

Citation: Ilyas, S., Khaliq, A., & Ahmad, R. (2021). The Impact of Communicative Language Teaching: A Study at University Level in Bahawalpur. *Global Language Review*, VI(1), 290-297. [https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2021\(VI-I\).31](https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2021(VI-I).31)



The Impact of Communicative Language Teaching: A Study at University Level in Bahawalpur

Shehla Ilyas^{*}Abdul Khaliq[†]Rasheed Ahmad[‡]

Abstract

Communicative language teaching (CLT) stresses communication as a medium and as the main objective of language education, a multilingual and international language teaching method. Communication is also a way to teach foreign languages and stresses communication as a means and primary language learning goal. The aim of the study is to explore the impact of communicative language teaching of BS students. It also recognizes the reasons why there are no proficient speakers of the English language even after the use of the communicative teaching method (Rababah, 2002). A five-point Likert scale was used in the questionnaires that were filled by 183 students of The Islamia University and GSC women university of Bahawalpur. The findings reveal that communicative language teaching is the completely suitable and perfect strategy to be applied in classrooms when teaching a second or foreign language. Due to certain factors, it is unable to produce proficient speakers of the English language.

Key Words: Communicative Language Teaching, Assessment, Effects, Impact and Proficient

Introduction

It is through the real meaning that learning takes place through effective language, which is the basis of the method of communication (Teh, 2021). No matter how much experience in teaching you have, sometimes you are unable to find out which strategy goes best for the students. "Communicative Language Teaching" means different things for different teachers (Gapparova, 2021). The word means other things. For certain teachers, this implies that greater focus is placed on using the target language in schools, particularly on orality. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emphasizes contact as the medium and primary aim of language acquisition, which is an approach to teaching second languages

and foreign languages (Spada, 2007; Chohan et al., 2018).

The 'Communication Approach,' also known as the CLT, has always been regarded as an ALM response and a notional functional syllabus extension and growth. With the more recent refinement of CLT, task-based language learning has become much more common. Communicative language teaching (CLT) stresses communication as a medium and as the main objective of language education, a multilingual and international language teaching method. CLT has traditionally been regarded as an expansion or improvement of the Notional Practical Syllabus in response to the Audio-Lingual System (ALM)

^{*} Subject Specialist Quaid-e-Azam Academy for Educational Development, Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, Pakistan.

[†] Assistant Professor, Department of Social and Allied Sciences, Cholistan University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: abdulkhaliq@cuvas.edu.pk

[‡] Visiting Lecturer, Department of English Literature, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.

([Akbarova, 2021](#)). The new refinement of CLT, working-based language learning, has been an enormous success. Communication in the communication language can be understood as a collection of rules concerning language learning purposes, how students master the language, the kinds of educational experiences that help them learn the most, and the roles of teachers and students in the classroom ([Noor et al., 2021](#)). The following facets of language knowledge require communication skills: Knowing how to use language for several functions; - Knowing how to vary our linguistic use by the context and the participants; - Knowing how to create and interpret various forms of texts. Communication is also a way to teach foreign languages and stresses communication as a means and primary language learning goal. The significance of this study is to recognize the reasons why there are no proficient speakers of the English language even after the use of the communicative teaching method ([Rababah, 2002](#)).

The intrinsic and extrinsic factors of students are to be observed. As the students are instilled with various skills, they are unable to keep pace with fluency and accuracy. It has to be known as to why students are unable to communicate well in the English language if communicative language teaching approach is successfully utilized in the classroom. It must also be known if this strategy used in Pakistan is a suitable approach for teaching. If all the factors are revealed, efforts can be made to finish them so that students face no trouble in speaking the targeted language proficiently. Focus has to be on accuracy, too, along with fluency, and that is only possible if the problems in the approach to communicative language teaching are identified (Dornyei, 2009, 2013; [Kumar, 2021](#)).

