



International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching

Volume 5, Issue 2, June 2017, p. 77-93

Received	Reviewed	Published	Doi Number
04.04.2017	18.05.2017	30.06.2017	10.18298/ijlet.1734

THE COMPARISON OF THE VIEW OF “COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING” IN ABANT IZZET BAYSAL UNIVERSITY, TURKEY AND SUSSEX UNIVERSITY; UK.

Bilge METİN TEKİN ¹

ABSTRACT

For language teachers, the study of education from international and comparative points of view, which is undertaken by comparative education, is essential because of the international nature of language education. For language teachers, working abroad to widen their experience is very common. Therefore, knowing the latest and common approach is also very important. The purpose of this study is to examine instructors' attitudes towards "communicative language teaching, CLT" in AIBU, Turkey and Sussex University, UK. Therefore, this study gives a chance to understand the instructors' views of CLT. Furthermore, as it is known that European countries start to use CLT before Turkey, it provides us with an opportunity to compare and contrast two universities. To accomplish this, 10 prep-class instructors from AIBU and 10 instructors from Sussex University were surveyed using an instrument. In analysis and presentation of the data derived from this study, SPSS 15 was used. At the end of the study, it is observed that there is a remarkable difference between two universities in terms of using CLT. The instructors at Sussex University appreciate using CLT in their teaching process. On the other hand, the instructors at AIBU are not comfortable while using CLT. They can't use it accurately. Moreover, the instructors at AIBU claim that there isn't a suitable environment to use this approach.

Key Words: Communicative Language teaching, CLT, teaching English, comparative education, university students and instructors.

1. Introduction

A lot of people all around the world use English for different reasons to communicate with each other. There are many ways or methods to teach English. One of them is Communicative Language Teaching known as CLT. Brown (1994: 77) defines CLT as;

"Beyond grammatical discourse elements in communication, we are probing the nature of social, cultural, and pragmatic features of language. We are exploring pedagogical means for 'real-life' communication in the classroom. We are trying to get our learners to develop linguistic fluency, not just the accuracy that has so consumed our historical journey. We are equipping our students with tools for generating unrehearsed language performance 'out there' when they leave the womb of our classrooms. We are concerned with how to facilitate lifelong language learning among our students, not just with the immediate classroom task. We are looking at learners as partners in a cooperative venture. And our classroom practices seek to draw on whatever intrinsically sparks learners to reach their fullest potential."

¹ Instructor, Ankara University, bilgemetin@gmail.com

As Jie (2010) pointed out in his thesis, "Howatt (1984) divides CLT into two versions – strong and weak. The strong version assumes that natural processes happening inside the learner's mind are responsible for language learning and the teachers cannot control these processes directly. On the other hand, in the "weak" version of CLT, the aim is the same, but the means used to achieve it are different. Classroom activities are more structured to enable learners to practice communicative functions in a controlled way". In short, strong version can be described as "using English to learn" while weak version is "learning to use".

CLT is a result of educators' and linguistics' displeasure with the other teaching methods such as Grammar Translation Method or etc. According to them, students cannot learn without enough realistic. They cannot know how to use social language, their gestures or etc. So, it can be said that teaching English does not only mean that teaching grammar. Teacher should teach to their students how to communicate in real life. Teaching functions and notions, real life communication strategies are essential in teaching process. For this reason, CLT is most appropriate. Teaching to students how to *use* the language is important which makes communicative competence more important.

According to Savignon (2002:3), "CLT put the focus on the learner: 'Learner communicative needs provide a framework for elaborating program goals in terms of functional competence'". She proposed five components of a communicative curriculum. These are:

"**1. Language arts** includes those elements that teachers often do best; it may be all they have been taught to do including exercises used in mother tongue to focus attention on formal accuracy. **2. Language for a purpose** is the use of language for real communication goals. **3. Personal English language use** relates to the learners' emerging identity in English. **4. Theatre arts** means to teach in a way that can provide learners with the tool they need to act in new language such as to interpret, express, and negotiate meaning. **5. Beyond the classroom** refers to the need to prepare learners to use the language they learn in the world outside the classrooms."

