

Challenges In Implementing The CLT Approach For Non-Native English Learners

Alka Vijay^{1*}, Dr. Suresh²

^{1*}Ph.D. Scholar, Department of English, NIMS University, Rajasthan, Jaipur

²Associate Professor, Department of English, NIMS University, Rajasthan, Jaipur

ABSTRACT

The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach has gained prominence in English Language Teaching (ELT), especially in teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) to non-native learners. However, its effective implementation faces numerous challenges. This paper explores and analyzes these challenges in CLT implementation for non-native English learners. Beginning with an overview of CLT's features and goals, the paper examines the roles of teachers and learners, as well as instructional activities in CLT. Through a comprehensive literature review, the study investigates challenges categorized as teacher-related, student-related, education-system-related, CLT methodology-related, and cultural differences-related. The primary hindrances encompass large class sizes, curriculum-assessment mismatch, cultural disparities, inadequate training, and socio-economic limitations. The paper highlights researchers' recommendations to overcome these challenges, enabling educators to adapt CLT to the diverse needs of non-native English learners. Ultimately, the paper underscores the implications of CLT implementation.

Keywords: Communicative Language Teaching, CLT, English Language Teaching, ELT, EFL, non-native learners, challenges, implementation, teacher roles, learner roles

INTRODUCTION

Communication is the fundamental aspect of human life, with language being the essential tool for interaction. The globalized world necessitates a common language for effective communication, and English has taken on this role (Crystal, 1997). As societies become more interconnected, the demand for effective English communication skills has grown. Various methods like Grammar-Translation, Audio Lingual, and Direct Methods have been employed to teach English, often emphasizing accuracy through grammar rules and repetition.

In the 1960s, criticisms arose about the limitations of existing language teaching methods, which focused primarily on grammar rules rather than real-life communication. This led to the emergence of the communicative approach, conceptualized by Dell Hymes in 1966 and later termed 'Communicative Language Teaching' (CLT) by linguist Christopher Brumfit in the 1970s. Influential figures like Wilga Rivers and H. Douglas Brown solidified CLT's principles, highlighting authentic language use, meaningful communication, and student-centred learning.

CLT is a paradigm shift in language education, focusing on language acquisition through real-life communication and interaction. It emphasizes practical language use in authentic contexts to develop communicative competence. Various definitions of CLT highlight its goal of achieving communicative competence (Richards et al., 2001), its connection to personal identity and social conduct (Savignon, 2007), and its reliance on natural language acquisition through communication (Littlewood, 2013).

Proponents of CLT stress that learners acquire language skills best when engaged in meaningful communication rather than rote grammar instruction. CLT adapts to individual learners' needs, promoting language skills that are relevant beyond the classroom setting. The emphasis is on using language effectively in real-world situations.

CLT IN EFL CONTEXT

English has achieved global acceptance as a language of communication, education, business, and research (Chang & Goswami, 2011). Even in non-western countries where English is taught as a foreign language (EFL), it serves as a global lingua franca (Chang & Goswami, 2011). The language's significance in mass communication, social media, trade, and overall development prompts individuals to learn it. Among the various approaches to learning English, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has particularly influenced EFL settings, with both challenges and successes (Anderson, 1993; Chang & Goswami, 2011).

The primary objective of the CLT in the context of EFL is to nurture communicative competence, encompassing effective expression, comprehension, and meaning negotiation (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Research underscores instances of CLT's triumph in EFL contexts. For instance, a study by Chang and Goswami (2011) illustrated CLT's positive impact on the motivation of nursing students. EFL teacher surveys have revealed their favourable inclination toward the CLT approach (Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Al-Mekhlafi & Ramani, 2011). Likewise, EFL learners also have exhibited a receptive attitude towards the communicative approach (Chung & Huang, 2009; Ngoc & Iwashita, 2012). These findings underline CLT's potential to bridge the gap between language acquisition theory and its practical application in diverse EFL contexts.