Despite the ardent use of communicative method approach, students are unable to speak the English language proficiently. The focus of this study is limited to the students enrolled in the undergraduate program in the private sector of one city of Pakistan. It is limited to those students who are being taught via the communicative language teaching approach. This involves the undergraduate students of The Islamia University and GSC women university of Bahawalpur, Pakistan. The study is limited by the following:

1. The participant students consist of male and female BS students of The Islamia University and GSC women university of Bahawalpur.
2. The study is restricted to finding the effects of CLT and the hindrance factors within the classroom.

Communicative language teaching was introduced in the 1970s, which follows a theory that communication is the primary function of the language. Since the inception of CLT, it has been considered to be the most sophisticated and prevailing approach, which focuses on developing the communicative competence of the students by involving them in real-life situations where they can interact very well with each other and the instructor ([Bhatti et al., 2020](#)).

In 2017, [Kwon \(2017\)](#) conducted a study in China on the efficacy of CLT. It has been prevalent among academic and professional researchers since China introduced the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) program. In this research, CLT results in the integrated English translation stage were studied to determine whether L1 is to be used in a timely fashion in the CLT class and whether students improved their learning conditions after two round trip surveys ([Kwon, 2017](#)). A case analysis on Pakistan by [Ahmad and Rao was carried out in 2013](#). The first part is a longitudinal study to investigate the comparative Advantages of English grammar and communicative language developing test severable, which, after assessment, is used to assess students' achievement and behaviour. In the second part of the report, we study Pakistani teachers on the second higher-level approach and impediments to the understanding of CLT.

Another research was performed by [Alamri in 2018](#) in Canada, where he critically analyzed Communicative language teaching. He made an evaluation that the complete review of history, theory, and application is the basis of this theory. He also discussed some of the problems involved in this approach, like the cultural conflicts, the training of the teachers, etc. Taking account of the diverse collections of CLT values proposed by many scholars, the principles can be summarized as Grammar place / significance, Mission and tasks for the group/pair, Error correction quality and quantity, teacher's role

in the lessons, and Learning the role and needs of students.

Aims and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of the study is to show how a teacher just does not has to be an instructor but a facilitator as well. It is through this approach that all four necessary skills of the English language are integrated among students, therefore some good research is mandatory. This study is significant in highlighting the reasons behind communicative language teaching not being able to produce proficient speakers of the English language despite its own success. It would help us to know whether this approach is a good choice for teaching the second language in class and, if yes, then how this approach is being applied in a classroom environment and what effects it has on students. Following are the objectives of the study:

- Explore the impact of communicative language teaching at the undergraduate level.
- Analyse the use of the communicative approach in the classroom.
- Evaluate the influence of communicative approach of teaching on speaking skills.

Research Questions

The research questions are as follows;

1. What is the impact of CLT in producing proficient speakers of English?
2. What are the factors affecting the success of CLT approach?
3. Is the classroom environment a hindrance in the success of the CLT approach?

Research Methodology

A research type is a quantitative approach achieved through a 5-point-Likert scale with closed-ended questions. The research aimed to find how the communicative approach of teaching is being used in classrooms. This meant to deduct the effects of this strategy and how despite its benefits, it is unable to produce proficient speakers of the English language. The research comprised of regular students of undergraduate department at The Islamia University and GSC women university of Bahawalpur. There

were close-ended questions for 183 students. A sample of 183 students was selected from The Islamia University and GSC women's university of Bahawalpur. The tools used in this study were the questionnaires. The questionnaires were designed in a way that would meet the main objective of the study, which was to find and determine why the communicative teaching approach is not able to produce proficient speakers of the English language and what barriers cause a hindrance in its success. Google document was used to make the questionnaire and for its online filling. Questionnaires were checked by the supervisor to clarify the reliability. Validity of the questionnaire was made sure by keeping the questions appropriate and relevant to the topic. All the relevant aspects of the research were covered in the questionnaire, and it was made compulsory in every question to completely avoid the personal benefits of the researcher.

