pair and group discussion.					
20	Evaluate students in paper and pencil test (on terms or semesters).					
21	Let learners do assignments at home and give feedback on other days for the whole class.					
22	Evaluate students’ progress on the basis of their day to day communicative performance (e.g. after making dialogue).					
23	Correct learners’ error in controlled practice activities like question and answer.					

APPENDIX- B: STUDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
የድህረ ምረቃ ት/ቤት
የቋንቋ ጥናት ኢኒስቲቲዩት
የውጭ ቋንቋዎች እና ስነፅሁፍ ት/ት ክፍል

❖ **ለሁለተኛ ደረጃ ተማሪዎች የቀረበ መጠይቅ**

➤ **ውድ ተማሪ**

የዚህ መጠይቅ አላማ፤ ተማሪዎች ስለ **ተግባቦታዊ የቋንቋ ትምህርት/Communicative Language Learning/** ያላቸውን ግንዛቤ ለማወቅና በክፍል ውስጥ የእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ትምህርት በምን መልክ እየተሰጠ እንዳለ መረጃ በመስጠት ለማጥናት ነው። መጠይቁ ሁለት ክፍሎች ያሉት ሲሆን፤ የመጀመሪያው ክፍል ስለ ተማሪው ግላዊ መረጃ ጥያቄዎችን የያዘ ሲሆን ፤ የሁለተኛው ክፍል ደግሞ የሁለተኛ ደረጃ ተማሪዎች ስለ ተግባቦታዊ የቋንቋ ትምህርት /Communicative Language Learning/ ያላቸውን ግንዛቤ እና በክፍል ውስጥ የእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ትምህርት በምን መልክ እየተሰጠ እንዳለ ለማወቅ የተዘጋጀ ነው።

ውድ ተማሪ፤ የዚህ ጥናት አስተማማኝነት የሚወሰነው አንተ/ቺ ለእያንዳንዱ ጥያቄ በምትሰጠው/በምትሰጩው ትክክለኛ ምላሽ በመሆኑ በእያንዳንዱ ክፍል ውስጥ ያሉትን መመሪያዎች በጥሞና በማንበብ ለጥያቄዎቹ ትክክለኛ መልስ በመስጠት የበኩልህን/ሽን አስተዋጽኦ እንድታደርግ/ጊ በትህትና እጠይቃለሁ። በመሆኑም፤

1ኛ. በመጠይቁ ማንኛውም ቦታ ላይ ስም አይፃፍም

2ኛ. እያንዳንዱ ጥያቄ የራስን ሃሳብና ሰምምነት የሚገልጥ እንጂ አንድ ትክክለኛ መልስ ስለሌለው የሌላውን መልስ በማየት ወይም ተወያይቶ መስራት የመጠይቁን ዓላማ ስለሚያዛባ የየራሳችሁን መልስ ብቻ በመስጠት እንትተባበሩኝ።

3ኛ. ስለመጠይቁ የምትሰጡት ምላሽ **በሚስጥር ተጠብቆ** ለጥናቱ ውጤት ብቻ የሚውል መሆኑን እየገለጥኩ፤

ለምታደርጉልኝ ቀና ትብብር ከወዲሁ አመሰግናለሁ።

ክፍል 1. ግላዊ መረጃ

መመሪያ አንድ: (ከ2-4 ላሉት ጥያቄዎች የምርጫዎቹን ፊደላት በማክበብ መልስ/ሽ)

1. የት/ቤቱ ስም _____
2. እድሜ ሀ. 13-15 ለ. 16-18 መ. 19-21 ሠ. 22 እና ከዚያ በላይ
3. ጾታ ሀ. ወንድ ለ. ሴት
4. የትምህርት ደረጃ ሀ. 9ኛ ለ. 10ኛ

ክፍል ሁለት: ተማሪዎች ስለ ተግባቦታዊ የቋንቋ ትምህርት/Communicative Language Learning/ ያላቸውን ግንዛቤ እና በእንግሊዝኛ ክ/ጊዜ ያለውን የመማር ማስተማር ሒደት ለማጥናት የቀረበ መጠይቅ።