KEY FEATURES AND OBJECTIVES OF CLT IN EFL CONTEXT

As per Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983), Brown (2001), Richards and Rodgers (2001), Derakhshan and Torabi (2015) and Ahmed (2016), CLT's key features and objectives are:

- (i) **Communication as the Primary Goal:** CLT emphasizes fluency and meaningful communication over grammar and vocabulary. It aims to enable effective language use in real-life situations by focusing on both oral and written communication skills.
- (ii) **Meaningful Contexts:** CLT utilizes authentic and relevant real-life situations. By incorporating materials of interest to learners, it prioritizes genuine language use over scripted dialogues.
- (iii) **Interactive Task-Based Activities:** CLT encourages role-plays, discussions, debates, and projects. It simulates real-life scenarios for goal-oriented language use, thereby promoting engagement through active communication.
- (iv) **Learner-Centred Approach:** CLT views learners as active participants in their learning and hence has a small class size. It considers individual needs, interests, and differences, and empowers learners to take ownership of their learning process.
- (v) **Error Tolerance:** CLT recognizes errors as a natural part of language learning, and encourages learners to communicate despite potential mistakes, thus promoting learning from errors and taking linguistic risks.
- (vi) **Integration of Four Language Skills:** CLT balances development of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It mirrors real-life language use and communication, and focuses on holistic language skills rather than isolated practice.

THE ROLES OF TEACHERS AND LEARNERS IN CLT CLASSROOMS

CLT is a student-oriented teaching approach and carried out in a small group or class, where teachers actively facilitate the language learning process by reduced speaking, attentive listening and keen observation (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). The teacher acts as a facilitator of the communication process, sets up language exercises for learners, promotes interactions and then steps back and observes, acting as an impartial supervisor or monitor. The teacher additionally functions as a collaborative communicator, participating in communicative tasks alongside students (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Furthermore, the teacher assumes roles as an evaluator, advisor, and overseer of group dynamics (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). The learners are the active contributors to the language learning process by performing the majority of speaking. Hence, frequently, the classroom becomes a bustling scene during exercises, with students frequently leaving their seats to negotiate for meaning among themselves and to accomplish tasks (Breen and Candlin, 1980). Due to their heightened involvement, students experience an increase in confidence when employing the target language in various contexts (Larsen-Freeman, 1986).

ROLES OF TEACHERS:

Teachers in CLT classrooms encompass a range of responsibilities that surpass traditional instructional methods. They serve as:

- **Facilitators of Learning Processes and Activities:** Teachers guide students in engaging with diverse tasks, encouraging communication through explanation, writing, and examples.
- **Interdependent Participants and Monitors:** Teachers listen more and talk less, organizing resources, managing activities, and creating an optimal learning atmosphere.
- **Needs Analysts and Counsellors:** They analyze learners' language needs, tailor instruction, and offer examples of effective communication.
- **Group Activity Managers:** Teachers foster collaboration among students, cultivating an environment conducive to communication.
- **Maintainers of Authority and Structure:** While CLT emphasizes a learner-centred approach, teachers maintain authority to effectively manage classroom procedures and activities.
- **Belief and Insight Shapers:** Teachers' beliefs, shaped by personal experience, principles, practices, and research insights, influence their role enactment.
- **Integrators of Context and Needs:** Teachers tailor language instruction by analyzing learners' needs and contextual factors, selecting suitable teaching methods.

ROLES OF LEARNERS/STUDENTS:

In CLT classrooms, learners are actively engaged participants in the language learning process. They act as:

- **Active Participants:** Learners actively participate in communicative activities like discussions, debates, and role-plays, expressing ideas, sharing information, and solving problems.
- **Communication Initiators:** They initiate conversations, asking questions, seeking clarity, and sharing perspectives, fostering language development and fluency.
- **Collaborators:** Learners collaborate with peers to complete tasks that require communication, enhancing teamwork and language skills.
- **Language Resource Providers:** Non-native learners contribute linguistic and cultural diversity, sharing vocabulary, expressions, and language patterns.

- **Context Creators:** Learners contribute to creating authentic contexts for language use through role-plays, simulations, and real-life tasks. They immerse themselves in scenarios that mimic real-world situations, promoting practical language skills.
- **Feedback Providers:** They offer feedback during discussions, presentations, and language activities, improving accuracy and fluency.
- **Autonomous Learners:** Learners take ownership of their learning, setting goals, making choices, and monitoring progress independently.
- **Cultural Ambassadors:** Learners share cultural insights, fostering cross-cultural understanding in an inclusive learning environment.
- **Reflectors and Self-Assessors:** Non-native learners engage in self-reflection and self-assessment to evaluate their language development and identify areas for improvement. They become proactive in identifying their strengths and weaknesses in language use.
- **Adaptive Communicators:** Learners adapt their language use to different contexts, audiences, and purposes. They practice flexible communication strategies, enhancing their ability to interact effectively in a variety of situations. Thus, in CLT classrooms, teachers act as facilitators, organizers, and counsellors, guiding meaningful communication and insight; and learners act as active participators, communication initiators, collaborators, and cultural contributors, fostering comprehensive language development and practical interaction skills.