Daugherty (2008: 39) thinks that "The goal of communicative language approaches is to create a realistic context for language acquisition in the classroom. The focus is on functional language usage and the ability to learners to express their own ideas, feelings, attitudes, desires and needs. Open ended questioning and problem-solving activities and exchanges of personal information are utilized as the primary means of communication. Students usually work with authentic materials (authentic realia) in small groups on communication activities, during which they receive practice in negotiating meaning."

Margie S. Berns writes "language is interaction; it is interpersonal activity and has a clear relationship with society. In this light, language study has to look at the use (function) of language in context, both its linguistic context (what is uttered before and after a given piece of discourse) and its social, or situational, context (who is speaking, what their social roles are, why they have come together to speak)". (Berns, 1984: 5) .

Brown (2001: 43) offers the following six interconnected characteristics as a description of CLT:

1. Classroom goals are focused on all of the components (grammatical, discourse, functional, sociolinguistics/pragmatic and strategic) of communicative competence.
2. Language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes. Fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative techniques.
3. At times fluency may have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learner meaningfully engaged in language use.
4. Students in a communicative class ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts outside the classroom.
5. Students are given opportunities to focus on their own learning process through understanding of their own styles of learning and through the development of appropriate strategies for autonomous learning
6. The role of the teacher is that of facilitator and guide not an all-knowing bestower of knowledge. Students are therefore encouraged to construct meaning through genuine linguistic interaction with others.

Finocchiaro and Brumfit's (1983: 91-3) detailed discussion summarized by Beale (2002: 15) is presented as follows:

1. Teaching is learner-centred and responsive to learners' needs 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.

Prabhu (1987) categorized activities which have been used in teaching process;

1- Information-gap activity, which involves a transfer of given information from one person to another – or from one form to another, or from one place to another – generally calling for the decoding or encoding of information from or into language. One example is pair work in which each member of the pair has a part of the total information (for example an incomplete picture) and attempts to convey it verbally to the other. Another example is completing a tabular representation with information available in a given piece of text. The activity often involves selection of relevant information as well, and learners may have to meet criteria of completeness and correctness in making the transfer.

2- Reasoning – gap activity, which involves deriving some new information from given information through processes of inference, deduction, practical reasoning, or a perception of relationships or patterns. One example is working out a teacher's timetable on the basis of given class timetables. Another is deciding what course of action is best (for example cheapest or quickest) for a given purpose and within given constraints. The activity 25 necessarily involves comprehending and conveying information, as an information-gap activity, but the information to be conveyed is not identical with that initially comprehended. There is a piece of reasoning which connects the two.

3- Opinion – gap activity, which requires that students give their personal preferences, feelings, or attitudes in order to complete a task. For instance, students might be given a social problem, such as high unemployment and be asked to come up with a series of possible solutions. Another task might be to compose a letter of advice to a friend who has sought their counsel about a dilemma. In our lesson, the students were only at the advanced-beginning level. Their opinion-gap task was a rather simple one which involved students' surveying their classmates about their favourite subjects. (Prabhu, 1987: 46-47)

When the classroom environment is thought, these kinds of activities are really important. So the activites should contain oral communication which consist of meaningful tasks and real life conversation, and they must be task-based and authentic.

However, there are some factors which affect to use these kinds of activities. For example; if the classroom size is too large, it is quite impossible to use pair or group work activities, or for instance, in Turkey, students have the same mother tongue and so they do not have to use English in their classroom. Moreover, they never have English outside the classroom. Another example for this, if the students are unwilling to learn language, it is again too difficult to use these kinds of activities.

Background of the Study

The University of Sussex, UK was founded in the 1960s and it is one of the biggest and leading university. Moreover, it is an international university, and there are more than 2,500 international students from 120 countries, and teaching staff who come from 50 nations. As it is an international university, University of Sussex Language Institute gives English language courses to international students.

Abant Izzet Baysal University, Turkey was founded on July 3, 1992 by the help of Izzet Baysal. It is still supported by a foundation, which was founded by İzzet Baysal. It is located between two metropolis, İstanbul and Ankara. Today, it has 10 faculties, 4 institutes, 6 schools, 7 vocational schools and 14 research centers. The educational language is English; therefore, the students have to know English. If they don't, they learn it at the School of Foreign Languages (in prep class) before starting their departments. The compulsory, optional, professional lectures are given by School of Foreign Languages.

