

Inconsistencies in English Language Teaching in Pakistan: A Comparison between Public and Private Institutions

Saeed Ahmad* ¹ , Congman Rao ²

1. Institute of International and Comparative Education, Northeast Normal University, 5268 Renmin Street, Changchun 130024, China
2. Faculty of Education, Northeast Normal University, 5268 Renmin Street, Changchun 130024, China

* Email: saeed_board@yahoo.com

Abstract:

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the substantial implementation of communicative approach in teaching English as a foreign language at higher secondary level in Pakistan. It also attempted to differentiate between public and private institutions in CLT application. A questionnaire, observation schedule and subsequent interviews were used to collect data. The results revealed that big gap is found in what teachers claim to do in class room and what they actually materialize. The teaching methodology adopted by the private domain teachers was found comparatively closer to the tenets of communicative approach. During the interview, the respondents tried to justify their inconsistencies in teaching style. Examination washback effect was a commonly forwarded justification by the teachers of both domains. Inexperienced teachers, physical environment, strategic facilities, over-crowded class rooms and non-availability of teaching material were some of the other excuses given by the interviewees.

Key words: ELT, teaching methodology, CLT, GTM, inconsistencies.

1. Introduction

In language teaching and learning process, to evaluate the efficacy of prevailing methodology is a norm rather than exception. 'New movements often begin as reaction to old ones. Their origins lie in a discontent with an existing state of affairs' (Johnson & Marrow, 1981). A number of teaching methodologies have been forwarded by the researchers and teachers. Every methodology is characterized with some notions matching with the requirements of its particular age. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach has widely been studied as a means of improving communicative competence of the L2 learners (Yu, 2001; Bax, 2003; Hiep, 2007; Hu, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Takanashi, 2004; Anderson, 1993; Burnaby and Sun, 1989; Jin and Cortazzi, 1998; Liao, 2004; Li, 1998; Ahmad & Rao, 2012a). There is a positive relationship between teaching methodology and learners' communicative competence (Lessard-Clouston, 1997). The researchers have pointed out gap between theory and practice in teaching methodologies (Littlewood, 2007; Nunan, 2003). In deed the progress in target language learning mostly lies in the real implementation of teaching methodology what so ever.

The key to teaching English effectively lies in the fact whether English is taught as language or as subject. Traditionally, the main consideration of EFL (English as a foreign language) has been on gaining maximum knowledge about the language itself instead of learning to use it in context. The use of Grammar Translation Method (GTL) was considered good in giving appropriate knowledge of language to the learners. But it has failed in the domain of practical use of language in real life situation. On the other hand, CLT approach is being praised worldwide for its main focus on improving communicative competence of the learners. To produce competent users of English has reached to the priority list of many East Asian governments. McClintock (2012) has pointed out the situation in her article. In Japan, the National Ministry of Education, Science and Culture included CLT approach in the revised curriculum of 1980 (Samimy & Kobayashi, 2004). The government of South Korea introduced CLT in the 7th curriculum in 1997 (Yoon, 2004). China introduced communicative approach in ELT in the early 1990s (Zhu, 2003).

English language is one of the important factors for progress educationally, socially and economically in Pakistan. It serves as a gateway to success, to further education and to white collar jobs. Socially English has been adopted as a polite and prestigious means of interaction among educated Pakistanis: those who know it are considered educated (Ghani, 2003). Ramanathan (2005) wrote in Pakistan context that : "...with globalization and the talk about English being a world language, with stories of young people emigrating all over the world armed with English- with all these things English is a commodity in more demand than ever before'. Keeping in view the use of English in Pakistan and the benefits associated with its usage, English language teachers have been urged to incorporate communicative practices in class room. Various teacher training programs are being conducted for the awareness of teachers so that they should implement strategies to

enhance communicative skill of students. Now for the first time in the history of Pakistan, there is a wide awakening towards the goal of achieving communicative competence which is evident from various steps taken by the stake holders towards this direction. The concerned educational authorities in the provincial as well as federal government are found conscious for education in general and the teaching of English for communicative purpose in particular. But still there is a need for the authorities to assert their verdict on this issue. Zaffar (2008) quotes one letter from the Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan to the heads of colleges and universities in Pakistan that: ‘(It is) advised to prepare plans for increasing students’ English language proficiency and enhance their communication skills for academic and professional purpose’. The role of government agencies is crucial in the real implementation of policies. The State Education Department of China (SEDC) addressed this issue in *English Teaching Syllabus, (1992, p.1)* and issued clear instructions to the English language teachers to adopt communicative approach in class room.

