

## Communicative Language Teaching

### Appendix B

#### Demerits of CLT

**Limited Preparation for Formal Writing and Standardized Exams**

**Prioritization of Fluency over Accuracy**

**Neglect of Explicit Grammar and Vocabulary Instruction**

One of the primary criticisms directed at the communicative language teaching approach is its alleged neglect of explicit grammar and vocabulary instruction (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Spada & Lightbown, 2008). Nassaji (2000) stresses the importance of integrating form-focused activities within an integrative approach to L2 teaching that balances meaning with form. The author argues that an overemphasis on meaning, as seen in traditional communicative language teaching, can affect learners negatively if they neglect the language structure. Consequently, to ensure the development of proficient language learners, form-focused activities should be incorporated within a communicative and meaningful context. The article provides various pedagogical strategies, such as the use of corrective feedback, explicit instruction, and consciousness-raising tasks, to help learners develop their form-focused abilities. These strategies aim to enhance learners' capacity to notice and analyze the form of language, leading to greater accuracy and fluency in language production. Likewise, in his work, Grim (2008) places much emphasis on the significance of form, particularly for beginning-level learners and cultural lessons. The author argues that integrating language structures into cultural lessons at the early stages of French L2 classes can be more effective for learning second language grammar, vocabulary, and cultural content in intermediate French L2 classes. Grim's approach departs from traditional communicative language teaching, which gives much more value to meaning than form. Instead, Grim contends that giving equal importance to form and meaning can boost language learning outcomes. El-Dakhs (2015) argues that without systematic and explicit instruction, students may struggle to develop a solid foundation in language structure and vocabulary knowledge. This limitation may hinder learners' ability to produce accurate and grammatically correct language. For example, the author's critique of communicative language teaching addresses significant language accuracy issues. CLT stresses meaning and communication, while El-Dakhs' research shows the risks of emphasizing meaning alone in language training. This view is supported by research that suggests pure CLT learners may lack linguistic accuracy, a key component of language mastery (Ahmad & Rao, 2013). El-Dakhs' criticism focuses on the necessity for a balanced approach to language development that includes communicative competency and formal teaching. Recognizing the importance of language accuracy allows educators to take a more holistic approach that ensures students communicate successfully and have the grammatical and linguistic precision needed for language competency. This

perspective enhances CLT discourse by highlighting its benefits and weaknesses in language instruction.

According to Bachman (1990), some researchers express concerns that the CLT approach may not provide students with sufficient preparation for formal writing and standardized exams that require precise grammar and vocabulary usage. While CLT's major focus on communicative activities is critical for effective communication, it may not fully address the intricacies required for formal language production. Consequently, students may lack the necessary skills to perform well in language assessment contexts that demand precise grammar and vocabulary usage. Furthermore, some sceptics argue against implementing CLT, as exemplified by Norland and Pruett-Said (2006). These critics express apprehension regarding the potential neglect of reading and writing abilities within the framework of CLT. They elucidate that if educators fail to instruct grammatical regulations or vocabulary, learners may ultimately experience difficulty expressing themselves clearly and effectively throughout interpersonal exchanges. Finally, a limitation of communicative language teaching is its applicability mainly to small class sizes. In the context of a large classroom, teachers may allocate an important amount of time towards assessing the language proficiency of individual students and rectifying any errors they may have made (Wilkins, 1976).

While fluency is an essential component in language production, it is important to maintain a balance between fluency and accuracy. The Communicative Language Teaching approach accentuates fluency, which may contribute to the development of fossilized errors if accuracy-focused activities are neglected (Ellis, 2003). These errors could become ingrained and difficult to correct, which can negatively impact language learning. Thus, it is crucial to include accuracy-focused activities in language learning to ensure that learners are not only fluent but also accurate in their language production. Striking a balance between fluency and accuracy can help learners develop a well-rounded and effective communication skill set. Similarly, according to Brumfit and Johnson's (1979) publication, the communicative approach to language learning, which gives emphasis to the ability to communicate effectively in a language, should not be prioritized to the detriment of language accuracy. The authors suggest that a balanced approach that incorporates both communicative competence and language accuracy is essential to achieving optimal language learning outcomes. This implies that a singular focus on communicative competence may not suffice to equip learners with the necessary language skills required for effective communication in real-life situations. As such, educators and language learners alike must strive to achieve a balance between the two approaches in order to maximize language learning outcomes. In addition, Gerges' (2016) research regarding the potential weakness of CLT brings attention to an essential aspect of language education. Although this approach is highly effective in improving oral fluency and communicative competence, it is essential to recognize that language proficiency encompasses more than just speaking abilities. The findings of Gerges draw attention to the significance of maintaining a balanced approach in the training of language. By placing exclusive emphasis on oral fluency, there is a possibility of unintended repercussions, including a potential decrease in the development of grammar skills and writing proficiency. This underscores the imperative for an all-inclusive strategy that incorporates both fluency and accuracy in language use.