Learner Conformity to Communicative Language Teaching Approach in EFL Contexts: A Case Study in Saudi Arabia

Dr. Mohammad Abdul Wajid  
English Language Institute  
King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah  
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Dr. Mohammad Saleem  
Department of English, Faculty of Sciences & Arts  
King Abdulaziz University- Rabigh branch  
Rabigh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Abstract
The present study is an outcome of a concern for the status of English language teaching in Saudi Arabia. It is felt that the standard of English in Saudi Arabia has deteriorated over time (Al-Seghayer, 2011). CLT is the major approach followed to teach English in the kingdom, and it is also felt that among others, learners’ lack of interest in an approach that places higher demands on them is the chief reason for the dismal scenario of English teaching. The present study explored the opinions of a small group of learners of English at a university to measure their conformity behaviour, and its level, towards CLT. The results of the study show that learners display a high level of conformity behaviour to the CLT activities carried out in English classes. This study is a small step, and if larger frame studies are conducted on the issue, we can have a better picture, pinpoint the exact reasons, and find a solution to the problem of deteriorating standards of English in Saudi Arabia.
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Introduction
The present study takes off in the backdrop of another study we conducted with teachers of English using CLT approach at colleges in Saudi Arabia, the results of which showed that teachers displayed conflict in their attitude towards CLT theory and practice, that is, teachers’ beliefs in CLT and their practice of it in classrooms were found to be conflicting (Wajid & Saleem, 2016). So, it rather became imperative upon us to look at the issue of CLT in Saudi Arabia from the perspective of learners as well. What we call ‘the issue of CLT’ is a broader framework envisaged to analyse the complexities arising out of introducing CLT as the most favoured approach to teach English in Saudi Arabia while many teachers hesitate to use CLT in full letter and spirit, owing to numerous hindrances in its use in the classroom. Thus, the present analysis of learners’ perspectives is just one facet of the larger issue we have taken up for research.

There are ample research studies on English teachers’ perspective on the use of CLT in Saudi Arabian classrooms, commonly coming up with the findings that mostly teachers are not fully conversant with the use of CLT in their classrooms, for multiple reasons, and therefore, they use mixed methods and approach. Teaching/learning a language is an interactive process, and since the major emphasis of CLT as an approach is on learner interaction leading to communicative competence, learners form an integral part of the process for the approach to be successful. Unless learners are actively involved in the learning process with deep faith and interest in the activities that form part of CLT, it is bound to be a failure. But, to my surprise, there is very little research in this area, especially in Saudi Arabian context. There has been very little effort to understand what maybe the level of learners’ conformity to learn English language through the activities involving their essential participation. Therefore, the objective of the present study is to gauge the learners’ level of conformity to the tenets of CLT practically applied in English language classrooms.
In other words, we would find out how closely do the learners of English at colleges in Saudi Arabia grasp the implications of learning English through an approach which demands their active participation in the class, more use of the target language and less demands on the teacher’s part, as well as very little traditional explanation of grammatical structures and sentence drills.

In view of the teaching/learning and research problem stated above, and in conjunction with the observations we have made in EFL classes in Saudi Arabia we have hypothesized that learners’ level of conformity to the use of CLT in English classrooms is quite high in Saudi Arabia.

To test the hypothesis stated above, we have framed the following research questions to be answered in the process of the present research:

1. Do learners at colleges in Saudi Arabia conform to learning English through Communicative Language Teaching Approach?
2. What is the level of learners’ conformity to learning English through CLT in colleges in Saudi Arabia?

The present study is very limited in its scope. Primarily, it was meant to collect learners’ opinions through a survey questionnaire on a range of issues concerning the use if CLT to learn English. The results obtained through the survey and the interpretations thereof are meant only to judge the level of learners’ conformity to the ways of learning the language. The results cannot be taken either to suggest a critique of the approach or an endorsement of it for Saudi Arabia.

Furthermore, the scope of the present study is limited to learners’ opinion expressed with regard to English language taught as a foreign language in colleges in Saudi Arabia using CLT as an approach, and not to any other setting. Still, on further experimentation and research, the results obtained from the present study may be applicable to other settings where English is taught as a foreign language in Saudi Arabia, and possibly other countries as well.

The obtained results cannot be interpreted as a generalized comment on the conformity behaviour of learners of English towards CLT approach used in Saudi Arabia. For a broader generalization, further research at a larger scale, with larger samples and larger area setting would be required.

The limitations of the present study are inevitably linked to this aspect, that is, for lack of time and resources, we could not carry out such a study at a larger scale.