2. Literature review

Although the teachers’ practice of CLT approach is mainly based on their theoretical knowledge about the methodology, yet its application can not merely be determined by it. In a communicative class room situation, the diverse role of teacher has been emphasized by the practitioners. Nunan (1989) and Lopez (1984) have asserted that as learners have varying interests and cognitive styles, the teacher is expected to eclectively use as many methods and techniques as possible in contrast to the past situation in which a teacher was supposed to follow one best methodology and one best text book (as mentioned in Tessema Tedesse Abebe, *et al*, 2012). ‘It should be kept in mind that English language teachers must be prudent and eclectic in designing a lesson plan, paying close attention to a wide range of methods and techniques that are at their disposal, and in selecting appropriate pedagogical tools that are congruent with the linguistic needs of their students’ (Jilani, 2004). To meet the objectives of this research, it is desirable to analyze the underlying principles of GTM and CLT approach.

2.1 Teaching methodologies: GTM v/s CLT

Previously, different teaching methodologies have been forwarded by linguists and scholars. The underlying concept of every methodology have some common characteristics, like, goals of teaching, role of students and teacher in the class room, teacher-student/s and student-student/s interaction, use of teaching materials, evaluation and feedback, importance of grammar, etc. To meet the requirements of this research, teaching methodology has to be judged on a certain criterion. Richards and Rodgers’ (2001) framework of teaching methodology is considered detailed and helpful in describing the phenomenon, where six elements have been discussed:

- i. Objectives of the method
- ii. The syllabus model
- iii. Class room activities
- iv. The teacher’s role
- v. The student’s role
- vi. Learning material

(Table 1: GTM vs. CLT in Richards and Rodgers framework)

GTM has a focus on the knowledge about language mainly covered by reading and writing practices. Accuracy of language is emphasized as contrary to fluency. The explanation of grammatical rules, memorization and reproduction of the likewise structures is the main characteristic. The use of L1 is in abundance to explain difficult words. The rules of L2 are compared with that of L1 for a better understanding. Parsing of long sentences is a way of learning complex structures. Immediate feedback by the teacher and an explicit correction of students’ error is a norm. Teacher’s role is dominant and most of the class room activities revolve around his/her personal choices about students’ learning. Learning materials comprise on textbooks and grammar. In CLT, teacher acts as a facilitator and monitor of the class room activities rather than leading the class. Lessons are normally topics or themes. The situational use of language is emphasized. The learners are promoted to communicate not only in written but rather in spoken language according to the need of situation. Dialogues are used freely with a communicative purpose. The learners are engaged in useful language rather than repetition of grammatical rules. Hence, fluency in the target language is acquired prior to accuracy of structure and rules of grammar. The desired goal in this approach is to increase the communicative competence of the learners (Brown, 1993).

Communicative language theory was highly influenced by Long's (1983, 1996) Interaction Hypothesis. For him, language is viewed as a tool employed to maintain social relation (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). '(CLT is) an approach of language teaching methodology that emphasizes authenticity, interaction, student-centered learning, task-based activities, and communication for the real world, meaningful purposes' (Brown, 1993). CLT is a contested term (Thompson, 1996; Hiep, 2007) and acts as an umbrella term covering a large variety of teaching techniques adopted by a language teacher in class room (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Harmer, 2007; Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Communicative approach has been influential in ESL and EFL context during the last two decades. Since communicative competence of the learners is the goal, they will learn to communicate by communicating (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p 131).

Today we are benefiting from the victories and defeats of our professional march through history. But today the methodological issues are quite different and complex. Beyond grammatical and discourse elements in communication, we are probing the nature of social, cultural and pragmatic features of language. We are exploring pedagogical means of "real life" communication in the class room. 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 class rooms. We are concerned with how to facilitate lifelong language learning among our students, not just with the immediate class room task. We are looking at learners as partners in a co-operative venture. And our class room practices seek to draw on whatever intrinsically speaks learners to reach their fullest potential (Brown, 1993).

3. Research Methodology:

A triangulation of data source was used in this research to ensure authenticity of the findings. Both qualitative and quantitative techniques were used to collect and analyze data. The following research questions were posed to meet the research objectives for this study:

- I. What is the difference between teachers' claimed methodology and their substantial implementation of it?
- II. To what extent the principles of CLT are a characteristic of English class room in Pakistan?
- III. Is there any significant difference between public and private institutions in applying CLT approach?