Data Analysis

The results are consistent with the findings of Ngoc and Iwashita (2012), who examined the attitudes of Vietnamese students and teachers towards Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in general and each of the four CLT-related factors such as instruction in grammar, correction of errors, workplaces between the two groups and the position of teachers. In their analysis, they concluded that learners were more favourable than the other CLT rules to the position of pairs/groups function, but were less favourable to grammar education. The findings of a more comprehensive study show that the bulk of the teachers in high school comply with all five CLT principles and respect them. Furthermore, the teachers had the best outlook towards "group/pair-work and activity tasks;" the less desirable is, however, "quality and amount of error correction" as well as "situation and value of grammar." The research has helped Rahimi and Naderi (2014), who have assessed the attitude of EFL teachers towards CLT and the issues they have in their classes with the implementation of this process. The results based on the results of the interview of previous studies were confirmed and checked with the results obtained in the current study through the students' survey. Based on the findings of semi-

structured polls, the majority of students agreed in general with CLT that this methodology enhances students' communication skills as well as their grammatical awareness in comparison to their

previous approach (GTM). Furthermore, all five values of CLT were decided by the majority of participants.

Table 1. Showing Means and Standard Deviation of Students' Responses

S. No	Statement	M	SD
1	I feel hesitant in interacting with people outside the classroom	3.89	.910
2	The interaction in the classroom increase when involved in group activities.	4.07	.789
3	Classroom activities assess my language needs properly.	3.89	.841
4	The assessment tasks in the classroom make a positive contribution to your language learning.	3.99	.767
5	The learning resources in the classroom promote better understanding of the language.	4.04	.755
6	I support constant interaction in the classroom for understanding the language better.	3.98	.798
7	The group work in the classroom promotes better interaction with people.	3.92	.907
8	The group work in class allows having better control over learning the language.	3.93	.868
9	The team work in the classroom help you in better language practice.	3.98	.667
10	I perceive improvement in your level of English through classroom activities.	3.81	.870
11	The student-centered method makes me comfortable.	3.88	.900
12	I think fluency is better than accuracy in speech.	4.15	.781
13	I find your speaking skills satisfactory.	3.96	.776
14	The large class size creates problems for you to interact with your instructor.	3.95	.817
15	The negative feedback from the teacher's side decrease your motivation in the classroom.	4.01	.791
16	In my opinion, do grammatical rules help in being fluent in English.	3.99	.802
17	The trial and error during classroom discussion improve speech production.	3.87	.764
18	The communicative activities promote better speaking skills.	4.08	.715
19	The positive feedback in the classroom develops communicative competence.	3.86	.817
20	The use of language increase proficiency more than the knowledge of language.	3.95	.827

Table 1 reveals that BS students responses about CLT i.e. I feel hesitant in interacting with people outside classroom (M= 3.89 SD=.910), The interaction in classroom increase when involved in group activities (M= 4.07 SD=.789) Classroom activities assess my language needs properly (M= 3.89 SD=.841), The assessment tasks in classroom make a positive contribution to your language learning (M= 3.99 SD=.767) , The learning resources in classroom promote better understanding of the language (M= 3.89 SD=.841), The learning resources in classroom promote better understanding of the language (M= 4.04 SD=.755), I support constant interaction in classroom for understanding the language better (M= 3.98 SD=.798), The group work in classroom promote better interaction with people (M= 3.92

SD=.907), The group work in class allow to have better control over learning the language(M= 3.93 SD=.868), The team work in classroom help you in better language practice (M= 3.98 SD=.667), I perceive improvement in your level of English through classroom activities (M= 3.81 SD=.870), I perceive improvement in your level of English through classroom activities (M= 3.88 SD=.900), The student centered method make me comfortable (M= 4.15 SD=.781), I think fluency is better than accuracy in speech (M= 3.96 SD=.776), I find your speaking skills satisfactory (M= 3.95 SD=.817), The large class size create problem for you to interact with your instructor (M= 4.01 SD=.791), The negative feedback from teacher's side decrease your motivation in classroom (M= 3.99 SD=.802), In my opinion, do

grammatical rules help in being fluent in English ($M=3.87$ $SD=.764$), The trial and error during classroom discussion improve speech production ($M=4.08$ $SD=.715$), The communicative activities promote better speaking skills ($M=3.86$ $SD=.817$), the

positive feedback in classroom develop communicative competence ($M=3.95$ $SD=.827$) and The use of language increase proficiency more than the knowledge of language.

