Place of CLT in Language Teaching

Ali Akbar Khansir[*]

Bushehr University of Medical Sciences, Iran

This paper, in briefly reviewing the history of CLT in language teaching, provides background information about language teaching and the history of ELT in language teaching. The first portion of this paper reviews a variety of factors that have been related to language teaching, including language movement, language learning, and language acquisition, language competence and performance. The second portion focuses on CLT and its role in language teaching. In fact, CLT is the results of the changes in the British Language Teaching tradition came back to the late 1960s. The main aim of CLT for language teaching closely related to the approach of communicative competence to teach foreign or second language learners. This approach has been used by applied linguistics as a reaction way from grammar- based approaches. In addition, the grammar –based approaches include the aural –oral approach. The first area of this paper will discuss will be the central focus of this article, communicative competence approach. In 1972 Hymes as a great researcher coined the theory of Communicative competence as a scientific theory for developing the communicative competence in learners along with the grammatical competence and not merely the grammatical competence.

Key Words: applied linguistics, CLT, communicative competence, competence and performance, English language

Artikel ini meninjau secara singkat sejarah Pengajaran Bahasa Komunikatif (CLT) dalam pengajaran bahasa, memberikan informasi latar belakang tentang pengajaran bahasa Inggris (ELT) dan sejarah ELT dalam pengajaran bahasa. Bagian pertama dari artikel ini mengulas berbagai faktor yang terkait dengan pengajaran bahasa, termasuk perkembangan bahasa, pembelajaran bahasa, pemerolehan bahasa, kompetensi dan kinerja bahasa. Bagian kedua berfokus pada CLT dan perannya dalam pengajaran bahasa. CLT adalah hasil dari perubahan tradisi Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris kembali ke

akhir 1960-an. Tujuan utama CLT untuk pengajaran bahasa erat kaitannya dengan pendekatan kompetensi komunikatif untuk mengajarkan pembelajar bahasa asing atau bahasa kedua. Pendekatan ini menggunakan linguistik terapan sebagai cara reaksi dari pendekatan berbasis tata bahasa. Selain itu, pendekatan berbasis tata bahasa termasuk pendekatan aural-oral. Area pertama dari artikel ini akan dibahas, dimana juga menjadi fokus utama artikel ini, yaitu pendekatan kompetensi komunikatif. Pada tahun 1972, Hymes sebagai peneliti hebat menciptakan teori kompetensi Komunikatif sebagai teori ilmiah untuk mengembangkan kompetensi komunikatif pada peserta didik bersama dengan kompetensi gramatikal dan bukan hanya kompetensi gramatikal.

INTRODUCTION

Before, this paper takes a look at communicative competence; the relationship between it and what is known about the process of language teaching. The usual way to do the discussion of communicative competence is that Chomskyan theory of competence and performance as a great theory in language teaching was coined by Chomsky (1965) should be discussed. Thus, we cannot ignore the history of language teaching in human society as a new phenomenon. We have to come back to the history of language teaching. In the history of language teaching, language has always been discussed among the great experts over the world. The results of these discussions helped language program administrators, syllabus designers, and language teachers have made better decisions about their works. These results have been broken into periods, or trends, of language development. In general, the main purpose of teaching language in schools and universities is to enable the learners to use it when they need, for example, when they need to write a scientific paper to a good journal in a country or when they need to speak with people to resolve their problems. Using every language involves listening, and understanding, speaking with clarity, reading and understanding, and writing with a written purpose. In other words, when the learners use language in situations where they need to use it for resolving their daily works. They are required to learn the language based on an academic work. I believe that as a language teacher and researcher, the aim of teaching language is to develop the language skills in language learners in educational system. Therefore, we need a good relationship between language teaching and linguistics. Khansir (2013, p. 1141) argued that "the history of linguistics has been as a subject is related to language teaching came to the end of the Second World War, the relation of linguistics has been generated as a subject to second language teaching". In this case, Bloomfield believed that the knowledge of linguistics can be used to analyze the language to be taught and the result proved to be satisfactory (1942).