መመሪያ ሁለት: የሚከተሉትን ጥያቄዎች በጥንቃቄ በማንበብ መስማማት ወይም አለመስማማትህን/ሽን ለመግለጥ ከተሰጡት አማራጮች አንዱን በጥያቄዎቹ ትይዩ ባሉት ሳጥኖች ውስጥ የ(✓) ምልክት በማድረግ ምረጥ/ጭ።

ለዚህ መጠይቅ የተሰጡት አማራጮች

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. በጣም እስማማለሁ (5) | 4. አልስማማም (2) |
| 2. እስማማለሁ (4) | 5. በጣም አልስማማም(1) ናቸው። |
| 3. አልወሰንኩም (3) | |
| 4. | |

ተ.ቁ	ጥያቄዎች	አማራጮች				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	የተማሪዎች እርስ በርስ መረዳዳት፤ በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ በቡድን እና በጥንድ መወያየት በቋንቋው የመናገር ብቃታቸው እንዲያድግ ይረዳቸዋል።					
2	በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ለመጻፍ፤ ፣ማለትም አስተዋጽኦ ለመንደፍ፤ ዋና ፅሁፍን ለመፃፍ እንዲሁም ለመክለስ ተማሪዎች በጋራ(በቡድን/በጥንድ) ቢወያዩና ቢሰሩ ይመረጣል።					
3	በቡድን መስራት ተማሪዎች ችግሮቻቸውን ራሳቸው እንዲፈቱ ያስችላቸዋል።					
4	በቡድን መስራት ማለት ጊዜ እንደማባከን (እንደማቃጠል) ይቆጠራል።					

5	ተማሪዎች በቡድን/በጥንድ የመስራት ፍላጎት እና ልምድ ስለሌላቸው ከትምህርቱ ይልቅ ቅድሚያ ለሌላ ተግባር ስለሚሰጡ በግላቸው ቢሰሩ ይመረጣል።					
6	የቡድን/የጥንድ/ሥራ የክፍሉን ጸጥታ ስለሚያደራጅበት ባይኖር ይመረጣል።					
7	በቡድን ስራ ተማሪዎች ብዙም ስለማይማሩ መምህሩ ቢያስረዱ (ቢያስተምሩ) እና ተማሪዎች ቢያዳምጡ ይመረጣል።					
8	የእንግሊዝኛን ስዋሶው(Grammar) ተማሪዎች በጋራ(በቡድን ወይም በጥንድ) ቢሰሩ(ቢማማሩ) የእንግሊዝኛን ቋንቋ በጥሩ ሁኔታ ሊማሩ ይችላሉ።					
9	ጥሩ የእንግሊዝኛ ስዋሶው(Grammar) የሚያውቅ ተማሪ በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ በጥሩ ሁኔታ ይግባባል።					
10	የእንግሊዝኛ ስዋሶው(Grammar) ማወቅ በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ በጥሩ ሁኔታ ለመግባባት ዋስትና አይሆንም።					
11	መምህራን የእንግሊዝኛ ስዋሶው ሕግጋትን(Grammatical rules) በቀጥታ ቢያስተማሩ ተማሪው በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ በጥሩ ሁኔታ እንዲግባባ ያስችለዋል።					
12	ተማሪዎች በእንግሊዝኛ ት/ት በጽሁፍም ይሁን በንግግር ጊዜ ግድፈት ሲታይባቸው(ስህተት ሲገኝባቸው) በቡድን/በጥንድ እርስበርስ ቢተራረሙ ቋንቋውን በጥሩ ሁኔታ ሊማሩት ይችላሉ።					
13	ተማሪዎች ሲሳሳቱ አስተማሪው በቀጥታ ቢያርማቸው ይመረጣል።					
14	ተማሪዎች በመንፈቅ(Semester) ማጠቃለያ ከሚፈተኑ ይልቅ በየለቱ የእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ት/ት ተሳትፎ ተከታታይ ምዘና ቢመዘኑ ይመረጣል።					
15	ተማሪዎች በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ጥሩ ተግባራት እንዲኖራቸው የመምህሩ ግብረመልስ(Feedback) ወይም ማስተካከያ በቋንቋው ትክክለኛ አጠቃቀም(አግባባዊነት) ላይ እንጂ በስዋሶው(Grammar) ትክክለኛነት ላይ መሆን የለበትም።					
16	የቋንቋ መምህር፤ ተማሪ የሚፈጽመውን ማንኛውንም የስዋሶው ስህተት(Grammatical errors) ማስተካከል አለበት።					
17	መሳሳት ተፈጥሮአዊ ስለሆነ፤ ተማሪዎች ሲሳሳቱ መምህሩ አንዳንዴ ማለፍ ይገባቸዋል።					
18	የእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ መምህር ከተማሪዎች በእውቀት ስለሚሻሉ በቋንቋ ትምህርት ክ/ጊዜ መምህሩ ብቻ ቢያስተምሩ እና ተማሪው መምህሩ የሚሉትን ቢያዳምጥ የተሻለ ይሆናል።					
19	በቋንቋ ት/ት ክ/ጊዜ የመምህሩ ሚና ያለውን እውቀት ለተማሪው ማስተላለፍ ነው።					