3.1 Participants of the study:

English language teachers at Higher Secondary level in Pakistan comprised population for this research. One district (Multan) of the province of Punjab was selected on purpose basis. The criterion for their selection was their teaching at higher secondary level. A total of 150 teachers were identified who met the criterion of sample population. Comprehensive sampling technique was used. The participants belonged to the public (92) as well as private (36) institutes. Both genders, i.e. male (73) and female (55) included; whereas urban (102) and rural (26) teachers alike participated. It should be noted that basic educational requirement for a teacher at college level is M.A/M.Sc. Teachers with various educational background and professional training participated (Compulsory qualification: M.A/M.Sc. 117, M.Phil. 11; professional education: B.Ed. 39, M.Ed. 14; ELT course/s: TEFL 19, TESOL 03; any other course/s 26, none 32).

3.2 Research Instruments:

Three research instruments were used to collect data (a) Questionnaire, (b) Observation Schedule and, (c) Semi-structured Interviews with the participants. These are detailed as below:

3.2.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was based on Karavas Doukas (1996) modal which has earlier been used to explore teacher's attitude in applying CLT approach. This questionnaire consisted on two parts. Part one covered demographic information of the participants, like name, age, gender, experience, qualification, affiliation, etc. Part two comprised on a Likert scale with 25 items related to the class room activities and the use of teaching methodology. Three options were given to know the teachers' response on individual items, i.e. frequently, occasionally and, rarely. The reliability of questionnaire as tested on Cronbach Alpha was 0.743.

3.2.2 Observation Schedule

The observation schedule was used with a purpose to find out any difference in theory and practice; what do the teachers claim to do in class room and what do they actually do. Collecting information through class room observation provides direct experience (Koul, 1996; Nunan, 1992; Wallace, 1998). Schmuck (1997) asserted, as mentioned in Barbara B. Kawulich (2005) 'Observation methods are useful to researchers in a variety of ways. They provide researchers with ways to check for nonverbal expression of feelings, determine who interacts with whom, grasp how participants communicate with each other, and check for how much time is spent on various activities'. The observation schedule was comprised on 27 items and every item with five options, i.e. always, frequently, occasionally, rarely and, never.

3.2.3 Interview

The purpose of interview was to seek justification/s for the mismatches and inconsistencies found during analysis of data from questionnaire and observation schedule. As this interview was a continuum of the class observation, the teachers whose classes had already been observed were contacted for interview. Ten out of twelve teachers were available for it. Keeping in view research ethics, the interviewees were pseudonym as P1, P2...P10.

3.3 Collection of data:

On the first stage, 150 participants were delivered the questionnaire from which 128 were returned after completion. An *Informed Consent Form* also accompanied with the questionnaire. On the second stage, observation schedule was used for observing classes of the twelve respondents from the sample population. Two classes (45 minutes for individual class) for every teacher were observed. Total time of class observation was 1080 minutes (18 hours). Audio recording was also made for these observations. Observation schedule, notes taken during this session and the audio recording were tallied to find out a clear situation of the class room practices. On the third stage, ten respondents were interviewed. This was a semi structured interview, the participants were informed that any emerging question/s during the interview could also be asked. An audio recording device was used for recording. The interviews were transcribed the same day of interview.

4. Data Analysis:

As the underlying idea of this research was to identify any significant difference on using CLT approach in public and private sector, the questionnaire and the observation schedule were separated after completion and made two categories, public (92) and private (36). Hence, the result was also presented in this vein. Both qualitative and quantitative techniques were used to analyze data. The questionnaire and the observation schedule were analyzed quantitatively while the interview was analyzed thematically which means that themes were identified and analyzed according to the research questions. The questionnaire data was analyzed using frequencies and percentages, while a t test was used to sort out any significant difference between public and private institutions on using CLT approach. To analyze data from class observation, frequencies and percentage was calculated, and then descriptive statistics was used like Mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum range to sort out any significant difference between the public and private domains on the substantial implementation of communicative approach. The interview was analyzed using qualitative analysis technique.

4.1 Results and Discussion

The first research question was *what is the difference between teachers' claimed methodology and their substantial implementation of it?* The teachers' response on which teaching methodology they use in class on the three options are given in table 2.

