

The Islamic University
College of Education
Deanery of Graduate Studies
English Methods Department



**Difficulties Encountering UNRWA Ninth-Grade Teachers in
Performing their Roles in Light of the Communicative
Approach to Teaching Speaking in the Gaza Strip**

Presented by

Islam Husni Abu Sharbain

Supervised by

Dr. Awad Soliman Keshta

**A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of Education in Partial Fulfillment
of the M.ED Degree in ELT Curriculum and Teaching Methods.**

2009

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



الجامعة الإسلامية - غزة
The Islamic University - Gaza

هاتف داخلي: 1150

عمادة الدراسات العليا

الرقم ج س غ/35/ Ref

12/10/2009

التاريخ..... Date

نتيجة الحكم على أطروحة ماجستير

بناءً على موافقة عمادة الدراسات العليا بالجامعة الإسلامية بغزة على تشكيل لجنة الحكم على أطروحة الباحث/ إسلام حسني علي أبو شاريين لنيل درجة الماجستير في كلية التربية/قسم مناهج وأساليب تدريس- لغة إنجليزية وموضوعها:

Difficulties Encountering UNRWA Ninth - Grade Teachers in Performing Their Roles in Light of the Communicative Approach to Teaching Speaking in the Gaza Strip

وبعد المناقشة العلنية التي تمت اليوم الاثنين 22 شوال 1430هـ، الموافق 2009/10/12 الساعة الحادية عشرة صباحاً، اجتمعت لجنة الحكم على الأطروحة والمكونة من:

.....	مشرفاً ورئيساً	د. عوض سليمان قشطة
.....	مناقشاً داخلياً	د. سناء إبراهيم أبو دقنة
.....	مناقشاً داخلياً	د. وليسد محمد عامر

وبعد المداولة أوصت اللجنة بمنح الباحث درجة الماجستير في كلية التربية/قسم مناهج وأساليب تدريس- لغة إنجليزية.

واللجنة إذ تمنحه هذه الدرجة فإنها توصيه بتقوى الله ولزوم طاعته وأن يسخر علمه في خدمة دينه ووطنه.

والله ولي التوفيق ،،،

عميد الدراسات العليا

د. زياد إبراهيم مقداد

Dedication

To the soul of my uncle.

To all martyrs who dedicated their souls for our sake in the war on Gaza.

To my parents.

To all my brothers.

Acknowledgement

I express my gratitude and offer my thanks and appreciation to all those who contributed to the good emergence of this research.

I dedicate this work to my advisor Dr. Awad Keshta whose advice and guidance assisted me to bring this work to light.

To Dr. Mohamed Atia who took time to help me understand methodological aspects of the study.

I'm also thankful to all professors who taught me and helped me in this study. I thank them all for their considerable pieces of advice.

My special thanks to all teachers who helped me greatly. I'm very thankful to their generous acceptance for observing them to apply this study.

I want to recognize those special people without whom this work would not have been completed. My parents, who set me on the path to this goal and encouraged me not to give up.

To my friends Adham Abu Hatab and Mohammed Jhaish to whom I'm greatly indebted for their support.

Once again I reiterate my cordial acknowledgement and high appreciation to all who helped.

Difficulties Encountering UNRWA Ninth-Grade Teachers in Performing their Roles in Light of the Communicative Approach to Teaching Speaking in the Gaza Strip

Abstract

This study investigates the difficulties that encounter UNRWA ninth grade teachers of English in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking in the Gaza strip. It also investigates the extent to which teachers perform these roles. The researcher uses two tools, interview and observation card. Through the (first tool) the researcher elicits the difficulties from three UNRWA experts. These difficulties were classified under six scopes to form the observation card (second tool) which was used to observe 24 male and female UNRWA ninth grade teachers from all areas of the Gaza strip. Results indicated that there is a general weakness in the level of all roles. Teachers' performance of their roles is considered weak due to their insufficient acquaintance knowledge of the nature of these roles in light of the communicative approach. Results showed that there are no differences between male and female teachers in performing their roles and no differences due to the age of the teachers. But there were statistically significant differences between morning shift teachers and afternoon shift teachers in favor of morning shift teachers in two scopes 'evaluator' and 'advisor and monitor'. Regarding experience, teachers from 1 to 7 years experience and those from 14 to 20 years experience showed better performance than teachers from 7 to 14 years experience, while there were no statistically significant differences between teachers from (1 to 7) and those from (14 to 20).

الصعوبات التي تواجه معلمو الصف التاسع بوكالة الغوث في تأدية أدوارهم في ضوء الاتجاه التواصلي لتدريس مهارة التحدث في قطاع غزة

ملخص الدراسة

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تبيان الصعوبات التي تواجه معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية للصف التاسع في وكالة الغوث في تأدية أدوارهم في ضوء الاتجاه التواصلي لتدريس مهارة التحدث في قطاع غزة. تبحث الدراسة أيضاً مدى تأدية وتطبيق المعلمين لهذه الأدوار. استخدم الباحث أداتين للبحث، المقابلة الشخصية وبطاقة الملاحظة. وحصل الباحث من خلال الأداة الأولى على الصعوبات التي تواجه المعلمين في تأدية أدوارهم التواصلية بعد مقابلة ثلاث خبراء من وكالة الغوث. وبعد ذلك تم تصنيف هذه الصعوبات إلى ستة مجالات أساسية حصل عليها الباحث من خلال أدب الدراسة مشكلاً بذلك بطاقة الملاحظة، وهي الأداة الثانية في البحث والتي قد تم استخدامها لملاحظة 24 معلم ومعلمة من معلمي الصف التاسع في وكالة الغوث من شتى المناطق التعليمية تم اختيارهم على أساس العينة العنقودية لوجود متغيرات أخرى مثل العمر والخبرة وفترة الدوام. أشارت النتائج إلى وجود ضعف عام في تأدية جميع الأدوار وكان أداء المعلمين ضعيفاً بسبب عدم إلمام المعلمين بشكل كافٍ بطبيعة هذه الأدوار. وبينت النتائج عدم وجود أي فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين المعلمين والمعلمات في مدى تأدية أدوارهم وأنه ليس هناك فروق تعزى إلى متغير العمر. ولكنها أشارت إلى وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية تعزى إلى فترة الدوام (صباحي أم مسائي) لصالح معلمي الفترة الصباحية في مجالين من ست مجالات. وأظهرت النتائج أن المعلمين من 1 إلى 7 سنوات من الخبرة وألئك من 14 إلى 20 سنة من الخبرة أبدوا أداءً أفضل من المعلمين ذوي 7 إلى 14 سنة من الخبرة.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	III
Acknowledgement	IV
Abstract in English	V
Abstract in Arabic	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VII
LIST OF TABLES	XI

Chapter I

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	2
Need for the study	5
The purpose of the study	6
Significance of the study:	6
Statement of the problem	7
Hypotheses	7
Limitations of the study	8
Definition of Terms:	8
Abbreviations	10

Chapter II

<u>LITERATURE REVIEW</u>	12
Evaluation of foreign and second language teaching approach	12
Communicative approach in language teaching	15
• <i>Communicative Competence</i>	16
• <i>Communicative Language Teaching Methods</i>	19
Communicative teaching of speaking	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUE)

• <i>Why speaking</i>	22
• <i>Teaching speaking cooperatively</i>	24
• <i>Why adults</i>	25
The teacher's roles in CLT of speaking	26
Definition of the teacher's roles as facilitator in CLT	29
The effective communicative teacher:	32
• <i>Role of caring</i>	32
• <i>Role of fairness and respect</i>	33
• <i>Attitude toward the Teaching Profession</i>	33
• <i>Promotion of enthusiasm and motivation for learning</i>	33
• <i>Cooperative learning</i>	34
In conclusion	34
<u>Previous studies</u>	35
Previous studies related to the communicative approach	35
Commentary on previous studies related to the communicative approach	39
Previous studies related to speaking skill	39
Commentary on previous studies related to teaching speaking	41
Previous studies related to the teachers' roles	42
Commentary on previous studies related to teacher's roles	43
<u>Chapter III</u>	
<u>THE METHODOLOGY</u>	45
The methodology of the study	45
The study population	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUE)

The sample of the study	46
• <i>Pilot study</i>	46
• <i>Sample of the study</i>	46
The instrumentation	47
• <i>Validity of the observation card</i>	48
• <i>Internal consistency</i>	49
• <i>Reliability</i>	53
• <i>Inter-rater reliability</i>	54
• <i>Statistical treatment</i>	55
<u>Chapter IV</u>	
<u>RESULTS OF THE STUDY</u>	57
Results of the research question number one.	57
Results of the research question number two.	64
Hypothesis number one.	72
Hypothesis number two.	74
Hypothesis number three	75
Hypothesis number four.	76
<u>Chapter V</u>	
<u>DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, PEDGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS,</u>	80
<u>SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	
Discussion	80
• <i>First: Interpretation of results related to question number two.</i>	80
• <i>Second: interpretation of results related to hypothesis number one.</i>	88

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUE)

• <i>Third: interpretation of results related to hypothesis number two.</i>	88
• <i>Forth: interpretation of results related to hypothesis number three.</i>	89
• <i>Fifth: interpretation of results related to hypothesis number four.</i>	89
Conclusion	90
The pedagogical Implications:	91
Suggestions	92
• <i>Suggestions for teachers of English in UNRWA</i>	92
• <i>Suggestions for supervisors and experts in UNRWA</i>	93
Recommendations for further studies	94
<u>References</u>	95
<u>Appendices</u>	103

LIST OF TABLES

1. The distribution of the sample according to Student's sex	46
2. The distribution of the sample according to duty shift	46
3. The distribution of the sample according to Experience	46
4. The distribution of the sample according to age	47
5. Number of the items in each scope in the observation card	48
6. Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the first scope with the total degree of this scope	49
7. Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the second scope with the total degree of this scope	50
8. Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the third scope with the total degree of this scope	50
9. Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the fourth scope with the total degree of this scope	51
10. Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the fifth scope with the total degree of this scope	51
11. Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the sixth scope with the total degree of this scope	51
12. Pearson Correlation coefficient for every scope from the observation card with the total degree of the observation card and the scopes with others scopes	52
13. Correlation coefficient between the two halves of each domain before modification and the reliability after modification	53
14. Alpha Correlation Coefficient of the observation card Reliability	54

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUE)

15. The calculation of Holisty coefficient for inter-rater reliability	55
16. The six questions asked in the brief interviews with experts about each scope	58
17. The answers of expert No. 1	59
18. The answers of expert No. 2	60
19. The answers of expert No. 3	61
20. The difficulties resulted from the interviews conducted by the researcher to answer the major question	62
21. Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation. And the % weight and rank of each item from of the manager and organizer	65
22. Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each difficulties from the Advisor and monitor scope.	66
23. Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each difficulty from the Evaluator scope	67
24. Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation. And the % weight and rank of each difficulties from the Good language model scope	68
25. Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each difficulty from the Motivator scope	69
26. Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation. And the % weight and rank of each difficulty from the Co-communicator scope.	70

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUE)

27. Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each difficulty in each scope of difficulties	72
28. Means of ranks, sums of ranks, "U", "Z", sig. value, and sig. level to know the difference between male and female	73
29. Means of ranks, sums of ranks, "U", "Z", sig. value , and sig. level to know the difference between morning shift and afternoon shift	74
30. Variance source, sum of squares, df, mean square, f value, sig. Value, sig. level concerning age variable	75
31. Variance source, sum of squares, df, mean square, f value, sig. Value, sig. level concerning experience variable	76
32. Scheffe post test Matrix to know the direction of differences between the three groups in the Fourth scope "good language model"	78

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In the field of foreign and second language education, communicative language teaching has been regarded as one of the ideal teaching approaches. As Chio, (1999:4) pointed out "In second and foreign language education, developing students' communicative competence in the target language is one of the most significant goals of language professionals."

The CLT sets the communicative competence as its desired goal because it views language as a tool for communication. It holds that language should be learned through use and communication. Based on this notion, the teacher usually creates real life situations in classes and has students to play roles, simulations, true-to-life interactions, and other communicative activities in order to learn to use language appropriately in different types of situations, to use language to perform different kinds of tasks, and to use language for social interaction with other people. (Liao, 1996:10)

Language is for communication and communicative approach may be a better way to achieve this purpose. Teachers of English have to realize the importance and nature of their roles in light of the communicative approach. As Melinda (2005: 108) asserted "The teacher's role in communicative classroom has now changed to that of facilitator rather than controller. The teacher's roles are simply to design tasks or information gap activities and let the students learn through interaction, offering help but not control."

English education in the Gaza strip can be categorized as true foreign language learning context rather than as English as a second language situation. That is, outside

the classroom, English is rarely used and the classroom instruction is most likely the only input for language learning. Learners, therefore, receive limited target language input and have limited language learning time, unlike the second language learning situations where the target language is used outside the classroom.

Hammarly (1991:36) stated that "classroom instruction is an artificial environment, and the time of teaching and learning is limited". Within this limited learning environment, the importance of the teacher's role in creating a communicative environment which increases the students communicative competence through providing meaningful input, communicative teaching methods and authentic materials should be emphasized.

Yalden (1981:1) stated that "while great efforts have been made to enrich second and foreign language teaching, there are still too many students who complain that they have never learned to use the language naturally. There are still problems with the methodologies teachers use".

In recent years, methodologists and linguists have begun to argue that the spoken language should be the principal objective in language teaching. In order to develop speaking skill, it should be identified, practiced, and improved by the use of various activities and tasks. Unfortunately, through out the researcher's notice, speaking skill is mostly neglected or in best cases, not taught the right way. This came as a result of the teachers' misunderstanding of how to teach speaking and their ignorance of its importance. Besides, teachers themselves are not good users of English, and those who cannot speak English fluently are unlikely to be able to teach speaking.

"Learning to speak a foreign language requires more than knowing its grammatical and semantic rules. Students know how native speakers use language in real situations. Diversity in interaction involves not only verbal communication but also paralinguistic elements of speech such as pitch, stress and intonation.", (Brown 1994, as quoted in Al- Khuli 2002:17) (Bygate 1993, as quoted in Al- Dakel , 1998:5) confirms that "One of the main problems in teaching English is to prepare the learners to be capable of using it orally with confidence in the classroom."

In light of his experience in teaching English, the researcher thinks that speaking is better when it is taught communicatively. Al-Mashharawi (2006:5) noted that "This helps to overcome specific problems in classroom such as high number of students, individual differences and the limited class time, through utilizing communicative strategies like pair and group work. Also it can build good habits like self - confidence and self - correction."

Students learn English for eight years, and they can't speak it satisfactorily. This comes as a result of the teacher's dominance of the class where the learner is only a silent listener. Communicative teaching of speaking breaks this barrier. The teacher has to secure a safe environment for the learner to talk, providing him with the social context required for this situation.

New teaching models call for new roles for language teachers. As we all know, the traditional teaching models are closed and at a standstill. The teachers occupy the commanding position and dominate the progress of all the teaching activities. But according to the new concept, the teaching models are open and multiple. The teaching

contents are open. The scope of the activities is open. So, language teachers must make a role transfer. They should change from dominators and commanders into organizers and explorers. (Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M, 1991:65)

Need for the study

The need for this study arises from three main things: the literature review on communicative language teaching and the roles of the teacher, real needs of teachers of English, and the personal experience of the researcher in this regard.

First, having reviewed the current literature, the researcher has figured out that the field of language teaching and learning is poor in studies concerning the roles of the teacher in light of the communicative approach to teaching **speaking**, and few studies touched briefly the area of difficulties and challenges which encounter the teachers in this regard. Many researchers admitted that studies on such areas are still relatively rare, and they invited other researchers to conduct more studies in this area.

Second, the unexpected low rate of success in UNRWA schools all over the Gaza strip is a problem which deserves to be studied. Due to the researcher's experience in teaching, the teachers' misunderstanding of their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking can be considered a remarkable part of the problem.

Third, the researcher's personal experience in this context. Being a teacher of EFL in UNRWA schools, the researcher believes that the role of the teacher in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking is not being performed the right way in UNRWA schools. The researcher asked many UNRWA teachers about their

perception towards their abilities in teaching speaking communicatively. They expressed that they did not receive or practice such important experience during their study or trained on this at work in courses.

The purpose of the study

This study aims to identify the extent to which UNRWA ninth grade teachers of English in the Gaza strip adopt their roles in the light of the communicative approach and the difficulties behind its adoption. According to the results, some pedagogical suggestions and recommendations will be offered to reduce those difficulties and develop the teachers' acquaintance and performance in this regard.