ACTIVITIES FOR EFL LEARNERS IN CLT CLASSROOMS

The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach employs diverse instructional activities tailored for non-native English speakers in EFL contexts. These activities prioritize authentic communication and interaction. Common activities within CLT include:

- **Role-Plays and Simulations:** Learners enact different roles to interact using English, encouraging practical language use in real-world situations like interviews or restaurant orders.
- **Information Gap Activities:** Students work in pairs or groups with distinct information, communicating to bridge knowledge gaps, fostering information exchange and shared objectives.
- **Pair and Group Discussions:** Enhances speaking and listening skills while fostering critical thinking and cooperation. Learners discuss topics in pairs or groups, sharing opinions and ideas.
- **Debates:** Students engage in topic debates, presenting arguments and counterarguments, honing persuasive speaking, critical thinking, and persuasive language skills.
- **Problem-Solving Tasks:** Collaborative problem-solving tasks require English usage, immersing learners in real-life language contexts.
- **Information Sharing Presentations:** Learners create presentations on self-selected topics, honing public speaking and information-sharing abilities.
- **Jigsaw Activities:** Expert groups study specific topics and share knowledge with others, encouraging collaboration, research, and information sharing.
- **Language Games:** Incorporating language learning games makes learning engaging and interactive, improving vocabulary, grammar, and communication skills.
- **Real-Life Tasks:** Students undertake practical tasks like composing emails, travel planning, or crafting advertisements, integrating language into real-world situations.
- **Storytelling and Narratives:** Fosters language proficiency, creativity, and self-expression by encouraging students to create and share stories.
- **Language Exchanges:** Facilitates communication with native speakers or other learners, fostering authentic interaction and exposure to diverse accents and language varieties.
- **Using Authentic Materials:** Employing real-world resources like news articles, songs, and advertisements exposes learners to genuine language use and cultural context.

These activities endorse active engagement, authentic language application, and collaboration. Aligned with CLT's principles, they prioritize communication, meaningful interactions, and practical language skills development.

CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTATION OF CLT APPROACH IN EFL CONTEXTS

Applying teaching methods developed in one region to another region, as noted by Holliday (1994), introduces complexities and obstacles. This holds true for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), initially designed in the Western context to align with Western society's needs and culture, later extended to non-western EFL teaching/learning environments.

While the CLT approach offers potential benefits for EFL learners, its execution is fraught with challenges that must be examined and resolved (Liu, 2015). Resistance from learners, teachers' limited expertise, resource constraints, and cultural differences significantly impede CLT implementation in EFL classrooms (Anderson, 1993; Chang and Goswami, 2011; Valdes and Jhones, 1991). Both teachers and learners face difficulties, particularly in large classes or with limited resources, necessitating the initial addressing of these challenges for effective CLT application.

Insufficient knowledge, skills, and training pose substantial hindrances to teachers when implementing CLT (Chang and Goswami, 2011). Teachers' unfamiliarity with the communicative approach and limited proficiency also impede CLT integration (Liao, 2000). Analyzing perceptions of CLT in South Korea (Li, 1998) unveiled incongruence between CLT principles and EFL contexts, leading to challenges for teachers. Similarly, Bangladesh (Karim, 2004) found mismatches between class practices and CLT principles due to flawed teacher perceptions, resource scarcity, large classes, administrative support gaps, and traditional examination systems. Challenges identified in Indonesia (Mustafa, 2009) included teachers' English confidence, large class sizes, time constraints, syllabus volume, exam focus, material scarcity, and limited student opportunities for English use beyond class. Saudi Arabia (Alzaidi, 2011) witnessed teachers resorting to traditional methods over CLT due to curriculum load and students' language inefficiency.

The studies indicate that CLT implementation challenges in EFL classrooms cluster into five categories: teacher-related, student-related, education system-related, methodology/CLT-related, and cultural differences (Heng, 2014).

Problems related to the EFL teachers:

The success or failure of implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) within EFL contexts heavily hinges on teachers' commitment and involvement. Extensive studies (Valdes and Jhones, 1991; Anderson, 1993; Li, 1998; Liao, 2000; Yu, 2001; Chang and Goswami, 2011) underline that significant constraints impeding the effective adoption of CLT in EFL classrooms are closely linked to the teachers themselves. Additional research by Kar (2019), Ahmad and Kumar (2019), Varughese (2019), and Mohan and Varma (2021) identify challenges like a lack of proper resources and teacher training as pivotal hurdles to the successful integration of CLT. Armnazi and Alakrash (2021) also note the scarcity of authentic materials and limited understanding of English culture exacerbating this challenge. Wu (2021) highlights how curriculum restrictions contribute to challenges faced by teachers.

