Hebron University

Faculty of Graduate Studies

English Department

Investigating The Use of Communicative English Language

Teaching at UNRWA Primary Schools in Hebron District: al-

Arroub Boys School – A Case Study

Prepared by

Hiba H. Jawabreh

Supervised by

Dr. Hazem Bader

DEDICATION

To my beloved well understanding husband who provided me with all kinds of encouragement.

A special   feeling of gratitude to my mother who encourages and pushes me toward success.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate whether UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency) primary teachers at Hebron district implement Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) or not, and whether UNRWA primary learners are considered active participants in the learning process. This study first presented the history of language teaching, some misconceptions related to CLT, literature review of current research, and background to CLT in Palestine. Four research methods were used for this research. Participants for this study were forty three Palestinian teachers. The main modes of data collection consisted of a quantitative method represented by a questionnaire, and a qualitative method represented by an observation checklist, semi-structured interviews with two teachers were used. An analytical method represented by an appraisal of a Final Achievement Test was also used. The study discussed the mismatch between UNRWA primary English teachers who claim adoption of the Communicative Approach in their classrooms and the reality of what is taking place in these classes. The findings of the study have revealed that UNRWA teachers are thought to be aware of what constitutes CLT, but they practically keep traditional methods in use. The study has showed that CLT was a favorable approach by most teachers in spite of their inability to basically adopt it. The study has also revealed that students do not practice language communicatively.

الملخص بالعربية

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى بحث مدى استخدام مدرسي المرحلة الأساسية في مدارس وكالة غوث و تشغيل اللاجئين (UNRWA) في منطقة الخليل للمنهج التواصلي، كما و تهدف الدراسة إلى بحث مدى قدرة الطلاب في هذه المدارس على استخدام اللغة الانجليزية بشكل تفاعلي خلال هذا المنهج. في البداية، تعرض الدراسة تاريخاً مختصراً عن طرق تدريس اللغة الانجليزية، وبعض المعتقدات الخاطئة حول تدريس المنهج التواصلي، بالإضافة إلى نبذه مختصرة حول استخدام الأسلوب التواصلي في المنهج الفلسطيني. ولجمع البيانات استخدم الباحث عدة وسائل بحث حيث استعان الباحث بثلاثة وأربعين مدرس فلسطيني ممن يعملون في وكالة الغوث، وقد استخدم الباحث الأسلوب الكمي الذي يتمثل باستخدام استبيان للمدرسين. كما و استعان الباحث بالأسلوب النوعي من خلال استخدام الباحث لقائمة فحص، ومقابلة شبه منظمة مع بعض المدرسين، بالإضافة إلى استخدام الأسلوب التحليلي، وذلك من خلال تحليل امتحان تحصيلي في نهاية الفصل الدراسي. وقد ناقشت الدراسة التباين بين آراء مدرسي وكالة الغوث الذين يدَعون استخدام المنهج التواصلي وحقيقة ما يحدث داخل الصفوف، حيث بينت النتائج أن المدرسين يعتقدون أنهم يتبنون المنهج التواصلي في التدريس، لكنهم عمليا متمسكون بالأساليب التقليدية. وكما أظهرت الدراسة رغبة المدرسين في استخدام المنهج التواصلي بالرغم من عدم قدرتهم على تطبيقه. أخيرا، أظهرت الدراسة عدم قدرة الطلاب على استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل تواصلي نتيجة استخدام مدرسيهم للأساليب التقليدية.

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM

1.0 Introduction

English language teaching has been subjected to many model changes in the last few decades. Communicative Language Teaching (or the Communicative Approach) has emerged whereas many other approaches such as the Audio-lingual and Grammar Translation methods have been increasingly invalidated. In the Palestinian context, English language teaching has also undergone a shift in the teaching learning process by adopting communicative approaches. "This happened when the Palestinian Authority decided to replace the old English curriculum which was based on old methods of teaching such as, the Direct Method, the Grammar Translation Method and the Audio-Lingual Method by (English for Palestine) which is based on the most recent approach of language learning and teaching - the Communicative Approach" (Fattash, 2010, p.189).

The Communicative Approach is a current and modern English language teaching approach. It involves diverse ways of teaching that are borrowed from different methods. It has been rooted by many research findings. Current research shows that there is a growing interest in the Communicative Approach compared to traditional ones. Teachers and learners feel satisfied adopting this approach since it yields communicative users in a world of global communication.

When asked to identify the methodology they employ in their classrooms, most language teachers today, point out "communicative" as the best methodology (Richards, 2006). The Ministry of Education in Palestine could be a good example for those who have adopted the Communicative Approach to language teaching, and because the traditional methods "failed to develop an adequate level of communicative competence (i.e. the ability to use the target language for authentic communication" (Hu, 2002, p.93).

The status of English as a global language has encouraged the Palestinian government to place high weight on English teaching and learning. It has subsequently made considerable efforts to implement CLT through changes in the English curriculum. As the cover page of the course (English for Palestine) Teacher's Book indicates: "the curriculum is designed to be taught communicatively. It systemically develops the competence in the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) and encourages pupils to become confident users of English" (Macmillan Education, 2013). Although the course design adopts the Communicative Approach, the Palestinian classroom context in primary schools does not reflect real, authentic, and meaningful communication. This context contradicts what Brown emphasizes about the importance of recognizing and understanding the relationship between theory and practice since it reinforces the teaching process (1994). In other words, contrary to what the course designer of the new Palestinian English curriculum claims about adopting the Communicative Approach in teaching English, reality different; the Palestinian context has failed to yield communicative users of English.

There is a great deal of evidence to indicate that most of the Palestinian English teachers such as the UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine

Refugees) teachers have failed to graduate communicative learners of English language as prescribed by the curriculum. On one hand, the Palestinian government has requested that schools and teachers implement CLT in order to develop communicative competence for the next generation. On the other hand, "teachers are blamed of paying lip service by telling the government that they are following CLT, when in reality they are adhering to their favorable traditional methods" (Hu, 2002, p.94).

Under the Communicative Approach it is important to have activities that resemble the types of communication that are likely to be encountered in authentic and real life situation. However, Palestinian English teachers still use traditional approaches to the teaching of English in primary grades. Their only concern is accuracy, and language training that focuses on literacy skills rather than on using language for communicative purposes. This might have resulted from the little knowledge about the understanding and implementing of CLT in classrooms if compared with theoretical developments (Sato and Kleinasser, 1999).

In this study, the researcher will try to shed light on Communicative Language Teaching and Learning in the context of UNRWA primary grades to investigate whether the methods and techniques of teaching English communicatively are implemented properly or not, and whether learners are considered as active participants in the learning process or not. Most of the Palestinian English teachers fail to apply CLT in their teaching. Consequently, Palestinian students fail to use language communicatively. Many educators and teachers keep complaining about this discrepancy between CLT in theory as prescribed in the new (English for Palestine) course and what happens in reality. In this respect, the researcher feels that there is a need for studying the case of using the

Communicative Approach of teaching English as a foreign language in the Palestinian curriculum (English for Palestine). The extent of the discrepancy behind the application of English in the Palestinian schools – UNRWA primary grades as a case- needs to be investigated in order to guarantee an acceptable degree of application of the Communicative Approach as prescribed by the course designer in the Palestinian context.

The researcher believes that teachers need a lot of training on how to teach English to young students communicatively. These teachers are also in need for vivid and practical ways for implementing materials, procedures and exercises effectively in the new curriculum to be able to produce communicative learners of English. This research will investigate aspects of their teaching 'English for Palestine' to learn about the extent the curriculum is used communicatively as prescribed and required.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The researcher has observed that many teachers have difficulty teaching English language communicatively in primary grades in UNRWA schools. The Palestinian curriculum is designed to be taught communicatively. However, most of the teachers are unable to apply this approach effectively and successfully in their classes. They usually use traditional methods to language teaching thought the curriculum call for adoption of CLT. Therefore, there's a great discrepancy between the approach prescribed for teaching, and practice in our Palestinian context. It is not adequately right that we announce that we adopt the Communicative Approach while we don't implement it. The teachers must be qualified in using it, learners need to use language for communication, and all teaching/learning factors need to work towards achieving communicative language competence.

1.2 Research Questions

The study will answer the following two main questions:

- To what extent do English primary teachers at UNRWA schools in Hebron observe Communicative Language Teaching?

- To what extent do UNRWA students at primary grades: al- Arroub Basic Boys School as a case practice English language communicatively?

1.3 Hypotheses

- UNRWA English teachers at primary grades do not observe Communicative Language Teaching while teaching 'English for Palestine'.

- UNRWA students at primary grades do not practice English language communicatively.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The present context in Palestinian UNRWA primary schools fails to provide students with adequate opportunities for meaningful practice using the Communicative Approach. Thus the purposes of this study were:

- To find out whether teachers at al- Arroub Basic Boys School teach English language for 6th graders communicatively as prescribed by the course designer/Ministry of Education.

- To find out whether learners (6th grade students) at al- Arroub Basic Boys School practice 'English for Palestine' communicatively as prescribed by the course designer/Ministry of Education.

- To suggest and recommend suitable applications of CLT based on academic investigations for UNRWA English primary teachers in order to develop and improve their methods and techniques in teaching English communicatively.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Since 'English for Palestine', which was designed to be taught communicatively, does not yield communicative users of English as agreed on by teachers, supervisors and officials this study investigates the extent to which the traditional approaches, which emphasize grammatical and linguistic competence, still influence English language teaching at UNRWA primary schools. In addition, it investigates the extent to which the Communicative Approach, which is a current and modern approach and   recommended by the new curriculum, is implemented. It also seeks to investigate the extent to which students at UNRWA primary schools practice the language communicatively. It is important to get an insight into the discrepancy between theory and practice in UNRWA primary grade teachers and students' performance for:

- The findings of this study would hopefully enrich the context of English language teaching and learning in Palestine. It would offer propositions for improving communicative language methodologies in UNRWA primary schools.

- The findings of the study would also guide UNRWA primary teachers in choosing the most effective classroom interactions and would facilitate the selection of items for their

courses. It would also attempt to provide UNRWA English teachers at primary grades with knowledge about the principles and the applications of the CA.

- The findings of the study would help UNRWA students at primary grades reduce the difficulties they have when trying to communicate using English. In addition, it aims at measuring the effect of Communicative Language Teaching on their communicative abilities.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

1. The research study deals with the Communicative Approach in English language teaching for primary grades:

   - It examines al- Arroub Basic Boys School as a case.
   - With 6th graders

2. The research aims at studying whether the Communicative Approach of teaching English is implemented by UNRWA primary teachers.

3. Even though 'English for Palestine' is used in all Palestinian public schools and some privet ones, the research is restricted to UNRWA primary schools in Hebron area where there are only 43 teachers.

1.7 Summary

In this chapter, the researcher discussed the shift from traditional methods to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the gap between theory and practice appearing when implementing the new methods in the Palestinian context. In addition, the statement of the problem, the research questions, the hypotheses, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, and the limitations of the study were presented.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the previous studies that are meant to provide background information on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Firstly, it presents the history of language teaching. Secondly, it discusses some misconceptions related to Communicative Language Teaching. Thirdly, it gives insight into theoretical and practical studies on current research related to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Fourthly, it deals with some studies about the discrepancy between theory and practice regarding CLT in different contexts. Finally, it presents the background of CLT in Palestine.

2.1 The History of Language Teaching

Nowadays, English language is the world's most commonly studied foreign language. The Grammar Translation Method was the "offspring of German scholarship" (Richards & Rodger,2001, p.5). It is a way to study language through deep analysis of its grammar rules. Textbooks consist of statements of abstract grammar rules and lists of vocabulary. Speaking and oral practice are partial. Reading, writing and translation are the centre focus of teaching. Learners' native language is the classroom medium, grammar is taught directly and accuracy is a major desire (Richards & Rodger,2001).

In the nineteenth century "Grammar augmented opportunities for communications among Europeans created a demand for oral proficiency in foreign language" (Richards

& Rodger, 2001, p.6). At this time, linguists created new teaching strategies for language teaching. They highlighted the importance of meaning in learning. They emphasized that the main form of language is speaking rather than writing. The Direct Method meant that the learner of a foreign language needs to think directly in the second language. In that way, the learner makes a connection between his thoughts and his expressions. According to Richards & Rodger, "It was difficult to implement in public secondary school education" (2001,p.12).

The years between 1950 to the 1980 came the time of Modern Era of Grammar. It was the most vigorous era in the history of approaches and methods (Richards & Rodger, 2001). The appearance of the Audio-lingual Method, Situational Method, and Communicative Methods was between 1950 and 1960 whereas in the 1990's, Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Language teaching became known. Additionally, approaches such as Cooperative Learning, Whole Language Approach, and Multiple Intelligences that were used commonly in classrooms have widened the L2 setting (Richards & Rodger, 2001).

The appearance of such modern approaches could be due to the bad reputation of the traditional approaches. Grammar-translation classes might be a waste of time since teachers give detailed explanations and exercises of grammar that reduce students' chance to communicate with language. Besides, Littlewood (1981) claimed that many aspects of language learning arise only through learners' natural practice for the sake of communication with others. Snow (1996) proposed the adoption of CLT since he believes that learners acquire language effectively when they participate dynamically in the communication with language rather than only passively respond to the teachers'

instructions. Hence, researchers call for implementing CLT in order to develop learners' communicative competence.

2.2 Some Misconceptions about Communicative Language Teaching

Harmer (2007) showed that teacher education and the principles of CLT are largely treated as clearly understood and accepted. Thompson (1996) argued that even though Communicative Language Teaching is accepted by many linguists and language teachers as a favorable approach and is spread as the dominant theoretical model in ELT among other approaches, there are still a number of misconceptions about what it involves. Many teachers have no obvious picture about CLT. Theoretically, CLT stresses language communication. Practically, CLT demands special activities, e.g. pair work, group discussion, role play and so on. In his survey of teachers from a range of countries, he found conceptions such as using pair or group work, teaching only speaking, not teaching grammar, and a lot of hard work for the teacher (Thompson,1996).