This response was considered somewhat vague in the sense that it was realized some teachers might claim using GTM or CLT approach, what they believe to practice in class room was the point to be explored in detail. The Likert scale in the questionnaire served this purpose.

4.1.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was used to explore teaching practices by the respondents, to evaluate how far the characteristics of CLT approach are found in Pakistani class rooms, and what is the difference between public and private domains in this context. The table 3 shows the results of public and private institutions collected through the questionnaire:

The public schools teachers' response shows that the majority teachers follow the principles of GTM in class room as their focus is on teaching the rules of language rather than teaching the use of it. They *frequently* translate and explain grammar rules and text with parsing of sentences. They *frequently* use L1 in class room, make on spot and direct corrections of students' errors and *rarely* use innovations in teaching. Their criterion of students' progress judgment is the use of correct language structure and their feedback is based on learners' appropriateness on the use of grammatical rules.

The teachers in private institutions mostly apply a teaching methodology close to CLT approach as their focus of teaching is the students' ability to use language. Their class room activities are *frequently* based on students' needs; use English *frequently* in teaching; and the teacher has different roles in class room. They *occasionally* translate and explain text and grammar rules and, parsing complex sentences; promote learners to suggest learning; organize teaching to suit every learner; promote teacher-student and student-student interaction in class room. But their response on the issues of feedback and correction of errors show that they still lag behind the real implementation of CLT approach in class room.

For the third research question *is there any significant difference between public and private institutions in applying CLT approach*, an independent samples t test was used. The three options in Likert schale, frequently, occasionally and, rarely were assigned marks, 3, 2,1 in case of a positive statement according to the principles of CLT approach, and vice versa. The result indicates that there is found significant difference between the two domains. The mean score of public and private domains is 44.73 and 55.44 respectively. The difference between two mean scores is 0.00 that is greater than 0.05 level alpha. So, there is found statistically significant difference between the two domains on the use of teaching methodology in English class room (Table 4).

The data collected through questionnaire of the both domains was considered generalized which means that for providing base for the subsequent observation of classes, the result of public and private domains was thought as to representing their respective domains.

4.1.2 Observation Schedule

Teachers' claimed methodology and their substantial implementation of it was the first research question. To find out the difference between the two, a classroom observation schedule was used. Sixteen classes of eight teachers (two classes each teacher) were observed. The data shows that public domain teachers' response in questionnaire is most of the part close to the data of observation schedule.

In the private domain, eight classes of four teachers (two classes each) were observed. The data collected through questionnaire and observation schedule of the private domain is partly inconsistent. On some issues, there was found a gap between what they claim to do in the class room (questionnaire) and what they actually do (observation schedule). On the issue of teacher-student student-teacher and student-student interaction the situation is not as good as it was claimed in the questionnaire. Explanation of grammatical rules and translation of text is also inconsistent with their responses in the questionnaire. However, on the issues of innovative teaching, use of English as a medium of instruction, peer feedback, creating life-like situations in classroom, and, a variety of teacher's role, we can realize that English teaching in the private domain is near to the characteristics of CLT approach.

The public school teachers rarely (25%) or never (75%) used English as a medium of instruction, while the private school teachers always (50%) and frequently (50%) used it. Teacher-student interaction was found equal on both sides. Student-student interaction in the public classroom was rarely (50%) or never (37.5%), while it was occasionally (75%) or (frequently (25%) in private schools. Student-teacher interaction in public school was occasionally (50%) or rarely (37.5%), while in the private schools, it was found occasionally (75%). The explanation of grammatical rules was found always (50%) or frequently (50%) in the public schools, whereas in private schools was occasionally (75%) or frequently (25%). Pair-work and group-work activities in the public schools was never (100%) found, whereas in private schools was found occasionally (75%). On spot correction of errors was found always (25%) and frequently (62.5%) in public schools, whereas in private schools was found occasionally (50%) or rarely (50%). The public schools never (100%) shown creating life-like situations, while private schools shown frequently (100%). The public schools were found always (100%) teacher-centered, whereas private schools were occasionally (75%) teacher-centered. The public schools were never (100%) student centered, whereas private schools were frequently (75%) student-centered. The public schools never (75%) promote students to interact in English, whereas private schools always (75%) promoted students to speak in English. The public schools rarely (62.5%) promote students to ask questions, while private schools always (100%) promote students to ask questions. The public schools never (75%) used teacher made materials in classroom, while private teachers always (75%) used it. The public and private teachers frequently (75% and 50% respectively) used text books in classroom. The public teachers always (75%) emphasized on accuracy, while the private teachers occasionally (50%) or rarely (50%) emphasized it. The public teachers rarely (75%) emphasized on fluency whereas the private teachers always (50%) or frequently (50%) emphasized it. The public teachers rarely (62.5%) tolerated students' errors, whereas the private teachers tolerated frequently (75%). The public teachers had always (100%) focus on reading and writing, whereas private teachers occasionally (50%) or rarely (50%) focused on it. The public teachers always (75%) emphasized on the use of structural language, whereas private teachers occasionally (50%) or rarely (50%) emphasized on it. The public teachers rarely (50%) or never (37.5%) emphasized on meaning conveyance, whereas private teachers always (50%) or frequently (50%) focused