The instructors of Abant Izzet Baysal and Sussex University use Communicative Language Teaching but the important point is how they use this method. By the help of this study, we can see the result of this question.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to compare and examine instructors' attitudes towards "communicative language teaching, CLT" in Abant Izzet Baysal University, Turkey and Sussex University, UK. Therefore, this study gives a chance to understand the instructors' view of CLT in Abant Izzet Baysal University, Turkey and Sussex University, UK. Furthermore, it provides us with an opportunity to compare and contrast two universities.

Research Questions

In the study, answers to the following research questions are guided:

- 1) What do instructors of AIBU know about Conception of CLT?
- 2) What do instructors of Sussex University know about Conception of CLT?
- 3) Is there a significant difference between instructors of AIBU and Sussex University in terms of using CLT in their teaching?
- 4) Is there a significant difference between instructors of AIBU and Sussex University in terms of any problems when implementing CLT in their classrooms?

Significance of the Study

The approaches, used in ELT, are not very new subject in the field of language teaching. There have been numerous studies carried out in this field in order to understand their effectiveness and weakness through the use of various techniques such as classroom observations, interviews, language learning diaries, detailed questionnaires and so forth.

In this study, I will study Communicative Language teaching and I will try to find out the differences and the similarities between Sussex University and Abant Izzet Baysal University about how CLT is applied. As it was said before, European countries, especially England, started to use CLT before Turkey. So, the teachers in Turkey try to use this approach in their classes like the teachers in European countries. However, it is doubtful whether they use this approach appropriately or not.

By the help of this study, we can understand what the instructors of Abant Izzet Baysal University think about CLT and CLT's advantages and disadvantages. Moreover, we can compare with the Sussex University where all the instructors and the candidate teachers use Communicative Language Teaching in their classes. Briefly, this study is important because at the end of this study, we can understand if the CLT, which is a common approach, is suitable for our students in Abant Izzet Baysal University or not, and how it can be used in our classes.

Assumptions

In the current research, it was assumed that;

- The research design in relation with the research questions is appropriate.
- The survey used in this study is suitable to collect relevant data.
- The sample chosen for this study is the right way to reach valid and reliable results
- The participants who took part in the current research willingly responded to the survey.

Limitations

This study is limited to:

- The instructors teaching English at Sussex University and Abant Izzet Baysal University.
- A survey consisting of different sections including items whose aims are to learn the opinions about Communicative Language Teaching.

2. Method

The current study is a quantitative one. A questionnaire was used in order to collect data. It was prepared by Huw Jarvis and can be seen at the Appendix A. There is a permission to use his questionnaire for this study.

This study was conducted at Abant Izzet Baysal University and Sussex University. The participants of this study were EFL instructors from the language preparatory classes of Abant Izzet Baysal University, Turkey and from language courses of Sussex University, UK. The questionnaire was given to 20 instructors (10 instructors of AIBU and 10 instructors of Sussex University). The instructors of AIBU are Turkish and most of them have 6-10 year experience while the instructors of Sussex University are British and they have more than 10 years experiences. The instructors' survey questions can be categorized in two parts: part1; is about the conception of Communicative Language Teaching, and part2 is about Communicative Language Teaching Implementation.

The answers given to the items in questionnaires were analyzed using The Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS 15) and Chi-square test.

3. Findings about Research Questions

In response to question 1, which asked for definition of CLT, nearly all of the instructors thought language as communication. These definitions are similar to the notions which are mentioned in the introduction part. They know what CLT is and its necessities. They are aware of the activities.

For question 2, every single instructor of Sussex University mentioned that they use CLT in their teaching; on the other hand, half of the instructors of AIBU mentioned that they don't use CLT in their teaching. These two questions confirm that the instructors of Sussex University know and use CLT while the instructors of AIBU know CLT but they don't use them in their classrooms. There is 55 a significant difference between two universities for using CLT in their classrooms ($p<0,005$).

Table 1: Whether there is a significant difference between two universities for using CLT.