The challenges associated with teachers in the successful CLT implementation are:

- (i) Inadequate knowledge and skills in applying CLT
- (ii) Insufficient training in CLT methodologies
- (iii) Misconceptions regarding CLT
- (iv) Limited qualifications, proficiency, and confidence in English
- (v) Scarcity of time and resources to prepare or develop original communicative materials
- (vi) Limited opportunities for professional development
- (vii) Obligation to meet institutional curriculum demands
- (viii) Fear and resistance toward practicing CLT

Some researchers have revealed that EFL teachers often lack the necessary qualifications and readiness to transition from traditional methods to CLT (Kustati, 2013). Furthermore, they are often ill-prepared to incorporate CLT into their teaching practices (Nunan, 2003).

Problems related to the EFL learners:

Implementing CLT in EFL classes presents multitude student-related challenges. The English proficiency of students, as noted by Li (1998), significantly impedes the successful execution of communicative activities, leading to frustration among both educators and students. Additionally, students' resistance to active participation due to the inertia from traditional learning methods further hampers their engagement in communicative activities (Li, 1998).

Globally, these issues manifest in different contexts. In Pakistan, resistance to class participation poses a primary obstacle to introducing innovative CLT (Shamim, 1996). Similarly, learner resistance hinders the adoption of CLT in China (Anderson, 1993), while in Taiwan, both learner resistance and low English proficiency hinder implementation (Chang & Goswami, 2011). In Thailand, challenges include low English proficiency, reluctance to engage, and conflicting learning styles (Jarvis and Atsilarat, 2005).

In summary, the challenges faced by EFL learners in CLT implementation include:

- (i) Low English proficiency
- (ii) Resistance to class involvement
- (iii) Unfamiliarity with CLT principles
- (iv) Lack of motivation to improve communicative skills
- (v) Limited desire to use English
- (vi) Low sense of responsibility in class
- (vii) Discomfort with the CLT approach
- (viii) Excessive focus on accuracy over fluency
- (ix) Aversion to active participation due to traditional learning habits
- (x) Inclination toward passive learning styles, contradicting CLT's essence.

Furthermore, learners' struggles with limited language skills hinder comprehension and active participation in English-focused activities. Fear of embarrassment discourages speaking, making collaborative tasks challenging. Such challenges collectively undermine students' engagement and impede the seamless integration of CLT principles. These issues clash with the ethos of CLT and complicate the establishment of a pro-CLT learning environment.

Problems related to Educational System:

The existing research exploring the application of the CLT approach for non-native English learners has underscored specific challenges arising from traditional educational systems. One major concern is the issue of large classroom sizes, which hinder personalized attention and monitoring during communicative activities like pair work, group work, and role plays (Anderson, 1993; Li, 1998; Yu, 2001). The presence of large number of students in a single classroom poses difficulties for teachers in providing personalized attention and support (Jarvis and Atsilarat, 2005; Hiep, 2007; Chang & Goswami, 2011).

Moreover, integrating CLT into EFL classrooms is hindered by the prevalence of rigid grammar-based assessments that prioritize grammatical structures, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and translation. This leads to a focus on test preparation, reducing interest in tasks aimed at enhancing communicative competence (Li, 1998; Ansarey, 2012; Vongxay, 2013), further compounded by time limitations. Preparing students for communicative activities and discussions is time-intensive due to their unfamiliarity with innovative approaches like cooperative learning and role-plays, juxtaposed with the pressure to cover the curriculum and prepare for exams within limited class time.

Additional challenges within the educational system discourage EFL instructors from adopting CLT. These include the scarcity of teaching resources and materials (Ho, 2002; Kustati, 2013), inadequate administrative and institutional support (Kaur 2021; Islam & Bari, 2012; Rahimi & Naderi, 2014; Sato & Kleinsasser, 1999), and the enduring influence of traditional teaching practices (Anderson, 1993; Chung & Huang, 2009; Liao, 2000). The shift from teacher-centred methods to student-centred CLT approaches requires a substantial change in pedagogical practices, necessitating educators to become learning facilitators. This transition demands skills in activity design, task management, and effective classroom control. To address these challenges, comprehensive teacher training programs that concentrate on CLT methodologies and classroom strategies are crucial in empowering educators for successful implementation.