Significance of the study:

It is hoped that this study will benefit:

1. UNRWA education department: as it will draw attention to:
 - The difficulties and challenges compromising teachers' performance of their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking.
 - Directing the training courses towards the real needs and shortages on the part of the teachers of English.
2. Teachers: it will draw their attention to points of weakness in their teaching and the importance of knowing the nature of their roles in communicative teaching of speaking and its characteristics.
3. Students: they will benefit as a result of teachers' compliance with the suggestions and recommendations.

Statement of the problem

The problem of the study can be stated in the following questions:

1. What are the difficulties encountering UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking in the Gaza Strip?
2. What are the levels of the difficulties encountering UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking in the Gaza Strip?

Hypotheses

1. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the difficulties encountering UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking in the Gaza Strip due to teachers' sex.
2. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the difficulties encountering UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking in the Gaza Strip due to teachers' duty shift.
3. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the difficulties encountering UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking in the Gaza Strip due to teachers' age.
4. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the difficulties encountering UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking in the Gaza Strip due to teachers' experience.

Limitations of the study

The academic limit: English language teachers in UNRWA ninth grade.

Time and place limit: the study was conducted in the second semester in UNRWA schools in the Gaza Strip.

Definition of Terms:

Communicative language teaching: focuses on communicative proficiency rather than on mere mastering of structures. Communicative teaching aims to make communicative competence the goal of language teaching, and develops procedures for teaching the four skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication." (Zhang, 2006:4)

Communicative competence refers to a learner's L2 ability. It not only refers to a learner's ability to apply and use grammatical rules, but also to form correct utterances, and know how to use these utterances appropriately. (Richards & Rodgers, 2000: 8)

Linguistic competence: the ability to produce grammatically correct language forms and expressions. It measures how well people can form coherent and grammatically correct sentences. (Mota, 2008:11)

Teacher's roles: The way a teacher chooses to manage the classroom, e.g. a teacher can choose to take a controlling role, giving directions or instructions in front of the class or to take a less controlling role, **monitoring** students as they work. (Britishcouncil.org)

Difficulties: was defined in (en.wiktionary.org) as a factor causing trouble in achieving a positive result or tending to produce a negative result, and in (Glossary of Rasch

Measurement Terminology) as the level of resistance to successful performance of the agents of measurement on the variable.

Performing: To perform a work means to recite, render, play, dance, or act it, either directly or by means of any device or process. (PASSIA Diary 2002)

UNRWA: The UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East was established by UNGA Res. 302 of Dec. 1949 to give emergency assistance to Palestinians displaced by the War of 1948 and began to operate in May 1950. Its mandate, to provide essential education, health and relief services to Palestine refugees living in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and the WBGS, has been renewed repeatedly ever since. Headquarters are in Gaza. (PASSIA Diary 2002)

Novice teachers and experienced teachers:

Experience is gained gradually through real practice in the field. Newly appointed teachers start their steps in education with no much experience as those who spent years in teaching. Once the teacher starts to practice teaching, he starts to encounter problems to which he has to respond positively. From one year up to ten years, these problems appear new to the teacher and he learns how to deal with them applying theory to practice. In this stage, the teacher is called **novice**. In ten years, the teacher will have gained so much experience to be called experienced teacher. From ten years up to twenty years, the teacher has three things, experience, power and intention to practice strategies he has gained through the previous stage. From twenty years, the teacher starts to lose power and intention gradually, so experience without application is almost fruitless, and we can't guarantee that the teacher in this stage has the features of the experienced teacher.

Abbreviations

CA: communicative approach

CLT: communicative language teaching

TTT: teacher's talking time

STT: student's talking time

SPSS: Statistical Product and Service Solutions

UNRWA: United Nations for Relief and Working Agency

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature review

This chapter presents a review of the relevant literature of the theoretical background of communicative language teaching. This chapter includes the description of the following areas in language teaching: The evaluation of foreign and second language teaching approach, communicative approach in language teaching, communicative teaching of speaking, and the teachers' roles in communicative classrooms.

Evaluation of foreign and second language teaching approach

For along time in foreign and second language education, language has been viewed as 'object' which is to be analyzed and broken down into its smallest components. The teachers' role has, therefore, been to help students learn what is in the textbook which is mostly grammar driven, and the study of foreign and second language teaching has been largely decontextualized and unrelated to students' real life (Tedick & Walker, 1994:18)

The grammar-Translation Approach is one example of those decontextualized teaching methods. The Grammar-translation method focuses on, in particular, the memorization of grammatical features, vocabulary and, direct translations of text in the mother tongue. This method no longer fit the demands of learners to use language as a tool of communication. The instruction is given in the learners' native language, and teachers, therefore, do not have to be able to speak the target language. (Masanobu, 2009:13)

"As a reaction to the failure of the grammar-translation to produce learners who could use the target language, the Direct Approach was suggested. In this method no use of learners' mother tongue is permitted, teachers, therefore, must be native speakers or have nativelike proficiency in the target language. Since the spoken language is primary in this method, learners hear the language first before seeing it in written form. Grammar rules are taught after learners have practiced the grammar points in context, that is, grammar is taught inductively. This method, however, depended too much on the teacher's skill, and not all teachers were proficient enough in the foreign language to follow the principle of this method". (Richards & Rodgers, 1998:10)

After the direct approach showed its impracticability in foreign language classrooms, reading was considered as the most useful skill since not many people traveled abroad around 1930. In this Reading Approach, only the grammar useful for reading is taught, vocabulary is controlled based on frequency and usefulness, and translation is used like in grammar-translation method. The teacher, therefore, does not need to have good oral proficiency in the target language.

While the direct approach and reading approach had not dealt with language content systematically, under the influence of systematic structural linguistics and behavioral psychology, a new approach, which is called Audio-lingual method was introduced and became dominant in language classrooms during 1940s, 1950s and 1960s. In this method, "the structure was identified with its basic sentence patterns and grammatical structures. The language was taught by systematic attention to pronunciation and by intensive oral drillings of its basic sentence patterns. Pattern practice was a basic classroom technique." (Richards & Rodgers, 1998: 46).

As a reaction to the behaviorist teaching approaches such as audio-lingual method, Cognitive Approach was introduced. In this method, language learning is viewed as rule acquisition, not habit formation. Learner errors are viewed as inevitable and as evidence of constructive learning process. Grammar is taught deductively; rules first, practice later. Reading and writing are as important as listening and speaking. The teacher is expected to have good general proficiency in the target language as well as an ability to analyze the target language.

Both the Audio-lingual Approach and the Cognitive Approach have, however, shown a lack of affective consideration about language learners. As a result, Affective-humanistic Approaches such as The Counseling-Learning Approach was introduced in language classrooms. In this approach, 'understanding' is emphasized between the teacher and students, and respect is emphasized for each individual and his or her feelings. Learning a foreign language is viewed as a self-realization experience. The teacher is viewed as a counselor or facilitator and should be proficient both in the target language and the students' native language. Learners bring materials to the class and communication that is meaningful to learners is emphasized in this approach.

On the other hand, under the assumption that second or foreign language learning is very similar to the first language acquisition, the Comprehension-based Approach such as Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrel, 1983:27) and Total Physical Response (Asher, 1981) was introduced in language classrooms. In this approach, listening comprehension is viewed as the most important skill that will allow speaking, reading, and writing over time. That is, it emphasized that learners need to begin by listening to meaningful speech and they progress by being exposed to the comprehensible and

meaningful input that is a little beyond their current level of competence. In this approach, it was believed that learning language rules may help learners monitor but it does not aid their acquisition or spontaneous use of the target language. If the teacher is not a native or near native speaker, the use of appropriate materials such as audiotapes and videotapes is emphasized to provide the appropriate input for the learners.

Finally, among all kinds of teaching approach have been suggested in language teaching history, the most important and popular teaching approach over 35 years, since the 1970s is named the 'Communicative Approach'. Savignon (1984:81) pointed out that the Communicative Approach has been the centre of foreign language and second language teaching for past several decades and has been considered as one of the ideal teaching approaches all around the world by researchers, teachers and educators associated with language teaching. In the following, it is obvious that Communicative Approach need to be discussed in more details than any other teaching approach in language pedagogy.

Communicative approach in language teaching

This part consists of two subparts. First, the concept of communicative competence will be presented as a theoretical background of communicative language teaching in language education. Secondly, many aspects of communicative language teaching methods will be discussed, which are recommended by researchers in language classrooms.

Communicative Competence

Language is different from other subjects because language is fundamentally used to communicate with other people. In order to explain people's language ability, Chomsky (1965:4) distinguished between the term 'competence' and 'performance'. In his view, competence refers to the linguistic rules that an ideal speaker of a given language has internalized: "the speaker-hearer's knowledge of his language" (Chomsky, 1965:4) while performance refers to "the actual use of language in concrete situations" (Chomsky, 1965:4). Chomsky (1965:3) introduced that "linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogenous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance". Within Chomsky's view, language learning is, therefore, a matter of acquiring 'competence' which means knowledge of the grammar and linguistic systems. Criticizing this restricted view of competence, Hymes (1972:277) argued that a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences, not only as grammatical, but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts to take part in speech events and to evaluate their accomplishments by others. That is, he emphasized that there are social components in the heart of grammar. Socio-cultural aspects are, therefore, an important part of communicative competence that consists of the following four systems of knowledge:

1. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible.
2. Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available.
3. Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated.
4. Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually performed, and what its doing entails (Hymes, 1972:281).

Communicative competence is thus viewed by Hymes as the interaction of grammatical (what is formally possible), psycholinguistic (what is feasible in terms of human information processing), sociocultural (what is the social meaning or value of a given utterance), and probabilistic (what actually occurs) systems of competence. (Canale & Swain, 1980:16)

From the above theoretical background, theories of language, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and other language related disciplines, Canale and Swain (1980) proposed a broader notion of communicative competence. They presented that communicative competence includes not only grammatical competence but also contextualized and sociolinguistic competence, which confirms Hymes' idea. The theoretical framework of communicative competence developed by Canale and Swain (1980:32) suggests four components of communicative competence:

1. Grammatical competence. Knowledge of the sentence structure of a language.
2. Sociolinguistic competence. Ability to use language appropriate to a given context, taking into account the roles of the participants, the setting and the purpose of the interaction.

3. Discourse competence. Ability to recognize different patterns of discourse, to connect sentences of utterances to an overall theme to topic; the ability to infer the meaning of large units of spoken or written texts.
4. Strategic competence. Ability to compensate for imperfect knowledge of linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse rules or limiting factors in their application such as fatigue, distraction or inattention. (Savignon, 1983:46).

Based on the above paradigm of communicative competence, Savignon (1983:240) suggested an interacting relationship among those components. She explained, "Communicative competence is greater than linguistic or grammatical competence and that one does not go from one to another as one strings pearls on a necklace. Rather, an increase in one component interacts with the other components to produce a corresponding increase in overall communicative competence". She further concluded that "Whatever the relative importance of the various components at any given level of overall proficiency, it is important to keep in mind the interactive nature of their relationships. The whole of communicative competence is always something other than the simple sum of its parts"

The above theoretical concept of communicative competence was practically applied into second and foreign language pedagogy, especially by Savignon's work (1972; 1983). For language education, Savignon (1983:249) defined the communicative competence as "the expression, interpretation and negotiation of meaning involving interaction between two or more persons or between one person and a written or oral text". She believed that the goal of any language teaching program needs to be the development of this communicative competence of learners:

the expression, interpretation and negotiation of meaning. Since Savignon's work, in second and foreign language pedagogy, the development of learners' communicative competence in the target language has been the goal of communicative language teaching.

Communicative Language Teaching Methods

The communicative approach grew out of the idea that language is fundamentally a system for communication. (Larsen-Freeman, 1986:53). Therefore, "the term communicative approach has largely been understood to describe any approach to language teaching that claims to be based on a view of language as communication." (Berns, 1990:82).

In language teaching history, the acquisition of linguistic structure or vocabulary have been emphasized for a long time and it has been acknowledged that structures and vocabulary are important. However, many researchers (e.g. Widdowson, 1978; Larsen-Freeman, 1986) insisted that preparation for communication will be inadequate if only they are taught. That is, they argued that students might know the rules of language usage, but would be unable to use the language. Widdowson (1978:33) made a distinction between language usage and use. According to Widdowson (1978:33), language usage refers to the language system and language use refers to the manifestation of that system. The same view of Savignon (1983:249) and Widdowson (1978:33) is that language should be taught through language use. Berns (1990:79) asserted that the term communicative language teaching identifies new pedagogical orientations that have grown out of the realization that knowledge of grammatical

forms and structures alone does not adequately prepare learners for effective and appropriate use of the language they are learning.

The basic focus of communicative language teaching, therefore is on use rather than usage (Widdowson, 1978:33), on fluency rather than accuracy (Brumfit, 1984:102), on functions rather than forms (Van EK, 1979:98) and on process rather than product (Brumfit, 1984; Larsen-Freeman, 1986).

In fact, the concept of 'communicative language teaching' has gained prominence in language pedagogy through the work of Savignon (1983:249). Berns (1990:50) evaluated that Savignon's main view of language is 'meaning making'. Therefore, the main emphasis of communicative language teaching in Savignon's model is 'meaning' as shown in the following:

"The importance of meaningful language use at all stages in the acquisition of second and foreign language communicative skills has come to be recognized by language teachers around the world, and many curricular innovations have been proposed in response. 'Real communication' as proposed to the drill-like pseudo communication to which teachers and learners have accustomed, 'meaningful activity' and 'spontaneous expression' are now familiar terms in discussions of what should go in a language classroom" (Savignon, 1983:V, italics added)

Savignon (1983:238) believed that the focus on the meaning in language study provides learners with motivation to communicate and the experience of communication. Larsen-Freeman (1986:123) insisted that since communication is a process, it is insufficient for students to simply have knowledge of target language forms, meanings and functions. Students must be able to apply this knowledge in negotiating meaning. It is through the interaction between speaker and listener (or reader and writer) that meaning becomes clear. Littlewood (1995:20) also asserted that

"one important aspect of communicative skill is the ability to find language which will convey an intended meaning effectively in a specific situation"

Yalden (1981:6) claimed that in the communicative approach to language teaching, language is viewed not only as a body of knowledge about sounds, vocabulary, and grammar, a body which speakers possess in common (at least to a degree), but also very much as an instrument for interpersonal communication, for a whole range of purposes and in a wide variety of situations (many of which are quite unpredictable).

Littlewood (1995:1) also noted that "one of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language, combining these into a more fully communicative view". He also insisted that "the structural view of language is not sufficient on its own to account for how language is used as a means of communication", even though "the structural view of language has not been in any way superseded by the functional view". It was, therefore, emphasized that "the learner needs to acquire not only a repertoire of linguistic items, but also a repertoire of strategies for using them in concrete situations" (Littlewood, 1995:4).

Littlewood (1995:6) summarized four broad domains of skill which make up a person's communicative competence, and which must be recognized in foreign language teaching.

1. The learner must attain as high a degree as possible of linguistic competence.
2. The learner must distinguish between the forms which he has mastered as part of his linguistic competence, and the communicative functions that they

perform. That is, items mastered as part of a linguistic system must be understood as part of a communicative system.

3. The learner must develop skills and strategies for using language to communicate meanings as effectively as possible in concrete situations.
4. The learner must become aware of the social meaning of language forms.

Berns (1990:103) summarized that communicative language teaching is founded on an understanding of the nature of communication and the variability of norms for communication from context to context. Since it draws on the functional approach to linguistics, for its theoretical perspective on language, language use, and language development, the concepts of function and use refer not only to function in the sense of apologizing or describing but also to the ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions of language.

Communicative teaching of speaking

This part is divided into three subparts. First, the researcher justifies investigating speaking skill not any other skill. Second, he reviews the literature related to collaborative speaking. Third, he justifies investigating adult learners not young learners.

Why speaking

Since the teacher dominates the class talk all the time, the learners have little opportunity to make their contributions. Speaking skill is neglected or, in other words, not given its right during the class time. Al Mashharawi (2006:4) noted that "Speaking is fundamental to human communication. If the goal of language course is truly to

communicate in English, then speaking skill should be taught and practiced in the language classroom. It can be a lot of fun raising general learner motivation and making the classroom a dynamic and effective environment."

The communicative approach calls for increasing the students' talking time (STT) and decreasing the teacher's talking time (TTT). This comes as a result of providing the learners with opportunities to speak through cooperative independent activities. Harmer (2001:47) says that "Communication is the central feature in teaching and learning language. It is, between students, creates opportunities for them to participate in the negotiation of meaning, to perform a range of language functions, and to attend to both language forms and functions."