Pearson Chi-Square	Value	Df	Asymp Sig.
Question 2	9,314 (a)	3	,001

Question 3 finds out a number of conceptions and misconceptions about CLT in practice. A great deal of date is generated from Likert attitude scales of this type.

Statement 1 (S1) indicates that while the instructors of AIBU (50%) would place accuracy above fluency, the instructors of Sussex University (60%) neither agree nor disagree about this statement. So, it can be said that for the instructors of Sussex University both accuracy and fluency are important. The 50% of the instructors of AIBU agree that accuracy is more important than fluency; however, the 30% of them disagree that statement.

Table 2: Fluency or Accuracy (Frequency and Percentage)

Statements	University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1- Teaching should focus on fluency rather than accuracy .	AIBU	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)
	Sussex	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)

For Statement 2, the vast majority (70% from AIBU and 90% from Sussex University) of the instructors see students as being centre of knowledge transmission which means that they choose learner-centred teaching style. So the teachers' roles are a "planner", a "counselor" and a "helper" in various stages of the activities.

Table 3: Learner-centered or Teacher-centered (Frequency and Percentage)

Statements	University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. The students should be the centre of the knowledge transmission. The teacher should be their facilitator.	AIBU	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)
	Sussex	1 (10%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)

The response to statement 3 and 4, the vast majority again (60% from AIBU and 70% from Sussex University) believe in an indeductive approach through “struggling to communicate” which is presumably seen as being achieved through use of role play games etc. (S4: 50% from AIBU and 70% from Sussex University). The 30% of the instructors of AIBU believe that deductive teaching is better; on the other hand, only one instructor of Sussex University believes it.

Table 4: Deductive or indeductive approach (Frequency and Percentage)

Statements	University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
3. The teacher should strongly encourage the students to learn by themselves through struggling to communicate.	AIBU	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
	Sussex	1 (10%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)

For statement 4, the vast majority of instructors of Sussex University (70%) are aware of the importance of role play/games/group or pair work; while, the half of the instructors of AIBU are aware of it.

Table 5: The importance of role play/games/ group or pair work instead of explicit teaching structures. (Frequency and Percentage)

Statements	University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. The teacher should spend a lot of time on role play/ games/ group and pair work instead of explicitly teaching structures	AIBU	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)
	Sussex	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)

The response to statement 5 shows that the instructors of both universities don't agree that the notion that CLT places speaking above other skills which means that it is not universally accepted (60% from AIBU and 60% from Sussex University). Moreover, it can be said that the 60% of the instructors of Sussex University believe that all skill are important and essential.

Table 6: The place of Speaking Skills. (Frequency and Percentage)

Statements	University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. The lesson should focus mostly on speaking skill.	AIBU	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)
	Sussex	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)

The response to statement 7 shows that while the 40% instructors of AIBU disagree that the teacher should not correct the students' mistakes at all unless they cause communication breakdown, the 40% instructors agree this statement. On the other hand, the 70% instructors of Sussex University disagree about this statement. This shows that views on error correction are varied.

Table 7: Correcting the students' mistakes. (Frequency and Percentage)

Statements	University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6. The teacher should not correct the students' mistakes at all unless they may cause communication breakdown	AIBU	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)
	Sussex	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	0 (0%)

The response to statement 7 shows that the role of authentic material is widely recognized because the vast majority of the instructors of both universities (60% instructors of AIBU and 40% instructors of Sussex University) agree on the importance of authentic materials. On the other hand, the 10% instructors of AIBU and the 40% instructors of Sussex disagree of the statement.

Table 8: The place of Authentic Material. (Frequency and Percentage)

Statements	University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. The students should be exposed to authentic language and material all the time.	AIBU	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Sussex	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)

The vast majority of the instructors (90% from AIBU and 100% from Sussex University) agree that language tasks should be meaningful and purposeful which is very important for CLT approach. According to them, tasks should be communicative instead of mechanic. Students should learn functions and how to speak.

Table 9: Language tasks should be meaningful and purposeful. (Frequency and Percentage)

Statements	University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. Language task should be meaningful and purposeful.	AIBU	3 (30%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
	Sussex	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

The response to statement 9 shows that the vast majority of the instructors (80%) of Sussex University think that CLT is an effective approach for their students; the 40% of instructors of AIBU neither agree nor disagree on this statement. In addition, the 40% of the instructors of AIBU disagree on this statement.