In summary, research highlights the following significant obstacles within the educational system concerning the implementation of CLT for non-native English learners:

- (i) Large class sizes
- (ii) Emphasis on grammar-based assessments
- (iii) Teaching oriented towards exam preparation
- (iv) Scarcity of teaching resources and facilities
- (v) Inadequate administrative and institutional support
- (vi) Persistence of traditional practices
- (vii) Limited teaching hours

Problems related to CLT Methodology:

Numerous research endeavours have highlighted obstacles associated with the implementation of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach for non-native English learners, particularly in relation to the methodology of CLT itself (Ahmad & Rao, 2013; Chang & Goswami, 2011; Li, 1998; Memari, 2013; Ozsevik, 2010). A notable concern arises from the origin of CLT. The ESL setting where CLT was developed is distinct from the EFL context where CLT is adopted or imported in terms of teachers' proficiency (i.e., native vs. non-native English teachers), language input, learning purposes, and learning environment (Bax, 2003). This results in a lack of clear guidance on instructional practices (Li, 1998), thereby giving rise to issues encompassing the objectives of English learning, learning environment, teachers' proficiency, and the availability of authentic materials (Li, 1998).

Additionally, an evident challenge emerges in the absence of well-defined and efficient assessment tools within the CLT framework. As a result, teachers encounter uncertainty regarding the criteria to include in assessment instruments, causing them to feel disheartened and unsettled while attempting to develop their own evaluation methods amidst a plethora of tasks (Li, 1998). Comparable concerns connected with CLT hinder its adoption among educators in diverse EFL settings, such as Turkey (Ozsevik, 2010), Taiwan (Chang & Goswami, 2011), Pakistan (Ahmad & Rao, 2013), and Iran (Memari, 2013).

Furthermore, the scarcity of English-speaking environments beyond the classroom context emerges as a formidable obstacle for effective CLT implementation. This shortage creates a substantial barrier, preventing teachers from fully embracing and incorporating CLT strategies into their instructional practices.

Another dimension of the challenges linked to CLT pertains to its time-intensive nature, which places excessive demands on educators. The method requires substantial preparation time for teachers to design materials for communicative activities and to devise effective techniques for their execution. It becomes evident that the successful integration of CLT within EFL contexts hinges on comprehensive support for classroom instructors, addressing concerns related to the scarcity of teaching resources, particularly materials suitable for communicative activities.

In essence, the challenges stemming from CLT methodology encompass:

- (i) Confusion between ESL and EFL contexts
- (ii) Lack of clear teaching practice guidelines
- (iii) Inadequate assessment instruments' effectiveness and efficiency
- (iv) Insufficient adaptation to EFL teaching
- (v) Burdensome demands on teachers

- (vi) Excessive preparation time requirements
- (vii) Lack of exposure to English language outside the classroom.

Problems related to Cultural Differences:

Apart from the previously mentioned obstacles, challenges arising from differences between Western and non-Western cultures significantly impact the adoption of the CLT approach in EFL contexts. Non-Western countries encounter difficulties aligning fundamental CLT principles with their educational values and beliefs. While CLT's key tenets prioritize fluency, communicative proficiency, and interactive activities, these often clash with educational philosophies in many non-Western nations.

Hu (2002) emphasizes that while CLT originated in Europe and drew on Western advancements, its core principles, such as learner-centeredness and interactive methods, may not align with non-Western educational norms. Traditional teacher-centric classrooms in non-Western countries emphasize grammatical accuracy, viewing students as passive learners rather than active participants. Ellis (1996) underscores the need for culturally aligned CLT that fits Asian EFL contexts. Hiep (2007) highlights cultural constraints concerning teacher and learner roles within CLT-based classrooms. Gupta (2004) finds that despite CLT's potential, successful implementation remains elusive in non-Western regions like India due to cultural and historical disparities. Kirkgoz (2008) stresses the adaptation required of non-Western EFL instructors to Western-based curricular goals, leading to feelings of unpreparedness and deviations from CLT principles. Carless (1999) emphasizes that cultural factors pose significant obstacles, as prevailing norms portray teachers as authoritative sources and learners as obedient recipients of knowledge.

The challenges stemming from cultural discordance encompass:

- (i) Misaligned Educational Values
- (ii) Resistance to Change
- (iii) Conflicting Western and Non-Western Norms
- (iv) Cultural Resistance
- (v) Historical Disparities
- (vi) Deeply Ingrained Cultural Beliefs

RECOMMENDATIONS

The discussed factors that hinder the implementation of CLT in EFL contexts indicate that despite its widespread acceptance as a modern language teaching method, CLT has not yet reached its highest level of success. These challenges need to be addressed in a comprehensive manner (Awang et al., 2022; Ghafar et al., 2023; Zhao, 2022; Nam, 2023). Incorporating following recommendations can facilitate the successful integration of the CLT approach in EFL classrooms, enhancing language acquisition for non-native English learners.