Table 2. Showing T-test of Gender Variable

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig.	Mean Difference
Male	27	71.15	11.471	-.030	.002	-.063
Female	156	79.21	9.983			

Table 2 shows significant t-test value of male and female students with a value of .002.

Discussion

Keeping in view the research questions, we had to find out if communicative language teaching had a positive effect in producing proficient speakers of English language. So far, we know that this approach promotes communication and interaction among people, which is a great way to polish the speaking skills of the students. Although through the survey, no negative impacts were discovered, still it was known that students are not able to communicate proficiently. That is because of a certain number of factors that overcome this approach. Some of those factors explored in this study include the large size of the classroom where students feel hesitant in communicating with the teachers and their queries go unanswered. Similarly, another factor is the negative feedback received from the teachers that demotivates the students and they believe they are incapable of doing something. They then do not make any more effort in trying to improve themselves. Additionally, the inability of students to use grammatical rules in creating a proper sentence causes a hindrance in their way of speaking the English language proficiently.

The focus on fluency instead of accuracy is a great trouble when they want to be called proficient speakers of English language. As we discovered the factors that explain why this approach is unable to produce proficient speakers, we also had to investigate whether this approach was good enough or suitable for students or not. According to the majority of students, they can be present better communication skills when involved in group activities. They believe the needs of their language can be assessed properly through the activities

scheduled to take place in class. This also requires constant communication between students and instructors as the understanding of language is enhanced. It all points out that the method is somehow focused on students, which make them comfortable enough to focus on the language and acquire it accurately. All the pointers hint towards the requirements in communicative language teaching, which shows that the approach is very well designed and suitable for the classroom. The only problem is the discovered factors that cause a hindrance in its way of producing proficient speakers of English language.

Conclusion

On the basis of the findings and discussion mentioned above, it is concluded that communicative language teaching is the completely suitable and perfect strategy to be applied in classrooms when teaching a second or foreign language. Due to certain factors, it is unable to produce proficient speakers of the English language. Some students hold the view that their speaking skills are satisfactory, and they remain unaffected by the factors that hinder the production of proficient speakers. While most of the students are not happy with their speaking abilities and completely agree with the fact that some reasons are a great hurdle in their way of acquiring the language proficiently. Also, a very low number of people prefer fluency over the accuracy, and the majority believe that accuracy is more important as compared to fluency. That is why the communicative method approach is better, as it promotes interaction among students and teachers. Although it is a great success in other countries,

improvements are needed for it to work more efficiently in Pakistan.

The research also observed that the use of language itself is better to improve the speaking skills of students. Simple knowledge about language may not be as helpful as using it in practice. Another great way of involving all students in communication is through group activities where they can portray their abilities better. The research deduced how the

inability of students to speak the English language proficiently is also somehow the fault of teachers. Some actions cause students to feel demotivated and they stop their attempts to speak the targeted language accurately and properly. The research concluded that basically large class size, negative feedback from teacher's side, trial and error process, etc. overshadow the hard work of students when trying to speak the targeted language proficiently.