The present study is very significant, for different reasons, the most important being its pedagogical implications. The study sheds light on the learners’ visualization of the ways English is taught to them and their liking or dislike of the basic activities aimed at building fluency in the target language. The study is also significant in that CLT is a learner-centred approach and learners’ interest in the activities and problem-solving steps is a prerequisite for the teachers of English to successfully implement the approach in the classroom. A positive feedback from learners is the right indicator of its appropriateness.

It is sometime felt by teachers that CLT is not appropriate for Saudi Arabia since the learners are unprepared to follow the model alien to their cultural sensibilities. Keeping this thought in mind, therefore, the present study is a significant step towards knowing the story from the other side too.

‘Communicative Language Teaching Approach’ or simply ‘CLT’ is a methodology of teaching a foreign language to learners in a non-native setting by putting emphasis on maximum communication in the target language in a simulated environment. The methodology came up as a reaction to ‘form-based teaching’ that primarily relied on learners’ understanding of the structure of the target language. Language theorists felt that the form-based methodology was a failure as it produced learners with a good grasp of grammar but little communicative ability in the target language. CLT was claimed to provide a solution, and in Saudi Arabia too CLT came in vogue. The idea behind this approach is to enable the learners to communicate effectively in various real-life situations. CLT courses are comprised of functions to be performed in the target language, like, suggesting, leave-taking, inviting, complaining, and resolving an issue, etc. The approach has its origins in Dell Hymes’ (1966) concept of “communicative competence,” an idea developed in reaction to Chomsky’s (1965) concept of “linguistic competence.” Linguistic competence is defined as the system of linguistic knowledge possessed by the native speakers of a language. In contrast to this, Dell Hymes gave the idea of communicative competence which rather extended the idea of linguistic competence further adding that in addition to speaker’s mastery over the system of linguistic knowledge, they must be able to use that knowledge appropriately in different real life situations.
Applied to foreign language teaching, it developed an approach in which both the end and the means of study is communication (Canale, 1983; Howatt, 1984; Littlewood, 1981; Nunan, 1991; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Rivers, 1987; Simmons, 2010). Speaking in general, CLT makes the maximum use of real-life situations so that the learners communicate. Commonly, the teacher creates, or rather simulates, a situation that the learners are most likely to encounter in real life to use the language.

David Nunan’s (1991) list of the following five general features of CLT is very useful to understand the nature of the approach in this regard. CLT relies on:

1. an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language;
2. the introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation;
3. the provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the learning process itself;
4. an enhancement of the learner’s own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning; and
5. an attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities.

Elaborating upon the perceived activities to be carried out to implement CLT in the classroom, Klaus Brandl (2008) quotes Wesche & Skehan (2002) who describe CLT activities as:

• Activities that require frequent interaction among learners or with other interlocutors to exchange information and solve problems.
• Use of authentic (non-pedagogic) texts and communication activities linked to “real-world” contexts, often emphasizing links across written and spoken modes and channels.
• Approaches that are learner centred in that they take into account learners’ backgrounds, language needs, and goals and generally allow learners some creativity and role in instructional decisions.

As it is clear from the discussion above, the approach makes room for learners to take responsibility of their learning, while the teacher functions only as a facilitator creating the right environment. This strategy, it seems, doesn’t work in all kinds of situations, especially where the teacher is perceived to “deliver” and the learners see themselves as passive recipients of ‘knowledge.’ The situation has prompted researchers to evaluate the outcomes and point out some flaws in the model. While most of the research studies have been teacher-oriented, that is, focussing on the role of teachers in implementing CLT in their classes (Ahmad & Rao 2013; Al Asmari, 2015; Al-Nofaiie, 2010; Al-Seghayer, 2014; Asassfeh, Khwaileh, Al-Shaboul & Alshboul, 2012; Badger & Yan, 2008; Batawi, 2007; Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Chang, 2011; Ellis, 1996; Farooq, 2015; Faruk, 2013; Islam, 2012; Kadwa, 2012; Koosha & Yakhabi, 2013; Li, 1998; Li, Xiaoju, 1984; Moskovsky & Alrabai, 2009; Srechhari, 2012; Tosuncuoglu, 2013; Vongxay, 2013), some of the studies have taken into account the role of learners, too.