Balancing Fluency and Accuracy: Organizations should integrate grammar and vocabulary activities within communicative contexts, promoting both accuracy and open communication. Teachers should find a balance between traditional methods and CLT, ensuring a focus on language proficiency along with meaningful interactions (Chang and Goswami, 2011).

Align Assessment with Real-Life Situations and Proficiency Levels: Assessments should reflect real-life language use and varying proficiency levels. Task design should evaluate linguistic competence and communicative abilities. Grouping students with similar proficiency levels for certain tasks can promote effective communication (Heng, 2014).

Empathize with Cultural Sensitivity: Educators must select culturally relevant and appropriate topics, fostering an inclusive and respectful environment. Curricula and materials should reflect cultural diversity while promoting communicative competence, striking a balance between cultural sensitivity and language development (Kumar, 2019).

Tackle Resource Scarcity: Technology incorporating online resources, multimedia content, podcasts, videos, and interactive activities must be utilized to bridge resource gaps and expose learners to real-life language usage (Adem and Berkessa, 2022).

Integrate Computer-Mediated Collaborative Learning (CMCL): CMCL needs to be combined with CLT to address class size challenges, and to facilitate small groups electronically through an online course management system, reducing reliance on the first language and promoting target language production (Nguyen, 2010).

Enhance Teaching Skills through Training: Teachers must be provided with professional development opportunities including workshops, training, seminars, and peer collaboration. Sharing effective practices and knowledge can improve teachers' understanding and application of CLT (Nyamayedenga and de Jager, 2020; Rezalou and Yağiz, 2021).

Collaborative Engagement: Collaborative efforts ought to be established among educators, institutions, and policymakers to address the challenges. Effective communication and joint planning can lead to improved implementation of CLT (Awang et al., 2022; Adem and Berkessa, 2022; Ghafar et al., 2023; Zhao, 2022; Nam, 2023).

Policy Interventions: There must be collaboration between educational institutions and government bodies to enact policies that limit class sizes, align exams with CLT principles, and ensure adequate teaching resources. Enhancing financial commitment for audio-visual facilities and necessary materials can enhance CLT implementation (Alharbi, 2022; Karim, 2004; Musthafa, 2009; Liu, 2015; Chang and Goswami, 2011; Mohan and Varma, 2021).

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

This paper provides theoretical and practical insights beneficial for educators, teachers, and policymakers looking to implement CLT within EFL contexts while addressing the associated challenges. The study emphasizes the following key implications:

Effective Teacher Training: The research highlights the importance of offering comprehensive in-service training to educators. Qualified teachers should possess the requisite knowledge and skills to effectively implement CLT. The study emphasizes that training should go beyond theory and equip teachers with the ability to apply CLT principles in real classroom settings (Mustapha, 2019; Liao, 2000; Das, 2014; Arora & Kalsi, 2017).

Cultural Awareness: Educators need to understand and accommodate the cultural disparities between non-western and western contexts when designing communicative activities for students. Acknowledging and respecting cultural differences can enhance student engagement and success in CLT classrooms (Hu, 2002; Ellis, 1996; Hiep, 2007).

Shift in Educational Priorities: The study suggests a change in educational priorities, urging students, teachers, school administrators, and parents to focus less on form-based exams and more on nurturing students' communicative competence. This shift aligns with CLT's emphasis on practical language use and meaningful communication (Musthafa, 2009).

Continuous Improvement and Research: Despite challenges, educators recognize CLT's benefits for English language learners. The paper suggests ongoing research with larger sample sizes and extended implementation durations to assess CLT's effectiveness more comprehensively (Ghafar et al., 2023). Additionally, further research should identify the most impactful CLT activities.

In conclusion, CLT holds immense promise for EFL learners. By fostering a culture of improvement, adapting teaching methodologies, and leveraging available resources, educators can harness CLT's potential to enhance the English language acquisition of non-native speakers. This approach equips learners to thrive in today's interconnected global landscape, where effective communication is crucial for success.