on it. The public teachers never (87.5%) promoted using variety of language structure, whereas the private teachers frequently (75%) promoted it. The public teachers always (100%) translated original text, whereas the private teachers frequently (50%) translated it. The public teachers always (62.5%) used L1 in classroom, while the private teachers rarely (50%) or never (50%) used L1 in classroom. The public teachers never (100%) promoted peer feedback, whereas the private teachers frequently (100%) promoted it. In the public schools, there was never (75%) found a variety of teachers role, while in the private schools it was always (50%) or frequently (50%) found. The public teachers always (100%) promoted memorization of vocabulary, while the private teachers rarely (75%) promoted it.

To examine the difference between public and private domains on the issue of substantial implementation of CLT approach, descriptive statistical analysis was made. For this purpose, five options in the Likert scale, always, frequently, occasionally, rarely and, never were assigned marks 5, 4,3,2,1 in case the statement described a CLT characteristic, and vice a versa. The result indicates that the private domain is better than the public domain on the use of communicative approach. The N (number) shows the number of teachers whose classes were observed (two classes of every individual teacher). The minimum score of public domain is 36, while the private domain is 97. The maximum score of public domain is 44, while the private domain is 104. The mean score of public domain is 39.25, while private domain is 101.25. And, the standard deviation of two domains is 2.49 for public, and 2.94 for private (table 5). The table indicates that teachers in private institutions are comparatively better than public teachers and are using a teaching methodology closer to the tenets of CLT approach. However, there were found inconsistencies in teaching style during the observation. The contradiction what they claim to do and what they actually do in class room and, the inconsistencies in implementing CLT strategies in teaching provided base for the sub-sequent interview with the class teachers.

4.1.3 Interview with teachers

The purpose of this interview was to bridge the gap between teachers' claimed methodology and actual materialization of it. There was found less gap between the responses of public teachers provided in the questionnaire and data collected through observation schedule. While comparatively larger gap was found in the responses of private teachers provided in the questionnaire and collected through observation schedule. The underlying idea of research was to examine the difference/s, if any, in the substantial implementation of communicative approach in teaching English at higher secondary level in Pakistan in public and private institutions. The data already collected through questionnaire and observation schedule provided the base for the interview questions. The inconsistencies found in the questionnaire and the observation schedule was the main issues to be resolved during the interview. The respondents tried to justify these inconsistencies giving different arguments. On some levels, both of the domains looked to stand together on their individual stance.

The interview responses of the public teachers were found different than the private teachers. The public domain teachers mostly used GTM in teaching. They showed their concern about the examination results of students. This was one of the most common reasons of teachers diverging from communicative technique to the traditional practices. And, it was found common on both sides, public and private. The interviewees from public domain were also found over-obsessed by the crowded classes. The physical environment in the public domain institutions was also revealed a big reason for not actualization of communicative approach; class rooms without computers, multimedia and other audio/visual aids was a big challenge for the enthusiastic teachers who wanted to apply CLT approach.

The data collected from the private domain teachers through questionnaire and observation were found more inconsistent than the public. The most inconsistent data was related to the teachers with less teaching experience. During the interview, it was realized that some teachers who are a product of GTM, despite taking language teaching courses were unable for the substantial utilization of CLT approach. Although physical conditions of the private institutions were comparatively better, the teachers were found using strategies associated with mixed methodology. However, the private domain interviewees' contradictions found in the data were not fully resolved. It needs further investigation to justify these inconsistencies. Some emerging themes were identified during the interview which matched to the objectives of this research. One of them was that teachers with an experience of working abroad are more inclined towards applying CLT approach, and they are comparatively more expert in it. Another emerging theme was ELT courses, like TESOL and TEFL, etc. The teachers who had taken these courses were found comparatively better than the others on applying CLT strategies in class room. Their ideas were clearer and close to the tenets of CLT approach.