No grammar teaching, according to Thompson, and avoiding explicit attention to grammar was never an essential part of CLT. However, applied linguists call for the exclusion of explicit grammar. It is undoubtedly clear that there was a reaction against the extensive stress on rules at the expense of natural communication (Thompson, 1996). "If students have no idea of the new knowledge, they won't be able to put them in words" (Jin, Singh & Li, 2005, p.4). Thus, grammar is considered to be necessary to insure efficient communication and that communication can be learned not only through speaking, but by means of reading and writing as well (Thompson, 1996). Li (1998) reported that this misunderstanding "led the teachers to believe that CLT contradicted their beliefs about language learning and did not allow them to prepare students for the

various exams that are critical to their future careers. For that reason, the teachers refused to accept CLT" (1998, p. 689). Nevertheless, teachers should be guiders, they shouldn't cover grammar rules. On the contrary, the focus is on learners who are responsible for discovering the rules themselves through teachers' guidance (Jin et al, 2005).

Teaching only speaking, it's true that many teachers who adopt CLT give more attention to speaking since they see real life communication through oral practice. Learners talk more in CLT classes than in grammar-translation ones. Teachers usually ignore the importance of developing learners' reading and writing skills. Contrary to these beliefs "teachers can manage special activities according to their students' different language learning needs so that to help students not only to speak in English, but also to read, write and think" (Jin et al. ,2005, p.5). However, this is inaccurate in that grammar is considered to be necessary to insure efficient communication and that communication can be learned not only through speaking, but reading and writing as well (Thompson, 1996).

CLT means pair work, which means role play. In fact, through pair and group work learners who work together can help each other. Learners can reach more developed ideas, and therefore greater self-confidence and more successful communication through providing each other with opportunity to experience ideas before introducing their ideas to other learners (Thomson, 1996). Many CLT teachers believe that pair work means only role play. In fact, role play is only one suggestion of practical techniques for developing students' communicative competence and one technique for carrying out meaningful real life language context.

CLT means expecting too much from the teacher. English teachers do not have the magic wandp; they're "enlighteners, facilitators, organizers and helpers" (Jin et al, 2005, p6). Since CLT demands a lot of planning and organization, teachers find it difficult to completely implement CLT method. They need intensive training, students' participation and government support. Certainly, "without having a full understanding and suitable training about the advantages of CLT and the right techniques of implementing it, there will be misconceptions about the method, and rejection to put it in to practice" (Wu, 2008, p. 51).

These misconceptions are due to the discrepancy between CLT theory and practice. Not surprisingly, this lack of certainty has been found also in teachers' conceptions of CLT. In Korea, for example, Li (1998) reported that teachers had unclear conceptions of the nature of communicative approaches. Showing this lack of certainty, Littlewood wrote that it is not surprising that (a) "different people focus on different features in characterizing" CLT but also that (b) "these same elements are found in other approaches which are not explicitly described as CLT" (Littlewood, 2013, p.3).

2.3. Communicative Language Teaching

The emergence of CLT in the 1970s has influenced language teaching practice around the world. Most of language teachers nowadays, when asked to identify the methodology they employ in their classrooms, point out "communicative" as the best methodology (Richards, 2006). CLT has been widely seen as the ultimate response to the inadequacy of the previous approaches and the communication needs of the globalized world (Littlewood, 2013). It is one of the most popular approaches to ELT.

Recently, Communicative Language Teaching has become a modern term to cover a variety of developments in curriculum design and in the methodology of foreign language teaching. It has been widely accepted as an effective approach of teaching English as a foreign language. According to Galloway (1993), the Communicative Approach is the product of educators and linguists who are not satisfied with the Audio-lingual and Grammar-translation methods of TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language). They felt that students were at a loss to communicate in the culture of the language studied. Richards and Rodgers argued that "There is a major paradigm shift within language teaching caused by the Communicative Approach, and such consequences still influence the contemporary English language classrooms" (2001, p.51).

Communicative Language Teaching is an effective way for bridging the gap between classroom language teaching and real life. It refers to a set of ideas which include a review of what aspects of language to teach plus a shift in emphasis in how to teach (Harmer, 2007). "It cannot now be defined in terms of precise characteristics but serves rather as an umbrella term for approaches that aim to develop communicative competence through personally meaningful learning experiences" (Littlewood, 2013, p.1). Brown proposed a definition of CLT to include the following issues: "classical goals are on all of the competence"; "language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes"; "fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative techniques"; and "students ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively" (Brown, 2000, p.245). Features of the Communicative Approach include the

goal of the learner to communicate with each other in L2, content that includes authentic materials, and   activities that involve negotiating meaning, group/pair work, and role play. In a CLT classroom the four skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking are integrated into most lessons.

There are many interpretations of CLT though they are commonly identified as "strong CLT" or "weak CLT". Butler (2011) recognized that in strong CLT features, the learners analyze the language with the teacher as facilitator. He identified that in weak CLT features, the teacher is a leader, guiding the learners through controlled activities. The two versions present demanding roles for both teachers and learners, especially teachers in the strong version where they are required to be creators and organizers of communicative activities. However, the weak version implements a more common agenda through its recognition of controlled and analytic learning (Littlewood, 2013). Littlewood further pointed out that focusing only on the strong version would not get learners used to the 'traditional' techniques such as explanations, drills and question-and-answer practice since the involvement in communication is sufficient in itself for learning (2013).

2.3.1 Characteristics and Principles of CLT

CLT allows the teachers useful communicative activities and principles within the classroom while keeping the additional useful elements of other approaches instead of putting them down (Kavanagh, 2012). The teacher is a facilitator, a co-communicator who shares the activities with the learners. Moreover, the teacher acts as an analyst, a counselor, and group process manager (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Learners are vigorously involved in negotiating meaning. They try to make themselves understood and

understanding others within the classroom procedures and activities (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The communicative classroom requires less teacher-centered instruction. The most important thing regarding the teacher's role in a communicative classroom is providing learners with opportunities to use the second language (Al-Twairish, 2009). The main characteristic of the pedagogic orientation of a CLT course relates to how could students use the second language (L2) rather than know about it, while paying attention to the four skills. The instructional content and presentation suggest that the target language is the language of the classroom and presentations focus on inductive teaching or on communicative tasks (Badger and Yan, 2008).

Accuracy is not stressed as much as fluency. Willems (1987) believed that teachers need to train students to just communicate in L2, and not to be perfect in it. That is to say fluency is encouraged over accuracy.

There are no restricted characteristics of the Communicative Approach because it is the selected outcome of several approaches. CLT has somewhat fixed principles that can be applied and adapted based on different contexts such as learners' age, level, goals, and so on (Richards, 2006). According to Littlewood, there was no obvious agreement about the nature of CLT features, and teachers experienced difficulty in defining and implementing it. However, there is now a common view that teachers need to adapt CLT to suit specific contexts (2013).

In brief, Bader (2009) displayed the pedagogical principles of the Communicative Approach as follows: "learner-centered, interactive communication, authentic along with unpredictable meaningful language, real communicative context, discovery learning of language forms and structure, and a whole language approach is used" (p.133). Richards

and Rodgers summarized the characteristics of the communicative view of language which they claim are rich and somewhat eclectic as the following:

- Language is a system for the expression of meaning;

- The primary function of language is for interaction and communication;

- The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses;

- The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse (2001, p.71).

To sum up, the CA main principle is to use language for communication and/or making use of real-life situations that necessitate communication. CLT is not a restricted method of foreign language teaching. On the contrary, it is based on a combination of features that call for developing learners' communicative competence in order to have authentic practice of English language in classrooms.

2.3.2 Communicative Competence

The goal of CLT is to develop learners' communicative ability. Savignon (2002) argued that "CLT refers to both processes and goals in classroom learning" and that "the central theoretical concept in Communicative Language Teaching is communicative competence" (p.1). CLT aims at developing students' communicative competence, which takes account of both the knowledge about the language and the knowledge about how to use the language appropriately in communicative situations. The concept of communicative competence was suggested by Hymes, who argued that the study of

human language should place humans in society. The definition of "communicative competence" is what a speaker needs to know in order to communicate in a speech community (Hymes, 1972). For instance, in real world, the speaker needs to consider the context in which he produces his words plus using correct grammar sentences in order to reach real communication. Hymes (1972) saw competence as "the overall underlying knowledge and ability for language which the speaker-listener possesses" (p. 13). In other words, communicative competence involves knowledge of the language and the ability to use the knowledge in context.

Hymes viewed communicative competence as having the following four elements: "whether or not something is formally possible" which relates to grammatical competence, "whether something is feasible" which deals with the acceptability of sentences, "whether something is appropriate" which means that a sentence should be appropriate to the context in which it is used, and "whether something is in fact done" which suggests that a sentence may be grammatically correct, feasible, and appropriate in context, but have no probability of actually occurring (Hymes, 1972, p. 14). It may be concluded that communicative competence includes knowledge of what to say, when, how, where, and to whom. However, according to Rao, the adoption of CLT methods has not inevitably resulted in the predictable outcomes for developing English communicative competence (Rao, 2002).

2.4 Background of CLT in Palestine

Education has played an important role in the Palestinian context for years. English as a Foreign Language has been compulsory in Palestinian public schools from the first grade through high school since 2001. Students' English scores are factors in

their placements in most of the Palestinian universities, and are factors in employment interviews. Nevertheless, English proficiency remains relatively low.

English for Palestine is a new English curriculum. It was first introduced in 2001 for first to twelfth grades. It was designed for the Palestinian students in public schools, and was designed based on the most current theories and approaches in the field of English language teaching to meet the needs and desires of the Palestinian students. The old curriculum (PETRA) which was designed for Jordanian students "continued to be used in the Palestinian schools for three decades" (Fattash, 2010, p.189), and was based on a combination of traditional methods of teaching such as the Grammar Translation Method, the Direct Method, and the Audio-Lingual Method (Fattash, 2010). It was used at   governmental and UNRWA schools. A team of experts in collaboration with Macmillan was chosen to take the responsibility for teaching English at the Palestinian government schools right from the first grade. Previously, English was introduced only from the fifth grade.

In the year of 2011, English for Palestine has been updated in a new version 'New English for Palestine.' The new curriculum publishers and designers have claimed to produce a modern communicative English course that has been particularly designed for the Palestinian schools. It is designed to develop the four language skills and to encourage students to become communicative users of English. The push for graduates to be able to communicate effectively can be seen in the new goals. Since the introduction of 'English for Palestine' in 2001, CLT started to be accepted and teachers were encouraged to teach communicatively and interactively in classes.

The 'New English for Palestine' changed the traditional approaches into a communicative methodology. However, because of the teaching context, teachers' lack of training, and the Palestinian testing system especially at the Tawjihi, most of the Palestinian English language teachers who have adopted CLT failed in implementing it. In other words, even though the CLT has had support from the Palestinian language planning offices, it has not been consistently implemented at the classroom level. Although ELT methodologies in Palestine have been moving towards CLT for over 13 years, there have been many challenges in implementing CLT at the classroom level across Palestine. The government may have prescribed CLT at the syllabus level, but very often the approach has not been adopted at the task level.

Although the Palestinian government mandated that Communicative Language Teaching be used to teach English for Palestine, the exercises in the textbooks are based on 'listen and find', 'listen and say' and 'listen and write' format with unnatural dialogues. In a study which aimed at examining the Palestinian school teachers' attitudes regarding the new English language curriculum that has been introduced recently as an alternate to the previous one Fattash (2010) investigated whether the new curriculum meets the Communicative Approach demands or not as it was planned to be. Undesirably, the study found that the new English language curriculum goes only with some features of the Communicative Approach. The curriculum designers do not take into account that it requires lot of investigation, suitable equipment, teacher's direction to touch the four skills (2010).

Many Palestinian teachers are neither qualified nor trained to teach English communicatively. This makes the textbook an incredibly important tool in the classroom. "In situations where there is a shortage of trained teachers, language teaching is very

closely tied to the textbook. This does not mean, of course, that the method demonstrated in the textbook is always faithfully reflected in the method as practiced by the teacher" (Williams,1983, p.1). If teachers do not have proper training in EFL methods or are not confident in their mastery of the English language, they may use the textbook exactly as it is written. As such, the book should be a strong model for the teacher (Williams, 1983) which is not the case in the Palestinian context. Ellis (1990) listed six criteria for evaluating communicative classroom activities: "communicative purpose, communicative desire, content, not form, variety of language, no teacher intervention, and no materials control." That is to claim that activities should resemble the language use in real life so that language learners will develop communicative competence, which is the ability to use language appropriately in social situations. On the contrary, the Palestinian English textbooks are aimed at developing language skills, but in fact they fail to do so because the activities are not designed from a communicative point of view.

Even though the Palestinian curriculum designers want to put into practice a more Communicative Approach to English language teaching, teachers appear to be paddled in adopting communicative teaching. This suggests that there is a large mismatch between what the government requires from the English curriculum and what is actually happening in the classrooms. The Communicative Approach is not the charming approach in language teaching, but at least language learning and teaching should be as close as possible to language use in real life.

2.5 Related Studies

Current studies about the Communicative Approach have revealed that despite the growing interest of the Communicative Approach, there is no complete

implementation of its principles inside the language teaching classrooms. Imperfect language learning is often attributed to imperfect syllabus design in which the learner does not learn the language correctly because of the wrong way of teaching and planning.

There has been a strong inclination by Palestinian language education policies towards following CLT. This is not surprising because almost every nation has faced a growing need for communicative speakers with speakers of other languages, mainly through 'English as a lingua franca' (Littlewood,2013). The Palestinian Ministry of Education has responded to the necessity of acquiring English language communicatively by changing the traditional grammar-based English curriculum to a modern and new one based on the Communicative Approach to language teaching. However, there has been a disparity between the ministry directives and what is really being adopted and done in the classrooms (Carless, 2003; Nunan, 2003). Regarding this issue, Karavas-Doukas argued that CLT seems to have brought originality on the theory's level whereas slight or no innovation on that of the teachers' actual classroom practices. He added the following comment: "the few small-scale classroom studies that have been carried out seem to suggest that communicative classrooms are rare. While most teachers profess to be following a Communicative Approach, in practice they are following more traditional approaches" (Karavas- Doukas 1996, p.187).

There have been many studies in different contexts focusing on the reasons why CLT may be favored, but cannot be applied in the classroom. Sato and Kleinasser (1999) used interviews, observations and surveys in order to identify how ten Japanese teachers in Australia defined and implemented CLT in their classrooms. They found that the teachers practice the teaching of L2 communicatively based on their personal philosophy,

notions and experiences. They saw themselves as adopting a Communicative Approach but "held varying, even fragmented, views" about what that meant. Most of them believed that it meant learning to communicate in the L2, focusing mainly on speaking and listening, teaching very little grammar and spending a lot of time preparing activities. In their actual practice; however, they were rarely guided by these beliefs and adopted mainly a teacher-fronted approach with little interaction amongst students (1999, p. 501).