3	መምህሩ በስፋት የሚያስተምሩበት/የሚያስረዱበት/ (ማለትም የተማሪው ተሳትፎ አነስተኛ የሆነበት) የትምህርት ጊዜያት ምን ያህል ነው?					
4	መምህሩ የስዋሰው/Grammatical/ ህጎችን በምሳሌ በማስደገፍ ያስረዳሉ					
5	መምህሩ፤ ተማሪዎች ባሉበት ቦታ ተቀምጠው(ማለትም ፊታቸውን ሳያዙ፤በክብ መልክ ሳይቀመጡ፤ በቡድን ወይም በጥንድ ሳይደራጁ) እንዲማሩ ደርጋሉ።					
6	መምህሩ፤ የአለቱን ቋንቋ ትምህርት ካስተዋወቁ፤ በልዩ ልዩ አውዳዊ አስረጃዎች(Contexts) ካብራሩ ትርጉሙንና ጠቀሜታውን ካስረዱ በኋላ፤ ተማሪዎችበቋንቋው እንዲናገሩ እንዲሁም እርስበርስ እንዲወያዩ ያበረታታሉ።					
7	መምህሩ ፤ተማሪዎች እንዲጠይቁና እንዲመልሱ ያደርጋሉ።					
8	መምህሩ ፤ተማሪዎች በተለያዩ ድራማዎች፤ እና ድራማ ነክ የክፍል ተግባራት ላይ እንዲሳተፉ ያደርጋሉ -ያበረታታሉ።					
9	መምህሩ ፤ተማሪዎች የተለያዩ እንቅስቃሴዎችንና ችግሮችን ለመፍታት በሚያደርጉት የእርስበርስ ውይይት ቋንቋውን እንዲማሩ ያደርጋሉ።					
10	መምህሩ፤ተማሪዎች በቡድን ወይም በጥንድ በመወያየት የስዕሎችን ልዩነትና ተመሳሳይነት እንዲለዩ ያደርጋሉ።					
11	መምህሩ፤ተማሪዎች በልዩ ልዩ ክርክሮች እና ንግግሮች ተሳትፎ እንዲያደርጉ ያበረታታሉ።					
12	መምህሩ ፤ተማሪዎች ልዩልዩ የቋንቋ ጨዋታዎችን እንዲጫወቱ በማድረግ ቋንቋውን በጨዋታ መልክ እንዲማሩ ሁኔታዎችን ያመቻቻሉ- ያበረታታሉ።					
13	መምህሩ፤ አንዱ ተማሪ ትእዛዝ ሲሰጥ ሌላው ተማሪ የታዘዘውን ትእዛዝ በወረቀት ላይ እንዲፅፍ(እንዲያሰፍር)እና እርስበርስ እንዲማማሩ ያደርጋሉ።					
14	መምህሩ፤ተማሪዎች ደብዳቤ እንዲጻፉ(እንዲለዋወጡ)፤ ሪፖርት፤ ማስታወቂያዎችን እና የመሳሰሉትን በመተባበር በጋራ እንዲፅፉ ያደርጋሉ።					
15	መምህሩ በክፍል ውስጥ እንደ ሬዲዮ፤ቴሌቪዥን ወይም ቴፕ ያሉትን የትምህርት መርጃ መሳሪያዎች በመጠቀም ያስተምራሉ።					
16	መምህሩ ትምህርቱን ተጨባጭ ለማድረግ ሥዕላ/ሥዕል፤ ካርታዎችን፤ወይም ቁሳቁሶችን በመጠቀም ያስተምራሉ።					
17	መምህሩ፤ ተማሪዎች ሁለት ሁለት በመሆን /በጥንድ/ የተለያዩ ተግባራትን ለመፈፀም በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ እንዲወያዩ ያደርጋሉ፤ያበረታታሉ።					
18	መምህሩ፤ ተማሪዎች ከሁለት በላይ(በቡድን) በመሆን የተለያዩ ተግባራትን ለመፈፀም በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ እንዲወያዩ ያደርጋሉ፤ ያበረታታሉ።					
19	መምህሩ፤ ተማሪዎችን በቡድን/በጥንድ በማደራጀት አንዱ ተማሪ የሌላውን					