5. Conclusion and Suggestions

The study was guided by the theme of differentiating public institutions from private on the use of communicative approach in teaching English at higher secondary level in Pakistan. On the first place, a questionnaire was used to collect data. Secondly, a class observation-schedule was used to evaluate the difference between what teachers claim on using of teaching methodology and what they actually materialize in classroom. Thirdly, a subsequent interview was used to seek justification for their inconsistent responses in the questionnaire and the observation schedule. The data indicates that there

is found a significant difference between public and private domains on the use of teaching methodology. Public domain teachers mostly use GTM, and their second priority is to use a mixed method approach to meet the learning needs of students. CLT approach is mostly absent from their teaching. The private domain teachers prefer to use CLT approach or their second option is to use mixed method approach. The data from observation schedule reveals that public teachers mostly do what they claim, while there is found a gap between what private teachers claim and what they actually materialize. However, their methodology is close to the tenets of CLT approach, though it cannot be claimed that they really implement it because of their inconsistencies in teaching style. The public domain teachers identified issues for not implementing CLT approach were the examination pressure, over-crowded class rooms, text based teaching and the non-availability of teaching materials. The private domain teachers were found more conscious about their teaching methodology. They seemed to be striving hard in a competitive environment. The physical environment found in most of the private institutions is conducive for their efforts in applying communicative approach. The contradiction and inconsistencies in their teaching style are caused by the lack of teacher training programs and examination pressure.

The set up of every country is unique in L2 teaching methodology. Pakistan is lagging behind than the other EFL countries in implementing CLT approach. Further research in this area is needed to evaluate the examination washback effect on teaching methodology (Ahmad & Rao, 2012 b), cultural constrains in different social settings, syllabus design to match CLT requirements, and, assessment of language skills under CLT system.

References

- Ahmad, S. & Rao, C (2012a) Does it work? Applying communicative language teaching approach in EFL contxt. *Journal of Education & Practice* Vol. 3, No, 12
- Ahmad, S. & Rao, C. (2012b) A review of the pedagogical implications of examination washback. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* Vol.2, No. 7
- Anderson, J. (1993) 'Is a communicative approach practical for teaching English in China? Pros and cons' in *System*, 21, 4, pp 471-480
- Barbara B. Kawulich (2005) Participants'' observation as a data collection method. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* Vol. 6, No.2, Art. 43.
- Bax, S. (2003) 'The end of CLT: a context approach to language teaching' in *ELT Journal*, 57, 3,pp 278-287
- Brown, H.D. (1994) *Teaching by Principles. An interactive approach to langue teaching pedagogy*, New York: Longman
- Brown, H.D.(2007) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc
- Burnaby, B. and Sun, Y.(1989) 'Chinese teachers' views of Western language teaching: Context approach to ELT' in *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 4, pp 635-660
- Ghani, M. (1999) *English Language Teaching in Pakistan* | UniversityInfoOnline.com
www.universityinfoonline.com/.../languages/
- Ghani, M. (2003) *The status and position of English Language in Pakistan* *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, Vol.1
- Harmer, J. (2001) *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd ed.) London: Longman
- Hiep, P.H. (2007) 'Communicative language teaching: unity within diversity' in *ELT Journal*, 61, 3,pp 193-201
- Hu, G. (2005a) 'CLT is best for China - An untenable absolutist claim' in *ELT Journal*, 59, 5, pp 64-68
- Hu, G. (2005b) 'Contextual influences on instructional practices: A Chinese case for an ecological informs paradigms' in *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 2, pp 219-238
- Jilani, Warsi (2004) *Conditions Under Which English is Taught in Pakistan : An Applied Linguistic Perspective*, SARID Journal Vol. 1, No.1
- Jin, L and Cortazzi, M,(1998) 'Dimensions of dialogue: large classes in China' in *International Journal of Educational Research*, 29, 8, pp 739-761
- Johnson, K & Marrow, K (1981) *Communication in the classroom*. England: Longman Group Ltd.
- Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996) Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT journal*, 50(3) 187-198
- Koul, L. (1996) *Methodology of Educational research* (2nd Ed.) Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006) 'TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends' in *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 1, pp 59-81
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986) *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000) *Techniques and principles in language teaching*, 2nd ed, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Lessard-Clouston, M. (1997). "Language Learning Strategies: An Overview for L2 Teachers" *The Internet TESL Journal*. 3 (12)