To know the language certainly differs from being able to speak it. When someone says '*I know English*' this does not mean that he can speak English. Scott (2005:28) adhered to this saying "It is this lack of genuine speaking opportunities which accounts for many students feeling that, however much grammar and vocabulary they '*know*', they are insufficiently prepared for speaking in the world beyond the classroom."

Al Mashharawi (2006:4) assured Scott and said "Learning to speak a foreign language requires more than knowing its grammatical and semantic rules. Students know how native speakers use language in real situations. Diversity in interaction involves not only verbal communication but also paralinguistic elements of speech such as pitch, stress and intonation."

Martine Bygate (1995:3) asserted that "One of the basic problems in foreign language teaching is to prepare learners to be able to use the language. How this preparation is done, and how successful it is, depends very much on how we as teachers understand our aims."

Johnson .K & Morrow .K (1987:71) clarified the role of the learner noting that the focus changes from the accurate production of isolated utterances to the fluent selection of appropriate utterances in communication. The learner is now concerned with using language, not English usage. In order to do this, learners take on roles and interact with other learners who also have roles. They added clarifying the role of the teacher "The role of the teacher changes, too. Instead of being the person who provides prompts that trigger utterances of a certain structure from the students, the teacher now sets up the conditions for communication to take place. Hence, the teacher will actually assume roles to model the language for the learners, or act as someone for the learners to communicate with."

Teaching speaking cooperatively

A good English conversation class involves more than sitting around chatting. To teach English conversation well, you'll need to carefully plan and direct the class, yet make sure the conversation stays spontaneous and uninhibited. (Sion, 2001:57)

The question of crowded classroom and the big number of students created a critical challenge on the part of the teachers especially in speaking activities. It badly affected the teacher's performance in communicative activities. (Johnes, 2000:14)

Richards (1996:142) stated that "pair and group work can greatly increase the amount of active speaking and listening undertaken by all students in the class."

In group work, learners perform a learning task through small group interaction. It is a form of learner activation that is of particular value in the practice of oral fluency. Al Mashharawi (2006:44) stated that "Learners in a class that is divided into five groups get five times as many opportunities to talk as in full –class organization."

Pair work allows teachers time to work with one or two pairs while the other students continue working. Harmer (2001:116) stated that "Students can practice language together in pair work, study a text, or take part in information gap activities. They can write dialogues, predict the content of reading texts or compare notes on what they have listened to or seen. The researcher thinks that pair work is suitable for activities such as mini-dialogue."

Why adults

According to the previous studies, the optimum age for language learning is proved to be adulthood. Haynes (2007:11) hypothesized that "Children learn a second language faster and more easily than teenagers and adults do." and investigated the validity of this hypothesis. Results proved the opposite of what he hypothesized. He believed that "In reviews of controlled research where young children were compared with teenagers and young adults, the teenagers and young adults learned a second language more readily."

Children under the age of 8 may outperform adults in the areas of social language and pronunciation because they usually have more occasions to interact socially. The requirements for communication are lower for younger students because they have less

language to learn when they interact in a school setting with their peers. Teenagers and adults, on the other hand, have acquired language learning and study skills. They use both acquisition and learning strategies to become fluent in their new language.

Kidd (1973:95) believed that the adult's mental learning state is not a black chalkboard on which you, the teacher, can write as you wish. Neither is the adult learner's head an empty pail for you to fill with your knowledge and ideas. The adult learner's chalkboard already has many messages on it, and his mental pail is almost full already. He said "Your job as teacher is not to fill a tabula rasa, but to help your participants to reorganize their own thoughts and skills. A prerequisite to helping adults learn is to understand how they learn."

The teacher's roles in CLT of speaking

If we look at foreign language learning as it occurs in the natural environment, it becomes clear that the processes of learning the language can work without any teacher at all, so long as the environment provides the necessary stimuli and experience. The most essential of these seem to be that the learner should need to use the foreign language for communicative purposes. (Littlewood, 1995:92)

This does not mean that teachers are not necessary, because the classroom is not the natural environment; unless the language classroom is intentionally structured, it will not provide learners either with adequate exposure to the foreign language or with adequate motivation to communicate through it. (Littlewood, 1995:92)

In his study, Liao (1996:3) asserted that "The teacher should only act as facilitator, advisor and monitor, co-communicator, motivator, good language model and evaluator while students should act as communicator."

The concept of the teacher as 'instructor' is thus inadequate to describe his overall function. In a broad sense, he is a 'facilitator of learning', and may need to perform in a variety of specific roles separately or simultaneously. (Littlewood, 1995:92)

With a safe classroom atmosphere, learners will contribute more, so the language teachers should make it possible for anxious students to maximize their language learning by building a non-threatening and positive learning environment. A comfortable classroom atmosphere facilitates language learning. The more comfortable the learners feel, the better they learn. (Gardner, D. & Miller, L, 1999)

Communicative approach takes its primary purpose as the development of students' ability to do things with language. It is both student-centered and task-based. In the class where students are provided with plenty of opportunities to be engaged in real-life communication in the target language, the teacher is more a patient listener than a talkative speaker. Instead of the teacher talking all the time, students take the initiative in class and actively indulge themselves in carrying out meaningful tasks with their partners or group members. (Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M, 1991:95)

So Littlewood (1995:92) assigned the teacher the role of "a general overseer of his students' learning, he must aim to coordinate the activities so that they form a coherent progression, leading towards greater communicative ability."

Learners feel frustrated and unsafe to speak under the pressure of overcorrection. In communicative classes, error correction is almost absent or infrequent. Littlewood (1995:94) asserted that "learners should not be constantly corrected. Errors are regarded with greater tolerance, as a completely normal phenomenon in the

development of communicative skills. He added that "The teacher will not intervene after initiating the proceedings, but will let learning take place through independent activity.

Instead of the teacher's correction of errors, learners may evaluate each other with the guidance of the teacher. This emerges in group and pair work. Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M, (1991:63) noted that with a cooperative rather than an individual approach to language learning, learners feel safer and less stressed since a good group atmosphere relaxes them and releases their tension. In addition, it is easier and more comfortable for them because they are speaking in a familiar and private environment, knowing that the communication and interaction are genuine.

"Cooperative learning brings learners together in adult like setting which, when carefully planned and executed, can provide appropriate models of social behavior." (Stevens & Slavin, 1995) quoted in (Gary 2004:332). Gary added quoting (Abruscato, 1994, Zehm & Kottler, 1993:145) "As a teacher, one of your most important roles will be to promote and model positive social interactions and relationships within your classroom.

Sometimes, the teacher may have to participate as a member of a group or take role in a play as one of the students. As Littlewood (1995:94) noted "He will sometimes wish to participate in an activity as 'co-communicator' with the learners. In this role, he can stimulate and present new language. This places him on an equal basis with the learners. This helps to break down tension and barriers between them."

More important than theory is practice. The question is, "Do teachers know their roles in communicative classrooms? Do they apply these roles practically?" In his study, Choi (1999:3) wanted to investigate the Korean teachers' beliefs about the communicative approach, and their performance in light of CLT approach. He found that:

"Korean EFL teachers had positive beliefs about the concepts of communicative language teaching, but it was reported that there were some discrepancies between their beliefs about CLT and their performance and practice of CLT in classroom instruction. The results showed that Korean English teachers supported the concepts of CLT, However, they reported that their teaching practices in classroom instruction were still largely teacher-centered, teacher-dominated and drill-driven rather than learner-centered."

Definition of the teacher's roles as facilitator in CLT

Richards and Rodgers (1998:79) said that the communicative teaching method aims to make communicative competence the goal of language teaching, and develops procedures for teaching the four skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication. It encourages activities that involve real communication and carry out meaningful tasks. Language teachers are expected to be managers, organizers, advisors, monitors, co-communicators, evaluators, good language models, and motivators.

Manager and Organizer:

In this role, one of the major responsibilities is to establish situations likely to promote communication" (Larsen-Freeman 1986: 131), trying "to organize the classroom as a setting for communication and communicative activities." (Richards and Rodgers 1998:78). Language is not spoken in a vacuum and communication takes place in a real situation, so classroom communicative activities should not be

performed abstractly but realistically in an appropriate situation. The teacher should set up situation by using words, visual aids, teacher's facial expressions, gestures and actions in classes where students exchange messages, solve problems to bridge the information gap, thus language is learned as it is actually used in real life situation.

Advisor and Monitor:

During learning activities, some students may have learning difficulties and need help, others may have problems and confusion to be settled, so the teacher is "expected to exemplify an effective communicator seeking to maximize the meshing of **speaker** intention and learner interpretation, through the use of paraphrase, confirmation and feedback." (Richards and Rodgers 1998: 78). He or she may walk around the classroom to a particular group, pair or individual to solve problems. Still other students may be not communicating effectively and making errors during conversation, so the teacher should act as a monitor.

Co-communicator:

At other times, the teacher might act as an independent participant with the students, thus insuring the two-way communication in class. However, the teacher is not a communicator for main purposes in order not to occupy students' communication time. He or she is only to demonstrate how to do activities, to help weaker students or to substitute an absent student.

Evaluator:

To examine how good students' performance in class is, and how much degree of their linguistic and communicative competences they have gained, the teacher should also act as an evaluator so as to improve his or her teaching if the evaluation does not

reach the desired goal. The teacher can informally evaluate students' performance on the role as an advisor, monitor or co-communicator. For some formal evaluation, the teacher is likely to use the integrative communicative test which contains '**rules of speaking**' as well as 'rules of grammar'. (Liao 1996:8)

Motivator:

Similarly, the teacher motivates the learners and facilitates maintaining discipline. If the teacher's knowledge and abilities are not enough to ensure him/her a dominant position, then the role of a dispenser of grades definitely enables the teacher to reign in the classroom. In short, according to the majority of the respondents, what the teacher should be primarily concerned with is motivating the students and teaching them not only about the language but also how to learn the language. What the teacher is preoccupied with, however, is sharing his/her knowledge with the learners and checking how well they have managed to take it in. (Kebrowska 1999:65).

Good language model:

Non native speakers are often not fluent in speaking or in their oral interaction with the class. They appear not relaxed and don't model accurate use of language. The teacher should provide a meaningful use of the language in communication activities where language is generally used by native **speakers**. (Liao 1996:8)

In brief and according to Littlewood (1995:94) "The teacher's role in the learning process is recognized as less dominant. More emphasis is placed on the learner's contribution through independent learning. The emphasis on communicative interaction provides more opportunities for cooperative relationships to emerge, both among learners and between teacher and learners."

The problem lies not only in the amount of information to be mastered, but in the organization and application of the knowledge to a practical situation. In other words the teacher can use his knowledge of linguistics, psychology, sociology and pedagogy to help students learn English." The researcher says that the teacher should be a good model for the students. (Harmer 2001:58)

The effective communicative teacher:

Role of caring

The impact of teachers on students learning is increased when students are taught by well-prepared professionals who combine their knowledge of the content and instructions with a deep sense of caring about their students. Effective teachers are not only caring (Johnson, 1997; Thomas & Montgomery, 1998), but also culturally competent and attuned to their students' interests and needs both in and out of school (Cruickshank & Haefele, 2001). Teachers who show that they care about students enhance the learning process and serve as role models to students (Collinson, et al., 1999). Caring is expressed in many ways, including the following:

- Listening
- Expressing feelings
- Knowing students on a personal level
- Demonstrating patience, honesty, trust, humility, hope, and courage
- Accommodating students' needs
- Using a considerate tone of voice and manner
- Paying attention to each student
- Showing receptive body language

- Valuing students' input in problem solving (Collinson et al.; Deiro, 2003; Ford & Trotman, 2001; Thomas & Montgomery, 1998).

Role of fairness and respect

Obviously, everyone wants to be treated in a fair and respectful manner. Often, fairness and respect are embodied in class rules, thus demonstrating the importance of these concepts. Every action taken by a teacher in the classroom, especially involving discipline can be perceived as fair or unfair. Perception is very powerful in determining fairness and respect, as each individual has his or her own internal definition of what constitutes such values. As a result, once student opinion has been set, it is difficult to change it. (James et al., 2004:33)

Attitude toward the Teaching Profession

Teachers' attitudes about the profession most directly affect the school climate. Some teachers are collegial in their demeanor, while others are disengaged (Woolfolk-Hoy & Hoy, 2003). A collegial approach enhances the school climate and the learning environment for students, but a purely social or disengaged one does little to enhance student achievement.

Promotion of enthusiasm and motivation for learning

Teachers fulfill multiple roles in their classrooms. Effective educators use their own enthusiasm for the subject as a tool to reach and motivate students. They are enthusiastic about the content they are teaching (Peart & Campbell, 1999) and they convey this feeling to their students through the activities they select, the energy they project, and their competence in the subject area. Effective teachers recognize that

motivation is critical to fostering and enhancing learning in students (NWREL, 2001). Their goal is not simply to present the material, but to see students' succeed in acquiring new knowledge (Ford & Trotman, 2001)

Cooperative learning

What good re critical thinking, reasoning, and problem-solving skills if your learners cannot apply them in interaction with others? Cooperative learning activities instill in learners important behaviors that prepare them to reason and perform in an adult world (Marzano, 2001).

In conclusion

Through out the review of the related literature, the researcher inferred that the main focus of communicative language teaching is learners' communicative competence. In order to achieve this aim, the teacher has to make a role transfer from dominator of the class into facilitator, helper and director of learning. Teachers of English have insufficient knowledge about their roles in communicative teaching of English. This reflects on their performance in communicative classes and on the learners' acquisition of communicative competence.

Previous studies

This part lists previous studies related to the communicative approach and to the teacher's roles in light of this approach.

Previous studies related to the communicative approach

Aydin's study (2003) This study investigated the attitudes of Turkish secondary school English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) teachers about various aspects of communicative language teaching, noting difficulties they encountered when teaching English communicatively in the Turkish EFL context. Data collection involved survey and focus group interviews with high school and university prep school teachers. Data analysis indicated that the teachers had favorable attitudes overall, and they agree that group/pair work activities developed oral conversational and communication skills, encountered students involvement to use English. Nonetheless, there were many constraints to teaching EFL, including the educational system (e.g, large classes and expectations of school administrators regarding classroom management and implementation of curriculum); the students (e.g, lack of motivation to participate); and the teachers themselves, teachers' reservations about teaching EFL stemmed from the conflict between what they believed and what they could actually practice within the context of their schools.

Bachrudin's study (2001) This paper describes the difficulties encounter Indonesian Ministry of National Education teachers in preparing students to use the English language for real life purposes after a course of study. It discusses the Indonesian government's 1994 English curriculum and makes suggestions as to how to

achieve the goals of the new curriculum. It argues that too much emphasis is placed on the learning of grammar and syntax, and not enough time and effort are spent on actually learning to speak English as it is spoken in countries where it is the first language.

Nathan's study (2001) This study examined a communicative language teaching program within a Taiwanese elementary school, investigating whether the program would improve students' English skills, which variables would account for improved English skills, whether participation students would enjoy the program, and implications for teaching English in other Taiwanese elementary language lessons taught by both Taiwanese and American native speakers of English. Teachers were trained in CLT and agreed to implement a CLT program within their schools. Researchers observed the classes. Students completed pretest and posttest of oral, reading, and writing skills. Students also completed pre and post intervention interviews about their experiences written surveys on their perceptions of the quality of their English teaching programs. Results indicated that students showed improvement in the development of all examined aspects of their English language skills. Variables influencing their improved English skills included having previously attended after-school classes in language centers and being satisfied with English classes. Most students enjoyed their CLT English classes.

Choi's study (1999) This study investigated the communicative language teaching in Korean middle school English classrooms as a foreign language from the teachers' perspectives. The purpose of this descriptive survey research was to explore Korean English teachers' beliefs about communicative language teaching (CLT) and

their beliefs about the main objectives of English teaching as well as teachers' practices of CLT in classroom instruction. School and classroom English teaching environments in the Korean context were also described. The target population of this study was all middle school English teachers in Seoul, Korea. The questionnaires, consisting of a total of 80 items, were sent to 110 Korean EFL teachers selected randomly from the target population. The data of 97 valid responses were coded and analyzed, using descriptive and correlational statistics. The results of the study showed that Korean EFL teachers had positive beliefs about the concepts of communicative language teaching, but it was reported that there were some discrepancies between their beliefs about CLT and their practices of CLT in classroom instruction. They reported that their teaching practices in classroom instruction were still largely teacher-centered, teacher-dominated and drill-driven rather than learner-centered.