The study of Mareva and Nyota (2012) established that although Communicative Language Teaching, which is recommended by the Zimbabwe School Examinations Council O'level, there has been a preference for the Structural Approach and its interrelated methods. They concluded that this could be due to teachers' ignorance of CLT aspects and merits, or it could be the result of "conservatism" as the teachers are traditional, and so are unwilling to experiment with new methods which are different from those with which they themselves were taught the English language. Al-Twairish study (which aimed at measuring the effect of the implementation of the Communicative Approach on the listening and speaking skills of Saudi third year secondary students) found that the most significant hindrance to an effective implementation of the CA is the teachers' unawareness of the principles that underlie the CA (Al-Twairish, 2009).

There has been a number of other studies highlighting the mismatch between CLT theory and implementation in different contexts. The contradiction between the teachers' attitudes and classroom practices can be seen in Karavas-Doukas' (1996) study. He observed 14 Greek English language teachers' classroom practices and discovered that the observed teachers grasped positive attitudes regarding CLT. However, there was a slight difference between their classroom practices and the principles of the

Communicative Approach. Teachers showed a tendency towards following an eclectic approach; a combination of both traditional and communicative approaches in their lessons. The classroom practices were teacher-centered and presented direct attention on form. Pair work activities were found to be used in two classrooms, but group work activities were never applied.

Badger and Yan study found that the most common methodology used is approximated to Communicative Language Teaching in addition to some portions of Audio-lingualism and Grammar Translation methods. The medium of instruction is still teacher centered where teachers also use Chinese more than what CLT requires (Badger and Yan, 2008). Hardison and Prapaisit de Segovia's (2008) study found that despite the fact that CLT was being authorized by the Thai Ministry of Education in 1999, many teachers were troubled about CLT methodologies, were not implementing it in the classroom, and considered themselves as being inadequately trained, not skillful in English, and not receiving sufficient support and resources to teach English in the CLT model.

In O' Sullivan article, the extent to which Communicative Language Teaching is appropriate to Nambian context has been explored based on a three-year action research study of an in-service education program for teachers' development (INSET) which aimws at helping unqualified teachers in performing communicatively. O' Sullivan found that if the Communicative Approach is simplified and adequate perspective guidelines are provided to support teachers, CLT could be transferred to Nambian context. If not, CLT will be beyond the professional capacity of teachers to adopt (O' Sullivan, 2001).

Shawar examined the influence of CLT on the students' learning and motivation in an attempt to lighten the continuing calls for communicative-based training programs in Egypt. He explored that teachers who grasp CLT methodologies and implemented them in their teaching improved students' cognitive development and motivation, whereas teachers who used structural approaches had a negative impact on students' learning (Shawer, 2010).

Bulter's (2005) conducted a study which aimed at presenting a detailed look at English teaching practice in Asia based on the elementary school level. By using multivocal ethnography, the study revealed a number of concerns and difficulties facing East Asian English teachers in implementing communicative activities at elementary school level and the teaching practices. Littlewood summarized the practical challenges reported from numerous countries where teachers have been asked to implement CLT in primary and secondary schools, and where classes are often large and resources are limited. The summary included:

- "Difficulties with classroom management, especially with large classes, and teachers' resulting fear that they may lose control;
- New organizational skills required by some activities such as pair or group work;
- Students' inadequate language proficiency, which may lead them to use the mother tongue (or only minimal English) rather than trying to 'stretch' their English competence;
- Excessive demands on teachers' own language skills; if they themselves have had limited experience of communicating in English;

- Common conceptions that formal learning must involve item-by-item progression through a syllabus rather than the less observable holistic learning that occurs in communication;

- Common conceptions that the teacher's role is to transmit knowledge rather than act as a facilitator of learning and supporter of autonomy;

- The negative 'washback' effect of public examinations based on pencil-and-paper tests which focus on discrete items and do not prioritize communication;

- Resistance from students and parents, who fear that important examination results may suffer as a result of the new approach." (2013, p.5).

Kim's factors in his analysis of teacher's behavior could be classified under similar categories: the teacher's own experience as an English learner, students' low proficiency level in English, the effectiveness of traditional methods of instruction for preparing students for high-stake school exams, top-down teacher training, class size, teachers' and students' socialization in the educational context, and teachers' and students' beliefs about language teaching and learning (Kim, 2008). As we have seen, "the term CLT is not only ambiguous but also often carries the misleading message that there is some real and proven version of CLT to which a teacher should try to conform, even if his or her intuitions say otherwise" (Littlewood,2013,p.8).

The studies mentioned above are representation of the wide discrepancy between the Communicative Approach theory and practice around the world. They showed that the difficulty in implementing and adapting the CA is not restricted to the Palestinian context. It is a universal issue that needs to be looked into and solved. The preceding review pointed clearly to the need for more research into the teachers' understanding of

CLT. This issue has become the focus of interest in this study for investigating the extent to which language practice in UNRWA Primary Schools using 'English for Palestine' observes Communicative Language Teaching. The review of the previous and related literature is the first step in learning about the mismatch between theory and practice in teaching English as a foreign language in our Palestinian schools, especially in UNRWA primary schools in order to guarantee an acceptable application of the Communicative Approach as prescribed by the course designer. It can be a good opportunity also for investigating teachers' attitudes towards teaching English communicatively.

2.6 Summary

This chapter provided a brief overview of the history of English language teaching. Some misconceptions of CLT were also presented. The chapter also discussed an overview of Communicative Language Teaching. A background to the teaching of CLT in Palestine was presented. Finally, different studies which explored the extent of CLT use in foreign language classrooms were also clarified.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter represents the research design and the methodologies used for putting the study into practice. It provides detailed information about the participants, the instruments used for gathering the data, and finally data analysis techniques.

3.1 Type of Research Methodology

The descriptive analytical methodology was selected to describe and analyze the information taken from the questionnaire, the classroom observation checklists, the interviews and the appraisal of UNRWA Final Achievement Exam to explore the teachers' perception and implementation of CLT at UNRWA primary schools. Descriptive research is defined as "A research that describes group of characteristics or behaviors in numerical terms" (Brown and Rodgers, 2002, p.117).

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative data were used. Quantitative data were drawn from the questionnaire and described numerically as descriptive research interprets data in words in case of qualitative data (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994). Additionally, qualitative data were drawn from the interviews and the observation checklist of the 6th grade classrooms at al- Arroub Basic Boys School. The researcher

also used the analytical method through the appraisal of UNRWA Final Achievement Primary Test at al-Arroub Basic Boys School.

3.2 Research Variables

A) Independent variables: age, gender, academic qualification, level of proficiency, and experience.

B) Dependant variables: teachers' perception toward CLT, UNRWA Final Achievement Primary Test.

3.3 Participants

3.3.1 Questionnaire Participants

The participants of the questionnaire consisted of all UNRWA primary English language teachers who worked in the Hebron area during the second term of the school year of 2013/2014. The population of the study was (43) teachers: (34) females and (9) males. This number was taken from the English language supervisor and with the help of the secretary of the UNRWA Department of Education after having the permission to get data (Appendix F).

3.3.2 Observed and Interviewed Teachers

Two female teachers who teach English at al- Arroub Basic Boys School (UNRWA) in Hebron where observed and interviewed. Both of them are BA holders in English from Bethlehem University. Teacher 1 has been working as an English teacher for four years now. Her class included 35 students. Teacher 2 has been a teacher of

English for two years. There were also 35 students in her class. These two classes were purposively selected from al- Arroub Basic Boys School for the classroom observation because the 6th grade is the highest primary level at the Palestinian UNRWA schools and the researcher expected to see higher communicative ability in them compared to other primary classes. They were also chosen to maintain similar students' variables such as the number of students in their respective classes, students' age range (13-15) and their level of English proficiency.

3.4 Instrumentation

The nature of the research questions required the set of two types of data. Quantitative data have been collected through a questionnaire since it shows the sum and frequencies of the teachers' responses. In addition, qualitative data were used to clarify and supplement the quantitative data. The qualitative data were drawn to explain certain ideas related to teachers' views and suggestions in addition to the appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Primary Test. It was collected through the interviews, the observation checklists and the appraisal of UNRWA Final Achievement Primary Test. The data obtained through the four instruments were triangulated in the discussion to present conclusions concerning whether UNRWA teachers teach English communicatively or not, and whether the learners practice 'English for Palestine' communicatively or not. An attempt was also made to link the discussion with the studies reviewed in the literature section of this study.

i.   The Questionnaire

The questionnaire aimed at investigating the extent to which language practice in UNRWA   primary   schools   using   'English   for   Palestine'   observes

Communicative Language Teaching. It was *adapted from Hu's questionnaire* "Contextual Influences on Instructional Practices: A Chinese Case for an Ecological Approach to ELT" *(*Hu,2005). It was concerned with the use of CLT vs. traditional approaches. In spring of 2014, the researcher administered the questionnaire to 43 English teachers working in UNRWA primary schools in Hebron. The questionnaire is composed of two sections. Section one sought background information. Section two requested UNRWA primary teachers' perceptions regarding their implementation of CLT as a methodology in their classes (Appendix A). All the 43 questionnaires distributed were handed back.

Teachers were asked to state clearly their actual notions regarding CLT in order to see whether they have an overlapping understanding concerning CLT vs. traditional approaches. Part I of the questionnaire contained seven close-ended questions that sought the teachers' background information. Part II of the questionnaire contained 58 items on a Likert Scale (ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree') and was divided into the following sections:

1- Items (1-8) showed teachers' perceptions toward implementing some pedagogical orientations in their classes.

2- Items (9-19) showed teachers' attitudes toward some instructional content and presentation regarding communicative and traditional teaching techniques in their English classes.

3- Items (20-31) showed teachers' views of language practice activities.

4- Items (32-45) showed both teacher and student roles.

5- Items (46-51) showed learning materials (syllabus) used at UNRWA primary classes.

6- Items (52-58) showed how UNRWA primary teachers evaluate students and correct their errors.

Teachers were asked to answer the 58 items by reading them and putting a tick (√) in the box which reflects their attitudes to the given statements.

3.4.1.1 The Validity of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was reviewed by three professors in the department of English at Hebron University. They agreed that it is suitable for the purpose of the study with minor modifications suggested. Their suggestions and modifications were taken into consideration by the researcher, and incorporated into the final version. In addition, the validity was measured through calculating the items of correlation matrix using the Pearson Correlation, which showed the internal consistency of the instrument as illustrated in table (3.1).

Table (3.1) Pearson Correlation of the Correlation Matrix and the Internal Consistency of the Questionnaire

Items	Statistical Sig.	R-value	Items	Statistical Sig.	R-Value
1	0.000	0.65	30	0.000	0.57
2	0.000	0.73	31	0.000	0.56
3	0.000	0.56	32	0.000	0.62
4	0.000	0.45	33	0.000	0.50
5	0.000	0.71	34	0.000	0.54
6	0.000	0.67	35	0.000	0.61

7	0.000	0.74	36	0.000	0.72
8	0.000	0.72	37	0.000	0.54
9	0.000	0.70	38	0.000	0.72
10	0.000	0.70	39	0.000	0.55
11	0.000	0.74	40	0.000	0.66
12	0.000	0.74	41	0.000	0.54
13	0.000	0.66	42	0.000	0.63
14	0.000	0.67	43	0.000	0.57
15	0.000	0.68	44	0.000	0.67
16	0.000	0.30	45	0.000	0.70
17	0.000	0.17	46	0.000	0.41
18	0.000	0.26	47	0.000	0.43
19	0.000	0.26	48	0.000	0.43
20	0.000	0.46	49	0.000	0.43
21	0.000	0.42	50	0.000	0.30
22	0.000	0.20	51	0.000	0.41
23	0.000	0.19	52	0.000	0.58
24	0.000	0.30	53	0.000	0.58
25	0.000	0.30	54	0.000	0.37
26	0.000	0.17	55	0.000	0.41
27	0.000	0.26	56	0.000	0.41
28	0.000	0.26	57	0.000	0.20
29	0.000	0.46	58	0.000	0.33

The data in the previous table showed that all values of the correlated items were statistically significant; this indicated the consistency of the measured items.

1.   **Reliability of the Questionnaire**

The reliability of the questionnaire's six domains was calculated using the Cronbach Alpha formula, and it was measured to be (0.85).

3.4.1.3 Data Entry

After the data were collected, they were reviewed in preparation for data entry. They were recorded by transforming verbal responses into numerical values. The response "Strongly agree" was assigned the value 5, "Agree" 4, "Don't know" 3, "Disagree" 2 and "Strongly disagree" 1. This means that as the frequency and mean increased towards 5, the degree of the availability of investigating the teachers' perceptions toward teaching 'English for Palestine' communicatively in UNRWA primary schools is on hand. The data were analyzed statistically by calculating frequencies, percentages and means. Some questions of study were tested using the following statistics: T-test, One Way Analysis of Variance, Pearson Correlation, and Cronbach Alpha, using the SPSS system (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).

3.4.2 The Classroom Observation Checklist

Two primary UNRWA male English classes at Al-Arroub Basic Boys School were observed ten times; five times for each class to draw information on their teachers' implementation of Communicative Language Teaching. While observing the classes, the researcher filled the checklist out based on the teachers' and students' implementation of the Communicative Approach practices. During observations the researcher noted down remarks about the teachers' implementation of CLT. The information obtained from this observation checklist was used to compare the data obtained from the questionnaires filled out by the teachers themselves. According to Wallace (1998), noting down

information can easily explore the amount of the teachers' and students' talk, and always supplies the researcher with different facts about their behavior.

The observation checklist was designed to validate UNRWA English teachers' attitudes towards CLT by comparing whether what they revealed in the questionnaire was consistent with what they actually did in the classrooms with regard to the important features of CLT mentioned in the literature review section of the study. It was also designed to see whether the students practice English communicatively or not.

The checklist contained some of the important features of CLT (e.g. *'grammar rules are inductively taught'*) and traditional approaches (e.g. *'grammar rules are largely defined and explained in lessons*'). It was used to evaluate the two UNRWA English teachers on the basis of these criteria by indicating whether they applied these common features of CLT or features of traditional approaches, and whether their students practice the language communicatively or not. The observer (researcher) also took notes of how these features were applied in the observed classes. For recording the findings of classroom observation, a checklist was prepared with fifty eight statements to be judged using the Likert Scale plus an additional column for the observer's comments. The items were prepared to focus on six broad areas of the lessons under observation (Appendix B). The checklist was divided into the following sections:

1- Items (1-8) investigated how the teachers implemented some pedagogical orientations in their classes.