We came back to language movement; one of the first language movements came back to the history of language translation is associated with the grammar translation approach to language teaching. It is interesting to note that before English language is known as an important and international language over the world; Latin and Greek were very important languages and were taught through the grammar translation method. Then this method was used for teaching English language. The fact that the grammar translation method has been dominant since the 1700s to the present day is proof of its popularity among the teachers of English; especially countries follow English as foreign language such as Iran. In addition, Khansir (2014a) reported that one of the main purposes of this method was to translate texts of the foreign language into native language and vice versa. According to Stern (1983), the first language is maintained as the reference system in the acquisition of the second language. Nagaraj (1996) mentioned that in this method, the mother tongue of the learner is used to

explain new items and make comparisons with their equivalents in the target language. Richards and Rodgers (2001) argued that this method studies a language that the approaches the language first by the use of its grammar rules, followed by application of this knowledge to the task of translating sentences and texts into and out of the target language. When the grammar translation method paid little importance to oral skills, and Latin and Greek lost their popularity and English became more popular as a world of communication, The Direct Method came into practice. Thus, this method was officially developed after the fall of the grammar translation method as a reaction to it. The age of this method came back to the nineteen century. According to the rule of this method in language teaching, the language teacher should use full sentences in the foreign language as input rather than words and phrases; no translation was used. In addition, some methods such as the Reform Method, the Psychological Method , the Series Method, the Phonetic Method and the Natural Method are grouped under the title Direct Method. The main aim of this method was to learn language through spoken form of the language and written form of the language was not important than spoken form. It is interesting to note that the materials used in English classes have dialogues in plenty. What is important for us to remember is that in this method, the target language is taught directly without the use of other language; English through English, for example. Therefore, one of the main aims of this method was to get the student to think in the target language. The third method in our discussion is Audio-lingual Method. One of the differences between Audio-lingual Method and Grammar translation method and Direct Method is that the Grammar translation method and Direct Method were European contributions to language teaching, whereas Audio-lingual Method had its origin in the USA. This method was the first language teaching method derived from the source discipline viz. linguistics and psychology. The aim of this method was to use the four language skills separately and focused on the skills of listening and speaking and then this method has not neglected writing and reading skills. What is important to us to know is that the use of the learner's mother tongue in English classes is not strictly prohibited but restricted to only when necessary. One of the major approaches to language teaching in general and ELT in particular which has been very popular among the language teachers and language experts for more than half century is the Structural Approach, which came into practice in the 1940s. Several methods sprang from this approach such as the Audio-lingual Method, The Audio-visual Method and the Situational Method. The principles of this approach are taken from linguistics and psychology. The great linguist researched in this approach is Bloomfield that focused on linguistics and other great scholar who worked in this approach based on psychology is Skinner. One of the most important principles of this approach in learning language is habit information (psychology) and this approach considered language through language structures (linguistics). Last approaches came into practice in the 1960s as a reaction in the practice of dull, mechanical drills devoid of meaning in the structural classes as successful techniques is the Communicative Approach. In addition, this approach mentioned a widespread criticism against the Structural Approach that even after ten to twelve years of learning English in structural classes, learners are not able to use English when they need; the CLT approaches have been suggested as a better alternative to this. The great researchers and scholars worked in this approaches in the area of linguistics and psychology such as (Chomsky, 1965: Hymes, 1972; & Savignon, 1972). Many great scholars of Applied Linguistics suggested several versions of the Communicative Approaches (Allwright, 1983; Brumfit ,1984; Rivers ,1973; Widdowson,1978; & Prabhu,1984) among others. In this approaches, what it is interesting is that language is known as a means of communication, so meaning is more important than form or structure and learning a language means understanding and using it when the language learner needs.

In this paragraph, this paper gives a brief summary of language learning and language acquisition. In language teaching, when we discuss about the distinction between language learning and language acquisition, this the distinction will link this discussion systematically with American linguist Krashen theory. Krashen (1987) mentioned that language acquisition is acquired through the natural process such as children acquire their mother tongue language in the home setting. Language learning is learned in the formal setting such as school and the students are exposed to learn their language skills in language classroom. Khansir (2014b) argued that acquisition does not occur consciously and in formal situations or through formal grammatical rules of language. Language acquisition process is the same as the process of acquisition of the native language, whereas, learning is conscious process and it used in the formal situations by teachers.