Zhang's study (1997) This study identifies and describes the difficulties faced by secondary school teachers of English as a foreign language (TEFL) in Qinghai Province (China) in adopting the communicative approach to language instruction. It examines the perceptions of both teachers and teacher trainers. Data were drawn from semi-structured interviews with one trainer and five trainees following a workshop on the communicative approach and from a program evaluation questionnaire completed by 19 participants (transcripts of both appended). Salient problems in implementing the communicative approach include: pressure of external examinations on both teachers and students, the textbook-centered nature of the uniform curriculum, problems inherent in ethnic minority education, the low status and poor motivation of teachers, teachers' distrust of educational administrators and their ideas, teachers' low level of

proficiency, poor facilities, and the location of the training sessions far from the province itself.

Al-Shirbini's Study (1988) This study aimed to analyze needs teachers of English for communicative and interactive methodology. It designed methodology course to achieve communicative aim of English teachers programs. The researcher used the experimental approach. The results of this research reinforced the integration of methodology and language. The results showed that the achieved degree of progress refer to the techniques of teaching programs. They proved that the theoretical basic of designing is correct through application and experimentation. They indicated that students achieved high degree as a result of this teaching program.

Abu-Aboud's Study (1987) This study examined the effect of an in- service teacher training course on the communicative competence of English language students in schools in Amman. The researcher prepared and administrated a test that was based on devices and techniques the teachers had to use to foster functional English and to achieve a communicative goal of the language. He used correlated T-test and the results revealed that the course improved students' communicative ability in the target language skills. The findings of the study revealed the need to study the in-service teacher training course offered by the Ministry of Education and Jordanian universities and examined their direct connection with English language curriculum.

Commentary on previous studies related to the communicative approach

These studies were conducted by different researchers in different universities and schools. There were relations similarities and differences between these studies and the current study. Some of the studies focused on analyzing needs of English teachers for communicative and interactive methodology, some concentrated on examining the effect of an in-service teacher training course on the communicative competence of English language students, and the others focused on investigating the effects of using cooperative learning strategy for developing oral communication skills of students.

Previous studies related to speaking skill

Jahan's study (2008) This paper aims to explore the problems of teaching speaking in English at tertiary level in Bangladesh and tends to find out the solutions regarding this issue. Since English is a significant vehicle of communication in this era of globalization, the complications in learning and teaching these skills must be solved. Therefore, through questionnaire survey including teachers and students, those conditions have been investigated by some statistical tools and found that the problems lie mainly within the teaching methods and techniques. Moreover, significant statistical association has been tested between students' satisfaction of language competence in spoken English before instruction and the level of their improvement in speaking skills after instruction.

Al-khuli's Study (2002) The main concern of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of using questioning strategy on developing the 1st secondary school students' speaking skill. The sample of the pilot study was randomly selected from

some secondary schools located in northern Cairo Educational directorate. Two questionnaires were designed to identify and select most suitable questioning strategies for the students' needs and interests and to find out the view points of teachers and professional experts in the field. The results of study showed much higher significance differences in favor of the experimental group and raised many proposals which need to be explored.

Al-Dakel's Study (1998) This study aimed to evaluate speaking skills in English among 3rd year secondary students for both literary and scientific section in Libya Jamahiriya. The researcher used the descriptive approach. He applied a questionnaire in this study. The sample was chosen from two secondary schools in Bani Waid city in Libya Jamahiriya. The researcher used another questionnaire for a sample of 25 teachers. The results of both questionnaires indicate the existence of the problem of the present study. There is poor standard of oral skill among the students. The preliminary result emphasized on the need to attempt to tackle this problem and suggest some measures to face and treat it.

Negem's Study (1996) This study aimed at developing a programmatic approach to discourse and revealing the functional links and interrelations between speaking and writing. The researcher depended on the interrelation between speaking and writing. The results argued that the same discourse function could be realized in both speaking and writing. Both of them are a media for communication and expression.

Abed Allah's Study (1996) aimed at discovering the nature of the relationship between speech and writing as manifested in linguistic theory. The researcher analyzed and revised over-lapping, specialized functions and types of linguistic form of discourse. The results showed that both spoken and written language is a kind of communication, but speech is from face to face interaction. The researcher recommended the other studies in the same field.

Negem's Study (1995) This study aimed at providing that speaking and writing are interdiscursive modes. The researcher compared between speech and written sentences to argue that speaking and writing are inter-discursive rather than completely different. He said that writing is detected talking, and the unconscious problems that occur in written sentences. Also, the speaker can explain two ideas in one sentence, the same problem can occur in written form.

Commentary on previous studies related to teaching speaking

The previous studies related to speaking focused on evaluating speaking skills in English among students to attempt to tackle speaking difficulties on the part of students. These studies also emphasized investigating the effectiveness of using questioning strategy on developing speaking skill. In addition to that, they aimed at discovering the nature of the relationship between speech and writing as manifested in linguistic theory. They completely differ from the present study, since they used different methods of searching. These studies were applied on different levels from different universities and used tests and questionnaires, which were used to achieve their aims. The majority of the previous studies revealed important results for students, but little studies for teachers. Accordingly, the researcher will benefit from these

studies in different points, especially in writing the theoretical framework, recommendations, and the design of the observation card and explanation of issues.

Previous studies related to the teachers' roles

Liao's study (1997) This descriptive paper aims to explore the roles of the learner, teacher and learning materials in communicative classrooms. It also outlines the link between linguistic and communicative competence and concluded that both should be taught for effective communication. Results indicated that teachers should act as managers of learning activities, advisors during activities, co-communicators, motivators and evaluators. The students' role is primarily as communicators. Instructional materials serve to promote language use.

Liao's study (1996) This paper discusses a Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TRSOL) method appropriate for use in classrooms in China and offers a methodological framework with the teaching principles. This method combines the communicative approach to language teaching with more traditional grammar method. TESOL approaches in China are influenced by the national College Entrance Examination and the new syllabus of China, and teaching methods must be in sync with these guides and encompass the theory of communicative language teaching. This new emphasis on communicative use as well as conscious cognition of language use may be called the communicative-cognition method. Using this approach, the teacher should only act as facilitator, advisor and monitor, co-communicator, and evaluator, while students should act as communicators ensuring that the student is the center of all classroom work, and increased practice without teacher explanation or interference.

Rod's study (1990) This study is a discussion of the relationship between teacher, learner and instructional materials in second language teaching. Using the communicative approach argues that the teacher is the primary element of instructional effectiveness, without which the other salient features of the approach, learner-centeredness and appropriate materials, can not be implemented. It is proposed that teachers can be enthusiastic about their classrooms and about new approaches if they have been encouraged in their training experiences and attained a degree of proficiency in the language they teach. In addition, socioeconomic security and stability are seen as essential to teacher effectiveness beyond a minimal standard.

Commentary on previous studies related to teacher's roles

Very few studies touch the teacher's roles in light of the communicative approach. These studies varied in the targeted group of study and in results but they all agreed on the idea that the focus is effective communication and that the teacher should act as a facilitator, director and helper, and he should stop acting as the dominator of the classroom activity.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The Methodology

Introduction

This chapter contains a description of the methodology of the study, the population, the sample, the instrumentation, the pilot study, a description of the observation card used in the study and the research design.

The methodology of the study

The study attempted the descriptive analytical approach. This approach is considered a broad and flexible umbrella which may include a number of sub-approaches and methods such as social surveys, case studies, and others. The descriptive approach is based on determining the characteristics of the phenomenon, describing its nature and identifying the relationship between its variables, causes and effects, to revolve around the aspects of exploring the depths of the problem. Some researchers considered that the descriptive approach includes all other approaches except for the two approaches Historical and empirical, because the process of description and analysis of the phenomena is almost an issue of common, and found in all kinds of scientific research. The descriptive approach relies on the interpretation of the status quo (i.e., what really exists) and determines the relationship between the variables. The approach goes beyond a mere collection of descriptive data and descriptive analysis of the phenomenon. It links the interpretation of these data, classification, measurement and extracting the results. (Morcy, 1986: 96)

The study population

The community of the study consisted of all ninth grade male and female teachers of English in UNRWA schools in the Gaza strip who work in the second term (2008 – 2009). The population of the study was (89) teachers (52) males and (37) females.

The sample of the study

Pilot study:

The pilot sample of the study consisted of (20) teachers with percentage of (22.4%) from the community of the study. The pilot study aims to assure the reliability and the stability of the study instrument.

Sample of the study:

The sample of the study consists of (24) teachers with percentage of (27%). These were stratified and randomly chosen from a purposive sample of English teachers at the UNRWA who work in the second term (2008–2009). Tables (1,2,3,4) show the distribution of the sample.

Table (1)
The distribution of the sample according to teacher's sex

sex	Frequency	Percent
male	12	50.0
female	12	50.0
Total	24	100.0

Table (2)
The distribution of the sample according to duty shift

shift	Frequency	Percent
am	12	50.0
pm	12	50.0
Total	24	100.0

Table (3)
The distribution of the sample according to Experience

exp.	Frequency	Percent
less than 7 years	9	37.5
from 7 to 14 years	7	29.2
more than 14 years	8	33.3
Total	24	100.0

Table (4)
The distribution of the sample according to age

age	Frequency	Percent
less than 30 year	11	45.8
from 30 to 40 year	6	25.0
more than 40 year	7	29.2
Total	24	100.0

The instrumentation

This study attempted two different tools, interviews and observation cards.

Interviews: the researcher interviewed English UNRWA experts and well-trained teachers to investigate and come out with a list of difficulties encountering ninth grade teachers of English in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking.

Observation card: the researcher attended a class for each participant of the teachers to observe him in accordance with the items in the observation card. The observation card is considered the main instrument in this study, to get data and information.

The researcher followed the following procedures to build the observation card:

1. He investigated the literature related to this study in general to avail from its tools, procedures and content, and came out with a list of six scopes of difficulties as shown in page (31).
2. He asked open questions to teachers and experts to express the difficulties that encounter teachers in teaching English speaking communicatively as shown in appendix (1)
3. He built an initial form of the observation card consisting of (38) items.
4. He categorized the items he came out with into six main scopes as shown in appendix (2)
5. He consulted a group of UNRWA supervisors and university professors who are specialists in education and methods of teaching to make their views on the appropriateness of the items.

6. He modified the content of the observation card in accordance with the comments of the referees to come out with its final form consisting of 35 items developed into six scopes as shown in appendix (3).

Recorded phone call interview: this tool was conducted at the end of the study.

The researcher found that the teachers' performance of their roles in light of the communicative approach is unsatisfactory, and this can be attributed to three things: lack of theoretical knowledge on the part of the teachers, lack of practical knowledge, or unwillingness to perform. To determine which one of the previously mentioned possibilities, the researcher conducted this tool calling five teachers randomly selected from the real sample of the study and asking them five questions. (appendices 4)

Validity of the observation card:

Honesty:

The observation card was shown in its initial form to a group of local university professors who are specialists in education and methods of teaching. They make their views and comments on the appropriateness of the items in the observation card, and the relevance of the items to each of the six areas of the card, In the light of those views, certain items were excluded and some of the others were amended to have (35) distributed as in table number (5):

Table (5)
Shows the number of the items in each scope in the observation card

Scopes	No. of items
Manager and organizer	8
Advisor and monitor	4
Evaluator	5
Good language model	6
Motivator	5
Co-communicator	7
total	35

Internal consistency:

Al Agha & Al Ostaz (2004: 110) state that the internal consistency indicates the correlation of the degree of each item with the total of the observation card. The internal validity coefficient was computed by using Pearson formula. The following tables (6,7,8,9,10,11) show the data analysis of the correlation coefficient of each item with the scope to which it belongs, and compare the whole degree of the observation card by using the SPSS.

Table (6)
Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the first scope with the total degree of this scope

Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. value	Sig. level
1. There is evidence of planned cooperative learning in speaking lessons. (group work – pair work)	0.869	0.000	sig. at 0.01
2. The teacher allows students to ask peers for help in speaking lessons.	0.734	0.000	sig. at 0.01
3. The teacher intervenes when discussion gets off the track in speaking lessons	0.754	0.000	sig. at 0.01
4. The teacher operates and distributes time appropriately to lesson stages. (warm up 3-4min, presentation 10-15min, practice 10min, production 10min, round up 5min)	0.650	0.002	sig. at 0.01
5. The teacher allows acceptable time (10-13sec) after questions for formulation of good answers in speaking lessons	0.590	0.006	sig. at 0.01
6. The teacher invites alternative or additional answers in speaking lessons	0.876	0.000	sig. at 0.01
7. The teacher involves a large proportion of the class in speaking lessons.	0.644	0.002	sig. at 0.01
8. The teacher allows students to respond to one another in speaking lessons	0.790	0.000	sig. at 0.01

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.444

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.561

Table (7)

Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the second scope with the total degree of this scope

Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
1. The teacher calls on non-volunteers as well as volunteers in speaking lessons	0.869	0.000	sig. at 0.01
2. The teacher helps students rather than controls them in speaking lessons.	0.882	0.000	sig. at 0.01
3. The teacher goes around offering help and checking up with students in the communicative activities.	0.769	0.000	sig. at 0.01
4. There is good question orientation in speaking lessons.	0.714	0.000	sig. at 0.01

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.444

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.561

Table (8)

Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the third scope with the total degree of this scope

Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
1. Error correction takes place after the student finishes his talk in speaking lessons	0.890	0.000	sig. at 0.01
2. The teacher gives priority to fluency rather than accuracy in speaking lessons	0.875	0.000	sig. at 0.01
3. The teacher gives the student opportunity to talk to the end within the track on the lesson in speaking lessons	0.951	0.000	sig. at 0.01
4. The teacher doesn't interrupt the student's flow of speech in communicative activity even if there are errors.	0.946	0.000	sig. at 0.01
5. The teacher avoids overcorrection when the student is talking in speaking lessons.	0.896	0.000	sig. at 0.01

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.444

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.561

Table (9)
Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the fourth scope with the total degree of this scope

Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
1. The teacher appears relaxed when interacting with the children in speaking lessons.	0.863	0.000	sig. at 0.01
2. The teacher is fluent in the target language	0.952	0.000	sig. at 0.01
3. The teacher is accurate in the target language	0.926	0.000	sig. at 0.01
4. The teacher rephrases and repeats messages in a variety of ways to clarify them in speaking lessons.	0.822	0.000	sig. at 0.01
5. The teacher varies intonation to mirror message in speaking lessons.	0.834	0.000	sig. at 0.01
6. The teacher models accurate use of language.	0.912	0.000	sig. at 0.01

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.444

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.561

Table (10)
Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the fifth scope with the total degree of this scope

Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
1. The teacher praises appropriate behavior or answer in speaking lessons.	0.607	0.005	sig. at 0.01
2. On-the-spot corrects incorrect answers in the flow of the student's speech.	0.908	0.000	sig. at 0.01
3. The teacher encourages and guides critical thinking in speaking lessons.	0.831	0.000	sig. at 0.01
4. The teacher accepts and acknowledges all answers ("I see what you mean,") or by reflecting, clarifying, or summarizing.	0.823	0.000	sig. at 0.01
5. The teacher encourages students to evaluate their own or one another's answers.	0.881	0.000	sig. at 0.01

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.444

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.561

Table (11)
Pearson Correlation coefficient for every item from the sixth scope with the total degree of this scope

Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
1. The teacher allows sufficient time when students are working cooperatively in speaking lessons	0.907	0.000	sig. at 0.01

Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
2. The teacher provides opportunities for students to interact socially in speaking lessons	0.799	0.000	sig. at 0.01
3. The teacher focuses on meaning rather than form in speaking lessons.	0.811	0.000	sig. at 0.01
4. The teacher provides opportunities for students' participation and questions.	0.709	0.000	sig. at 0.01
5. The teacher encourages students to interact directly by asking students to comment on each other's remarks	0.861	0.000	sig. at 0.01
6. The teacher checks to see whether answers has been understood in speaking lessons	0.813	0.000	sig. at 0.01
7. The teacher asks questions on matters of opinion, where any answer is right in speaking lessons.	0.911	0.000	sig. at 0.01

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.444

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.561

The results of tables (6,7,8,9,10,11) show that the value of these items were suitable and highly consistent and valid for conducting this study. The researcher also made sure of the correlation between the six scopes with the total degree of the observation card, and the six scopes with others as shown in table (12).