2- Items (9-19) investigated the teachers' attitudes towards some instructional content and presentation.

3- Items (20-31) investigated the teachers' views of language practice activities.

4- Items (32-45) showed both the teacher and student roles .

5- Items (46-51) investigated the learning materials (syllabus) used at UNRWA primary classes.

6- Items (52-58) investigated how UNRWA primary teachers assessed students and corrected their errors.

3.4.2.1 Validity of the Checklist

The checklist was reviewed by an UNRWA English supervisor and two English instructors at the English Department/Hebron University. They provided some comments which were incorporated into the final version.

3.4.3 The Interview

Following the teachers' questionnaire and the observation checklist, the researcher conducted an in-depth semi-structured interview with the two observed teachers at al-Arroub Basic Boys School to explore further information about their understanding of English teaching in Palestinian primary schools, and the difficulties they face while implementing CLT. (Berg, 1989) pointed out that "the semi structured interviews were conducted in a systematic and consistent order but allowing the interviewer sufficient freedom to investigate far beyond the answers to the prepared and standardized questions", p. 17). The researcher believed that the interview was suitable for the study because it was aimed at generating in depth information from the two interviewees on their understanding and implementation of CLT. It was also used as a follow-up to the

responses of the questionnaire and the checklist. The interviews were conducted in English. The researcher made sure that the two teachers were able to express their ideas fully by preparing and sending a number of questions to them ahead of time. While formulating interview questions, the researcher made sure that the questions were clear, precise, and motivating (Denzin, 1989). The two interviews lasted 35 minutes each, and the most important points were noted down by the researcher as the interviewees did not prefer the recording technique.

The two interviewees were asked twelve questions based on the research questions of the study (Appendix C).

3.4.4 The Appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Test

Final exams, along with progress tests, are the way of assessing students in UNRWA schools. These exam reflect students' competence of language following instruction. They can be linguistic or communicative.   Communicative tests should focus on the understanding of the functional use of language rather than on the limited mastery of language forms. An appraisal of UNRWA Final Achievement Primary Test at al-Arroub Basic Boys School was performed to see whether the test is designed to measure English language communicatively or not (Appendix D). The appraisal was also meant to see how satisfactorily the teachers at UNRWA primary schools test naturally the use of English through socio-cultural and everyday life contexts (observing CLT), and whether they test the four language skills, or they just focus on grammar and vocabulary. Doing so can help the researcher get more insights into the UNRWA teachers' perceptions and implementation of CLT. It also helps to measure the extent to which UNRWA primary

students practice English communicatively by means of looking into their examination system and what they are required to do on their exams.

3.5 Data Analysis

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative approaches of data analysis were used. The statements of the questionnaire were analyzed statistically by using the SPSS program in order to provide a descriptive analysis, and the teachers' responses were tallied and the frequencies were converted to percentages. Then the results of the classroom observation checklists, the interviews and the appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Exam were sorted out, summarized and analyzed qualitatively.

3.6 Summary

This chapter covered the methods and procedures used for implementing this study. It covered the methodology and procedures used in the study research design, sample selection, instrument development, and data collection. Four types of instruments were used to analyze the data: a questionnaire, an observation checklist, an interview, and an appraisal of UNRWA Final Achievement Exam. Moreover, it presented the validity of the questionnaire and data analysis techniques. Mentioning the steps of analyzing the data thoroughly would lead the researcher to discuss the findings of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter shows the findings of the study. They are discussed in light of the UNRWA primary English teachers' understanding and implementation of CLT as appeared in the teachers' questionnaire as well as the students' practice of CLT in their classrooms as observed by the researcher. The teachers' opinions as expressed in the interviews are also discussed in addition to the appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Primary Test. The information collected from the classroom observation checklist, the interviews and the appraisal of UNRWA Final Achievement Primary Test are used to support the quantitative data drawn from the teachers' questionnaires.

Before starting the discussion, an important point is to be stated. In answering the two research questions of the study, the four research methodologies will be used harmoniously. Research questions are: To what extent do English primary teachers in UNRWA schools in Hebron observe Communicative Language Teaching?, and To what extent do UNRWA students at primary grades: al- Arroub Basic Boys School as a case practice English language communicatively?

4.1 Discussion of the Statistical Analysis of the UNRWA Teachers' Questionnaire

The findings of the teachers' questionnaire are going to be presented in this section. In addition to some background information questions, answers are elicited through asking the teachers about their perceptions regarding their implementation of CLT as a methodology in their classes.

4.1.1 Results Related to Demographic Data

As table (4.1) shows, most teachers were females. Out of 43 teachers; females were 34 (79.1%), and males were only 9 (20.9%).

Table (4.1) Demographic Data of the Teachers

Gender	N	Percent
Male	9	20.9
Female	34	79.1
Total	43	100.0

As table (4.2) shows, regardless of gender as a factor which may affect the adoption of CLT at UNRWA primary schools, the results of the T-test indicated that CLT was a favorable approach by both male and female teachers.

Table (4.2) T-test Results Regarding Teachers' Gender

Items	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-value	DF	Sig.
Pedagogical Orientation	Male	9	3.50	0.60	2.225	41	0.032
	Female	34	3.90	0.44			
Instructional	Male	9	3.23	0.32	1.672-	41	0.102

Content and Presentation	Female	34	3.48	0.41			
Language Practice Activities	Male	9	3.75	0.54	0.113-	41	0.910
	Female	34	3.77	0.37			
Teacher and Student Role	Male	9	3.91	0.30	0.308-	41	0.760
	Female	34	3.95	0.41			
Learning Materials (Syllabus)	Male	9	3.66	0.44	1.230-	41	0.226
	Female	34	3.95	0.65			
Errors Correction & Assessment	Male	9	3.47	0.36	0.703-	41	0.486
	Female	34	3.63	0.64			
Total Degree	Male	9	3.61	0.31	1.611-	41	0.115
	Female	34	3.78	0.26			

As table (4.3) shows, regarding their years of experience, around 55.8% of the teachers had less than ten years of experience, 23.3% had from eleven to seventeen years of experience, and around 14% of them had more than 17 years of experience. Three teachers did not answer this question

Table (4.3) Demographic Data of Teachers' Years of Experience

Years of Experience	N	Percent
Less than 10	24	55.8
11-17	10	23.3
17+	6	14.0
Total	40	93.0

Missing Values=3

Note: Missing figures refer to the items that were not completed by the sample.

As table (4.4) shows, regardless of teachers' years of experience as a factor which may affect the adoption of CLT at UNRWA primary schools, the results of One Way Analysis of Variance indicated that CLT was a favorable approach by most of them.

Table (4.4) Results of One Way Analysis of Variance Regarding Teachers' Years of Experience

Years of Experience.		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig.
Pedagogical Orientation	Less than 10	24	3.90	0.41	0.228
	11-17	10	3.77	0.60	
	More than 17	6	3.52	0.57	
	Total	40	3.81	0.49	
Instructional Content and Presentation	Less than 10	24	3.44	0.44	0.769
	11-17	10	3.43	0.32	
	More than 17	6	3.30	0.50	
	Total	40	3.42	0.42	
Language Practice Activities	Less than 10	24	3.79	0.40	0.908
	11-17	10	3.81	0.29	
	More than 17	6	3.72	0.65	
	Total	40	3.78	0.41	
Teacher and Student Role	Less than 10	24	3.92	0.41	0.826
	11-17	10	3.95	0.33	
	More than 17	6	4.03	0.46	
	Total	40	3.94	0.39	

Learning Materials (Syllabus)	Less than 10	24	4.01	0.49	0.087
	11-17	10	3.51	0.72	
	More than 17	6	3.94	0.67	
	Total	40	3.87	0.60	
Errors Correction & Assessment	Less than 10	24	3.76	0.422	0.125
	11-17	10	3.35	0.96	
	More than 17	6	3.38	0.23	
	Total	40	3.60	0.60	

Concerning their English level of proficiency, around 20 of the teachers were excellent (46.5%), around 18 teachers were very good (41.9%) while 5 teachers were good (11.6%).

Table (4.5) Demographic Data of Teachers' Level of Proficiency in English

Level of Proficiency in English	N	Percent
Excellent	20	46.5
Very good	18	41.9
Good	5	11.6
Total	43	100.0

As table (4.6) shows, regardless of teachers' level of proficiency as a factor which may affect the adoption of CLT at UNRWA primary schools, the results of the One Way Analysis of Variance indicated that CLT was a favorable approach by most teachers.

Table (4.6) Results of One Way Analysis of Variance Regarding Teachers' Level of Proficiency in English

Level of Proficiency in English.		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig.
Pedagogical Orientation	Excellent	20	3.72	0.49	0.253
	Very good	18	3.96	0.49	
	Good	5	3.65	0.54	
	Total	43	3.81	0.50	
Instructional Content and Presentation	Excellent	20	3.38	0.50	0.464
	Very good	18	3.52	0.32	
	Good	5	3.30	0.20	
	Total	43	3.43	0.40	
Language Practice Activities	Excellent	20	3.62	0.41	0.033
	Very good	18	3.96	0.36	
	Good	5	3.66	0.37	
	Total	43	3.77	0.41	
Teacher and Student Role	Excellent	20	3.98	0.33	0.002
	Very good	18	4.05	0.32	
	Good	5	3.41	0.42	
	Total	43	3.94	0.38	
Learning	Excellent	20	3.85	0.49	0.04

Materials (Syllabus)	Very good	18	4.09	0.54	5
	Good	5	3.33	1.01	
	Total	43	3.89	0.62	
Errors Correction & Assessment	Excellent	20	3.75	0.49	0.064
	Very good	18	3.58	0.41	
	Good	5	3.05	1.16	
	Total	43	3.60	0.59	

As table (4.7) shows, 33 of the teachers were BA holders (79.7%), 7 of them were diploma holders (16.3%), and only 3 who were MA holders (7%).

Table (4.7) Demographic Data of Teachers' Qualification

Qualification	N	Percent
BA	33	76.7
MA	3	7.0
Other	7	16.3
Total	43	100.0

As table (4.8) shows, regardless of teachers' qualification as a factor which may affect the adoption of CLT at UNRWA primary schools, the results of the One Way Analysis of Variance indicated that CLT was a favorable approach by most teachers.

Table (4.8) Results of One Way Analysis of Variance Regarding Teachers'

Qualification

Qualification		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig.
Pedagogical Orientation	BA	33	3.84	.46669	0.790
	MA	3	3.66	.26021	
	Other	7	3.75	.75000	
	Total	43	3.81	.50249	
Instructional Content and Presentation	BA	33	3.41	.39097	0.935
	MA	3	3.45	.68635	
	Other	7	3.48	.44757	
	Total	43	3.43	.40998	
Language Practice Activities	BA	33	3.81	.37458	0.326
	MA	3	3.86	.24056	
	Other	7	3.55	.59651	
	Total	43	3.77	.41201	
Teacher and Student Role	BA	33	3.93	.41008	0.799
	MA	3	4.09	.29738	
	Other	7	3.94	.33935	
	Total	43	3.94	.38790	
Learning Materials (Syllabus)	BA	33	3.90	.58930	0.863
	MA	3	4.00	.44096	
	Other	7	3.78	.86984	

	Total	43	3.89	.62030	
Errors Correction & Assessment	BA	33	3.64	.64988	0.655
	MA	3	3.61	.45922	
	Other	7	3.40	.34433	
	Total	43	3.60	.59685	

Coming to teachers' professional training such as courses and workshops in using CLT, around 33 (76.7%) of the teachers had professional training, and only 10 (23.3%) teachers had never had professional training as table (4.9) shows.

Table (4.9) Demographic Data of Teachers' Professional Training in Using CLT

Professional Training (Courses/Workshops) in Using CLT	N	Percent
Yes	33	76.7
No	10	23.3
Total	43	100.0

Regarding teachers' using of CLT in their classes, 39 (90.7%) teachers used CLT while only 3 (7%) did not try it.

Table (4.10) Demographic Data of Teachers' Using Communicative Language

Teaching (CLT) at Teachers Classes

Have You Tried Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Your Classes?	N	Percent
Yes	39	90.7
No	3	7.0
Total	42	97.7

Note:

- Missing Values=1

- Missing figures refer to the items that were not completed by the sample.

Concerning students' numbers at UNRWA primary grades at Hebron district, 16 (37.2%) of the classes included less than 36 students, and 27 (62.8%) of the teachers had 37 students and above. This indicated how UNRWA classes are loaded of students.

Table (4.11) Sample Distribution of How Many Students do Teachers have in their

Classes

How Many Students do You Have in Your Classes?	N	Percent
Less than 36	16	37.2
37 and above	27	62.8
Total	43	100.0

4.1.2 Results Related to UNRWA Teachers Perceptions Regarding Their Implementation of CLT

4.1.2.1 Pedagogical Orientation

In order to measure the extent to which UNRWA English language teachers at primary schools implement and understand CLT regarding **pedagogical orientation**, means and standard deviations were calculated as seen in table (4.12)**.**

Table (4.12) Pedagogical Orientation

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Balanced attention is given to the four language skills	4.19	1.07
Communicative competence is the desired goal in teaching	4.19	0.82
Focus is on the students' ability to use language communicatively in L2	4.14	0.86
Attention is given to reading and writing	3.79	1.28
Fluency is primary as it keeps students meaningfully engaged in language use	3.74	1.15
Linguistic competence (grammar knowledge) is the desired goal in teaching	3.63	0.97
Focus is on students' knowledge about language usage (rules)	3.47	1.05
Emphasis is on formal accuracy (structures of language)	3.40	1.07

The above table indicated that the teachers' pedagogical orientation regarding CLT was highly acceptable and competent. They are ordered and ranked as the following: 'balanced attention is given to the four language skills being the most important' (4.19), followed by 'communicative competence as the desired goal in

teaching' (4.19), 'focus is on the students' ability to use language communicatively in L2' (4.14), 'attention is given to reading and writing' (3.79), 'fluency is primary as it keeps students meaningfully engaged in language use' (3.74), 'linguistic competence (grammar knowledge) is the desired goal in teaching' (3.63), 'focus is on students' knowledge about language usage' (3.47) , and 'finally emphasis is on formal accuracy' (3.40).