Table 10: CLT is an effective or ineffective approach for their students. (Frequency and Percentage)

Statements	University	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
9. CLT is an effective approach for your students.	AIBU	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
	Sussex	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)

Part 2 explores issues surrounding its implementation. In response to question four every instructor of AIBU (100%) reported finding problems when implementing CLT in their classroom; on the other hand, half of the instructors of Sussex University reported finding problems and half of the instructors reported not finding problems when implementing CLT in their classroom. "Is there a significant difference among the teachers' at AIBU and Sussex University problems about CLT?". The answer to this question was given by Chisquare Test. Whether there is a significant difference between the instructors' (of AIBU and Sussex University) opinions can be seen by the help of Chi-square test. ($p < 0,05$ means there is a significant difference). As can be seen in table 13 below there are some significant differences between AIBU and Sussex University instructors' problems with CLT for this part of the survey was found, like; Part 2: Question 4.7., 4.8., But as it was said before, the instructors of Sussex University don't have any problems; whereas, half of the instructors of AIBU have some problems which means that there is a significant differences between two universities' instructors because for the question 4 in Teacher questionnaire $p < 0,005$.

Table 11: Whether there is a significant difference among the teachers' views at AIBU and Sussex University about CLT.

Pearson ChiSquare	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig.
Part 2: Question 4	7,246(a)	3	,002
Part 2: Question 4.1	6,147(a)	3	,105
Part 2: Question 4.2.	6,376(a)	3	,095
Part 2: Question 4.3.	9,947(a)	3	,019
Part 2: Question 4.5.	1,955(a)	3	,582
Part 2: Question 4.6.	,743(a)	3	,863
Part 2: Question 4.7.	13,016(a)	3	,005
Part 2: Question 4.8.	14,048(a)	3	,003
Part 2: Question 4.9.	2,561(a)	3	,464
Part 2: Question 4.10.	11,209(a)	3	,011

The problems, as the table below indicates, are varied but mainly relate to the level of students, to their responsibility and their learning styles. Class size, time of the period of lessons and, to lesser extent, the demands of the examination system are also significant. Moreover, while the instructors of AIBU have more problems about CLT, the instructors of Sussex University have few problems. For example, time is really important to catch up with the syllabus for instructors of AIBU, on the other hand, the 20 % of the instructors think that it is a problem. Although the percentage is different, the second problem is for both universities' instructors are the same; "You are not ready to give up your authoritative role". As it was mentioned in the introduction part, in Turkey the class size is too big for CLT and exam style doesn't match with CLT. Also, the students got used Grammar Translation Method, so they are not comfortable with CLT based instruction.

Table 12. Problems implementing CLT according to AIBU instructors

Percentage	Problems
100%	3. Time is limited.
100%	10. You are not ready to give up your authoritative role.
80%	8. Material does not facilitate CLT implementation.

70%	1. The students' English proficiency level is too low.
70%	2. Class size is too big.
50%	6. The examination format is not totally CLT-based.
40%	9. You are not clear what CLT expects you to do.
10%	5. The students are not comfortable with CLT.
10%	7. The students need accuracy rather than fluency.
0%	4. The students' responsibility is low
0%	11. You mind if your students question or challenge your knowledge.

Table 13. Problems implementing CLT according to Sussex University instructors

Percentage	Problems
40%	1. The students' English proficiency level is too low.
30%	10. You are not ready to give up your authoritative role.
20%	3. Time is limited.
20%	6. The examination format is not totally CLT-based.
10%	2. Class size is too big.
10%	9. You are not clear what CLT expects you to do.
0%	4. The students' responsibility is low
0%	5. The students are not comfortable with CLT.
0%	7. The students need accuracy rather than fluency.
0%	8. Material does not facilitate CLT implementation.
0%	11. You mind if your students question or challenge your knowledge.