Table (12)

Pearson Correlation coefficient for every scope from the observation card with the total degree of the observation card and the scopes with others scopes

	Total	Manager and organizer	Advisor and monitor	Evaluator	Good language model	Motivator	Co-communicator
Total	1.000						
Manager and organizer	0.938	1.000					
Advisor and monitor	0.918	0.838	1.000				
Evaluator	0.953	0.903	0.869	1.000			
Good language model	0.868	0.721	0.795	0.732	1.000		
Motivator	0.941	0.809	0.835	0.903	0.835	1.000	
Co-communicator	0.970	0.922	0.854	0.902	0.813	0.896	1.000

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.444

r table value at df (18) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.561

As shown in the table (12), there is correlation between the scopes and the total degree, and each scope with the other scopes at sig. level (0.01) which shows a high internal consistency of the observation card which reinforces its validity.

Reliability

The test is reliable when it gives the same results if it is reapplied in the same conditions (Al Agha & Al Ostaz, 2004: 108). The researcher used the pilot study to calculate the reliability of the observation card which was measured by Alpha Cronback and split-half methods.

The researcher calculated the correlation between the first and the second half of each domain of the observation card and the whole of its items. Then, the researcher used Spearman Brown Formula to modify the length of the observation card to find out the reliability coefficient as shown in table (13).

Table (13)
Correlation coefficient between the two halves of each domain before modification and the reliability after modification

Scope	No. of items	Correlation between two parts	Reliability after modifying
Manager and organizer	8	0.792	0.884
Advisor and monitor	4	0.625	0.769
Evaluator	5	0.897	0.947
Good language model	6	0.862	0.926
Motivator	5	0.806	0.893
Co-communicator	7	0.927	0.941
Total	35	0.958	0.959

* The researchers used Gutman coefficient for unequal halves.

The table shows that the reliability coefficient by using split-half after modification is more than (0.769) and this indicates that the observation card is reliable and satisfactory to apply on the sample of the study.

A total sample of 20 teachers participated in testing the reliability of the observation card, Alpha formula was used to determine the reliability of the observation card as shown in table (14).

Table (14)
Alpha Correlation Coefficient of the observation card Reliability

Scope	Number of Items	Alpha Cronbach
Manager and organizer:	8	0.877
Advisor and monitor:	4	0.818
Evaluator:	5	0.948
Good language model:	6	0.940
Motivator:	5	0.874
Co-communicator:	7	0.923
total	35	0.979

The results of table (14) showed that the ranges of reliability of the two domains were above 0.818. So results indicate that the observation card is suitable for conducting such a study. The reliability of the observation card was measured by Alpha Cronbach and the split-half methods.

Inter-rater reliability

Inter-rater reliability is the extent to which two or more individuals (coders or raters) agree. The inter-rater reliability addresses the consistency of the implementation of a rating system. It is dependent upon the ability of two or more individuals to be consistent. The researcher discussed the items of the observation card with two UNRWA experts and two UNRWA teachers. (Their names are listed in appendix 5). One of the experts or the teachers accompanied the researcher in classes to observe the same teacher and fill in the observation card to have two observation cards and two raters for one observed teacher. Holisty coefficient was used to calculate the reliability by using the following equation:

$$\text{Inter rater reliability coefficient} = \frac{\text{times of agreement}}{\text{times of agreement} + \text{times of differences}}$$

Table (15)
The calculation of Holisty coefficient for inter-rater reliability

No. of items	No. of o. card	Times of agreement + time of differences	Time of differences	Times of agreement	Inter rater reliability coefficient
35	10	350	36	314	89.7 %

Table (15) shows that the inter-rater reliability percentage is (86.6%). This means that the observation card is reliable and suitable for implementation.

Statistical treatment:

The researcher used the following statistical styles:

1. Frequencies and percentages.
2. Mann Whintny test.
3. One Way ANOVA and Scheffe post test.
4. Alpha Cronbach
5. Split-half method
6. Gutman correlation coefficient
7. Spearman correlation coefficient

Chapter IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction:

After describing the procedures in this study which explores the difficulties encountering UNRWA ninth grade English teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach, this chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis of the data collected from the observation card. For the data analysis, descriptive statistics and co-relational statistics were used. The results were organized in a way to answer each research question apart.

Results of the research question number one.

The major question is: What are the Difficulties Encountering UNRWA Ninth-Grade Teachers in performing their Roles in Light of the Communicative Approach to Teaching Speaking in the Gaza Strip?

To answer this question, the researcher reviewed the literature related to this area of study and came out with six main scopes, each scope represents a major role of the teacher in the communicative classroom (see literature review p.12).

The six main scopes of difficulties are as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Manager and organizer | 2. Advisor and monitor |
| 3. Evaluator | 4. Good language model |
| 5. Motivator | 6. Co-communicator |

In order to get the difficulties related to each scope, the researcher conducted brief interviews and asked open questions to three experts in the field of teaching methods and the fundamentals of education in UNRWA, about the difficulties which

encounter ninth grade teachers of English in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach in each scope as shown in table (16)

Table (16)

This table lists the six questions asked in the brief interviews with experts about each scope.

1.	What are the difficulties encountering 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>managers and organizers</u> in communicative speaking classes?
2.	What are the difficulties encountering 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>advisors and monitors</u> in communicative speaking classes?
3.	What are the difficulties encountering 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>evaluators</u> in communicative speaking classes?
4.	What are the difficulties encountering 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>good language models</u> in communicative speaking classes?
5.	What are the difficulties encountering 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>motivators</u> in communicative speaking classes?
6.	What are the difficulties encountering 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>co-communicators</u> in communicative speaking classes?

Table (17) lists the answers of expert No. 1

1. Manager and organizer:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely use pair and group work in speaking lessons.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't allow students to ask peers for help in speaking lessons.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't allow enough time after questions for formulation of good answers in speaking lessons.
2. Advisor and monitor:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't go around offering help and checking up with students in the communicative activities in speaking lessons.
3. Evaluator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Error correction takes place on the spot where the student is not done with the answer in speaking lessons.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers overcorrect student in speaking lessons.
4. Good language model:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers appear upset (not confident or relaxed) when interacting with the students in speaking lessons.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers are not fluent in the target language.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers are not accurate in the target language.
5. Motivator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely praise appropriate behavior or answer in speaking lessons.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely create a sense of safety to speak in the students.
6. Co-communicator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't allow sufficient time when students are working cooperatively in speaking lessons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't focus on meaning rather than form in speaking lessons.

Table (18) lists the answers of expert No. 2

1. Manager and organizer:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely intervene when discussion gets off the track in speaking lessons.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely operate and distribute time appropriately to lesson stages.
2. Advisor and monitor:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers control students rather than help them in speaking lessons.
3. Evaluator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers interrupt the student's flow of speech in communicative activity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers overcorrect student in speaking lessons.
4. Good language model:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely model accurate use of language.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't vary intonation to mirror messages in speaking lessons.
5. Motivator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely encourage and guide critical thinking in speaking lessons.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't accept and acknowledge all answers by reflecting, clarifying, or summarizing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely create a sense of safety to speak in the students.
6. Co-communicator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't ask questions on matters of opinion, where any answer is right in speaking lessons.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't check to see whether answers have been understood in speaking lessons.

Table (19) lists the answers of expert No. 3

1. Manager and organizer:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't invite alternative or additional answers in speaking lessons.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't involve the largest proportion of the class in speaking lessons.
2. Advisor and monitor:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't call on non-volunteers as well as volunteers in speaking lessons.
3. Evaluator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't give priority to fluency rather than accuracy in speaking lessons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers overcorrect student in speaking lessons.
4. Good language model:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely model accurate use of language.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't rephrase and repeat messages in a variety of ways to clarify them in speaking lessons.
5. Motivator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't encourage students to evaluate their own or one another's answers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers rarely create a sense of safety to speak in the students.
6. Co-communicator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't encourage students to interact directly by asking students to comment on each other's remarks.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers don't check to see whether answers have been understood in speaking lessons.

The researcher integrated the answers together under each scope and turned all the difficulties into positive affirmative items (should be all in one direction to suit Likart Scale) developed under six scopes to form the **observation card** as follows:

Table (20)

This table lists the difficulties resulted from the interviews conducted by the researcher to answer the major question.

1. Manager and organizer:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is evidence of planned cooperative learning in speaking lessons. (group work – pair work) b. The teacher allows students to ask peers for help in speaking lessons. c. The teacher intervenes when discussion gets off the track in speaking lessons d. The teacher operates and distributes time appropriately to lesson stages. (warm up 3-4min, presentation 10-15min, practice 10min, production 10min, round up 5min) e. The teacher allows acceptable time (10-13sec) after questions for formulation of good answers in speaking lessons f. The teacher invites alternative or additional answers in speaking lessons g. The teacher involves a large proportion of the class in speaking lessons. h. The teacher allows students to respond to one another in speaking lessons
2. Advisor and monitor:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The teacher calls on non-volunteers as well as volunteers in speaking lessons b. The teacher helps students rather than controls them in speaking lessons. c. The teacher goes around offering help and checking up with students in the communicative activities. d. There is good question orientation in speaking lessons.

3. Evaluator:

- a. Error correction takes place after the student finishes his talk in speaking lessons
- b. The teacher gives priority to fluency rather than accuracy in speaking lessons
- c. The teacher gives the student opportunity to talk to the end within the track on the lesson in speaking lessons
- d. The teacher doesn't interrupt the student's flow of speech in communicative activity even if there are errors.
- e. The teacher avoids overcorrection when the student is talking in speaking lessons.

4. Good language model:

- a. The teacher appears relaxed when interacting with the students in speaking lessons.
- b. The teacher is fluent in the target language
- c. The teacher is accurate in the target language
- d. The teacher rephrases and repeats messages in a variety of ways to clarify them in speaking lessons.
- e. The teacher varies intonation to mirror message in speaking lessons.
- f. The teacher models accurate use of language.

5. Motivator:

- a. The teacher praises appropriate behavior or answer in speaking lessons.
- b. The teacher encourages and guides critical thinking in speaking lessons.
- c. The teacher accepts and acknowledges all answers ("I see what you mean,") or by reflecting, clarifying, or summarizing.
- d. The teacher encourages students to evaluate their own or one another's answers.
- e. The teacher creates a sense of safety to speak among the students.

6. Co-communicator:

- a. The teacher allows sufficient time when students are working cooperatively in speaking lessons
- b. The teacher provides opportunities for students to interact socially in speaking lessons
- c. The teacher focuses on meaning rather than form in speaking lessons.
- d. The teacher provides opportunities for students' participation and questions.
- e. The teacher encourages students to interact directly by asking students to comment on each other's remarks
- f. The teacher checks to see whether answers have been understood in speaking lessons
- a. The teacher asks questions on matters of opinion, where any answer is right in speaking lessons.

Results of the research question number two.

The first question is: What are the levels of Difficulties Encountering UNRWA Ninth Grade Teachers in performing their Roles in Light of the Communicative Approach to Teaching Speaking in the Gaza Strip?

To answer this question the researcher used the frequencies, the sum of responses, the means, std. deviation, the percent weight and the rank of each item in the observation card. Tables (21,22,23,24,25,26,27) show that:

First: Manager and organizer:**Table (21)**

Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation. And the % weight and rank of each item from of the manager and organizer

No.	items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank
A1	There is evidence of planned cooperative learning in speaking lessons. (group work – pair work)	70	2.917	1.283	58.3	5
A2	The teacher allows students to ask peers for help in speaking lessons.	68	2.833	0.963	56.7	6
A3	The teacher intervenes when discussion gets off the track in speaking lessons	88	3.667	0.637	73.3	1
A4	The teacher operates and distributes time appropriately to lesson stages. (warm up 3-4min, presentation 10-15min, practice 10min, production 10min, round up 5min)	82	3.417	1.018	68.3	2
A5	The teacher allows acceptable time (10-13sec) after questions for formulation of good answers in speaking lessons	72	3.000	1.022	60.0	3
A6	The teacher invites alternative or additional answers in speaking lessons	66	2.750	1.225	55.0	7
A7	The teacher involves a large proportion of the class in speaking lessons.	72	3.000	0.978	60.0	4
A8	The teacher allows students to respond to one another in speaking lessons	54	2.250	0.944	45.0	8

From table (21) we can see that items No. 3 & 4 occupied the highest two ranks:

- No. (3) "The teacher intervenes when discussion gets off the track in speaking lessons" occupied the first rank with percent weight (73.3 %).
- No. (4) "The teacher operates and distributes time appropriately to lesson stages. (warm up 3-4 min, presentation 10-15min, practice 10min, production 10min, round up 5min)" occupied the second rank with percent weight (68.3%).

And items No. 6 & 8 occupied the lowest two ranks:

- No. (6) "The teacher invites alternative or additional answers in speaking lessons" occupied the seventh rank with percent weight (55%).
- No. (8) "The teacher allows students to respond to one another in speaking lessons" occupied the eighth rank with percent weight (45.00%).

Second: Advisor and monitor:

Table (22)

Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each difficulty from the Advisor and monitor scope

No.	Items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	%	rank
B1	The teacher calls on non-volunteers as well as volunteers in speaking lessons	65	2.708	0.955	54.2	4
B2	The teacher helps students rather than controls them in speaking lessons.	73	3.042	0.999	60.8	3
B3	The teacher goes around offering help and checking up with students in the communicative activities.	80	3.333	1.167	66.7	1
B4	There is good question orientation in speaking lessons.	78	3.250	1.032	65.0	2

From table (22) we can see that items No. 3 & 4 occupied the highest two ranks:

- No. (3) "The teacher goes around offering help and checking up with students in the communicative activities." occupied the first rank with percent weight (66.7 %).
- No. (4) "There is good question orientation in speaking lessons" occupied the second rank with percent weight (65.0%).

And items No. 2 & 1 occupied the lowest two ranks:

- No. (2) "The teacher helps students rather than controls them in speaking lessons" occupied the third rank with percent weight (60.8%).
- No. (1) "The teacher calls on non-volunteers as well as volunteers in speaking lessons" occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (54.2%).

Third: Evaluator:

Table (23)

Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each difficulty from the Evaluator scope

No.	Items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	%	rank
C1	Error correction takes place after the student finishes his talk in speaking lessons	63	2.625	1.279	52.5	5
C2	The teacher gives priority to fluency rather than accuracy in speaking lessons	67	2.792	1.318	55.8	2
C3	The teacher gives the student opportunity to talk to the end within the track on the lesson in speaking lessons	67	2.792	1.215	55.8	3
C4	The teacher doesn't interrupt the student's flow of speech in communicative activity even if there are errors.	64	2.667	1.239	53.3	4
C5	The teacher avoids overcorrection when the student is talking in speaking lessons.	70	2.917	1.248	58.3	1

From table (23) we can see that items No. 5 & 2 occupied the highest two ranks:

- No. (5) "The teacher avoids overcorrection when the student is talking in speaking lessons" occupied the first rank with percent weight (58.3%).
- No. (2) "The teacher gives priority to fluency rather than accuracy in speaking lessons" occupied the second rank with percent weight (55.8%).

And items No. 4 & 1 occupied the lowest two ranks:

- No. (4) "The teacher doesn't interrupt the student's flow of speech in communicative activity even if there are errors" occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (53.3%).
- No. (1) " Error correction takes place after the student finishes his talk in speaking lessons" occupied the fifth rank with percent weight (52.5%).

Fourth: Good language model:

Table (24)

Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation. And the % weight and rank of each difficulty from the Good language model scope

No.	Items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	%	rank
D1	The teacher appears relaxed when interacting with the students in speaking lessons.	77	3.208	0.833	64.2	1
D2	The teacher is fluent in the target language	77	3.208	0.833	64.2	2
D3	The teacher is accurate in the target language	77	3.208	0.779	64.2	3
D4	The teacher rephrases and repeats messages in a variety of ways to clarify them in speaking lessons.	67	2.792	0.977	55.8	5
D5	The teacher varies intonation to mirror message in speaking lessons.	67	2.792	1.021	55.8	5
D6	The teacher models accurate use of language.	76	3.167	0.868	63.3	4

From table (24) we can see that items No. 1 & 2 occupied the highest two ranks:

- No. (1) "The teacher appears relaxed when interacting with the students in speaking lessons" occupied the first rank with percent weight (64.2%).
- No. (2) "The teacher is fluent in the target language" occupied the first repeated rank with percent weight (64.2%).

And items No. 4 & 5 occupied the lowest two ranks:

- No. (4) "The teacher rephrases and repeats messages in a variety of ways to clarify them in speaking lessons" occupied the fifth rank with percent weight (55.8%).
- No. (5) "The teacher varies intonation to mirror message in speaking lessons" occupied the fifth repeated and the last rank with percent weight (55.8%).