- Li, D. (1998) 'It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea' in *TESOL Journal*, 32, 4, pp 677-703
- Liao, X. (2004) 'The need for communicative language teaching in China' in *ELT Journal*, 58, 3,
- Liao, Xiao Qing (2000) *How CLT became acceptable in Secondary Schools in China*, The Internet TESOL Journal Vol. VI, No.10
- Littlewood, W. (2007), Communicative and task-based language teaching in East-Asian class rooms. *Language Teaching*, 40 243-249
- Lopez, C.L. (1984) The role of the Teacher in Today's Language classroom. *Teacher Developments, Making the Right moves-selected articles from the English Language Teaching Forum 1989-1993*, Thomas Kral, Washington
- Long, M.H. (1983) Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 5, 1177-193
- Long, M.H. (1996) The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.) *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468) San Diego, C.A: Academic Press.
- McClintock, K. (2011) Korean university students' perceptions of communicative language teaching, p. 145-158 retrieved from www.tesolreview.org/down/Kathryn.pdf
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Nunan, D. (2003), The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asian-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37 (4) 589-613
pp 270-273
- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S.(2001) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Samimy, K.K. & Kobayashi,C. (2004) Towards the development of Intercultural Communicative Competence: Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications for Japanese English teachers. *JALT*, 26(2), 245-261
- Takanashi, Y. (2004) 'TEFL and communication styles in Japanese culture' in *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 17, 1, pp 1-14
- Tessema Tadesse Abebe, et al (2012) The role of instructor in implementing Communicative Language Teaching methodology. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* Vol.2, No.3,2012
- Thompson, G. (1996) 'Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching' in *ELT Journal*,50, 1, pp 9-15
- Wallace, M.J. (1998), *Action research for language teachers*. Cambridge: CUP
- Yoon, K. (2004) CLT theories and practices in EFL curricula. A case study of Korea. *Asian EFL Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/September-04-yke.php>
- Yu, L. (2001) 'Communicative language teaching in China: Progress and resistances' in *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 1, pp 194-198
- Zaffar (2008) retrieved from <http://kba-ips.com/2010/11/english-language-teaching-in-pakistan>
- Zhu, H. (2003) Globalization and new ELT challenges in China. *English Today*, 19 (4), 36-41

	Grammar Translation Method	Communicative Language Teaching
Objectives of the method	Learners' knowledge of the target language	Learners' use of the target language
	Mastery in grammar	Equal attention to all language skills
	Production of accurate language	Fluency in target language
Syllabus	Prescribed Syllabus	Teacher's discretion
Class room activities	Translation of the text	Integrated practice of the four language skills
	Grammar exercises	Teacher-student interaction
	Vocabulary learning	Student-student interaction
	Contrastive analysis of L1 and L2	Group-work activities
		Situational use of language
Teacher's Role	Lecturing	Initiator and monitor of class room activities
	Parsing complex sentences in text	Implicit feedback of faulty language
	Explanation of language rules	Grouping students
	Feedback and an explicit correction of errors	
Students' role	Listeners and viewers of class room activities	Central role in class room activities
	Cramming of language rules	Peer feedback
	Doing multiple exercises	Suggestive
	Receiver of teacher's instructions	
	Listeners and viewers of class room activities	
Learning material	Text books as prescribed by the Textbook Board	Authentic material
	Translation and solved exercises books	Teacher developed material
	Grammar and Vocabulary books	Use of Realia

Table 1: GTM vs. CLT in Richards and Rodgers framework

Institutions	Option	Response	
		Frequency	Percentage
Public domain (total 92)	GTM	43	56.74
	CLT	19	20.65
	Eclectic Approach	30	32.61
Private domain (total 36)	GTM	04	11.11
	CLT	21	58.33
	Eclectic Approach	11	30.55