When asked to elaborate on problems or offer other limitations, the vast majority instructors of AIBU reported that;

- 1- CLT is not suitable for their students.
- 2- The students should have some level in order to push them to communicate in the target language.
- 3- Without knowing some structures, the students cannot make any progress no matter how hard you try to encourage them to express their ideas.
- 4- This method may work well with smaller classes.
- 5- It causes some problems when it is used at beginner level.
- 6- Due to some factors, such as time, syllabus or the unwillingness of the students, using these techniques practically can be impossible.
- 7- As all their students are Turkish, their mother-tongue causes a problem.
- 8- Sometimes students' attitudes towards communicative activities make you reluctant.
- 9- The exam their students are supposed to prepare for requires accuracy rather than fluency; so students focus on grammar and feel better if they teach them the rules.
- 10- The motivation is low.
- 11- Their students' background is not suitable for CLT. Generally, they are taught English by using Grammar Translation Method. So they are not comfortable with CLT.
- 12- Their students aim is to pass the proficiency exam not to communicate.

When asked to elaborate on problems or offer other limitations, the vast majority instructors of Sussex University reported that;

- 1- With younger learners it is difficult (but not impossible) to find a balance between discipline + CLT.
- 2- Many formal examinations (especially the Cambridge ones) use a very formal Grammar translation method of testing; so, when preparing for those exams they use less CLT methodology.

4. Conclusion

The results of this study revealed that the data shows that teachers tend to hold certain beliefs about their work; however, there was a significant difference between the instructors' from Sussex University and the instructors' from AIBU attitudes towards CLT. Whereas the instructors from Sussex University could use CLT appropriately without any difficulties, the instructors from AIBU had some problems while they were using CLT in their classrooms. The instructors at Sussex University are comfortable while using CLT, on the other hand, the instructors at AIBU claim that they have some problems while using CLT in their teaching process.

All of the instructors of Sussex University use Communicative Language teaching in their classrooms. Moreover, most of them agree that they have no problems while using CLT. I think this is because they have 8-9 students in their classrooms, moreover generally they are from different countries so they can't use their mother tongue and they have to use target language.

On the other hand, the instructors of AIBU have knowledge about CLT but they can't use this in their classrooms exactly because the most important problem is the students' mother tongue. Moreover the classroom size affects using CLT and some students, depending on their background, actually want grammar classes. They do not take lessons seriously when they are taught through CLT. In addition to them time is too limited for the heavy syllabus. They want the students to learn the English in a detailed way but in a short time.

The recent studies in Turkey also show the same results. As Hunutlu (2011) stated before that teachers in Turkey have positive views on CLT and they try to use CLT in their teaching environment. However, there are some difficulties to implement CLT in their teaching process. Moreover, Özsevik (2010) also pointed in his doctoral dissertation that there are some obstacles such as large classes, teachers' heavy workload or students' low motivation or etc. in Turkey which affects implementing CLT.

Moreover, as Cimen (2008; 71) stated that there are some differences between the senior and junior teachers' opinions about CLT.

The reason for the remarkable level of adequacy of junior language teachers' of CLT background knowledge may be the very recent graduate levels and their interests of language teaching on contrary some of the senior language teachers graduate level are so far and different from junior ones like graduated from Teachers High Schools or Education Institutes. But the case cannot stand by pointing the issue considering the graduate departments or levels. The main idea can be concealed in the interest of language teachers on language teaching. On that case senior language teachers -according to this survey, are in loss of the background knowledge of CLT.

Briefly, the findings of this and previous case studies show that the teachers have knowledge about CLT and they try to use CLT in their classroom but they have some difficulties while they are implementing it in their classrooms.

References

- Androsenko, V. P. (1992). A Refresher Course in Communicative Teaching. Forum, Volume 30, Number 2, April 1992, pp. 2-6.
- Beale, J. (2002). "Is Communicative Language Teaching a Thing in the Past?" TESOL .37/1: 12-16
- Berns, M. S. (1984). Functional approaches to language and language teaching: Another look. In S. Savignon & M. S. Berns (Eds.), "Initiatives in communicative language teaching. A book of readings" (pp. 3-21). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Fourth Edition. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, Second Edition. New York: Longman.
- Brumfit, C. J. & K. Johnson (eds) (1979). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cimen, C. (2008). The comparison of senior and junior language teachers' awareness of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) background theory, in Turkey. (Published Master's Dissertation). Abant İzzet Baysal University, Turkey.