Fifth: Motivator:

Table (25)

Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each difficulty from the Motivator scope

No.	Items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	%	rank
E1	The teacher praises appropriate behavior or answer in speaking lessons.	92	3.833	0.868	76.7	1
E2	The teacher encourages and guides critical thinking in speaking lessons.	77	3.208	1.103	64.2	3
E3	The teacher accepts and acknowledges all answers ("I see what you mean,") or by reflecting, clarifying, or summarizing.	60	2.500	1.142	50.0	4
E4	The teacher encourages students to evaluate their own or one another's answers.	79	3.292	1.160	65.8	2

From table (25) we can see that items No. 1 & 5 occupied the highest two ranks:

- No. (1) "The teacher praises appropriate behavior or answer in speaking lessons" occupied the first rank with percent weight (76.7%).
- No. (5) "The teacher encourages students to evaluate their own or one another's answers" occupied the second rank with percent weight (65.8 %).

And items No. 2 & 4 occupied the lowest two ranks:

- No. (2) "The teacher encourages and guides critical thinking in speaking lessons." occupied the third rank with percent weight (55.8%).
- No. (4) "The teacher accepts and acknowledges all answers (I see what you mean) or by reflecting, clarifying, or summarizing" occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (50.0%).

Sixth: Co-communicator:

Table (26)

Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation. And the % weight and rank of each difficulty from the Co-communicator scope

No.	Items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	%	rank
F1	The teacher allows sufficient time when students are working cooperatively in speaking lessons	67	2.792	1.141	55.8	3
F2	The teacher provides opportunities for students to interact socially in speaking lessons	63	2.625	1.173	52.5	6
F3	The teacher focuses on meaning rather than form in speaking lessons.	70	2.917	1.060	58.3	2
F4	The teacher provides opportunities for students' participation and questions.	78	3.250	1.152	65.0	1

No.	Items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	%	rank
F5	The teacher encourages students to interact directly by asking students to comment on each other's remarks	62	2.583	0.881	51.7	7
F6	The teacher checks to see whether answers has been understood in speaking lessons	66	2.750	1.225	55.0	5
F7	The teacher asks questions on matters of opinion, where any answer is right in speaking lessons.	67	2.792	1.062	55.8	4

From table (26) we can see that items No. 4 & 3 occupied the highest two ranks:

- No. (4) "The teacher provides opportunities for students' participation and questions" occupied the first rank with percent weight (65%).
- No. (3) "The teacher focuses on meaning rather than form in speaking lessons" occupied the second rank with percent weight (58.3%).

And items No. 2 & 5 occupied the lowest two ranks:

- No. (2) "The teacher provides opportunities for students to interact socially in speaking lessons" occupied the sixth rank with percent weight (52.5%).
- No. (5) "The teacher encourages students to interact directly by asking students to comment on each other's remarks" occupied the seventh rank with percent weight (51.7%).

Table (27)

Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each difficulty in each scope of difficulties

Scopes	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	%	rank
Manager and organizer	572	23.833	6.169	59.6	4
Advisor and monitor	296	12.333	3.409	61.7	2
Evaluator	331	13.792	5.771	55.2	6
Good language model	441	18.375	4.642	61.3	3
Motivator	375	15.625	4.332	62.5	1
Co-communicator	473	19.708	6.403	56.3	5
total	2488	103.667	28.859	59.2	-

From table (27) we can see that **"Motivator"** and **"Advisor and monitor"** occupied the highest two ranks:

- **"Motivator"** occupied the first rank with percent weight (62.5%), and **"advisor and monitor"** occupied the second rank with percent weight (61.7%),

And **"Co-communicator"** and **"Evaluator"** occupied the lowest two ranks:

- **"Co-communicator"** occupied the fifth rank with percent weight (56.3%) and **"Evaluator"** occupied the sixth rank with percent weight (55.2%).

Hypothesis number one.

Hypothesis number one assumes that: there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in difficulties Encountering UNRWA Ninth Grade Teachers in performing their Roles in Light of the Communicative Approach to Teaching Speaking in the Gaza Strip due to teachers' sex.

To prove this hypothesis the researcher used Mann-Whitney Test.

Table (28) shows this:

Table (28)

Means of ranks, sums of ranks, "U", "Z", sig. value, and sig. level to know the difference between male and female

scope	sex	N	mean	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	Z	Sig. value	Sig. level
Manager and organizer	male	12	22.000	10.333	124	46	1.506	0.132	not sig.
	female	12	25.667	14.667	176				
	Total	24							
Advisor and monitor	male	12	11.167	10.208	122.5	44.5	1.600	0.110	not sig.
	female	12	13.500	14.792	177.5				
	Total	24							
Evaluator	male	12	12.250	10.625	127.5	49.5	-1.305	0.192	not sig.
	female	12	15.333	14.375	172.5				
	Total	24							
Good language model	male	12	16.917	10.208	122.5	44.5	-1.606	0.108	not sig.
	female	12	19.833	14.792	177.5				
	Total	24							
Motivator	male	12	14.667	10.958	131.5	53.5	-1.075	0.282	not sig.
	female	12	16.583	14.042	168.5				
	Total	24							
Co-communicator	male	12	17.750	10.125	121.5	43.5	-1.653	0.098	not sig.
	female	12	21.667	14.875	178.5				
	Total	24							
total	male	12	94.750	10.083	121	43	-1.675	0.094	not sig.
	female	12	112.583	14.917	179				
	Total	24							

Table (28) indicates that there are no statistically significant differences between males and females in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking, which means that the difficulties are general. This will be elaborated in the discussion of results in chapter V.

Hypothesis number two.

Hypothesis number two assumes that: there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in difficulties Encountering UNRWA Ninth Grade Teachers in Performing their Roles in Light of the Communicative Approach to Teaching Speaking in the Gaza Strip due to teachers' duty shift?

To prove this hypothesis the researcher used Mann-Whitney Test.

Table (29) shows this:

Table (29)

Means of ranks, sums of ranks, "U", "Z", sig. value , and sig. level to know the difference between morning shift and afternoon shift

scope	Duty shift	N	Mean	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	Z	Sig. value	Sig. level
Manager and organizer	morning	12	25.583	14.958	179.5	42.5	1.708	0.088	not sig.
	afternoon	12	22.083	10.042	120.5				
	Total	24							
Advisor and monitor	morning	12	13.917	16.000	192	30	2.444	0.015	sig. at 0.05
	afternoon	12	10.750	9.000	108				
	Total	24							
Evaluator	morning	12	15.917	15.750	189	33	-2.263	0.024	sig. at 0.05
	afternoon	12	11.667	9.250	111				
	Total	24							
Good language model	morning	12	19.417	13.958	167.5	54.5	1.022	0.307	not sig.
	afternoon	12	17.333	11.042	132.5				
	Total	24							
Motivator	morning	12	16.833	14.083	169	53	1.104	0.269	not sig.
	afternoon	12	14.417	10.917	131				
	Total	24							
Co-communicator	morning	12	21.750	15.292	183.5	38.5	1.943	0.052	not sig.
	afternoon	12	17.667	9.708	116.5				
	Total	24							
total	morning	12	113.417	15.583	187	35	2.137	0.033	sig. at 0.05
	afternoon	12	93.917	9.417	113				
	Total	24							

From table (29) we can see that there are statistically significant differences between morning shift, and afternoon shift in (Advisor and monitor), and (Evaluator) and the total degree of observation card, toward morning shift, and there are no statistically significant differences in other scopes. This will be elaborated more in the discussion of results in chapterV.

Hypothesis number three

Hypothesis number three assumes that: there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in difficulties Encountering UNRWA Ninth Grade Teachers in performing their Roles in Light of the Communicative Approach to Teaching Speaking in the Gaza Strip due to teachers' age.

To prove this hypothesis the researcher used Kruskal-Wallis Test Table (30) shows such things:

Table (30)

No., mean rank, chi- square , asymp. Sig. and sig level for experience variables

scope	AGE	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	sig. level
Manager and organizer	less than 30 year	11	12.727	0.754	0.686	not sig.
	from 30 to 40 year	6	10.500			
	more than 40 year	7	13.857			
	Total	24				
Advisor and monitor	less than 30 year	11	13.409	0.363	0.834	not sig.
	from 30 to 40 year	6	11.417			
	more than 40 year	7	12.000			
	Total	24				
Evaluator	less than 30 year	11	12.909	0.069	0.966	not sig.
	from 30 to 40 year	6	12.167			
	more than 40 year	7	12.143			
	Total	24				
Good language model	less than 30 year	11	14.045	2.261	0.323	not sig.
	from 30 to 40 year	6	8.833			
	more than 40 year	7	13.214			
	Total	24				
Motivator	less than 30 year	11	14.364	1.943	0.379	not sig.
	from 30 to 40 year	6	9.417			
	more than 40 year	7	12.214			
	Total	24				

scope	AGE	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	sig. level
Co-communicator	less than 30 year	11	14.136	1.747	0.417	not sig.
	from 30 to 40 year	6	9.417			
	more than 40 year	7	12.571			
	Total	24				
total	less than 30 year	11	13.409	0.772	0.680	not sig.
	from 30 to 40 year	6	10.333			
	more than 40 year	7	12.929			
	Total	24				

Table (30) indicates that there are no statistically significant differences between the three groups of age; this means that the difficulties are general. This indicates that the teacher's performance of his roles is not affected by his age. This will be elaborated more in the discussion of results in chapter V.

Hypothesis number four.

Hypothesis number one assumes that: there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in difficulties Encountering UNRWA Ninth Grade Teachers in performing their Roles in Light of the Communicative Approach to Teaching Speaking in the Gaza Strip due to teachers' experience.

To prove this hypothesis the researcher used Kruskal-Wallis Test Table (31) shows such things:

Table (31)

No., mean rank, chi- square , asymp. Sig. and sig level for experience variables

scope	EXP	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Sig. level
Manager and organizer	less than 7 years	9	13.667	2.259	0.323	not sig.
	from 7 to 14 years	7	9.143			
	more than 14 years	8	14.125			
	Total	24				
Advisor and monitor	less than 7 years	9	14.556	2.972	0.226	not sig.
	from 7 to 14 years	7	8.714			
	more than 14 years	8	13.500			
	Total	24				

scope	EXP	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Sig. level
Evaluator	less than 7 years	9	13.611	1.054	0.590	not sig.
	from 7 to 14 years	7	10.214			
	more than 14 years	8	13.250			
	Total	24				
Good language model	less than 7 years	9	15.444	7.698	0.021	sig. at 0.05
	from 7 to 14 years	7	6.357			
	more than 14 years	8	14.563			
	Total	24				
Motivator	less than 7 years	9	14.444	4.589	0.101	not sig.
	from 7 to 14 years	7	7.714			
	more than 14 years	8	14.500			
	Total	24				
Co-communicator	less than 7 years	9	15.444	4.501	0.105	not sig.
	from 7 to 14 years	7	8.000			
	more than 14 years	8	13.125			
	Total	24				
total	less than 7 years	9	14.389	3.296	0.192	not sig.
	from 7 to 14 years	7	8.429			
	more than 14 years	8	13.938			
	Total	24				

From table (31) we can see that there are no statistically significant differences between the three groups of experience expect the "good language model", this means that the difficulties are general. To know the direction of the difference, the researcher used scheffe post test. Table (32) shows that:

Table (32)

Scheffe post test Matrix to know the direction of differences between the three groups in the Fourth scope "good language model"

Experience period	less than 7 years m =20.000	from 7 to 14 years m=14.286	more than 14 years m=20.125
less than 7 years m =20.000	-	5.714*	0.125
from 7 to 14 years m=14.286	-	-	5.839*
more than 14 years m=20.125			

*sig. at 0.05

From table (32) we can see that there are statistically significant differences between the experience group (less than 7 years) and (from 7 to 14 years) towards (less than 7 years), and between (more than 14 years) and (from 7 to 14 years) towards (more than 14 years), and there are no statistically significant differences between (less than 7 years) and (more than 14 years). This will be elaborated more in the discussion of results in chapter V.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, PEDGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS, SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the results of the study. It sums up the conclusions which were deduced in the light of study results and the pedagogical implications that the researcher has reached. It also involves suggestions and recommendations for further study. Such suggestions are expected to be beneficial for the teachers of English, supervisors, experts and English language practitioners in general.

Discussion

First: Interpretation of results related to question number two.

In this study the second research question investigated the extent to which UNRWA ninth grade teachers perform their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking. The discussion of the results will touch each of the six scopes of the observation card separately as follows:

Manager and organizer

In this scope, almost all items got below 60%. This means that teachers find difficulties in being good managers and organizers. This indicates that there is weakness on the part of the teachers in this connection where student-student interaction should be encouraged in communicative classrooms.

Sometimes, you as a teacher can find many students who have many different answers and you get only one student to participate. When 55% of the teachers do this, it reflects on the intention of the students to participate. Also when you invite alternative answers you give more opportunities to students to think creatively, and to those inattentive students to cope with the answers.

For most teachers, confronting some sort of classroom management problem is a daily occurrence. These problems may include simple infractions of school or classroom rules, or they may involve more serious events, including disrespect, cheating, obscene words and gestures, and the open display of hostility. (Gary. 2004:25).

Grouping and pairing students in speaking lessons are considered as main roles of the teacher to organize the classroom as a setting for communication and communicative activities. CLT teachers tend to use a lot of pair work and group work in the classroom in order to highlight the interactional nature of real language. However, individual work is also a part of a CLT classroom.

In groups, students tend to participate more equally than they are in a whole class arrangement. On the other hand, pair work allows many more of the students to work than if the teacher is working with the whole class where one student talks at a time. (Harmer. 2001: 18)

In light of the results, 58.3% of the teachers promote cooperative learning and the rest don't. In this case, 42% of the teachers deprive their students from cooperative learning.

The management of your classroom must begin with developing trusting relationships with your students. Without mutual feelings of trust and respect, you will be unable to assume the role of an instructional leader in your classroom. (Gary.2004: 43).

Advisor and monitor

When item number (3) "The teacher goes around and checks up with students" gets the highest rank (60.8%), it does not mean that it is in the safe side; it is still poor in general. This scope showed poor results at all levels, especially in item number (1) "The teacher calls on non-volunteers as well as volunteers". The researcher attributes these poor results in all items to the problem of crowded classrooms and the high number of students since monitoring is always connected with how many students are being monitored. This also comes as a result of teachers' inadequate knowledge concerning this role.

With crowded classes, Use pair work or group work. This strategy maximizes students' participation. When doing this, it is important to make your instructions clear. (Harmer. 2001: 26)

There are several simple ways to increase your monitoring and the extent of your students' active engagement in the learning process. One way is to increase your physical presence through eye contact. (Karl. 1994: 50)

If your eye contact is limited to only a portion of the classroom, you effectively lose monitoring (with-it-ness) for the rest of the classroom. It is surprising to not that a great many beginning teachers constantly do the following:

- Talk only to the middle front rows.
- Talk with their backs to the class when writing on the board.
- Talk while looking toward the windows or ceiling.

- Talk while not being able to see all students because other students are blocking their view.

In each of these instances, you see only a portion of the classroom, and the students know you see only a portion of the classroom. Your eye-contact that covers all portions of the classroom is one of the most important ingredients in conveying a sense of monitoring (with-it-ness). (Harmer, 2001: 31)

Evaluator

Evaluation is directly connected to reinforcement. Repetitive correction frustrates students and makes them think of not participating another time to avoid correction and not to lose their faces in front of the rest of their colleagues. So, most important, is to let the participant talk to the end even if there are errors and not to kill his answer by overcorrection. The gravity of the error should determine whether the correction is necessary or not. (Norrish. 1983: 62)

We have to be careful when correcting students, if we do it in an insensitive way, we can upset our students and dent their confidence. The teacher's job is to point out when something has gone wrong and see if the student can correct himself, however sometimes students can't put mistakes right in their own, so we have to help them. (Harmer. 2001: 13)

Most teachers know intuitively that supplying the correct form for a student might actually prevent him from retesting his own hypotheses about the new structure. It is a form of talking down to the student. He needs another chance to correct his error, but that requires time and energy and there is never enough of those. What can the teacher do to help students learn from their errors? General advice is sometimes

given: that symbols should be used, that teachers should not overcorrect, or that comments should be explicit, not vague; but there is a conspicuous lack of direction in this area. (Norrish. 1983: 48)

Results of the observation card showed the opposite. All items got poor scores which means that ninth grade teachers of English are not good evaluators and they are in need for developing the skill of evaluation and correction.