Zhiwen Feng (2013) opines that in general learners in China prefer CFI (communication focussed instruction) in comparison to FFI (form focussed instruction), though perceptions of learners may differ in accordance with their gender. According to Khoi Mai Ngoc and Noriko Iwashita (2012), “it is important to consult learners in order to establish a match between teachers’ and learners’ views. Since both learners and teachers are major stakeholders in CLT, learners’ voices need to be heard before effective pedagogical decisions can be made.” (25-26). The researchers have noted that teachers and learners both show a favourable attitude towards CLT, though learners are found to be a bit reserved. Craig Gamble, Jonathan Aliponga, Yasuko Koshiyama, Michael Wilkins, Keiko Yoshida, and Shirley Ando (2013) conclude in a study that university students in Japan are more positive towards CLT methodology in general, though to learners at secondary school level form-based instruction may look more appealing. The present research is in-line with the research works discussed above, to analyse learner conformity to CLT approach, in the setting and context of Saudi Arabia, but at the same time the present study is different, since the obtained results may be influenced by cultural and other factors.

**Method**

In the present study we have followed a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies since it was proposed to be an analytical study of attitude. Quantitative data has been collected from students from colleges in Saudi Arabia learning English as a foreign language. The data were collected through a survey questionnaire, while qualitative analysis involved in the interpretation of the numerical data collected through the questionnaire.
Data Collection: Instrument

Questionnaires have been used as the primary sources of data collection for this study. Questionnaires save time, and since questionnaires can be easily packed with detailed as well as desired information, excluding all unnecessary information (Brown and Rodgers, 2002: 116), we chose to use questionnaires for data collection. The questionnaires used in the study contained attitudinal questions meant to elicit learners’ responses on what their English teachers do in the class, and their liking or dislike for the techniques used to teach English to them, rating their opinions on the given issue on a scale.

The questionnaires used in this study have been adapted from Savignon and Wang (2003). The questionnaire tested and used by them is found to be reliable and valid, and so, it has been taken as a model in preparing the questionnaire for the present study. Certain changes have been made in the questionnaires to suit the needs of the present study according to its context. Savignon and Wang used 7-point scale for measurement, while in the present study 5-point Likert scale has been used. They have also used the questionnaire to gather opinions of students, but they have used a long questionnaire with many sub-sections on attitude, beliefs, experiences, etc. of students learning English through different approaches at different stages of their schooling, whereas my questionnaire is smaller with 28 statements, and not divided into sub-sections. Every statement comprised of five options. – 1. Strongly disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Neutral, 4. Agree, and 5. Strongly agree. The distribution of credit on attitude for a positive direction was as follows:

Response: Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree
Credit: 1 2 3 4 5

Whereas, for a negative direction the credit allocation was reversed, i.e., 5, 4, 3, 2, 1.

Measurement Technique

To analyse the results obtained in this study, we have used two different measurement techniques: (i) Calculating Cronbach’s Alpha for internal consistency of the questionnaire statements, and (ii) Calculating means and percentage of the scoring done for the responses received from the participants.

(i) To calculate Cronbach’s Alpha, the following formula was used:

$$\alpha = \frac{k}{(k-1)} \times (1 - \frac{\Sigma Var}{Var})$$

Where,

- $k =$ number of statements in the questionnaire
- $Var =$ variance (population standard deviation) of obtained scores for each statement
- $\Sigma Var =$ sum of variance

(ii) The mean and percentage of scores was calculated using simple arithmetic calculations.

Validity and Reliability

I used statistical calculation procedures to test the instrument of data collection, i.e., the questionnaire, for validity and reliability as well as for internal consistency of the test items. The reliability and internal consistency [calculated using the formula given above: $\alpha = \frac{k}{(k-1)} \times (1 - \frac{\Sigma Var}{Var})$] on Cronbach Alpha was obtained 0.6017. An Alpha of 0.60 indicates acceptable reliability according to a commonly accepted rule. Expert opinion was sought to ensure the validity of the scale constructed to measure the attitude of learners, and experienced professors were consulted for the purpose. In the pilot study conducted with 10 students, the average score for positive direction statements was measured 70.25, and for negative direction statements it was 43.
Table 1: Scoring: Mean, Standard Deviation, Variance, and Cronbach’s Alpha