REFERENCES:

1. Adem, H., & Berkessa, M. (2022). A case study of EFL teachers' practice of teaching speaking skills vis-à-vis the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 1-23
2. Ahmad, S. & Rao, C. (2013). Applying communicative approach in teaching English as a foreign language: A case study of Pakistan. *Porta Linguarum*, 20, 187-203.
3. Ahmad, S. F., & Kumar, N. (2019). Perception and practices of communicative language teaching among secondary school teachers in India. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(4), 1361-1376.
4. Ahmed, M. (2016). Communicative Language Teaching: A Practical Scenario in the Context of Bangladesh. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(5), 97-104.
5. Alharbi, A. O. (2022). Issues with Communicative Language Teaching Implementation in Saudi Arabia Concerning the Government Policy, Teachers, and Students: Two Decades of Research. *Arab World English Journal*, 13 (2) 412-423.
6. Al-Mekhlafi, A., & Ramani, P. (2011). Expectation versus reality: Communicative approach to EFL teaching. *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation & Development*, 8(1), 98-113.
7. Alzaidi, A. (2008). Secondary school head teachers' job satisfaction in Saudi Arabia: The result of a mixed methods approach. *Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences*, 5, 161-185
8. Anderson, J. (1993). Is a communicative approach practical for teaching English in China? Pros and cons. *System*, 21, 471-480.
9. Ansary, D. (2012). Communicative language teaching in EFL context: Teachers attitude and perception in Bangladesh. *ASA University Review*, 6(1), 61-78
10. Armnazi, M., & Alakrash, H. (2021). Factors Affecting the Application of Communicative Language Teaching CLT in Syrian Schools. *TESOL and Technology Studies* 2(1), 1-14.
11. Awang, S., Wan Hassan, W. N. F., Abdullah, N., Wan Zakaria, W. N. F., & Razak, S. S. (2022). Use of Communication Strategies in Oral Interactions: (In)effectiveness of CLT Approach in L2 Teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 15(10), 64-74

12. Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: a context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal* 57(3), 278-87.
13. Breen, M., & Candlin, C. (2001). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. In D. R. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp. 9 – 26). London: Routledge
14. Breen, M., & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 89-112.
15. Brown, H. D. (1980). The Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition, *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 157-164
16. Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Brumfit, C.J. (1979). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
18. Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2-27). Harlow: Longman
19. Carroll, B. J. (1983). Communicative language tests: Tasks, enabling skills, formats, and measurement criteria. *World Language English*, 2(1), 37-39.
20. Chang, M., & Goswami, J. S. (2011). Factors Affecting the Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching in Taiwanese College English Classes. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2),
21. Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press
22. Chung, I. F. & Huang, Y. C. (2009). The implementation of communicative language teaching: An investigation of students' viewpoints. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher* 18(1), 67-78.
23. Cook, V. (1991). *Second language learning and language teaching* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
24. Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
25. Derakhshan, A., & Torabi, M. (2015). The Implications of Communicative Language Teaching: Teachers Perceptions in the Spotlight. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 4(4), 203-211
26. Ellis, G. (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 213-218.
27. Finocchiaro, M., and Brumfit. (1983). *The Functional Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press
28. Ghafar, Z.N., Sawalmeh, M.H., & Mohamedamin, A.A. (2023). Impact of Communicative Language Teaching Method on Students' Speaking and Listening Skills: A Review Article. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*. 6(1), 54-60.
29. Gupta, D. (2004). CLT in India: context and methodology come together. *ELT Journal*, 58(3), 266–269. doi:10.1093/elt/58.3.266
30. Heng, K. (2014). *Communicative Language Teaching in EFL Contexts: Challenges and Suggestions for Successful Implementation*. Thesis for: MA TESOL, University of Canberra, Australia
31. Herman, J. L., Aschbacher, P. R., & Winters, L. (1992). *A practical guide to alternative assessment*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
32. Hiep, P. H. (2007). Communicative language teaching: Unity within diversity. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 193-201.
33. Ho W. K. (2002). English language teaching in East Asia today: An overview. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 22(2), 1-22, DOI: 10.1080/0218879022020203
34. Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
35. Hossain, M. T., Mohd-Asraf, R., & Eng., T. K. (2019). Fifty years of communicative language teaching: A synthesis of critical implementation issues. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 15(1.2), 150-179
36. Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 93-105.
37. Hymes, D. (1967). On communicative competence. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.
38. Islam, M. J., & Bari, I. S. (2012). Implementation of CLT in Bangladesh and Thailand: Problems and challenges. *Outlooks*, 2(1), 87-105.
39. Jabeen, S. S. (2014). Implementation of communicative approach. *English Language Teaching*, 7(8), 68-74.
40. Jarvis, H., & Atsilarat, S. (2005). Shifting paradigms: From a communicative to a context-based approach. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 50(1), 9-15.
41. Kar, R. (2019). *Communicative language teaching in India: An exploratory study of teachers' perceptions and practices*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Calcutta
42. Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 187-198
43. Karim, K. M. R. (2004). Teachers' perceptions, attitudes, and expectations about communicative language teaching (CLT) in post-secondary education in Bangladesh. Unpublished master thesis, University of Victoria.
44. Kaur, P. (2021). An exploration of teachers' attitudes towards communicative language teaching (CLT) in Malaysia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 10(2), 167-175.
45. Kumar, R. (2019). Communicative language teaching in EFL context: A review of literature. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 1-10.
46. Kustati, M. (2013). The shifting paradigms in the implementation of CLT in Southeast Asia countries. *AL-TA'LIM*, 20(1), 267-277.