- Clarke, D. (1989). Communicative theory and its influence on materials production.' *Language Teaching* 22/2: 73-86.
- Daugherity, F.L. (2008). *A Correlative Study of the International English Language Testing System Listening Test and a New Repetition Test*. Published Thesis, Capella University.
- Demirel, Ö. (2004). *ELT Methodology*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları.
- Finocchiaro, M. & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The Functional-Notional Approach. From Theory to Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howatt, A.P.R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hunutlu, S. (2011). Communicative Language Teaching in Turkey: Teachers' views and Classroom Practices.(MA Thesis, 2011, Ataturk University).
- Hymes D. Pride & Holmes J. (1972). 'On communicative competence' in J. B., *Sociolinguistics*, HarmondsworthPenguin
- Jarvis, H. & Atsilarat, S. (2000). *Shifting paradigms: from a communicative to a context-based approach*. Asian EFL Journal.(http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Dec_04_HI&SA.pdf)
- Jie, Z. (2010). The Application of Eclectic Approach to Primary School English Teaching. (Published Master's Dissertation). Shanghai International Studies University.
- Littlewood, W. (1992). *Teaching Oral Communication: A Methodological Framework*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative Language Teaching: Making it work. ELT Journal, 41/2, 136-145.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1991). "Communicative tasks and the language curriculum." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 2, Summer 1991, pp. 279-95.
- Özsevik, Z.,(2010). The use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL teachers' perceived difficulties in implementing CLT in Turkey (Doctoral dissertation,2010, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), 10-130.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Interactive Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R.W. (1983). *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.
- Richards, J. C. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in language teaching: a description and analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2000). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rogers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savignon S. (2002). 'Communicative curriculum design for the 21st century', *English Teaching Forum*, vol. 40 (pg. 2-7)
- Savignon, S., & Berns, M. S. (Eds.). (1984). "Initiatives in communicative language teaching." Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Thompson, G. (1996). *Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching*. English Language Teaching Journal, 50(1), 9-15.
- Yu, L. (2001). *Communicative Language Teaching in China: Progress and Resistance*. TESOL Quarterly, 35(1), 194-198.

Note:

- 1- This study is related to my MA thesis carried out at Abant Izzet Baysal University, Turkey (2008).
 2-It was presented at III. International Educational Congress, Faculty of education, Girne American University as a notice (16-18, April, 2008)

APPENDIX**Questionnaire****Part 1: Conception of Communicative Language Teaching**

1. Briefly define CLT (one or two sentences)

2. Do you use CLT in your teaching? Please put ✓.

YES NO

3. Please put ✓ in a column that matches your opinion most.

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1- Teaching should focus on fluency rather than accuracy .					
2. The students should be the centre of the knowledge transmission. The teacher should be their facilitator.					
3. The teacher should strongly encourage the students to learn by themselves through struggling to communicate.					
4. The teacher should spend a lot of time on role play/ games/ group and pair work instead of explicitly teaching structures					
5. The lesson should focus mostly on speaking skill.					
6. The teacher should not correct the students' mistakes at all unless they may cause communication breakdown					
7. The students should be exposed to authentic language and material all the time.					

8. Language task should be meaningful and purposeful.					
9. CLT is an effective approach for your students.					

Part 2 CLT Implementation

4. Have you experienced any problems when implementing CLT in your classroom?

YES (please go to 4.1 and then to 5) NO (please go to 5)

4.1 If yes, please tick \any problems that you find relevant to your situation.

- The students are not comfortable with CLT.
- The students need accuracy rather than fluency.
- The students' English proficiency level is too low.
- You are not ready to give up your authoritative role.
- You mind if your students question or challenge your knowledge.
- The students' responsibility is low.
- Class size is too big.
- Time is limited.
- Material does not facilitate CLT implementation.
- The examination format is not totally CLT-based.
- You are not clear what CLT expects you to do

From 4.1 please feel free to use the space below to give any further explanation for the above choice(s)

Please use the space below to identify any other limitations that prevent you from successfully implementing CLT.

- | | | | |
|---------|--|--------|---|
| 5. I am | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> British | I have | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> less than 1 year teaching experience. |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Turk | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1-5 years |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> American | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6-10 years |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> more than 10 years |