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | Tot al |
| 3 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Q1 0 | Q1 1 | Q1 2 | Q1 3 | Q1 4 | Q1 5 | Q1 6 | Q1 7 | Q1 8 | Q1 9 | Q2 0 |  |
| 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 80 |
| 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 55 |
| 6 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 66 |
| 7 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 52 |
| 8 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 66 |
| 9 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 63 |
| 10 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 58 |
| 11 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 63 |
| 12 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 68 |
| 13 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 60 |
| 14 | 1 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 70 |
| 15 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 57 |
| 16 | 1 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 63 |
| 17 | 1 | 14 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 61 |
| 18 | 1 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 58 |
| 19 | 1 | 16 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 66 |
| 20 | 1 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 60 |
| 21 | 1 | 18 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 69 |
| 22 | 1 | 19 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 61 |
| 23 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 68 |
| 24 | 1 | 21 | Total | 83 | 87 | 79 | 76 | 29 | 33 | 88 | 33 | 86 | 87 | 74 | 63 | 73 | 60 | 78 | 47 | 47 | 40 | 61 | 60 |
| 25 | 1 | 22 | Mea n | 4.1 | 4.35 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 4.4 | 1.6 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| 26 | 1 | 23 | SD | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| 27 | 1 | 24 | Var. | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| 28 | 1 | 25 | K | 20 |
| 29 | 1 | 26 | Σ var | 16.0 |
| 30 | 1 | 27 | Var. | 37.3 |
| 31 | 1 | 28 | A | 0.60 |

**Sampling**

The participating colleges and participant students were selected for the study through a random selection technique, and enough care was taken to minimize bias in selection or in responses. English is taught in Saudi Arabia following a uniform syllabus, and to conform to a set standard, all the colleges and universities put emphasis on following CLT approach to teach the language, so, there was no problem in randomized selection, either in the selection of the participating colleges or in the selection of students. The only criteria strictly adhered to in the selection of participating students was that they understood English very well since no Arabic translation of the questionnaire was provided.
Sample Size

20 students were chosen to participate in the study and questionnaires were distributed to them. The number of participating students was kept small for ease of collecting and handling the data, since at this stage it would have been extremely difficult for us to collect data from a larger number of students. The present sample size represents 3 different colleges. We briefed all the participants chosen for the study about what the research was all about and their role in it. Whatever possible ethical issues we could think of arising in the process, were discussed and settled in advance. We made sure they understood the questionnaire well by asking the students this question before administering the questionnaire to them. The questionnaires were distributed only after ascertaining everything was alright.

Research Setting and the Participants

The present study was conducted at King Abdul-Aziz University, and the colleges selected for the research are colleges affiliated to it, at Jeddah, Uswan, and Khulais. There is uniformity in education in Saudi Arabia, so, there was no difficulty in choosing the participating students, but still it was made sure that the selected students had a good knowledge of English to understand what it meant to express positive or negative opinions on various aspects of the methods being used to teach them English, and their own liking or dislike of it, with logical reasoning. We had already talked to many students on various methods of teaching English to informally gather their opinions on what they liked or disliked about various methods, particularly CLT (without mentioning the term) and the traditional grammar-translational method. The selected students were from among those who had expressed their opinions for and against some EFL teaching methods.

Variables

(a) Independent Variable

The present study is designed to measure the conformity behaviour of learners of English to a particular model and approach to teach the language. The said behaviour is an outcome of perceived [and experienced] benefits derived from the approach. The approach is practically realized through certain inputs or activities carried out by the teacher and learners in the class. The elements of CLT that are used in this study as inputs to note the change in learners’ behaviour towards the teaching approach function as independent variables. They are as follows:

i. Use of only English in the class.
ii. Mother tongue not permitted to be used in FL class.
iii. Communication is the ultimate goal of learning a foreign language.
iv. Activities forcing learners to speak English are essential.
v. Perceived difficulties in learning English through CLT approach.

These elements/inputs function as independent variables in the present study as they bring about the intended change. Independent variable are those factors that bring about the expected, perceptible change in something, but which themselves remain unchanged in the process, that is, these factors are not dependent on some other external or internal factors. All the independent variables described above are used as input statements in the questionnaire in various forms in the present study to elicit responses from students indicative of their conformity towards CLT.

(b) Dependent Variable

In the present study conformity behaviour of learners towards CLT is set as the dependent variable. Dependent variables are the factors that vary according to the nature of something affecting them, that is, these factors are dependent on some external or internal factors, and they change according to the nature of the given input. In other words, conformity behaviour of learners under study is expected to change owing to the effects in their thoughts brought about by the inputs enlisted as independent variables above.