47. Larsen-Freeman, D. & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
48. Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
49. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
50. Lee, M. W. (2014). Will communicative language teaching work? Teachers' perceptions toward the new educational reform in South Korea. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 1-17.
51. Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703.
52. Liao, X. Q. (2000). Communicative language teaching innovation in China: Difficulties and solutions. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED 443294).
53. Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
54. Memari, M. (2013). How appropriate is communicative language teaching (CLT) in EFL context (an Iranian case study). *Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine*, 3(6), 432 - 438
55. Mohan, A., & Varma, S. (2021). A study on implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in primary schools of Kerala, India. *English Language Teaching*, 14(2), 196-208.
56. Mowlaie, B., & Rahimi, A. (2010). The effect of teachers' attitude about communicative language teaching on their practice: Do they practice what they preach? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1524-1528.
57. Musthafa, B. (2009). Communicative language teaching in Indonesia: Issues of theoretical assumptions and challenges in the classroom practice. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 2(2). ERIC database, (ED462833).
58. Nam, H. (2023). Challenges and Constraints of Implementing Communicative Language Teaching: Teacher-Related vs. Non-Teacher-Related Factors. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 16(1), 75-96.
59. Ngoc, K. M., & Iwashita, N. (2012). A comparison of learners' and teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching at two universities in Vietnam. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 7, 25-49.
60. Nunan, D. (1991). *Communicative Tasks and the Language Curriculum*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 279-295.
61. Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
62. Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37 (4), 589-613.
63. O' Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Language strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
64. Ozsevik, Z. (2010). The use of communicative language teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL teachers' perceived difficulties in implementing CLT in Turkey (MA thesis). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA.
65. Rahimi, M., & Naderi, F. (2014). The relationship between EFL teachers' attitudes towards CLT and perceived difficulties of implementing CLT in language classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 3(3), 237-245.
66. Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T.D. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
67. Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
68. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. D. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
69. Rivers, W. (1981). *Teaching Foreign Language Skills* (2nd ed.). Chicago University of Chicago Press
70. Rivers, W. (1987). *Interactive Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
71. Roy, S. (2016). Challenges to Implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh. *Language in India*, 16(3), 218-235
72. Sato, K., & Kleinsasser, R. (1999). Communicative language teaching (CLT): Practical understandings. *Modern Language Journal*, 83(4): 494-517.
73. Savignon, S. J. (2001). *Communicative language teaching: context and concerns in teacher education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University press
74. Savignon, S. J. (2007). Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 207-220.
75. Shamim, F. (1996). Learner resistance to innovation in classroom methodology. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 105-121). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
76. Thamarana, S. (2014). An Overview of Communicative Language Teaching. In 5th International Conference on English Language and Literature (ICELL): Hyderabad, INDIA
77. Valdes, A. I., & Jhones, A. C. (1991). Introduction of communicative language teaching in tourism in Cuba. *TESL Canada Journal*, 8(2), 57-63.
78. Varughese, S. (2019). A study of communicative language teaching (CLT) practices in Kerala schools. Unpublished master's thesis, Mahatma Gandhi University.

79. Vongxay, H. (2013). The implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) in an English department in a Lao higher educational institution: A case study (Unpublished master dissertation). Unitec Institute of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.
80. Widdowson, H. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. London. Oxford University Press.
81. Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
82. Wu, Y. (2021). An investigation into English teachers' implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) in China. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(1), 77-99.
83. Yu, L. (2001). Communicative language teaching in China: Progress and resistance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 194-198.
84. Zhao, Y. (2022). 3rd International Conference on Language, Art and Cultural Exchange. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 673