	ስህተት እንዲያርም(እርስ በርስ እንዲተራረሙ) እንዲሁም በስህተታቸው ላይ እንዲወያዩ ያደርጋሉ-ያበረታታሉ።፤					
20	መምህሩ በመንፈቅ(Semester) መጨረሻ ላይ ወይም በሩብ አመት (Term) መጨረሻ ላይ ተማሪዎችን የወረቀት ላይ ሙከራ/ፈተና ይሰጣሉ/ይፈትናሉ።					
21	መመህሩ፤ ተማሪዎች ልዩልዩ መልመጃዎችን(ሙከራዎችን) ቤታቸው እንዲሰሩ ካደረጉ በኋላ አጠቃላይ መልሶችን በቀጣይ ቀናት ውስጥ ለሁሉም ተማሪዎች ባንዴ ይሰጣሉ።					
22	መመህሩ፤የተማሪዎችን የእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ መሻሻል(ለውጥ) ለማወቅ ተማሪዎችን በየቀኑ በሚያደርጉት/በሚያሳዩት የክፍል ውስጥ ልዩልዩ ተሳትፎዎች ይገመግማሉ፤ (ለማሳሌ፡- ከቡድን ሥራ ወይም ከውይይት በኋላ) ውጤታቸውንም ይመዘግባሉ።					
23	መምህሩ የተማሪዎችን ስህተት በጥያቄና መልስ መልክ ያስተካክላሉ፡-/ጥያቄ በመጠየቅ እና መልስ በመስጠት/።					

APPENDIX- C: CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

School _____ Lesson _____

Grade and Section _____ Date _____

Teacher _____ Time _____

No	Activities to be observed	Class Time 45'								
		1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45
1	Instructional Activities									
1.1	Classroom activities maximizing communication opportunity e.g. (role play, drama, dialogue, simulation, problem solving etc.)									
1.2	Focus on language as a medium of communication									
1.3	More pupil –oriented									
1.4	Tolerating error correction									
1.5	More emphasis on group- work and pair- work									
1.6	Emphasis on meaning									
1.7	Emphasis on both fluency and accuracy									
2	Teacher’s Role									
2.1	Independent participation in learners’ group									
2.2	Organizing group –work									
2.3	Organizing pair-work									
2.4	Lecturing /L/									
2.5	Facilitating and monitoring class activities									
3	Learners’ Role									
3.1	Listening to teacher’s explanation									
3.2	Participating in group and pair work									
3.3	Taking note									
3.4	Asking questions to teachers									
3.5	Doing individual work									
4	Instructional Materials Used									
4.1	Textbook									
4.2.	Duplicated materials									
4.3	Audio-visual material									
4.4	Magazines									
4.5	Newspaper									
4.6	Pictures, maps ,charts									

APPENDIX- D: INTERVIEW GUIDSE FOR TEACHERS

Good morning/afternoon: my name is _____. I came from the Department of Foreign Language and Literature, Addis Ababa University to study English teachers perceptions and classroom practice of communicative language teaching (CLT) in the teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL).

I appreciate your cooperation and willingness to my interview. Your genuine opinion or response has its own contribution to my study and I kindly request you to give me the required information, therefore. I would like to thank you again for sparing your valuable time and effort in this interview. I would like to let you know that any information will be kept confidential and used only for this study.