In this part of this article, a brief history of English language will be discussed. English language passed three periods in the history of human being: Old English, Middle English and Modern English. Trask (1996) argued that the language was introduced into Britain about 1500 years ago by invaders from the North Sea coast of the Continent is called English. Old English is not easy for everybody to read and write it. In fact this language is needed to special study for the people who like to read and write it. We can say that this language is English language but it is different from the English the people use in their daily life now. Crystal (1992) added that Old English is referred to as Anglo-Saxon; however, its oldest extent from, found in texts from the 7th century, is generally called Old English. Thus, in Old English time, the English passage was not easy for people who preserved many features of Germanic. In Middle English period, the people could get more understand English passages than Old English but all the Middle English passages were not familiar and were strange. The people had problems in understanding spelling such as riche, pleye, thre, etc. Crystal (1992) mentioned that the Middle English period is started from the 11th to the 14th centuries. In this time, grammar and the word order are conspicuously more familiar than Old English. Crystal (1992) added that in the Middle English period, vocabulary was vastly increased through recurring waves of borrowing, especially from Latin and French. Literary excellence in this time is basically preserved in the work of Chaucer (1345-1400). After this period, we faced with modern English time, this time started from the 15 century to the present. What is important for us to know is that the English language has experienced changes in grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary between the Old English and Modern English periods. It is interesting to note that speakers of Modern English are trying to recognize Old English as a relative of their familiar language. Akmjian et al (2001) added that scholars studying the history of English are fortunate in that there are written documents spanning more than 1200 years that enable them to trace many of the changes that English has undergone during in this time. Finally, English language which people over the world as native or second and foreign language use now came from the eighteen century. Trask (1996, p. 6) supported this claim that as follows:
"By the eighteen century, a hundred years or so after Shakespeare, several more generations of change had produced a form of English which scholar recognize as Modern English that is, for purpose of classification, it is considered to be essentially the kind of English we use now."

Howatt and Smith (2014) believed that there are two stage structures on the subject of Modern language teaching in Europe from 1750-1920; and the second refers to English language teaching beyond and within Europe from 1920 to 2000 +. These periods are started of Grammar Translation Method (1750–1880) to The Communicative approaches (1970–2000+). As mentioned in the previous paragraphs of this article.

What we should remember is that languages have been changed through the history of human being. English also is no exception from this issue. Khansir and Pakdel (2016) added

that from the time of the Anglo-Saxons 1500 years ago, there have been changing in new words, pronunciations, grammatical form of English language in the history of England from the Anglo-Saxons to the new generation.

Once we discuss about the communicative approach, the communicative approach cannot be studied properly without touching upon the study of Applied Linguistics. Khansir (2012) argued that the term applied linguistics started of 1940 in the United States. Applied linguistics including the practical applications of linguistics and language teaching and learning theory. Applied Linguistics considers all language problems and tries to resolve the problems. Richards et al (1992) mentioned that the work of applied linguistics is to study second and foreign language learning and teaching. It also studies language and linguistics in relation to practical problems, such as lexicography, translation, speech, pathology, etc. It uses information from psychology, sociology and anthropology. It is interesting to note that applied linguistics is founded by a group of great linguists in Britain and USA and Dr. Pit Corder is known as the founding father of British applied linguistics. Brumfit (1995) argued that the discipline of applied linguistics has been usually described as the theoretical and empirical investigation of real world problems in which language is a central issue. Thus, over the years the relationship between applied linguistics and language teaching has always been most important in resolving language teaching and linguistics problems. What is important for us is that applied linguistics has left a deep influence on language teaching in general and English language teaching in particular in all of the language subjects over the years.

A discussion was made from 1940s to 1970s in language teaching and learning in USA and Europe countries especially in Britain; several approaches have been made by the great scholars in linguistics and psychology. One of the language schools in psychology was behavioristic movement and developed its concept. This school rejected the role of mentalism in learning language. Thus, one of the great linguists in this area was B.F. Skinner. Khansir and Pakdel (2019) said that this theory started from the 1950s and 1960s and it is known behaviourist learning theory. Khansir and Pakdel (2019) added that learning second language in behaviourist learning theory is based on habits. According to this theory, learning language is the result of the connection between a stimulus and a response. In the history of human language learning, we cannot ignore the role of this theory as psychological theory which has the effect of learning second language in language classroom. Ellis (2003) reported that behaviourist account of second language acquisition emphasizes only what can be directly observed and ignores what goes on in the black box of the learner's mind. The Behaviourist learning theory was rejected by Noam Chomsky. In the discussion of language acquisition device, we face with the theory of Chomsky and his supports in linguistics; they believed that every child of human being was born with a language acquisition device (LAD). Children can get the basic knowledge about the nature and structure of their mother tongue in early their life (time of birth). Noam Chomsky argued that the children have competence in acquiring their mother tongue. What is important for us to know from this theory is that human brain has the capability of storing information for future use. In the era, the approach of the cognitive was coined by Chomsky. This approach is related to mentalistic approaches to linguistics. This approach is referred to Chomsky's Transformational Generative grammar (TGG), which links language structure to the human cognitive processes. Farhady and Delshad (2007) mentioned the principles of the TGG regarding to the nature of language and those of cognitive code learning psychology in relation to learning formed the foundations of the cognitive method of teaching as follows:

1) The objective of language teaching is to train learners who may develop a native –like ability in using the language.