The teachers highly considered the balanced attention to the four language skills and communicative competence as a desired goal in teaching. This indicated that the teachers are aware of the pedagogical orientation features of CLT, and thus the majority of the respondents agreed that such features create communicative classes which all modern educators admire. Focusing on the students' ability to use language communicatively in L2 has also proved importance by respondents. They agreed that students' ability to use language communicatively is a crucial element in communicative classes, and that focusing only on students' knowledge about language usage will hinder communication. And the least communicative is the emphasis on formal accuracy. This finding supported the belief that focusing on meaning and messages, and not on grammar and other linguistic forms, frees the learners "from keeping language in a controlled mode and can more easily proceed to automatic modes of processing" (Brown, 2007, p. 213).

4.1.2.2 Instructional Content and Presentation

In order to investigate the teachers' attitude regarding the instructional content and presentation of CLT, means and standard deviations were calculated as seen in table (4.13).

Table (4.13) Instructional Content and Presentation of CLT

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
L2 is used in conducting lessons	3.88	0.79
Communicative functions are taught	3.79	1.10
L1 is used by the students	3.67	1.04
Parsing of sentences in texts is common	3.53	0.90
Grammar rules are inductively taught	3.53	1.12
L2 culture is given attention to	3.44	1.18
Correction is indirect and implicit	3.35	1.17
L2 is used in conducting lessons	3.30	1.18
Grammar rules are largely defined and explained in lessons	3.23	1.08
Correction is direct and explicit	3.21	1.26
Language texts are explained sentence by sentence	2.79	1.12

The table (4.13) indicated the attitude of the teachers toward presenting the instructional content communicatively. They are ranked as the following: 'L2 is used in conducting lessons' (3.88), 'communicative functions are taught' (3.79), 'L1 is used by the students' (3.67), 'parsing of sentences in texts is common' (3.53), followed by 'grammar rules are inductively taught with the same degree of importance' (3.53), 'L2 culture is given attention to' (3.44), 'correction is indirect and implicit' (3.35), 'L2 is used in conducting lessons' (3.30), 'grammar rules are largely defined and explained in lessons' (3.23), 'correction is direct and explicit' (3.21), and finally 'language texts are explained sentence by sentence' (2.79).

The attitude of the teachers toward presenting the instructional content communicatively was moderate by a mean equaled to (3.88) for using L2 as a medium of instruction. This shows that the teachers were aware of the characteristics and features of CLT; therefore, their choice of some features of the traditional approaches appeared to be limited. This finding supports the instructional content and presentation which suggest that the target language is the language of the classroom, and presentations focus on inductive teaching or on communicative tasks (Badger and Yan, 2008).

Regarding the items L1 is used by students and parsing of sentences in texts, although they are features of the traditional approach, they received support from the teachers. This shows that the teachers have somewhat confusion regarding some features of the Communicative Approach. It seems they were reluctant when deciding to rank these items. This might be the result of inexperience. The least two features that teachers did not support for using in class are direct and explicit correction, and explaining texts sentence by sentence. This might indicate the teachers' awareness of communicative teaching obstacles, and their willingness toward adopting and practicing the modern approach of teaching the CA.

4.1.2.3 Language Practice Activities

In order to know the teachers' perceptions toward language practice activities, means and standard deviations were calculated as seen in table (4.14).

Table (4.14) Language Practice Activities

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Classroom techniques engage students in functional and authentic use of language for meaningful purposes	4.14	0.91
Language practice activities resemble	4.05	1.02

real-life tasks		
All language skills are practiced in an integrated manner	3.95	0.87
Teacher-student interaction happens in L2	3.93	0.85
Focus in language practice is on meaning	3.93	0.88
Language practice activities in class involve real communication in L2	3.93	1.07
Students use L2 to communicate with one another (genuine interactions)	3.91	0.86
Language skills are introduced and practiced using various topics	3.81	1.05
Focus in language practice is on form	3.77	1.15
Students are constantly exposed to new language input	3.70	1.08
Language practice occurs by means of work on grammar exercises	3.30	1.18
Translation is largely used during lessons	2.86	1.16

The results of the above table show that the teachers thought that using classroom techniques which engage students in functional and authentic use of language for meaningful purposes, and language practice activities resemble real-life tasks were the most important items for implementing in CLT classes. The teachers' perception toward some language practice activities is in line with Brown's definition of CLT as "an approach to language teaching methodology that emphasizes authenticity, interaction, student-centered learning, task based activities, and communication for the real world, meaningful purposes" (Brown, 2007, p. 378).

The teachers' choice for teaching of grammar rules was infrequent which indicated that most teachers shared the same perception toward using CLT in their classes. This comes in accordance with Galloway (1993) who claimed that the Communicative Approach is the product of educators and linguists who had grown dissatisfied with the Audio-lingual and Grammar-translation methods of foreign language instruction.

4.1.2.4 Teacher and Student Role

In order to know the teachers' perceptions toward the role of both teachers and students in CLT classes, means and standard deviations were calculated as seen in table (4.15).

Table (4.15) Teacher and Student Role

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
The teacher motivates students to use language communicatively (functionally and meaningfully)	4.35	0.68
Learners' interests and needs are in the forefront	4.35	0.89
Pair and small group work are common	4.35	0.72
Instruction is student-centered (students are important)	4.26	0.97
The teacher links classroom practice with activities outside of class	4.19	0.93
The teacher enhances students' own personal experiences for their better learning	4.19	0.69
Peer feedback and evaluation is common	4.14	0.83
The teacher's job is to make learners work on the process of communicating in L2	4.12	0.76

Students work on accomplishing tasks with one another while the teacher observes and facilitates	4.09	0.97
Students are intrinsically motivated as they are interested in communicating in L2	4.07	0.76
The teacher's job is to make learners master the rules of language	3.63	1.11
Instruction is teacher-fronted	3.35	1.04
The teacher controls class and is the central figure in the class	3.35	1.30
The teacher talks most of the time	2.86	1.40

Table (4.15) shows that the most important role of the teacher in a communicative class is to 'motivate students to use language communicatively (functionally and meaningfully')' (4.35), followed by 'learners' interests and needs are in the forefront and pair and small group work are common with the same degree of importance' (4.35), 'the teacher enhances students' own personal experiences for their better learning' (4.26), 'the teacher links classroom practice with activities outside of class and the teacher enhances students' own personal experiences for their better learning' with the same degree of importance (4.19), 'peer feedback and evaluation is common' (4.14), 'the teacher's job is to make learners work on the process of communicating in L2' (4.12), 'students work on accomplishing tasks with one another while the teacher observes and facilitates' (4.09), 'students are intrinsically motivated as they are interested in communicating in L2' (4.07), 'the teacher's job is to make learners master the rules of language' (3.63), 'instruction is teacher-fronted, followed by the teacher controls class and is the central figure in the class' with the same degree of importance (3.35), and finally 'the teacher talks most of the time' (2.86).

The previous results show that the teachers believe in their roles as facilitators and motivators. They also believe in the importance of their students' roles in communicative classes. Motivating learners functionally and meaningfully was at the top of the table. This result might suggest that teachers pick out some CLT features and give some good signs since Shawar (2010) found that teachers who grasp CLT methodologies and implemented them in their teaching improved students' cognitive development and motivation, whereas teachers who used structural approach had a negative impact on students' learning.

The item learners' interests and needs are in the forefront occupied the second rank followed by the familiarity of pair and small group work. That indicates teachers' awareness of the learners' roles and needs in the communicative classroom. Table (4.15) shows that most teachers have the same perceptions toward the role of both the teachers and learners in the communicative classroom. These findings are in consistent with Richards and Rodgers' description of the role of both teachers and students in which learners are vigorously involved in negotiating meaning. They try to make themselves understood and in understanding others within the classroom procedures and activities (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The teacher is a facilitator, a co-communicator who shares the activities with the learners. Moreover, the teacher acts as an analyst, a counselor, and a group process manager (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Most of the teachers also indicated that the item the teacher talks most of the time as the least communicative practice activity used by teachers. Another significant uncommunicative techniques from the teachers' point of view were instruction is teacher-fronted and the teacher controls class and is the central figure in the class. This indicates how UNRWA primary teachers are aware of their roles as adopters of the CA.

4.1.2.5 Learning Materials (Syllabus)

The fifth headline aimed at investigating the teachers' perceptions toward the learning materials of CLT.

Table (4.16) Learning Materials (Syllabus)

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Materials develop students' functional language ability to use L2 communicatively	4.14	0.77
Materials enable students to use L2 meaningfully	4.12	0.98
Authentic materials are used (e.g., realia, signs, magazines, advertisements, newspapers, graphic and visual sources)	4.09	1.01
Materials are task-based using a variety of games, role plays, and simulations	4.05	0.95
Materials (textbook) used are structure-based	3.60	1.13
Materials are teacher-developed	3.35	1.08

Table (4.16) shows the teachers' perceptions toward the learning materials of CLT as the teachers claimed in the questionnaire. The answers are ranked as the following: 'materials develop students' functional language ability to use L2' (4.14), 'materials enable students to use L2 meaningfully' (4.12), 'authentic materials are used' (4.09), 'materials are task-based using a variety of games', 'role plays, and simulations' (4.05), 'materials (textbook) used are structure-based' (3.60), and finally 'materials are teacher-developed' (3.35).

The above table shows that the materials develop the students' functional language ability to use L2 communicatively, institutional professional development and materials enable students to use L2 meaningfully were highly selected by teachers. This indicated that the teachers were aware of the importance of functional and authentic materials in developing the learners' communicative competence and using L2 meaningfully. At the same time the teachers discouraged the use of structure-based materials and materials that were developed by the teachers themselves. This might indicate that the teachers are satisfied with their textbooks which were designed to support and direct CLT.

4.1.2.6 Error Correction and Assessment

In order to investigate the teachers' perceptions toward the right way of assessing and evaluating CLT learners in CLT classes, means and standard deviations were calculated as seen in table (4.17).

Table (4.17) Error Correction and Assessment

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Tests measure students ability to use L2 communicatively	4.09	1.01
Teachers allow errors for the sake of communication	3.95	1.04
Teachers' feedback on students' responses focuses on how language is to be used meaningfully and purposefully in L2	3.81	1.07
Errors are seen as a natural part of the learning process	3.77	1.25
Tests measure students' grammar ability	3.23	1.21
Teachers' feedback on students' responses focuses on the linguistic forms	3.21	1.30

of language (language structures)		
Students' errors are not tolerated and so they are swiftly corrected	3.14	1.22

The above table presents the teachers' perceptions toward the right way of assessing and evaluating their learners in CLT classes. The teachers' answers are ranked as the following: 'tests measure students ability to use L2 communicatively' (4.09), 'teachers allow errors for the sake of communication' (3.95), 'teachers' feedback on students' responses focuses on how language is to be used meaningfully and purposefully in L2' (3.81), 'errors are seen as a natural part of the learning process' (3.77), 'tests measure students' grammar ability' (3.23), 'teachers' feedback on students' responses focuses on the linguistic forms of language' (3.21), and finally 'students' errors are not tolerated and so they are swiftly corrected' (3.14).

The table shows different ways of correcting errors in classes. Teachers believe that tests measure students' ability to use L2 communicatively, errors are allowed for the sake of communication and that errors are seen as a natural part of the learning process. These results are in agreement with Krashen's views (1982) when he considered the learners' errors as a natural consequence of the language learning process, and that corrective feedback is ineffective and harmful. At the same time, the teachers are in agreement with Richards who believes that only errors that hinder communication should be corrected, and that errors based on form are not important (Richards, 2006).

4.2 Analysis of Classroom Observations Checklist

As mentioned in chapter three, two English classes (6th graders) at al- Arroub Basic Boys School were observed by the researcher to investigate whether Communicative Language Teaching is actually used in UNRWA primary schools and whether the students practice communicative learning or not. The checklist identifies some features and categories/subcategories of CLT, all of which occur now and then in English classrooms.

Regarding the **pedagogical orientation** in the 6th grade classes at al- Arroub Boys School, the two observed teachers never focused on the students' communicative competence. They only focused on the linguistic one. They taught grammar by explaining the rules and structures explicitly. There was no evidence of teaching grammar in communicative contexts and both teachers focused only on formal accuracy.

While dealing with the four language skills, both teachers gave attention to reading and writing rather than to speaking and listening. For example, an observed unit started with a speaking warm-up about some pictures for the Water Cycle. In this part of the unit, students were expected to work in pairs and answer the questions about the Water Cycle. Instead, both teachers explained the Water Cycle directly and drew an explanatory picture of the Cycle using chalk and board. They both controlled the two classes and asked direct questions. There was a fill-in-the blank type of grammar exercise which was followed by a task of rewriting the respective sentence with a similar meaning. Throughout the lesson, the two teachers' focused on accuracy which hindered students' fluency. The students were not interactive and the strategies that the teachers used did not present more listening materials, and did not attempt to encourage students

to produce any of spoken English. Both teachers played the recorder in the middle of the lesson after the students heard and acquired their way of pronouncing the new words which did not resemble native like speakers' pronunciation as the 6th grade listening materials do.

While observing the two classes **instructional content and presentation**, grammar rules were largely defined and explained in the lessons. The teachers used the textbook contents for generating grammar points. They presented grammar items to the students by referring to the grammatical explanations, rules and definitions. In this part, there was also no evidence of teaching grammar in communicative contexts, and both the first and the foreign languages were commonly contrasted while teaching. One of the two teachers used English throughout the lesson for giving instructions. The other teacher used a mixture of both Arabic and English as medium of instruction. While reading the English text aloud to the students, both teachers used Arabic translations to explain the meaning of the text. It is clear that both teachers had a tendency of slipping into Arabic after starting a sentence in English. While presenting the lesson to the students, both teachers used Arabic translations to explain the meaning of the new words. The two teachers tended to speak in Arabic after starting a sentence in English.

Even though correction is direct and explicit, it is also clear from the classroom observations that the two teachers were somehow patient and gentle while correcting their students' errors. However, the students felt shy and preferred using their first language to communicate during the lessons. Doing so, both teachers and students caused serious damages to the spirit of the communicative classroom.

The two teachers did not give attention to L2 culture throughout the ten observed lessons despite its significance in presenting and understanding English language communicatively. Samovar, Porter & Jain (1981, p. 24) claimed that:

> "Culture and communication are inseparable because culture not only dictates who talks to whom, about what and how the communication proceeds, it also helps to determine how people encode messages, the meanings they have for messages, and the conditions and circumstances under which various messages may or may not be sent, noticed, or interpreted... culture is the foundation of communication."