References

- Abbas, F., Aslam, S., & Khan, R. A. M. (2011). Code-mixing as a communicative strategy among the university level students in Pakistan. *Language in India*, 11(1), 95-108.
- Abbas, F., Rana, A. M. K., Bashir, I., & Bhatti, A. M. (2021). The English language proficiency as a global employment skill: the viewpoint of Pakistani academia. *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*, 9(3), 1071-1077.
- Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2013). Applying communicative approach in teaching English as a foreign language: a case study of Pakistan.
- Akbarova, M. (2021). The Communicative Language Teaching Method and Its Interactive Strategies of Motivating. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*, 2021(1), 19-28.
- Alamri, W. (2018). Communicative Language Teaching: Possible Alternative Approaches to CLT and Teaching Contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 11(10), 132. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n10p132>
- Alamri, W. A. (2018). Communicative language teaching: Possible alternative approaches to CLT and teaching contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 11(10), 132-138.
- Bhatti, A. M., Abbas, F., & Rana, A. M. K. (2020). An Empirical study of learning styles used by undergraduate English learners in public sector colleges in Pakistan. *Elementary Education Online*, 19(3), 1864-1875.
- Boucher, A. (1991). Mitchell, Rosamond. Communicative Language Teaching in Practice. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 47(3), 545-546. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.47.3.545>
- Chohan, M. N., Abbas, F., & Saleem, M. (2018). CALL as a tool in teaching EFL in Pakistani religious institutes (Madaris): A survey of issues and challenges. *Al Qalam*, 23(1), 355-368.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The 2010s Communicative language teaching in the 21st century: The 'principled communicative approach'. *Perspectives*, 36(2), 33-43.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2013). *Communicative language teaching in the twenty-first century: The principled communicative approach*. J. Arnold, & T. Murphy, Meaningful Action (Eds.), 161-171.
- Gapparova, A. N. (2021). the effective methods and principles of communicative language teaching. *Academic research in educational sciences*, 2(Special Issue 1).
- Hoque, M., Idrus, R., & Islam, Y. (2018). A Health-Check of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Rural Primary Schools of Bangladesh. *English Language Teaching*, 11(7), 163-175. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n7p163>
- Ju, F. (2013). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): A Critical and Comparative Perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(9), 1579. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.9.1579-1583>
- Kasumi, H. (2015). Communicative language teaching and its impact on students' performance. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 5(1), 155-161.
- Kumar, T. (2021). The impact of written visual materials in the development of speaking skills in the English language among secondary level students. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2).
- Kwon, Y. (2017). A study of Thai teachers' perceptions toward the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching of English. *HRD JOURNAL*, 8(1), 114-125.
- Light, T., & Littlewood, W. (1982). Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction. *Language*, 58(4), 952. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413984>
- Molla, N. (2019). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Approach Towards Speaking Ability. English Focus: *Journal of English Language Education*, 2(1), 10-24. <https://doi.org/10.24905/efj.v2i1.50>
- Nazir, S., Abbas, F., & Naz, F. (2020). Historical development of orthography in English and impact of computer-mediated communication (CMC) on the emerging orthographic patterns in English. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(11), 162-175.

- Nguyen, C., & Le, D. (2020). Communicative Language Teaching: Do Tasks and Activities in School Textbooks Facilitate Learners' Development of Communicative Competence?. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(5), 688. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1105.04>
- Noor, A., Shahid, A., Ahmed, S., & Ahmad, M. (2021). An Evaluation of Communicative Language Teaching in Pakistan: A Study of Undergraduate English Learners of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(3), 259-264.
- Rababah, G. (2002). Communication Problems Facing Arab Learners of English.
- Rahmatillah, K. (2019). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) through Role Play and Task-Based Instruction. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching*, 4(2), 161. <https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v4i2.339>
- Shah Jabeen, S. (2014). Implementation of Communicative Approach. *English Language Teaching*, 7(8), 24. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n8p68>
- Spada, N. (2007). Communicative language teaching. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 271-288). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Sung, K. (2010). Promoting Communicative Language Learning through Communicative Tasks. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(5). <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.5.704-713>
- Tayebinik, M., Tizjang, E., & Najarian, S. (2018). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method in Iran. *International Academic Journal of Humanities*, 05(02), 58-65. <https://doi.org/10.9756/iajh/v5i2/1810026>
- Teh, W. (2021). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the context of online learning: A literature review. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 1(2), 65-71.
- Wu, W. (2008). Misunderstandings of Communicative Language Teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 50-53. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v1n1p50>