2) The learning process should move from developing the competence in the learners toward performance. This was based on the natural sequence of first language acquisition where the speakers first listen, understand, and then practice. In other words, the learners should first develop the competence and then move on to performance.

3) Since language is a creative process, the learners should be given an opportunity to be creative. Creativity requires that the learners understand the rules of the language and use them to create novel and new sentences. They need to activate their mental abilities to create the context in which the language is used.

4) As mentioned before, the learning should be meaningful. That is, the learners should understand what they are saying and why they are saying what they are saying. They should also understand what they are reading and writing.

What is certain is that Chomsky intended to introduce this model for the description of all languages over the world. Finally, he has changed his theory over the years and he also published his thesis in a book "Aspect of the Theory of Syntax in 1965". He changed his mind to Aspects Model or Standard Theory. Richards et al (1992) mentioned the theory or Model based on the four main parts as follows:

1) The Base Component, which produces or generates basic syntactic structures, is known deep structures.

2) The Transformational Component, which changes or transforms these basic structures in sentences, is known surface structures.

3) The Phonological Component, which gives sentences a phonetic representation so that they can be pronounced.

4) The Semantic Component, which deals with the meaning of sentences.

Finally, Chomsky and his supports later modified the Aspect Model. Richards et al (1992) added that Chomsky and others felt that not only the base component but also the transformational and phonological components had some effect on the semantic interpretation of a sentence. It is known as Extended Standard Theory.

The last discussion of introduction of this manuscript is about error approaches. These approaches consist of Contrastive and Error approaches. Contrastive and Error approaches are still new for language researchers. Both of these approaches have been claimed that are hybrid drawing on the sciences of linguistics and psychology. Khansir and Pakdel (2018, p. 531) emphasized that a research on language learner's errors is needed a component of linguistics and psychology. Contrastive was added to language approaches of 1940s and it compared two systems of languages such as native language and target language. Pioneers of this school were Fries and Lado and the research works of this approach was referred to the works of Fries in 1945 and Lado in 1957. According to contrastive approach, interference of mother tongue is the major source of errors in target language. Corder (1967) pointed out errors of language learners are systematic and he added that interference of mother tongue is part of errors of language learners and several reasons are involved in increasing the errors of language learners in target language such as teaching materials, learning strategies, incomplete application of rules, age of learner, complexity of the target language and overgeneralization. Khansir and Pakdel (2018, p.531) added that "contrastive analysis focuses on pedagogical orientation, input, practice and inductive learning, whereas error analysis focuses on scientific orientation, linguistic and cognitive processes". In several decades

passing of the life of the errors in language teaching; the great researchers have worked on these approaches and syllabus designers have designed materials for language learners in acquiring target language. Thus, the language teachers and learners have got good feedback from them to reach the purpose of language teaching and learning in second and foreign language settings. In general, the error approaches have helped in increasing the knowledge of the language teacher and learner in acquiring target language effectively.

Competence and Performance
Noam Chomsky's is the great linguist of the United States introduced the concept of competence and performance is somewhat similar to Saussure's concept of langue and parole. Before I explain Chomsky's competence and performance, I prefer to look at briefly to Saussure's concept of langue and parole and then I continue my discussion about Chomsky's theory. Saussure was a linguist from Swiss. He made a distinction between langue and parole. According to Saussure, the conceptual level of language, the abstract system of rules which contains it, he called langue. The substance side, the representation of those rules in actual sentences or utterances, he called parole. On the other hand, langue is the totally (the collective fact) of a language, deducible from an examination of the memories of all the language users. It can be said a storehouse, the sum of word-images in the mind of individuals. It is a corporate, social phenomenon. Ultimately, langue has to be related to parole which is the actual usage of individuals, which a community manifests in its every day speech, the actual, concrete act of speaking on the part of an individual, the controlled or controllable psycho-physical activity. Therefore, parole is the set of all utterances that have actually been produced, while langue is the set of all possible grammatical sentences in the language. According to this discussion, we can say that parole is the only object available for direct observation to the linguist. The main differences between langue and parole are written by Varshney (1998) as follows:
Langue comprises: Code, Potential, Social, Fixed, Slow-moving, and Psychological.
Parole comprises: Encoding of a message, Actualized, Individual, Free, Ephemeral, and Psycho- physical.
If we consider the role of langue and parole in linguistics, we face with the idea of Finch (2000) argued that historically, linguists have been more concerned about langue than about parole, but with developments in pragmatics and the revaluation of language in use , the interests of parole have been more widely promoted.