Good language model

Fluency is given the priority in communicative language teaching rather than accuracy. CLT teachers do not focus on accuracy at the expense of fluency or communicativeness. They aim first at fluency, then at accuracy. But this does not mean that the teacher is possibly acceptable to be inaccurate. He should be both fluent and accurate to be good language model for the students.

Teachers in communicative classrooms should use English all the time for instruction, but they should not hesitate to use the learners' native language to expedite learning. Usually such native language use is limited to clarifying a vocabulary item or a complex grammatical structure. (Hymes 1972: 36)

Results showed that teachers have insufficient command of the target language. They are neither fluent nor accurate in the target language to allow the students the opportunity for good exposure to native like language at least.

Motivator

To praise the student who gives a right answer is not a hard mission. Sometimes, you may thank the student only for his participation even if his answer is incorrect in order to encourage him to participate again and again. Whatever urges the students to participate positively is considered motivator. When the teacher asks open questions, all answers related to this question should be accepted as long as they suffice. This answer may need modification, simplification, clarification, or summarizing. Ninth grade teachers of English accept only specific answers and ignore all other answers.

It is also difficult to keep the attention of students because of the different levels in the class: what's interesting and challenging for one learner is boring and too easy for another. So while the teacher's attention is fixed on one side of the class, the other side begins to slip away, switches off, gets increasingly noisy, and before long the class is in fragments. (Karl. 1994: 25)

Apart from the kind of motivation, the one who is highly motivated is the one who learns better. The teacher has to provoke interest and involvement by choosing the appropriate topic, by creating fun and hummer, by their attitude to class participation. (Harmer, 2001)

Co-communicator

STT (students' talking time) is more important than TTT (teacher's talking time). In communicative classrooms, the floor is the students' not the teacher's.

Harmer (2001) noted that "Students are the ones who need to practice speaking not the teacher. Therefore a good teacher maximizes STT and minimizes TTT. Good

TTT may have beneficial quality if the students get chance to hear language which is above their level but which more or less they can understand."

The more opportunities given to the students to participate, the more interactive the class will be. The most successful class is one where students, not the teacher, do most of the classroom work. In order to promote and reinforce this interaction, the teacher should act as one of the students. He should not act as an independent personality which dominates the situation. Results showed that ninth grade teachers of English lack this feature. They rarely encourage classroom interaction among students.

There is nothing wrong with teachers to get involved in a role play if they feel that the topic began to run out of steam, provided they don't start to dominate. (Gary, 2004: 43).

All scopes

The scores of all scopes indicate that there is a general weakness on the level of all roles. This unsatisfactory performance can be attributed to:

- **Lack of theoretical knowledge.**

Teachers don't know enough about the communicative approach and about their roles in communicative classrooms. This can be attributed to the shortage of knowledge teachers got from their academic studies at the university or lack of courses UNRWA presents to teachers of English.

- **Lack of practical knowledge.**

Teachers know about this approach and about their roles but they don't know how to perform these roles in classes.

- **Unwillingness to perform.**

Teachers are unwilling to perform their communicative roles.

To shed light on the problematic area behind this unsatisfactory performance, the researcher used a third tool in this study. The researcher randomly selected 5 teachers from the real sample of the study and conducted recorded phone-call interviews with them. The researcher asked the interviewees four main questions (listed in appendix 4) through which the unsatisfactory performance can be attributed to one of the above listed problematic areas.

The answers of the first, second and third questions indicate that the teachers have theoretical knowledge about the communicative approach and about their communicative roles, but they don't have the practical side of knowledge. In other words they don't know how to perform these roles practically. They attribute this to university carelessness towards field practical training and micro-teaching courses. This appears in the forth question.

In brief, teachers' performance of their roles is considered not acceptable due to their insufficient knowledge about how to perform their roles in light of the communicative approach. Even though, there is some kind of variance between the results of each scope. The researcher returns this to the following:

1. High English language proficiency required of teachers.
2. Large class sizes (e.g., 40-50 students in a single class) for one teacher to handle.
3. Lack of teacher training in effective CLT strategies.
4. Lack of practice among teachers in using effective CLT strategies.

5. Much time on the part of the teacher needed for preparing effective CLT activities.
6. Much time required in the classroom for implementing effective CLT activities.
7. Speaking skill is not tested in examinations.

Second: interpretation of results related to hypothesis number one.

In this study, the first research hypothesis investigated if there are statistically significant differences in the difficulties encounter UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking due to sex variable. Results of this hypothesis showed no differences between male and female teachers. The researcher thinks that both male and female teachers have the same extrinsic and intrinsic deficiencies in this regard. In other words, if there is a lack of training, both male and female teachers are affected by this lack of training. If male teachers don't have sufficient knowledge about their roles in light of the communicative approach, female teachers certainly share male teachers the same feature.

Third: interpretation of results related to hypothesis number two.

The third research question investigated if there are statistically significant differences in the difficulties encounter UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking due to duty shift. Results of this question showed that there are differences in two scopes 'advisor and monitor' and 'evaluator'. The role of monitor requires the teacher to stand on tips of toes to be able to check, help, advice and encourage students. Even the role of evaluator needs spiritual readiness on the part of the teacher which provides him with patience and tolerance regarding students' errors. Both teachers and students are always

less energetic and less active in the afternoon shift than they are in the morning shift. This affects the teachers' performance generally in all roles and especially in the above mentioned two roles.

Forth: interpretation of results related to hypothesis number three.

The forth research hypothesis investigated if there are statistically significant differences in the difficulties encounter UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking due to the age of the teacher. Results showed that there are no differences. This indicates that the teacher's performance of his roles is not affected by his age. Such tactical roles need no much effort to be exerted by the teacher than knowledge about how to perform these roles. Age is not necessarily an equivalent of experience or, in other words, it is not always true that the older the teacher is, the more experience he has.

Fifth: interpretation of results related to hypothesis number four.

The fifth research hypothesis investigated if there are statistically significant differences in the difficulties encounter UNRWA ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking due to teachers' experience. Results showed that there are statistically significant differences between the experience group (less than 7 years) and (from 7 to 14 years) towards (less than 7 years), and between (more than 14 years) and (from 7 to 14 years) towards (more than 14 years), and there are no statistically significant differences between (less than 7 years) and (more than 14 years).

The researcher sees that novice teachers (from 1 to 10 year experience) have more theory than practice, so they find difficulties in performing their roles, and they acquire experience gradually. Whereas, experienced teachers (from 10 to 20 year

experience) have both practice and theory, so they outperform their novice counterparts. The researcher extracted a group of semi experienced teachers (from 7 to 14 year experience) and compared their performance with the other two groups (less than 7 and more than 14). Results showed that these two groups outperform the extracted group (from 7 to 14 years) while no statistically significant differences appeared between the two groups (less than 7 and more than 14).

Conclusion

In the light of the results and according to the discussion, the researcher found out that teachers' performance of their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking is unsatisfactory. This unsatisfactory performance can be attributed to the lack of theoretical knowledge on the part of teachers concerning their roles, lack of practical knowledge (how to perform these roles practically in class), or to the unwillingness of the teacher to perform these roles. To spot light on the real reason behind the unsatisfactory performance of the teachers, the researcher conducted one more tool which is recorded phone-call interviews with five teachers randomly selected from the real sample of the study. According to the teachers' answers in the phone-call interviews, teachers need more training on **how** to teach speaking communicatively, they already know about CLT and about their roles but they don't know practically **how** to apply these roles in the field. They encounter difficulties in their performance of all the communicative roles they have to adopt. There are almost no differences between male and female, morning and afternoon, and novice and experienced teachers in the difficulties they encounter in performing these roles, which means that the difficulties are general to some extent.

The pedagogical Implications:

The pedagogical implications of the results of the present study suggests that ninth grade teachers should be cognizant of their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking and apply these roles in communicative classrooms, because recognizing the roles without applying them makes no difference. The following pedagogical implications were suggested by the researcher:

1. Teachers should avoid acting as the center of the educational process and should avoid dominating the classroom activity. They should pass the responsibility to the students to manage their own learning and to build self-confidence and self-autonomy.
2. Teachers should improve their command of English fluency and accuracy to be good language models for their students. This secures exposure to appropriate language and compensates for the insufficient language environment.
3. Teachers should be cognizant of their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking.
4. Teachers should be cognizant of the importance of speaking skill and give this skill enough concern in classroom activities.
5. Teachers should raise the awareness of their students towards the importance of speaking skill and the importance of communicative activities.
6. Teachers should reinforce social interactions using the language items learned in each lesson.
7. School and classroom environment should be provided with motivating factors to enhance students' enthusiasm and engagement in the educational process.
8. Planned cooperative learning of English should be given especial consideration in classroom.

9. Overcorrection should be avoided and teachers should be more tolerant with students' errors to decrease their anxiety.
10. A sense of safety should be given to students to speak and to express themselves even if there are mistakes.
11. Focus on meaning should be given priority rather than focus on form.
12. Self-evaluation should be encouraged by the teachers. Students should be asked to evaluate each others and to evaluate themselves.
13. UNRWA experts should pass their experience to the teachers through training courses to acquaint them with the communicative roles they should perform in communicative classes.
14. Teachers should develop their communicative competence through continuous practice and extensive exposure to the language.
15. English teachers in schools should use English all the time to communicate with each others and stop using their native language, as a means for improving their fluency.

Suggestions

Based on the findings of this study and in the light of the difficulties teachers encounter in performing their roles in teaching speaking communicatively, the researcher offers some suggestions to ninth grade teachers of English, supervisors and experts in UNRWA.

Suggestions for teachers of English in UNRWA

1. Ninth grade teachers of English are advised to recognize their roles in light of the communicative approach and apply these roles in teaching speaking.

2. Ninth grade teachers of English are advised to encourage students to speak freely and fluently in groups and pairs.
3. Ninth grade teachers of English are recommended to use the communicative approach, because it helps to solve the problem of the over crowded classes and individual differences.
4. Ninth grade teachers of English are advised to improve their English fluency and accuracy to be good language models in communicative classrooms.
5. Ninth grade teachers of English are advised to be more facilitators than dominators in communicative classrooms.
6. Ninth grade teachers of English are expected to be more tolerant with students' errors in order to avoid student frustration.
7. Ninth grade teachers of English are expected to improve oral/aural proficiency.
8. Ninth grade teachers of English are advised to be aware of the individual differences among students in the learning process.

Suggestions for supervisors and experts in UNRWA

1. Supervisors are advised to conduct model lessons in ninth grade classes to show teachers (practically) how to teach speaking communicatively applying the teacher's roles in light of the communicative approach.
2. Experts are advised to conduct training courses to ninth grade teachers of English to acquaint them with their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching speaking.
3. Experts are expected to conduct workshops and micro-teaching courses for ninth grade teachers of English to train them to teach speaking communicatively.

Recommendations for further studies

The researcher suggests the following topics for further study in future:

1. Conducting other studies similar to this study concerning the teacher's roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching skills other than speaking.
2. Investigating the teacher's performance of their roles in light of the communicative approach to teaching writing.
3. A suggested program for training teachers on how to teach speaking according to the communicative approach.
4. A suggested program for developing speaking skill among students in UNRWA schools.

References

- Abed Allah, (1996). *On the Speech-Writing: Occasional Papers: In Development of English Language*. Education Vol.23. Winter. Cairo: Center for Developing English Language Teaching.
- Abu-Aboud, Asma. (1987). *The Effect of an In-Service Teacher Training Program on the Communicative Competence of Some English Language Students*. Unpublished M.A Study, The Faculty of Education . The Hashemite University, Amman.
- Al – Dakel, S. Ramadan. (1998). *Evaluating the Speaking Skills in English Language among the 3rd Year Secondary School Students in Libyan Jamahiria*. Unpublished M.A Study, Faculty of Education Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.
- Al-Khuli, Saber. (2002). *The Effect of Using Some Questioning Strategies in Teaching English on Developing the First Year Secondary School Students Speaking Skills*. Unpublished MA thesis, Ain Shams University ,Cairo , Egypt.
- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M. (1991). *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Al-Mashharawi, B. (2006). *Evaluating Teachers' Performance in Teaching Speaking Communicatively in Preparatory Stage in Jabalia Area*. Unpublished MA study. The Islamic University.
- Al-Shirbini, Zeinab. (1988). *Designing on Interagive Methodology Course within a Communicative Approach to English Teacher Education Programs*. Unpublished MA thesis, Ain Shams University, Cairo , Egypt.
- Aydin, E (2003). *EFL teachers' voice on communicative language teaching*. Turkey. ERIC.

- Berns, M. (1990). *Context of Competence: Social and Cultural Considerations in Communicative Language Teaching*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Bolitho, Rod. (1990). *Roles for Teachers, Learners, and Teaching Materials in a Communicative Approach*. MA study, ERIC Press.
- British Council, Teaching English, TKT Glossary. [online], Available: <<http://courses.britishcouncil.org/pub/tkt/mod/glossary/view.php?id=368&mode=cat&hook=0&sortkey=&sortorder=asc&fullsearch=0&page=10>> [Accessed 9th June 2009].
- Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bygate, M. (1995). *Language Teaching. Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing". *Applied Linguistics*, 1: 1-47.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). "Language Teaching Approaches: an overview." In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. (pp. 3-10). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Choi, S. (1999). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Korean Middle Schools*. MA study. Ohio State University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. [online], Available: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linguistic_competence> [Accessed 9th June 2009].
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Ford, D.Y, & Trotman, M. F. (2001). Teachers of gifted students: suggested multicultural characteristics and competencies. *Roper Review*, 23(4), 235-239.

- Gardner, D. & Miller, L. (1999). *Establishing Self-access from Theory to Practice*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Gary, D.B. (2004). *Effective Teaching Methods*. New Jersey: Ohio Press.
- Glossary of Rasch Measurement Terminology. [online], Available: <www.rasch.org/rmt/rmt152e.htm> [Accessed 9th Aug 2009].
- Hammarly, H. (1991). *Fluency and Accuracy: toward balance in language teaching and learning*. Clevedon: Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters ltd.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *How to Teach English*. London: Longman Press.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London. Longman Press.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2001). *The Practice of English Language teaching*. Longman.
- Haynes, J. (2007). *Getting Started with English Language Learners*. Virginia USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hymes, D.H. (1972). "On Communicative Competence". In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Jahan, A (2008). *Teaching Speaking Skills at Tertiary Level in Bangladesh: An Empirical Investigation*. Daffodil International University Journal of Business and Economics, Vol. 3, No. 1
- Johnes, Peter. (2000) . *Group Work*. Penguin . England.
- Johnson, K & Morrow, K (1981). *Communication in the Classroom*. London: Longman Press.

- Jonson, B.L. (1997). An organizational analysis of multiple perspectives of effective teaching: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11, 69-87.
- Karl, Thomas. 1994. *Teacher Development: making the right moves*. English Language Programs Division. United States. Washington, D.C
- Kebrowska, (1999). *The role of the foreign language teacher in the classroom -- the teachers' beliefs and role behavior versus the students' expectations*. Linguistics.
- Kidd, R. (1973). *How Adults Learn*. New York: New York Association Press.
- Krashen, S.D. & Terrel, T. (1983). *The Natural Approach*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Liao, X.Q. (1996). *Tradition and Innovation: A new Way to Explore TOESL Method*. MA study. Eric Press.
- Liao, X.Q. (1997). *A brief introduction to the communicative language teaching*. MA study. Eric Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1995). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marzano, R. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing students' achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Masanobu, N. (2009), *A Communicative Grammar-Translation Approach*. 平成20年度 提出.

- Melinda T. (2005). "CLT-Beliefs and Practice". *Journal of Language and Learning*. University of Central Lancashire, UK. Vol. 3 No. 1.
- Mota, Marisol. (2008), *Linguistic Competence in English and Exposure Factors*. Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes (UAA), México.
- Musthafa, Bachrudin. (2001). *Communicative Language Teaching in Indonesia: Issues of Theoretical Assumptions and Challenges in Classroom Practice*. MA study. ERIC Press.
- Nathan, J (2001). *Applying Communicative language teaching in a Taiwanese Elementary School*. Taiwan. ERIC.
- Negem, M . (1996). *Speaking and Writing as In the Development of English Language Education* , (1996). Vol.(22) , Winter , Cairo: Center for Developing English Language Teaching . Ain Shams University.
- Negem, M. (1995). *Speaking and Writing as In the Development of English Language Education*, (1996). Vol.(23) , Winter , Cairo: Center for Developing English Language Teaching. Ain Shams University.
- Norrish, John. 1983. *Language learners and their errors*. London: Macmillan press.
- NWREL. (2001) Understanding motivation and supporting teacher renewal. Retrieved Nov. 13, 2009, from <http://www.nwrel.org/nwreport/jan03/motivation.html>.
- PASSIA Diary 2002. [online], Available:<[http://www.passia.org/diary/Palestinian - Dictionary-Terms.htm#u](http://www.passia.org/diary/Palestinian-Dictionary-Terms.htm#u)> [Accessed 9th Aug 2009].
- Paulston, C.B. (1980). *English as a Second Language*. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association.