1. What does communicative language teaching mean for you?
2. What, do you think, are the ways of teaching English language communicatively?
3. How do you relate communicative language teaching method to your teaching experience?
4. How do, you think, learners should learn English language in the classroom (meaning concerning with learner centered and /or teacher fronted teaching ways)?
5. What, do you think, should the role of the teacher be in the language classroom?
6. What, do you think, should the role of the learner be in the language classroom?
7. What do you say about the importance of error correction in EFL learning?
8. How do you correct your students when committing errors?
9. How do you evaluate your students' language progress or what evaluation techniques do you employ?
10. What materials do you employ in the language classroom?

APPENDIX- E: ቃለ መጠይቅ ለተማሪዎች

ጤና ይስጥልኝ፤ _____ እባላለሁ። የመጣሁት ከአዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ የድህረ ምረቃ ት/ቤት የእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ትምህርት ክፍል ነው። የመጣሁትም ተማሪዎች ስለ ተግባቦታዊ የቋንቋ ትምህርት/Communicative Language Learning/ ያላቸውን ግንዛቤ ለማወቅና በክፍል ውስጥ የእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ትምህርት በምን መልክ እየተሰጠ እንዳለ መረጃ በመስጠሱ ለማጥናት።

በቃለመጠይቁ ለመሳተፍ ፍቃደኛ በመሆንህ/ሽ በቅደሚያ ላመሰግንህ/ሽ እወዳለሁ። የምትሰጠኝ/ጭኝ ትክክለኛ ምላሽ ወይም አስተያየት ለጥናቴ ከፍተኛ አስተዋጽኦ ስላለው ሚዛናዊ ምላሽ/አስተያየት እንድትሰጠኝ/ጭኝ በትህትና እጠየቃለሁ። የምትሰጠኝ/ጭኝ አስተያየት/ምላሽ በሚስጥር ተጠብቆ ለጥናቴ ውጤት ብቻ የሚውል መሆኑን እየገለጥኩ፤ውድ ጊዜህን/ሽን ሰውተህ/ሽ ለቃለ መተይቁ ስለተባበርከኝ/ሽኝ በደጋሚ ከልብ አመሰግናለሁ።

1. ተግባቦታዊ የቋንቋ ትምህርት/Communicative Language Learning/ እንዴት ትረዳዋለህ/ትረጂዋለሽ?
2. በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ት/ት/ ክ/ጊዜ በጥንድ ወይም በቡድን ከክፍል ጓደኞችህ ጋር የመስራትን/መወያየትን ጠቀሜታ እንዴት ትገልጠዋለህ?
3. ላንተ/ላንቺ በክፍል ውስጥ መምህር ቢያስረዳህ (ቢያስተምርህ) የሻልሃል ወይስ እርስ በርስ ከጓደኞችህ ጋር በመወያየት ብትማማር?
4. ቋንቋን መማር ማለት ላንት/ቺ ምን ማለት ነው-ማለትም የቋንቋውን ስዋሶው ጠንቅቆ ማወቅ ወይስ በቋንቋው የመግባባት ክህሎትን ማዳበር?
5. የቋንቋን ህግጋትን ከመማር ይልቅ ቋንቋን በጨዋታ፤ እንቅስቃሴ፤ በስላሳስላሳ ወዘተ. መልክ ብትማር ምን ይመስልሃል?
6. የመምህሩ ሚና በቋንቋ ት/ት ክ/ጊዜ ምን አይነታ መሆን አለበት ብለህ/ሽ ታስባለህ/ታስቢያለሽ?
7. የተማሪውስ ?
8. በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ትምህርት ያሳየኸውን/ያሳየሽውን መሻሻል ለማወቅ መምህርህ/ሽ በምን መልክ ቢገመግምህ/ሽ ትመርጣለህ/ትመርጫለሽ?
9. ከመማሪያ መፃህፍት በተጨማሪ መምህርህ/ሽ በምን ቢያስተምርህ/ሽ ወይም ምን አይነት የማስተማሪያ መሳሪያዎች ቢጠቀም ትመርጣለህ/ትመርጫለሽ?
10. ተማሪው እርስ በርስ በመረዳዳት/በመወያየት ከመምህሩ ብዙም ሳይጠብቅ በራሱ መማር ይችላል ብለህ/ሽ ታስባለህ/ታስቢያለሽ?