This could be related to the nature of 'English for Palestine' textbooks. As had been claimed that Palestinian English textbooks were designed to "reflect Palestinian cultural dimensions and to make it reflect to some extent the students' cultural identity and at the same time make the students see themselves as part of the world community" (Abbas, 2011, p. 87).

Regarding **language practice activities**, even though it is believed that frequent use of the mother tongue will discourage CLT, it has been observed that both teachers focused on the form of language practice rather than on meaning. The teachers used the mother tongue when they did not find simple alternative English words for what they want to say. That happened also due to the lack of materials such as pictures and realia which help in using less Arabic. The teacher-student interaction interchanged between L1 and L2. Whereas language practice occurred by means of work on grammar exercises, teachers neither applied tasks that resemble real-life nor activities that involved real communication of L2.

Students were occasionally exposed to new language input. They used L1 to communicate with one another. In the two classes, you would never see genuine interactions among students. Moreover, not all language skills were practiced in an integrated manner. Instead, both the teacher and the textbook highlighted a given skill intentionally in order to develop only one skill at a time. This leaded to communication immobility. Language skills were introduced and practiced using restricted topics selected by the syllabus designers which did not lead students to gain free practice.

Coming to the **role of teacher and student**, teachers were responsible for doing everything in class. Students were the passive receivers of knowledge and they admitted that they had much to say or do. Instructions were teacher-fronted and students felt shy and reluctant to speak out. They preferred to keep silent and only listen.

Even though the 'English for Palestine' textbook provides lots of interactive activities for the learners such as pair and group work, teachers did not take the effort to engage their students in interacting with one another. Instead of engaging students in pair work, both teachers used whole class activities. The two teachers "continue to teach what is comfortable and culturally acceptable using Grammar-Translation method and Audiolingualism" (Hu, 2002, p. 100) because these approaches offer teachers full control of the classroom and what is being learned. That is also due to the fact that the teachers' education and training focused on grammar translation rather than on communicative competence.

The two teachers had control over their classes and were the central figures since a student-centered class requires more time. Both teachers spent more time in presenting rules, structures and vocabulary, but when it came to real practice of English

language by students, the time of the class was always over. In addition, the teachers did not enhance students' own personal experiences for their better learning. They did not link classroom practice with activities outside of class, and English practice was only restricted to the classroom activities. Peer feedback and evaluation were very limited since students' modest level in English and their shyness did not encourage them to employ such a strategy.

Regarding **learning materials**, the researcher hardly saw communicative presentations and applications through using 'English for Palestine' textbook even though the teachers claim they are communication-oriented. The writers of textbooks claimed to have incorporated a communicative perspective in them, and more listening and speaking. In fact, the materials are not task-based which use a variety of games, role plays, and simulations. One of the observed teachers tried to use some games and songs, but for the sake of mastering the grammar rules only. For example, she threw a ball at each students for the purpose of mastering the first and third person instructions. The other teacher had never tried using either games or songs.

Authentic materials were never used (e.g., realia, signs, magazines, advertisements, newspapers, graphic and visual sources). Both teachers did not develop any communicative materials. They used translation and explanation to present new words and vocabulary. There was no task-based materials, and teachers did not encourage any use of games, role plays, and simulations for developing their students' communicative competence.

As for **error correction and assessment**, errors were seen as a natural part of the learning process and the teachers allowed them in the speaking sections. But when it

came to reading, writing and grammar, the teachers focused on the linguistic forms of language. In this case, errors were not tolerated and so they were swiftly corrected. The teachers' feedback on the students' responses focused on how language is to be used grammatically and correctly in L2.

4.3 Analysis of the Teachers' Interview

As mentioned earlier, twelve open-ended questions based on the research questions were asked to two female interviewees at al- Arroub Basic Boys School to elicit further information which might not have appeared in the questionnaire and the observation checklist. Their answers were analyzed to provide insight concerning their understanding and implementation of CLT in their classes. The interviews were meant to present more evidence concerning the real application and practice of CLT at UNRWA primary grades.

With regard to the questions: "*Do you think your classroom situation is suitable for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)?*", and "*What challenges do you face in implementing CLT in your classroom?*", both teachers believed that their large classes, lack of materials, limited English classes hours (3 hours per week), the students' modest English level, the nature of the textbook which has lots of exercises, and seats arrangement, all hinder them from developing CLT classes. The following were their responses: T1: "*I do believe that abstract concepts and lists of memorized vocabulary and structures which have no function on my students' daily life all hinder communication in my English classroom, but I do use them since my classroom situation is not suitable for communicative teaching. My students think they are learning when they are exposed to something on the blackboard, but actually our new language teaching and*

learning is far from this". T 2: "*I have tried to do some communicative activities. I wrote a list of classroom functions on a wall magazine so that they can ask me in English when doing some functions, and I sometimes try communicative activities through breaking my students into groups and pairs, but I usually fail since the noise deviates the class out of the lesson's goal*."

Concerning the questions: "*What is the nature of interactions you like to promote in your lessons?*", and "*What do you think of the use of pair and group work activities in the classroom?*" Please explain.

T2 agreed that communication among students or between the students and the teacher is obviously helpful for students to master the target language. However, in her response, T1 admitted that she does not take the pain of engaging her students in interacting with one another since this will lead to a lot of noise and chaos during the lesson. T2 claimed to allow some interactions among groups; however, she never felt fully satisfied since the activities do not pass as she usually plan; she usually lost t control of the class.

Coming to the questions: "*Do you think teachers should mostly speak English in the classroom?*", and "*What should be the role of the mother tongue in an English language class?*"

Regarding the language of interaction, it was suggested by T1 that the mother tongue is used only when there is no alternatives: "*I expect my students to learn from the English environment that I create inside my classroom*" whereas T2 claimed to use L1 for presenting classroom instructions since students will get the message directly. This

could keep time for practicing other skills. She added: "*my students' English low level do not help them to communicate with each other in English due to the lack of their spoken English skills.*"

In answering the third question: "*What should be the role of the teacher in a communicative classroom? What do you think the major responsibilities of CLT teachers are?*", both teachers believed in their roles as facilitators. T1 claimed that "*my responsibilities are in facilitating the work among the students and advice them. I believe that teachers in CLT classes should be guiders and participants, but at the same time I try to control the class since I usually fail to fulfill the sense of communicative class with so many hinder circumstances.*"

With regard to the question: "*According to you, what are the roles of the students in a CLT classroom?*", both teachers believed in the important role of the students in CLT classes. T2 claimed that "*Despite the significance roles of the students in CLT classes as participants, they are reluctance to engage in communicative class activities. Their low levels make them feel shy to participate.*" As T1 claimed, "*Most students don't feel free when they are assigned to do communicative activities during the lesson especially in listening or speaking ones.*"

Concerning the question: "*Do you think English teachers should emphasize fluency or accuracy in class?*", even though fluency is more important than accuracy in CLT, both teachers complained that students' resisted to participate in communicative class activities as their modest level in English do not encourage them to participate. Moreover, both teachers claimed that both (teachers and students) prefer grammar lessons since they feel more secure in such lessons in order for the students to gain marks in their

exams which are usually based on grammar exercises and accuracy. T1 responded: "*Actually, when I have tried presenting activities based on fluency, my students usually do not care especially in listening activities since they are usually sure that I will never present such activities in their English exams*."

Coming to the question: "*How often do you get satisfactory stationery materials that assist you to apply CLT methodology?*" even though the Ministry of Education supplies schools with teaching aids such as flashcard, posters and CDs, both teachers felt dissatisfied using such materials since they felt that such materials are not adequate and sufficient. They would like to send the Ministry a message in which they ask for more realias, videos and modern computers along with some suggestions on how to use them.

In answering the questions: "*How do you correct your students' mistakes? What do you think of selective error correction? Who should correct students' errors: the student himself, peers, the teacher? Why?*" T1 said: "*I correct their mistakes indirectly. I use the gentle correction way. I repeat their mistakes using the correct forms without embarrassing them. This means that I myself correct the errors gently.*" T2 said: "*I correct my students' errors using the clarification requests technique. For example, when one of my students gives a wrong answer, I might say 'I don't understand'. This, of course, will give him a chance to think again about the answer. Then, he will repeat the right answer. If he failed, I will ask another student to give the right answer. I sometimes correct the errors myself by repeating the right answer adjusting intonation to highlight the error.*" Looking at the teachers answers shows that they use different techniques for correcting errors: student himself, peers, and the teacher, depending on the situation as they both claim.

In response to the question: "*In your way of teaching, are students given the chance to contribute their experiences to classroom learning? How often do you attempt to link classroom language teaching with language activation outside the classroom?*", both teachers argued that due to large students' numbers and the limited time allocated to each lesson, it is challenging for them to allow discussion of the students' own experiences inside the classroom since they are under the pressure of finishing and completing the whole curriculum. In addition, many students have low English language proficiency levels which do not allow students to do so.

Regarding the second part of the question, the teachers claimed to do their best in linking classroom language teaching with language activation outside the classroom especially at the school's morning broadcast and on the Open Day by means of presenting some proverbs, aphorisms and songs in the English language. However, they claimed that these activities are restricted to high level students.

Concerning the last question: "*Do you have any other suggestions regarding your implementation of CLT?*" the two teachers called for more adequate training in CLT so that the teachers could do their best while teaching English communicatively. T1 saw that "*it is a chance to call the Ministry of Education and the other concerned bodies (e.g., AMIDEAST and British Council) to organize successive workshops and in-service trainings so that teachers can get the chance to share experiences on how to develop their implementation of communicative teaching in classes with so many obstacles.*" T2 added that "*the Ministry should divide the classes to have less students who would have more chances to involve in real situations.*"

The findings of the interviews have shown that the two teachers' have favorable attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching, but face a number of limitations that hinder their effective implementation of the communicative methodology in their classrooms.

4.4 The Appraisal of the Final Achievement Exam at al- Arroub Basic Boys School

Since 'English for Palestine' was designed to be taught communicatively, the English tests used to measure students' performance in English should also focus on the understanding of the functional use of language rather than on the mastery of language form. The appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Primary Test at al- Arroub Basic Boys School was performed to see whether the test was designed to measure language communicatively or not. It was also conducted to see how satisfactorily the teachers at UNRWA primary schools tested their students' natural use of the language through socio-cultural and everyday life contexts. In addition, the appraisal was meant to see whether teachers integrated the four language skills while testing, or they just focused on grammar and vocabulary.

The appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Test was based on the four principles for communicative test design which are based on a communicative view of the language competence built by a team at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) (Bailey,1998).

The first principle is to "*start from somewhere*" in which test makers should outline carefully what they expected the students to do when they use the target language in a specific context; that is they should know what they want to test (Phan,2008). Looking at the al- Arroub Basic Boys School Final Achievement Test, you wouldn't see

any stated objectives, teachers are unable to know what they're measuring regarding their students communicative ability. There is neither communication process nor real situation.

The second principle is "*concentration on context*" in which the context refers to tasks and topics which should be based on student's relevant needs (Phan, 2008), for instance, how could the student present himself. Regarding the second principle, you will also never see any kind of tasks. From the first to the sixth question, you will see just direct form-based questions.

Coming to the third principle which is "*bias for best*" (Phan, 2008) in which according to Brown "a term which goes little beyond how the student views the test to a degree of strategic involvement on the part of the student and teacher in preparing for, setting up, and following the test itself" (2003, p. 34), the UNRWA Final Achievement Test questions are direct and somehow copy-paste from the pupil's book. There is no need for doing such a strategy since the questions seem to be clear for the students.

The fourth principle "*working on washback*" where clear scoring criteria should be provided for both teachers and students (Phan, 2008). Since there are no tasks and the exam questions are direct, each point has a mark, and there are no certain criteria such as rubrics.

Additionally, Brown listed some characteristics of the communicative test which are: "meaningful communication, authentic situation, unpredictable language input, creative language output, and integrated language skills" (Brown, 2005, p.21). Looking at the UNRWA Final Achievement Test, there are no life situations where the students may experience, there are no communicative assignments which their solution requires some communicative skills. In addition, the exam does not integrate the four language skills of

listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Moreover, it neglects the listening and speaking skills completely.

The UNRWA Final Achievement Exam hasn't either communicative test principles or characteristics. This -of course- shows how the teachers at primary schools are far from communicative teaching. It also highlights the gap between what they say and what they actually do. It also reflects how the learners are far from practicing communicative learning since their final exam, which assesses their knowledge of the subject, does not assess their communicative ability.

4.5 Discussion

Palestinian schools began to reform English teaching by introducing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the early 2000s. With CLT now in place, the stress is on listening and speaking activities in addition to the previous focus on reading and writing. However, many Palestinian teachers seem to have difficult time carrying out the Communicative Approach in their classrooms. This might be resulted from their uncertainty regarding CLT as a method. This study investigated whether Communicative English Language Teaching is used in UNRWA primary schools by both teachers and students.

'English for Palestine' claimed to follow the new trends in ELT that marked a significant change from the way English had been previously taught in Palestine. Dajani and Mclaughline (2009) who shed lights on the first Palestinian English language curriculum claimed that the Palestinian teacher training programs, which do offer a course on *English Language Training* (ELT) methods, are unfortunately focused on theory rather than on practicable ideas for realistic use in the classroom. Consequently,

they focused on the coverage of assumptions more than on developing critical and reflective users. For instance, 'English for Palestine' books do not give attention to L2 culture, UNRWA students shyness and their modest language level restrict them from practicing English language communicatively. The lack of materials and the rare expansion to new language input are also additional hindering factors. Moreover, even though 'English for Palestine' teacher's book emphasizes the importance of having different interaction patterns, the activity book has little real communication events and do not foster a great deal of communicative development. Looking at the 6th grade pupil's book exercises, you will never find any task that includes information gap to encourage interaction among groups. Moreover, most of the exercises that include pair work and/or group work are of the sorts that develop the reading skill which is by itself does not lead to real communication. For these reasons, English teachers do not observe the Communicative Approach while teaching English as a foreign language, and still use traditional techniques while introducing English to their students. Shawer maintained that "theoretical understanding of CLT and use of communicative syllabuses are not enough for teachers to run actual communicative based teaching" (2010, p. 352), and that CLT is resulted in remarkable developments of "students' learning and motivation when teachers translated its principles into actual classroom practice" (Shawer, 2010, p. 325).