Data Analysis

The data obtained through the questionnaires was tabulated and analysed to calculate Percentage, Mean and Standard Deviation. The table given below shows the totals of conformity scores on each statement in the questionnaire, calculated through a Likert Scale with five points, following the credit scoring scheme described above. These scores were used to calculate the Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and the percentage of scores indicating the conformity behaviour of learners towards CLT.
Table 2: Learners’ Responses to Implementation of CLT in Class: Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Total of scores</th>
<th>Mean of Scores</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English teachers in our class allow us trial-and-error attempts to communicate in English.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My English teachers often create an atmosphere for us to always use English.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My English teachers often correct my errors in class.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I like grammar-focused English teaching.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I like sentence drills and repetition after my teachers in my English class.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I like it if my English teacher uses Arabic in the classroom most of the time.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I like it if most of the time grammar rules are explained in the classroom.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>English class in which I do not need to open my mouth.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Communication-based English teaching.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I like communicative activities so that I can interact in English with other students.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I like my English class to be focused on communication, with grammar explained when necessary.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I like my English teachers to allow us to make trial-and-error attempts to communicate in English.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I like my English teachers to create an atmosphere to encourage us to use English in class.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I like it if my errors in speaking are corrected by my teachers.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I find learning English through Communicative Language Teaching Approach (CLTA) very difficult.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CLT puts unrealistic demands on me since I come from a non-native FL setting like Saudi Arabia.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I find learning English through CLT difficult because I am not well prepared to follow the communicative approach.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I find CLT difficult because I like learning English in a traditional way.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I find CLT difficult because we have to discuss many topics forbidden in our socio-cultural setup.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CLT is not effective in Saudi Arabia since we have no chance to speak English outside the class.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enough care was taken to keep the present research study bias-free, and to this end the questionnaire was designed in a way that it included statements which, in accordance with the research hypothesis, had two clear directions, positive and negative. Moreover, to avoid bias in data collection, both types of statements were presented in one questionnaire, without any division of segments. Accordingly, the Mean of the scores obtained for the positive direction statements is much higher (76.461) than the Mean of scores obtained for the negative direction statements (38.571).

**Interpretation**

All the positive direction statements imply that CLT is the right kind of approach to learn English in the given contexts, and if the respondent students are in favour of the statements, they display conform behaviour towards CLT. High Mean and high Percentage of scores for the positive direction is indicative of high conformity behaviour. Negative direction statement simply that CLT is not the right approach, and therefore, learners rather prefer the approach indicated by the statement. Low Mean and low Percentage of scores for the negative direction is indicative of low conformity of learners to the approach other than CLT. A Mean of scores pegged at 76.46 indicates that a majority of learners who participated in the present study show a very high conformity to CLT as an approach to learn English.
The lower Mean and lower Percentage of scores for the negative direction indicates that though the learners are aware of other methods and approaches used by their teachers to teach them English, they do not conform to its use in the class any longer. The Mean of scores for this direction is 38.57, which is not at all significant. This rather suggests that the learners are in a transition phase, from traditional approaches still in use in some contexts, to CLT which is taking over.

Conclusion

The present study was taken up to seek answers to the following research questions:
1. Do learners at colleges in Saudi Arabia conform to learning English through Communicative Language Teaching Approach?
2. What is the level of learners’ conformity to learning English through CLT in colleges in Saudi Arabia?

The statistical analysis of the data collected for the study clearly reveals that,
1. Students learning English as a foreign language at colleges in Saudi Arabia conform to learning English through Communicative Language Teaching approach.
2. The learners show a very high level of conformity behaviour to leaning English through CLT, as compared to very low conformity to approaches other than CLT.

Taking a cue from the results obtained, we can safely deduce that learners in Saudi Arabia are very strongly in favour of CLT as an approach to learn English.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings of the present research study have a deep pedagogical implications as regards the teaching of English in Saudi Arabia. The obtained results indicate that learners display a high conformity behaviour to:

- Only use of English in the EFL classes,
- Trial-and-error attempts at communication in English,
- The right atmosphere created so that they get a chance to speak in English,
- Communication-based teaching, and
- Communication activities.

The learners’ mandate hints towards a more well thought-out plan and well-preparedness on teacher’s part, making sure they have –

- No use of Arabic in English classes,
- More liberal attitude towards learners allowing them to communicate in English as freely as possible, and
- More communication-based activities in English classes.

The learners display a high conformity to teaching of grammar too, but that may be because they may feel they need some scaffolding in grammar to build fluency.

Suggestions for Further Research

This has been a challenging as well as an interesting study to me. The study was conducted on a very small level, for several reasons. But we hope, future researchers will take up the issue further and dig deep into learners’ conformity to CLT from various angles, some of which may be as follows:

Gender: The present study was conducted with only male learners. It is not yet explored what may be the conformity behaviour/level of female learners in Saudi Arabia.

Level of Study: The present study was conducted with undergraduate students. An interesting are of conformity study is secondary school learners of English.

Region: The present study was conducted at King Abdul-Aziz University which is located in a metropolitan city. It is possible that learners from small towns and rural areas hold different views towards CLT.
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