- Peart, N. A., & Campbell, F. A. (1999). At-risk students' perceptions of teacher effectiveness. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, 5(3), 269-284.
- Richard, Jack C. & Theodore S. Rodgers, (2000). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Richards, J & Lockort, C. (1996). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. (1998). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 14th Ed, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savignon, S. & Berns, M. (Eds) (1984). *Initiative in Communicative Language Teaching*. Reading. MA study. Addison-Wesley.
- Savignon, S.J. (1972). *Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching*. Philadelphia: The Center for Curriculum Development, Inc.
- Scott, T. (2005). *How to Teach Speaking*. London: Longman Press.
- Sion , Chris.(2001). *Creating Conversation in Class*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tedick, D.J. & Walker, C.L. (1994). "Second Language Teacher Education: The Problems that Plague us". *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 300-311.
- Thomas, J. A, & Montgomery, P. (1998). On becoming a good teacher: Reflective practice with regard to children's voices. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(5), 372-380.
- van EK, J. (1976). *The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in School*. London: Longman.

- Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woolfolk-Hoy, A. W, & Hoy, W. K. (2003). *Instructional leadership: A learning-centered guide*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Yalden, J. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching: Principles and Practice*. Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.
- Zhang J. Lawrence, (2006). *The Ecology of Communicative Language Teaching: Reflecting on the Singapore Experience*. National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
- Zhang, Xiu-qin (1997). *The difficulties and challenges of adopting the communicative approach in TEFL at secondary school in Qinghai province, China*. Unpublished MA thesis, ERIC Press.

Appendices

Appendices

Appendix No. (1)

This table lists the six questions asked to experts in UNRWA about the difficulties encounter ninth grade teachers in performing their roles in each scope.

1.	What are the difficulties encounter 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>managers and organizers</u> in communicative speaking classes?
2.	What are the difficulties encounter 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>advisors and monitors</u> in communicative speaking classes?
3.	What are the difficulties encounter 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>evaluators</u> in communicative speaking classes?
4.	What are the difficulties encounter 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>good language models</u> in communicative speaking classes?
5.	What are the difficulties encounter 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>motivators</u> in communicative speaking classes?
6.	What are the difficulties encounter 9 th grade teachers of English in being <u>co-communicators</u> in communicative speaking classes?

Appendix No. (2)

Shows items categorized under each scope.

1. Manager and organizer:

- i. There is evidence of planned cooperative learning in speaking lessons. (group work – pair work)
- j. The teacher allows students to ask peers for help in speaking lessons.
- k. The teacher intervenes when discussion gets off the track in speaking lessons
- l. The teacher operates and distributes time appropriately to lesson stages. (warm up 3-4min, presentation 10-15min, practice 10min, production 10min, round up 5min)
- m. The teacher allows acceptable time (10-13sec) after questions for formulation of good answers in speaking lessons
- n. The teacher invites alternative or additional answers in speaking lessons
- o. The teacher involves a large proportion of the class in speaking lessons.
- p. The teacher allows students to respond to one another in speaking lessons

2. Advisor and monitor:

- e. The teacher calls on non-volunteers as well as volunteers in speaking lessons
- f. The teacher helps students rather than controls them in speaking lessons.
- g. The teacher goes around offering help and checking up with students in the communicative activities.
- h. There is good question orientation in speaking lessons.

3. Evaluator:

- f. Error correction takes place after the student finishes his talk in speaking lessons
- g. The teacher gives priority to fluency rather than accuracy in speaking lessons
- h. The teacher gives the student opportunity to talk to the end within the track on the lesson in speaking lessons
- i. The teacher doesn't interrupt the student's flow of speech in communicative activity even if there are errors.

- j. The teacher avoids overcorrection when the student is talking in speaking lessons.

6. Good language model:

- a. The teacher appears relaxed when interacting with the students in speaking lessons.
- b. The teacher is fluent in the target language
- c. The teacher is accurate in the target language
- d. The teacher rephrases and repeats messages in a variety of ways to clarify them in speaking lessons.
- e. The teacher varies intonation to mirror message in speaking lessons.
- f. The teacher models accurate use of language.

7. Motivator:

- f. The teacher praises appropriate behavior or answer in speaking lessons.
- g. The teacher encourages and guides critical thinking in speaking lessons.
- h. The teacher accepts and acknowledges all answers (“I see what you mean,”) or by reflecting, clarifying, or summarizing.
- i. The teacher encourages students to evaluate their own or one another’s answers.
- j. The teacher creates a sense of safety to speak in the students.

6. Co-communicator:

- g. The teacher allows sufficient time when students are working cooperatively in speaking lessons
- h. The teacher provides opportunities for students to interact socially in speaking lessons
- i. The teacher focuses on meaning rather than form in speaking lessons.
- j. The teacher provides opportunities for students' participation and questions.
- k. The teacher encourages students to interact directly by asking students to comment on each other’s remarks
- l. The teacher checks to see whether answers have been understood in speaking lessons
- b. The teacher asks questions on matters of opinion, where any answer is right in speaking lessons.

Appendix No. (3)
Shows the final form of the observation card.

The role of the teacher to be observed:	Very poor	poor	acceptable	good	Very good
1. Manager and organizer:					
q. There is evidence of planned cooperative learning in speaking lessons. (group work – pair work)					
r. The teacher allows students to ask peers for help in speaking lessons.					
s. The teacher intervenes when discussion gets off the track in speaking lessons					
t. The teacher operates and distributes time appropriately to lesson stages. (warm up 3-4min, presentation 10-15min, practice 10min, production 10min, round up 5min)					
u. The teacher allows acceptable time (10-13sec) after questions for formulation of good answers in speaking lessons					
v. The teacher invites alternative or additional answers in speaking lessons					
w. The teacher involves a large proportion of the class in speaking lessons.					
x. The teacher allows students to respond to one another in speaking lessons					

The role of the teacher to be observed:	Very	poor	acceptabl	good	Very good
2. Advisor and monitor:					
i. The teacher calls on non-volunteers as well as volunteers in speaking lessons					
j. The teacher helps students rather than controls them in speaking lessons.					
k. The teacher goes around offering help and checking up with students in the communicative activities.					
l. There is good question orientation in speaking lessons.					
The role of the teacher to be observed:	Very	poor	acceptabl	good	Very good
3. Evaluator:					
k. Error correction takes place after the student finishes his talk in speaking lessons					
l. The teacher gives priority to fluency rather than accuracy in speaking lessons					
m. The teacher gives the student opportunity to talk to the end within the track on the lesson in speaking lessons					
n. The teacher doesn't interrupt the student's flow of speech in communicative activity even if there are errors.					
o. The teacher avoids overcorrection when the student is talking in speaking lessons.					

The role of the teacher to be observed:	Very	poor	acceptabl	good	Very good
8. Good language model:					
a. The teacher appears relaxed when interacting with the children in speaking lessons.					
b. The teacher is fluent in the target language					
c. The teacher is accurate in the target language					
d. The teacher rephrases and repeats messages in a variety of ways to clarify them in speaking lessons.					
e. The teacher varies intonation to mirror message in speaking lessons.					
f. The teacher models accurate use of language.					
The role of the teacher to be observed:	Very	poor	acceptabl	good	Very good
9. Motivator:					
k. The teacher praises appropriate behavior or answer in speaking lessons.					
l. The teacher encourages and guides critical thinking in speaking lessons.					
m. The teacher accepts and acknowledges all answers (“I see what you mean,”) or by reflecting, clarifying, or summarizing.					
n. The teacher encourages students to evaluate their own or one another’s answers.					
o. The teacher creates a sense of safety to speak in the students.					

The role of the teacher to be observed:	Very	poor	acceptabl	good	Very	good
6. Co-communicator:						
m. The teacher allows sufficient time when students are working cooperatively in speaking lessons						
n. The teacher provides opportunities for students to interact socially in speaking lessons						
o. The teacher focuses on meaning rather than form in speaking lessons.						
p. The teacher provides opportunities for students' participation and questions.						
q. The teacher encourages students to interact directly by asking students to comment on each other's remarks						
r. The teacher checks to see whether answers has been understood in speaking lessons						
c. The teacher asks questions on matters of opinion, where any answer is right in speaking lessons.						

Appendix No. (4)

- **What is the communicative approach?**
- **What is the main role of the teacher in the communicative approach?**
- **What are the sub-roles of the teacher in the communicative approach?**
- **Why do you think teachers of English are weak in teaching speaking communicatively in UNRWA schools?**
- **So what do you think the problem, is it with the intention to teach communicatively or with their knowledge about the CLT?**

Appendix No. (5)

Interviewee No. 1

- **What is the communicative approach?**

"Yes, for me I think that the communicative approach is a method of teaching in which the teacher adopts the student centered approach. I mean the main goal behind this approach is to carry out the students to achieve the daily dialog and daily discourse in the life. The main function of this approach is not concentrating on grammar or accuracy as they say. The main concentration is on fluency. ."

- **What is the main role of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"Yes, I think it is to be advisor, organizer, guide, to be a model!"

- **I mean one word not more. What is the main role?**

"Yes, he is a guide."

- **What are the sub-roles of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"Yes, as I told you, to correct mistakes if there is any, to organize the work, I mean to put the students in groups, cycles, to correct them, to give them instructions."

- **Why do you think teachers of English are weak in teaching speaking communicatively in UNRWA schools?**

"Yes, I think that teachers themselves lack the speaking fluency. I mean that they don't adopt the policy of the communicative approach, if they adopt this policy they would have taught their students so."

- **So what do you think the problem, is it with the intention to teach communicatively or with their knowledge about the CLT?**

"Yes, ok they can,,,,. They know well about the communicative approach, they studied it at the university but"

- **You said they know well about the communicative approach. Knowledge is three types (theoretical, procedural and conditional) where do you think the problem? Do teachers know how to teach communicatively?**

"I think they have the theoretical knowledge but they don't have the procedural or practical knowledge. They themselves were not taught with the CLT, if they were taught with it, they would have taught their students with it."

Interviewee No. 2

- **What is the communicative approach?**

"One of the important approaches for teaching language, this approach forgives the students' errors. Its goal is to make students able to communicate."

- **What is the main role of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"The communicative approach sees the teacher as facilitator instead of controller."

- **What are the sub-roles of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"Helper, corrector, praiser, facilitator, communicator."

- **Why do you think teachers of English are weak in teaching speaking communicatively in UNRWA schools?**

"Teachers of English don't know a lot about the communicative approach and they didn't have the information about it in the university and they didn't practice teaching speaking communicatively in the field."

Interviewee No. 3

- **What is the communicative approach?**

"It is teaching English for communication, it tolerates errors, it asks the teacher to help students, it needs the teacher to be good in English, and it motivates the students."

- **What is the main role of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"Helping the students."

- **What are the sub-roles of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"Going around the classroom to help students, praising students, playing roles, acting, motivating, correcting."

- **Why do you think teachers of English are weak in teaching speaking communicatively in UNRWA schools?**

"I talk to my colleagues all the time about these things, they know the communicative approach and they know their roles. But I don't know if your research discovered that they don't know the communicative approach or they don't practice it. This may be because they don't want to apply it or don't know how to apply it."

Interviewee No. 4

- **What is the communicative approach?**

"This is an approach like the cognitive approach, the audio-lingual approach, the natural approach and the grammar translation approach."

- **Ok, what is it about what are its features?**

"It is to teach communication and to make the students able to use the language in situations. It looks at the students as communicators and the teacher as director. "

- **What is the main role of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"Director or!"

- **What are the sub-roles of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"Checking up with students, being friendly with them, directing them, helping them answering the questions and so on....!"

- **Why do you think teachers of English are weak in teaching speaking communicatively in UNRWA schools?**

"It's the problem of the university. They didn't teach us how to teach English communicatively. I know the communicative approach we took it in the university, but we don't know how to teach speaking communicatively and to play the roles you asked about."

Interviewee No. 5

- **What is the communicative approach?**

"It is an approach seeks communicatively competent students able to use the language rather knowing about the language. This approach centralizes the student in the educational process rather than allowing the teacher's dominance. It concentrates on fluency more than accuracy, meaning more than form, function more than grammar."

- **What is the main role of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"Yes, the teacher is a director."

- **What are the sub-roles of the teacher in the communicative approach?**

"Yes, helper, motivator, observer, evaluator, manager, and model."

- **Why do you think teachers of English are weak in teaching speaking communicatively in UNRWA schools?**

"Theory is much easier than practice. We are all equipped with minds and can keep theoretical ideas in these mind but the problem is with practice, how to perform the theory. Unfortunately, universities teach us theories and ideas with huge number of books to be examined at the end of the semester, but when it came to practice, the university provides only two careless humble courses with not sufficient supervision. So teachers graduate with no enough practice to teach."

Appendix No. (6)

Inter-rater reliability committee

Each of the following educationalists accompanied the researcher in observing classes for ninth grade teachers of English.

Mr. Karam El Shanti UNRWA expert North Gaza

Mr. Kamal Hasaballah UNRWA expert Gaza

Mr. Hassan Ramadan UNRWA teacher Middle Area

Mr. Ahmad Herzallah UNRWA teacher South Gaza

Appendix No. (7)

Referees

Dr. Izzo Afana	The Islamic University of Gaza
Dr. Mohammed Atya	Al Aqsa University
Mr. Maha Barzaq	Qattan Education Centre
Mr. Karam El Shanti	UNRWA expert
Mr. Awni Abu Swairih	UNRWA expert

Appendix No. (8)

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



الجامعة الإسلامية - غزة
The Islamic University - Gaza

هاتف داخلي: 2400

مكتب عميد كلية التربية

Ref. 293/63/ع

Date التاريخ
27 ربيع أول 1430هـ

24 مارس 2009م

حفظه الله،

الأخ الدكتور/ مدير برنامج التعليم بوكالة الغوث الدولية بغزة

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته،،،

الموضوع: تسهيل مهمة الطالب/ إسلام أبو شاريين

تهديكم كلية التربية بالجامعة الإسلامية تحياتها، ويرجى من سيادتكم التكرم بتسهيل مهمة الطالب/ إسلام حسني أبو شاريين برقم جامعي 2007/0351 من برنامج الدراسات العليا بكلية التربية- تخصص مناهج وطرق تدريس- لغة إنجليزية، وذلك بالسماح له بحضور محاضرات صقية لنصف التاسع الأساسي في بعض المدارس التابعة لوكالة الغوث بغزة في مختلف محافظات غزة، حيث أن بحث دراسته بعنوان: "Difficulties UNRWA Ninth-Grade Teachers Encounter in performing their Roles in light of the Communicative Approach to teaching speaking Gaza, Palestine).

وذلك بهدف البحث العلمي.

وبارك الله فيكم،


ودمتم في خدمة العلم وطلبته،،،

ملاحظة: الطالب يعمل مدرساً في مدرسة ذكور بيت حانون الإعدادية (أ).

عميد كلية التربية
أ.د. محمود أبو داف
Faculty of Education

- صورة للملف.

Appendix No. (9)



UNITED NATIONS
RELIEF AND WORKS
AGENCY FOR
PALESTINIAN REFUGEES
IN THE NEAR EAST

وكالة الأمم المتحدة
للاجتماع والتشغيل للاجئين الفلسطينيين في الشرق الاكبر

NATIONS UNIES
OFFICE DE SECOURS ET DE
TRAVAUX POUR LES
REFUGIES DE PALESTINE DANS
LE PROCHE ORIENT

Request for Formal Permission

I'm writing to request permission to conduct a master fulfillment study around (Difficulties Encounter UNRWA Ninth-Grade Teachers in performing their Roles in light of the Communicative Approach to teaching speaking in the Gaza Strip). The target sample of the study is 30 ninth -grade male and female teachers and out of the total number in schools of Gaza. The tool of the study is class observation. The permission will help the researcher observe the teachers in their classes knowing that the researcher is an UNRWA staff member.

RESEARCHER: *ISLAM H. ABU SHARBAIN*

POST TITLE: *TEACHER OF ENGLISH*


EMPLOYER: *UNRWA*

EMP CODE: *213029*

24 March 2009

Head of Education Program
Signature

To all my colleagues
Please help as you can
Best regards


 1.4.09