Table 2: On the use of Teaching methodology by public and private domains

Item statements	Public School Teachers						Private School Teachers					
	Frequently		Occasionally		Rarely		Frequently		Occasionally		Rarely	
	Frq	%age	Frq	%age	Frq	%age	Frq	%age	Frq	%age	Frq	%age
Your focus of teaching is the students' knowledge of the rules of language.	54	58.7	35	38.0	03	3.3	22	61.1	14	38.9	-	-
Your focus of teaching is the students' ability to use the target language.	03	3.3	38	41.3	51	55.4	31	86.1	05	13.9	-	-
Explanation and illustration of grammar rules.	54	58.7	33	35.9	05	5.4	-	-	11	30.6	25	69.4
Translation of text word by word.	65	70.7	27	29.3	-	-	03	8.3	15	41.7	18	50.0
Explanation of the text sentence by sentence.	44	47.8	32	34.8	16	7.4	03	8.3	25	69.4	08	22.2
Parsing of complex sentences.	46	50.0	26	28.3	20	21.7	10	27.8	10	27.8	16	44.4
Contrastive explanation of L2 with that of L1.	42	45.7	37	40.2	13	14.1	11	30.6	13	36.1	12	33.3
Direct and on-spot correction of students' errors.	41	44.6	23	25.0	28	30.4	11	30.6	14	38.9	11	30.6
Use of English language while teaching.	-	-	33	39.9	59	64.1	28	77.8	06	16.7	02	5.6
Promote Teacher-Students interaction in English.	66	71.7	25	27.2	01	1.1	17	47.2	15	41.7	04	11.1
Promote Student-Student interaction in classroom.	12	13.0	29	31.5	51	55.4	23	63.9	12	33.3	01	2.8
Innovations in teaching.	01	1.1	41	44.6	50	54.3	27	75.0	08	22.2	01	2.8
Promote pair and group-work activities.	22	23.9	37	40.2	33	35.9	17	47.2	19	52.8	-	-
Promote a culture of peer feedback in classroom.	31	33.7	23	25.0	38	41.3	23	63.9	13	36.1	-	-
Use of teacher-developed material.	32	34.8	31	33.7	29	31.5	19	52.8	15	41.7	02	5.6
Promote a rote memorization of vocabulary.	69	75.0	11	12.0	12	13.0	03	8.3	11	30.6	22	61.1
You organize teaching in a way to suit every learner.	65	70.7	24	26.1	03	3.3	09	25.0	19	52.8	08	22.2
You promote learners to suggest class room activities.	06	6.5	40	43.5	46	50.0	09	25.0	17	47.2	10	27.8
Your feedback is focused on the learners' appropriateness.	68	73.9	04	4.3	20	21.7	11	30.6	11	30.6	14	38.9
You consider errors as a part of learning.	66	71.7	09	9.8	17	18.5	14	38.9	11	30.6	11	3.06
Much correction is necessary for learning.	61	66.3	10	10.9	21	22.8	06	16.7	06	16.7	24	66.7
A teacher has different roles than only lecturing.	01	1.1	30	32.6	61	66.3	23	63.9	13	36.1	-	-
Class room activities are based on students needs.	-	-	54	58.7	38	41.3	21	58.3	15	41.7	-	-
Direct instruction of rules of language is essential.	67	72.8	13	14.1	12	13.0	03	8.3	13	36.1	20	55.6
Your criterion to judge a learner's performance is the correctness of grammar.	41	44.6	50	54.3	01	1.1	04	11.1	11	30.6	21	58.3

Table 3: Teaching practices by public and private domain teachers

groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error (D)	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Public	92	44.73	5.21642	.94038	-13.624	.000
Private	36	55.44	3.40960	.78657		

Table 4: Difference in public and private domains on the use of CLT approach

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
public	8	36	44	39.25	2.49
private	4	97	104	101.00	2.94

Table 5: Difference in public and private domains on actualization of CLT approach

Authors' biography:

1. Saeed Ahmad is a Pakistani scholar, presently located in China to earn his Ph.D in the International & Comparative Education of the Northeast Normal University, P.R.China. Earlier he earned his Masters in Teacher Education and, Masters in English Language and Literature from Pakistan. His research interest is the comparative analysis of teaching methodologies and the application of communicative approach in teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context.

2. Congman Rao is Professor of the Faculty of Education, Vice-Dean of the Graduate School and, Executive Dean of the Academy for Research in Teacher Education in the Northeast Normal University, P.R.China. He is a multi-disciplined teacher, possessing vast experience of supervising and teaching in the areas of Teacher education, Citizenship & Moral Education, and, International & Comparative Education. He has published extensively in academic journals in all these areas. He earned his Masters and Ph.D in Education from the Northeast Normal University, China. He did his Post-doc research in Nagoya University, Japan.

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