This study discussed the mismatch between UNRWA primary English teachers' claim of adopting the Communicative Approach in their classrooms, and the realities of what is taking place in these classes. The researcher found that the present study is similar to Sato and Kleinasser (1999), Mareva and Nyota (2012), Karavas-Doukas' (1996), Hardison and Prapaisit de Segovia's (2009), and Bulter (2005) studies. All these

studies showed the discrepancy and gap between the teachers' theory, and their real practices regarding CLT. This study also indicated that the traditional approaches are still the common methods used in the EFL classroom. Similar to the research done by Butler (2011) and Hardison and Prapaisit (2009), the study shows that UNRWA teachers in Hebron area are unprepared to teach using the Communicative Approach despite what the Palestinian Authority mandated in 2001, and despite what they claim about adopting CLT as the results of the questionnaire have shown.

There is a disparity between the government and teachers regarding the methods of how English should be taught. This implies that the teachers and the government are not on the same side regarding the goals of English language teaching which results in the failure of implementing CLT in Palestinian schools. Most UNRWA teachers were supportive of CLT adoption since the questionnaire findings indicated that. Their responses were favorable toward CLT and were willing to practice it. The results showed highly acceptable and favorable attitudes towards "*balanced attention to the four language skills*" and "*communicative competence as a desired goal in teaching.*" Moreover, in the interview, the two interviewees displayed favorable attitudes toward CLT despite the limitations that hinder the effective implementation of it. They articulated their harmony with CLT such as focusing on meaning rather than form, and that materials should be task based. On the contrary, the observation checklist suggested that UNRWA teachers were unable to apply CLT in their classes. For example, both teachers favored student-centered instructions by mentioning their advantages on students' communicative ability, but when it came to actual teaching, they seemed to

control the class through presenting the materials and ask direct questions to their students.

The researcher also noted that while most UNRWA primary English teachers in the Hebron area support the implementation of the Communicative Approach in their classes, it is also evident that too many discouraging factors inhibit their enthusiasm for actually implementing CLT in reality. Looking at the interviews and the questionnaire results show that so many hindering factors hold back their desires toward actual practice of the CA including the lack of materials, limited English hours, huge classes, students' modest level in English and their shyness, seats arrangements, and the lack of inadequate teachers' training. Regardless of such limitations, CLT will, as Richards (2006) claimed, continue to be the main general language teaching methodology for many years to come.

The appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Test based on a communicative view of language competence built by a team at the OISE has been seen as additional evidence to the discrepancy between what teachers say, and what actually happens in their classrooms.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter presented the analysis and the findings of the data collected by means of the questionnaire, the classroom observation checklist, the interview and the appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Test. These findings have been presented in terms of answers to the questions of the study. T-test, One Way Analysis of Variance, Pearson Correlation, and Cronbach Alpha using the SPSS system were used in the analysis of the data collected by the questionnaire. The study focused on many variables

such as the teachers' gender, level of proficiency and years of English teaching experience.

The findings of the questionnaire and the interview revealed teachers' awareness of CLT features, and their positive attitudes toward using it. The findings of the observation checklist showed that despite their awareness of the Communicative Approach, the teachers were unable to apply and implement it at their classes, and that the learners do not take responsibility for their own learning without the help of the teachers. Moreover, the appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Exam revealed that the examination system is far from observing the Communicative Approach principles and characteristics which indicates that the UNRWA primary schools contexts are far from practicing communicative language teaching and learning.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This study has attempted to find out whether teachers at UNRWA schools in the Hebron area (6th graders at al- Arroub Basic Boys School as a case) teach English language communicatively as prescribed by the course designer of 'English for Palestine.' The study also aimed at finding out whether learners (6th grade students) at al- Arroub Basic Boys School practice 'English for Palestine' communicatively or not. In addition, it explored some reasons that hinder the adoption of CLT. Moreover, it hopefully tried to present some suggestions and recommendations for both teachers and policy makers in order to develop and improve the methods, techniques, and application of communicative teaching based on academic investigations. To achieve the purpose of the study, four research instruments were used: a questionnaire, a classroom observation checklist, an interview and an appraisal of UNRWA Final Achievement Test.

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the data obtained by the four instruments, the following conclusions could be presented:

A new Communicative Approach 'English for Palestine' has been introduced by the Ministry of Education in collaboration with Macmillan Publishers since 2001 to implement curriculum changes and improve the quality of English language teaching in Palestine. However, in practice, curriculum changes have not been largely implemented.

Regardless of gender, level of proficiency, educational qualification and years of English teaching experience as factors which may affect the adoption of CLT at UNRWA

primary school, the findings of the present study indicated that CLT was a favorable approach by most teachers in spite of their inability to basically adopt it.

The results also showed that there is agreement between Sato and Kleinasser (1999), Mareva and Nyota (2012), Karavas-Doukas' (1996), Hardison and Prapaisit de Segovia's (2009), and Bulter (2005) studies in the contexts of Australia, Zimbabwe, Greece, Thai, Asia and the present results in the Palestinian context. All these studies indicated the mismatch between the teachers' classroom practices and their visions towards Communicative Language Teaching. It appeared that teachers had somewhat clear understanding of the approach. Nevertheless, they were unable to practice it in their classrooms.

These findings could be explained by adopting Wu's argument who highlighted the reasons for such mismatch in that "complete understanding and proper training about the benefits of CLT and techniques of how it should be taught lead undoubtedly to misconceptions about the method, and rejection to implement the approach altogether" (Wu, 2008, p.51). These misconceptions can be seen as a sign of the gap between the Palestinian Authority's policy and the performance of CLT in schools. If teachers do not properly understand the nature of the CA they hope to implement, it indicates that the educational bodies in Palestine are not effectively training their teachers in using the CA. This could explain why UNRWA teachers altered their methods based on their beliefs of what and how English should be taught regardless of the government's expectations, language policies, and their beliefs about the importance of the Communicative Approach.

In addition, large classes, the lengthy curriculum, the lack of materials, the limited English classes hours (3 hours per week), the students' shyness and their modest

English level, the nature of the textbook, the seating arrangement, the rare exposure to L2 culture, and new language input all push UNRWA teachers "to continue teaching what is comfortable and culturally acceptable: Grammar-Translation method and Audiolingualism. These approaches offer the teachers with full control of the classroom and what is being learned" (Hu, 2002, p.100). Moreover, traditional methods seem to be less demanding on the teachers' language proficiency and pedagogic techniques (Carless, 2003) since changing the job of the teacher from being a leader to facilitator of communication has been difficult for Palestinian teachers to recognize. Teachers have been seen as guiders and students should only follow them.

Students' English instruction and assessment are restricted to traditional techniques where group working, and task-based teaching are limited. At the same time, grammar, lexis, reading and writing are given significant attention, and listening and speaking are neglected. Students learn English at early ages; however, they cannot communicate effectively using the English language. Furthermore, since UNRWA primary students have little opportunity to engage in authentic English communication outside the classroom, they might feel there is no necessity for communicative English skills.

Finally, based on the appraisal of the UNRWA Final Achievement Test, English teaching practice appeared to be grammar-based since the current examination system is seen to be a grammar-based one. This means that English teaching practice is formulated according to the skills tested on these exams, which are mainly structure, reading, writing and lexis whereas the skills of listening and speaking are completely ignored.

5.2 Implications and Recommendations

The study provides both theoretical and practical recommendations for teachers, educators, and policy-makers to implement CLT in the Palestinian schools. Based on the findings of the present study, the following recommendations are offered:

- The gap between the teachers' vision and actual practice could be attributed to the government and policy makers' ignorance of the teachers' attitudes towards implementing CLT. That is, only suggesting the approach and trying to persuade the teachers of the usefulness of CLT do not successfully change the teachers' existing beliefs about language learning and teaching (Karava-Doukas,1996). The findings of the study suggested the need to offer sufficient in-service training for teachers to practice CLT. As pointed out by the teachers, they are in need to practical training. That is why the Palestinian Authority should provide teachers with adequate training such as presenting some teaching techniques for classroom management, cooperative learning, and task-based teaching which would engage students in pair-and-group discussions instead of teacher-centered classes.

- The findings suggested a call for understanding the Palestinian schools context in which most of the students are somewhat shy in expressing their ideas in front of their classmates using English because, in their classrooms, students do not have adequate opportunity to speak English, and are required to wait for the teachers' call to answer questions.

- Teachers should create an English environment in the school to increase the students' opportunities to practice English. For instance, an English club might give an opportunity for practicing more English.

- Evaluating students' communicative competence should be encouraged by integrating the four English language skills. Teachers should try to find new and creative ways to integrate the assessment of the four skills.

- Since CLT is a desired western method, the Palestinian educators, applied linguists, policy makers, and curriculum designers should try to modify it and coin it to suit our Palestinian context.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

This study examined the extent of using CLT in the primary levels in UNRWA schools in Hebron district. Further research can be conducted to examine the use of CLT for different grades all around Palestine. Research can be more comprehensive and on a larger scale if more schools and levels are investigated.

The research data were collected through the eyes of the teachers and the researcher. Next research could go beyond this to investigate the curriculum designers, supervisors, and the learners' points of view in order to get more precise results.

REFERENSES

Abbas, I. (2011). Palestinian and Global Cultural Dimensions in English for Palestine Textbooks for Grades 11&12. Journal of Al-Quds Open University for Research and Studies, 24 (1), (pp. 69-91).Retrieved from http://www.qou.edu/arabic/index.jsp?pageId=3464

Al - Twairish, B. (2009). The Effect of the Communicative Approach on the Listening and Speaking Skills of Saudi Secondary School Students: An Experimental Study, King Saud University.

Bader, H. (2009). A Dictionary of English Language Learning and Teaching: A Dictionary and a Resource Book. Hebron, Palestine.

Badger, R. , & Yan, X . (2008). To What Extent is Communicative Language Teaching a Feature of IELTS Classes in China?. University of Leeds. IELTS Research Reports, 13(1).

Bailey, K. M. (1998). Learning about language assessment: Dilemmas, decision, and directions. Pacific Grove, CA: Heinle & Heinle.

Berg, B.L. (1989). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, J. D., & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). Doing second language research. Oxford: University Press.

Brown, D. H. (2000). Principles of language learning & teaching. (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Brown, H. D.(2003). Language assessment: Principals and classroom practices. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Brown, J. D. (2005). Testing in language program. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Brown, H.D. (2007). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, H.D. (1994). Teaching by principles an interactive approach to language pedagogy. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Bulter, X. G. (2005) . Comparative Perspective Towards Communicative Language Teaching Research,9(4) ,423- 446.

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31, pp. 36-57. doi:10.1017/S0267190511000122

Carless, D. (2003). Factors in the implementation of task-based teaching in primary schools. System, 31(4), 485-500. doi:10.1016/j.system.2003.03.002

Dajani, D, & Mclaughlin, S. (2009). Implementing the First Palestinian Curriculum: A Need for Teacher Emowerment. Mediterranean Journal of Studies. 14(2), 27- 42.

Denzin, N.K. (1989). Interpretive Biography. Sage, Newbury Park, CA. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/978141298458

Ellis R. (1990). "Activities and procedures for teacher preparation", in Richards J. C. and D. Nunan (Eds.) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Estroga, J. I.(2013). History of Language Teaching. [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from:

http://www.slideshare.net/josephestroga/history-of-language-teaching-24038832

Fattash, M. (2010). Congruity or Disparity: Teachers' Perception Assessment of the New

English for Palestine English Language School Curriculum. TESOL Journal, 2,

189-206. Retrieved from http://www.tesol-journal.com

Galloway, A. (1993). Communicative language teaching: An introduction and sample

activities. ERIC Digest (ED 357 642).

Hardison, D. & Prapaisit de Segovia, L. (2008). Implementing education reform: EFL

teachers' perspectives. ELT Journal, 63(2), 154-162.

Harmer, J. (2007). The practice of English language teaching (4th ed.). London:

Longman.

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. doi: 10.1080/07908310208666636

Hu, G. (2005), Contextual influences on instructional practices: A Chinese case for an

ecological approach to ELT. TESOL. 39(4), 635-660.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In C. J. Brumfit, & K. Johnson

(Eds.). The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching (2nd ed., pp. 5-27).

Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jin, L., Singh, M., & Li, L.(2005, December).Communicative Language Teaching in

China: Misconceptions, Applications and Perceptions. A paper presented at

AARE' 05 Education Research "Creative Dissent: Constructive Solutions" the

Australian Association for Research in Education Room EDG79 on 1 Dec. 2005.

Kavanagh , B. (2012) . The Theory and Practice of Communicative Language Teaching in Japan. Academic Research International. 2(2), 730- 738.

Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. ELT Journal, 50(3), 187-198.

Kim, E.J. (2008). Status quo of CLT-based English Curricular reform: A teacher's voice from the classroom. English Teaching, 63 (2), 43-69.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practices in second language acquisition. New York: Pergamon Press.

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.

Littlewood, W. (2013 September). Developing a Context-Sensitive Pedagogy for Communication-Oriented Language Teaching. English Teaching(Korea), 68 (3). Hong Kong Baptist University: Hong Kong.

Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction (1st ed). Cambridge: Cambridge.

Macmillan Education. (2013). English for Palestine; Teacher's Book, Grade Six (New Edition). Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Macmillan   Palestine.   (n.d.).   Retrieved   August   4,   2014,   from http://www.englishforpalestine.com/#

Mareva, R. & Nyota, S. (2012). Structural or Communicative Approach: A Case Study of English Language Teaching in Masvingo Urban and Peri-urban Secondary Schools. Great Zimbabwe University. Masvingo, Zimbabwe. Internal journal of English and literature, 3(5), 103-11. DOI: 10.5897/IJEL11.015).

Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide. London: The Falmer Press.

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), pp.589-613.

O' Sullivan, M.C (2001). Communicative Approach to Teaching English in Namiba: The Issue of Transfer of Western Approaches Developing Countries. International Journal of Early Years Education, 9(1).

Phan, S. (2008). Communicative Language Testing. TESOL Working Paper Series, 6(1).

Rao, Z. (2002), Chinese Students' Perceptions of Communicative and Non-Communicative Activities in EFL Classroom. System, 30(1),pp.85-105.

Richards, Jack C. (2006). Communicative Language Teaching Today. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. (2001). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Descriptive and Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J., C. (2005). Materials development and research: Making the Connection. Paper presented at colloquium on research and materials development, at the TESOL convention. San Antonio, 27(1), 5-26. doi: 10.1177/0033688206063470

Samovar. L., Porter. R., & Jain, N.(1981). *Understanding Intercultural* Communication. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sato, K & Kleinsasser, R, C. (1999). Communicative Language Teaching: Practical Understanding. The Modern Language Journal, 83, 495- 517.

Savignon, S. J. (2002). Communicative language teaching: Linguistic theory and classroom practice. In S. J. Savignon (Ed.). Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching (pp. 1-27). New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Savignon, S. (2001). Communicative language teaching. Theory into Practice, 26(4),235-242.

Shawer ,S. (2010). Communicative Based Curriculum Innovations Between Theory and Practice: Implementations for ESL Curriculum Development and Students Cognitive and Affective Change. The Curriculum Journal. 21(3),333-359.

Snow, D. (1996), More Than A Native Speaker: More Than a Native Speaker: An Introduction for Volunteers Teaching English Abroad. Alexandra, Virginia: TESOT, Inc.

Swan, M. (1985). A critical look at the Communicative Approach (1). ELT Journal, 39 (1): 2-12.doi: 10.1093/elt/39.1.2

Thompson, G. (1996). Some Misconceptions about Communicative Language Teaching. ELT Journal, 50(1), 9-150.

Wallace, M. J. (1998). Action research for language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willems, G. (1987). Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language teaching. System, 15, 351-364.

Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. ELT Journal, 37(3), 251-254.

Wu, W. (2008). Misunderstandings of Communicative Language Teaching. English Language Teaching, 1(1), 50-53. Retrieved from https://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/download/509/491

Appendix A

Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear UNRWA Teacher,

This questionnaire aims at investigating the extent to which language practice in UNRWA primary schools using 'English for Palestine' observes Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The questionnaire is composed of two sections. Section One seeks background information. Section Two asks for perception regarding your implementation of CLT as a methodology in your classes. There is no correct or best response to the questions. Please answer them based on your thinking at this time.

Your name is not requested, and all the answers you provide for this questionnaire will be confidential and will be used for research purposes only.

<div align="right">

Thank you for your time

Researcher

Hiba Jawabreh

</div>

Section One: Background Information

- Gender: male □   female □

- Years of experience: ………………………………………

- Level of proficiency in English: excellent □   very good □   good □   average □   low □

- Qualification: BA □   MA □   other ………….

- Have you had any professional training (courses/workshops) in using CLT?
  ………………………………………………………………........

- Have you tried Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in your classes?

  a. Yes   b. No

- How many students do you have in your classes?

  ....

- How many hours of teaching English do you offer each class every week?

  ………………………………………**…………………………..**

Section Two: Methodology Information

UNRWA English Language Teachers' Perceptions toward Implementing

Communicative Language Teaching in their Classes

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Pedagogical Orientation					
1. Communicative competence is the desired goal in teaching					
2. Linguistic competence (grammar knowledge) is the desired goal in teaching					
3. Focus is on students' knowledge about language usage (rules)					
4. Focus is on the students' ability to use language communicatively in L2					
5. Attention is given to reading and writing					
6. Balanced attention is given to the four language skills					
7. Emphasis is on formal accuracy (structures of language)					
8. Fluency is primary as it keeps students meaningfully engaged in language use					
Instructional Content and Presentation					

9. Grammar rules are largely defined and explained in lessons					
10. Grammar rules are inductively taught					
11. Language texts are explained sentence by sentence					
12. Parsing of sentences in texts is common					
13. Communicative functions are taught					
14. L1/L2 are commonly contrasted while teaching					
15. L2 is used in conducting lessons					
16. L1 is used by the students					
17. Correction is direct and explicit					
18. Correction is indirect and implicit					
19. L2 culture is given attention to					
Language Practice Activities					
20. Focus in language practice is on form					
21. Focus in language practice is on meaning					
22. Language practice occurs by means of work on grammar exercises					
23. Translation is largely used during lessons					
24. Teacher-student interaction happens in L2					
25. Language practice activities resemble real-life tasks					
26. Language practice activities in class involve real communication in L2					
27. Students are constantly exposed to new language input					
28. Students use L2 to communicate with one another (genuine interactions)					
29. Classroom techniques engage students in functional and authentic use of language for					

meaningful purposes					
30. All language skills are practiced in an integrated manner					
31. Language skills are introduced and practiced using various topics					
Teacher and Student Role					
32. The teacher talks most of the time					
33. Instruction is teacher-fronted					
34. The teacher's job is to make learners master the rules of language					
35. The teacher's job is to make learners work on the process of communicating in L2					
36. Instruction is student-centered (students are important)					
37. Learners' interests and needs are in the forefront					
38. Students work on accomplishing tasks with one another while the teacher observes and facilitates					
39. The teacher controls class and is the central figure in the class					
40. The teacher motivates students to use language communicatively (functionally and meaningfully)					
41. Students are intrinsically motivated as they are interested in communicating in L2					
42. The teacher enhances students' own personal experiences for their better learning					
43. The teacher links classroom practice with activities outside of class					
44. Pair and small group work are common					
45. Peer feedback and evaluation is common					
Learning Materials (Syllabus)					

46. Materials (textbook) used are structure-based					
47. Materials develop students' functional language ability to use L2 communicatively					
48. Materials are task-based using a variety of games, role plays, and simulations					
49. Materials are teacher-developed					
50. Authentic materials are used (e.g., realia, signs, magazines, advertisements, newspapers, graphic and visual sources)					
51. Materials enable students to use L2 meaningfully					
Errors Correction & Assessment					
52. Errors are seen as a natural part of the learning process					
53. Students' errors are not tolerated and so they are swiftly corrected					
54. Teachers allow errors for the sake of communication					
55. Teachers' feedback on students' responses focuses on the linguistic forms of language (language structures)					
56. Teachers' feedback on students' responses focuses on how language is to be used meaningfully and purposefully in L2					
57. Tests measure students' grammar ability					
58. Tests measure students ability to use L2 communicatively					

Appendix B

Classroom Observation Checklist

Observing Whether UNRWA Primary Students are Practicing English Language
Communicatively or not

Observation No: ……….   Date:…………   Class:………..   Subject:…………

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Researcher's Comments
Pedagogical Orientation						
1. Communicative competence is the desired goal in teaching						
2. Linguistic competence (grammar knowledge) is the desired goal in teaching						
3. Focus is on students' knowledge about language usage (rules)						
4. Focus is on the students' ability to use language communicatively in L2						
5. Attention is given to reading and writing						
6. Balanced attention is given to the four language skills						
7. Emphasis is on formal accuracy (structures of language)						
8. Fluency is primary as it keeps students meaningfully engaged in language use						
Instructional Content and Presentation						
9. Grammar rules are largely defined and explained in lessons						
10. Grammar rules are inductively taught						

Statement						
11. Language texts are explained sentence by sentence						
12. Parsing of sentences in texts is common						
13. Communicative functions are taught						
14. L1/L2 are commonly contrasted while teaching						
15. L2 is used in conducting lessons						
16. L1 is used by the students						
17. Correction is direct and explicit						
18. Correction is indirect and implicit						
19. L2 culture is given attention to						
Language Practice Activities						
20. Focus in language practice is on form						
21. Focus in language practice is on meaning						
22. Language practice occurs by means of work on grammar exercises						
23. Translation is largely used during lessons						
24. Teacher-student interaction happens in L2						
25. Language practice activities resemble real-life tasks						
26. Language practice activities in class involve real communication in L2						
27. Students are constantly exposed to new language						

input					
28.Students use L2 to communicate with one another (genuine interactions)					
29.Classroom techniques engage students in functional and authentic use of language for meaningful purposes					
30.All language skills are practiced in an integrated manner					
31. Language skills are introduced and practiced using various topics					
Teacher and Student Role					
32.The teacher talks most of the time					
33.Instruction is teacher-fronted					
34.The teacher's job is to make learners master the rules of language					
35.The teacher's job is to make learners work on the process of communicating in L2					
36.Instruction is student-centered (students are important)					
37.Learners' interests and needs are in the forefront					
38.Students work on accomplishing tasks with one another while the teacher observes and facilitates					
39.The teacher controls class and is the central figure in the class					

40. The teacher motivates students to use language communicatively (functionally and meaningfully)					
41. Students are intrinsically motivated as they are interested in communicating in L2					
42. The teacher enhances students' own personal experiences for their better learning					
43. The teacher links classroom practice with activities outside of class					
44. Pair and small group work are common					
45. Peer feedback and evaluation is common					
Learning Materials (Syllabus)					
46. Materials (textbook) used are structure-based					
47. Materials develop students' functional language ability to use L2 communicatively					
48. Materials are task-based using a variety of games, role plays, and simulations					
49. Materials are teacher-developed					
50. Authentic materials are used (e.g., realia, signs, magazines, advertisements, newspapers, graphic and visual sources)					
51. Materials enable students to use L2 meaningfully					

Errors Correction & Assessment					
52. Errors are seen as a natural part of the learning process					
53. Students' errors are not tolerated and so they are swiftly corrected					
54. Teachers allow errors for the sake of communication					
55. Teachers' feedback on students' responses focuses on the linguistic forms of language (language structures)					
56. Teachers' feedback on students' responses focuses on how language is to be used meaningfully and purposefully in L2					
57. Tests measure students' grammar ability					
58. Tests measure students ability to use L2 communicatively					

Appendix C

A Semi- Structured Interview

1. Do you think your classroom situation is suitable for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)? Please explain.
2. What should be the role of the teacher in a communicative classroom? What do you think the major responsibilities of CLT teachers are?
3. Do you think English teachers should emphasize in class: fluency or accuracy?
4. According to you, what are the roles of students in a CLT classroom?
5. What is the nature of interactions you like to promote in your lessons? What do you think of the use of pair and group work activities in the classroom?
 Please explain.
6. In your way of teaching, are students given the chance to contributing their experiences to classroom learning?
7. How do you correct your students' mistakes? What do you think of selective error correction? Who should correct students' errors: student himself, peers, the teacher? Why?
8. Do you think teachers should mostly speak English in the classroom? What should be the role of mother tongue in an English language class?
9. How often do you attempt to link classroom language teaching with language activation outside the classroom?
10. How often do you get satisfactory stationery materials that assist you to apply CLT methodology?
11. What challenges do you face in implementing CLT in your classroom?
12. Do you have any other suggestions regarding your implementation of CLT?

Appendix D

Sixth Grade

Second Semester Final Exam

Name: .... Section: ....

Reading Skill

Question 1: **Read** this paragraph and **answer** the given questions.   (5 marks)

Omar and Rania talk about Ibn Battuta. Omar thinks he did the most exciting things. Rania thinks he was very wise because **he** visited so many interesting places. Ibn Battuta visited Asia in the east, Europe in the north and Africa in the south, but not North America.

a. Omar and Rania talk about...

b. Why does Rania think Ibn Battuta is wise?

....

c. The opposite of west is..

d " **he**" refers to..

e. Ibn Battuta visited North Africa.   (√ . x)

Question 2: **Complete** the following sentences: (5 marks)

stars	below sea level	generous	helpful	desert

1. Mohammad is very..............................He helps his grandmother.

2. Amy is very.........................She gives her books to her friends.

3. The Dead Sea is 400 metres..

4. Wild cats and Jerboas live in the...

Grammar

Question 3: **Read** and **circle** the correct answers.   (15 marks)

1. Ahmad agrees..................................... English with his friend.

a. speaking   b. to speak   c. speaks

2. I am good at..................................... stories.

a. writing   b. to write   c. writes

99

1

3. Have you ever.......................... in the Dead Sea?

a. float   b. floated   c. floats

4. Have you ever.......................... a game?

a.win   b. wins   c. won

5. I.......................... watched TV.

a. has   b. have   c. been

6. Ansam.......................... done her work.

a. has   b. have   c. been

7. The boys..........................played football.

a. has   b. have   c. been

8.Omar has been in Nablus.......................... two days.

a. since   b. for   c. but

9. I have had flu.......................... yesterday.

a. for   b. since   c. but

10. She.......................... Arabic is difficult.

a. think   b. thinks   c. is thinking

11. The clouds.............. wet and rain falls in the water cycle.

a. become   b. becomes   c. is becoming

12.Who.......................... you think you are?

a. do   b. does   c. is

13.What.............. vapour change into?

a. does   b. do   c. is

100

4. I like playing football................... I don't like playing volleyball.

a. but   b. untill   c. so

15. I am going school...................... I feel better.

a. but   b. untill   c. so

Vocabulary:

Question 4: (A) Write the names of continents.   (4 marks)

| Asia | Australia | Europe | North America | South America | Africa | Antarctica |

(B)- Write the elements of the water cycle.   (4 marks)

| rain | sun | cloud | vapour | air | mountain | rises | Ocean | heavy cloud |

Writing Skill

| Question 5: **Write** the following paragraph. | (3 marks) |

Ben and his family are waiting in a queue in a restaurant. A small boy and his mother do not notice the queue and push in rudely.

| Question 6: **Write** these sentences **correctly**. | (4 marks) |

1. ive never climbed a tree

....

2. have you ever been to an oasis

....

3. yes i have ive seen palm trees and a spring

....

4. good morning how long have you been sick

....

Good Luck

Miss Intisar Al-Hore & Miss Azeeza Battai

4

Appendix E

حضرة السيد ~~كك~~ رئيس برنامج التربية التعليم – القدس المحترم
تحية طيبة وبعد

الموضوع: متطلبات رسالة الماجستير

أنا المعلمة هبة حسن جوابرة رقم وظيفي 611795 أرجو من حضرتكم السماح لي بتوزيع استبانه على معلمي اللغة الانجليزية للمرحلة الأساسية في مدارس وكالة الغوث الدولية , كما وأرجو السماح لي بحضور 10 حصص لغة انجليزية للصف السادس في مدرسة ذكور العروب الأولى في أوقات فراغي وذلك بالتنسيق مع مديري المدرستين, وذلك لإتمام متطلبات درجة الماجستير .

– مرفق نسخة من الاستبانه

مع الاحترام

المعلمة : هبة جوابرة
الرقم الوظيفي: 611795
مدرسة ذكور العروب الثانية

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
U N R W A F.O. - JERUSALEM
2 8 -04- 2014
FILE No. ED/
PASSED TO:

D/ CT&P

Approved
W. Subran
30/4/2014