  According to Chomsky (1965), competence is the native speaker's knowledge of his language, the system of rules he has mastered, his ability to produce and understand a vast number of new sentences. Chomsky believed that competence is the study of the system of rules, whereas performance is the study of actual sentences themselves, of the actual use of the language in real-life situation. According to this Chomsky's theory, so the speaker's knowledge of the structure of a language is his linguistic competence and the way in which he uses it, is linguistic performance. He continues his discussion about competence and performance, said that the speaker has represented in his brain a grammar that gives an idea account of the structure of the sentences of his language, but, when actually faced with the task of speaking or understanding many other factors, acts upon his underlying linguistic competence to produce actual performance. He added that competence in linguistics is the linguistic ability, in fact, the ability to produce and understand indefinitely many novel sentences; it refers to the native speaker's innate creativity and productivity implicit in the normal use of language. Chomsky (1971) argued that internal grammar which enables a speaker to utter and understand an infinite number of potential utterances is a speaker's

competence. This competence is free from the interference of memory span characteristic errors, lapses of attention, etc.

Communicative Competence

The focus of the paper is on communicative competence. Communicative `competence theory which used as the main goal of communicative language classrooms in language teaching introduced by Hymes (1972), an anthropological linguist. He claimed that the theory of competence was coined by linguist Chomsky was not enough for the development of the knowledge and ability of language learners in order to learning process in target language. Therefore, it seems that there are several others components such as grammatical, discourse, socio-cultural, and strategic competency which are necessary for the development of ability of learners to comprehend and produce written and spoken language in communicatively proficient and accurate ways. What is certain, however, is that communicative competence is the knowledge which helps the language learner to use a language effectively and his / her ability actually to use the knowledge for his/her communication. It is interesting to note that the term of communicative competence has been widely used in language teaching and sociolinguistics. After Hymes, Canale and Swain more than ten years later in their article, "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing" was published in Applied Linguistics Journal in 1980, alternatively proposed three sub-competences: grammatical, sociolinguistic including sociocultural and discourse competence and strategic competence.

Discussion of this theory was initiated by attacking on Chomsky by Hymes. Chomsky focused on grammatical competence whereas, Hymes (1972) proposed four interrelated components such as grammatical, discourse, socio-cultural, and strategic competency. In order to have grammatical competency means to be able to recognize sentence-level grammatical forms, including lexical items such as vocabulary or words; morphological items contain smallest units of meaning, such as re-meaning again in remind; syntactic features like word order and phonological features like consonant and vowel sounds, intonation patterns , and other aspects of the sound system. The second component is related to discourse competency in communicative competence. It is interconnected to a series of utterances such as written or spoken are used to form a meaning full text like letter, e-mail , essay, conversion, and formal speech. It can follow both text coherence and cohesion in language. The third component of communicative competence is called socio-cultural competency that is the ability to use language in social contexts in culturally appropriate ways. For example, we can use English language as an international language in social contexts. We can conclude that people have different cultures when they use English in their societies. Therefore, the different cultures influence on the people when using English. The forth of component of communicative competence is strategic competency. It is also known as the ability to cope with breakdowns in communication, to problem solve in unfamiliar contexts when communication fails and to draw on strategies that help restore communication. The example of this part of communicative competence contains recognizing how to explain directions by drawing a map.

The Notional –Functional Syllabus and Communicative Approach

This part of this paper looks at notional functional syllabus as the basis for CLT in language teaching. First of all, this paragraph defines syllabus design and then draws attention to a distinction between curriculum and syllabus. Finally, it focuses on notional –functional syllabus. Nunan (1993, p. 5) argued that "syllabus design is seen as being concerned essentially with selection and grading of content, while methodology is concerned with the selection of learning tasks and activities".   Allen (1984) made a distinction between

curriculum and syllabus. According to Allen, Curriculum is a very general concept which involves consideration of the whole complex of philosophical, social and administrative factors which contribute to the planning of an educational program whereas syllabus refers to that subpart of curriculum which is concerned with a specification of what units will be taught. Communicative approach focus on language use and it opposed to language usage. Birjandi and Mosallannejad (2010) argued that functional –notional combines a communicative grammar with cognitivism. In fact, notional syllabus centers on semantic /notional categories such as time, space, suasion etc. According to Van EK (1976), language is analyzed into two components such as language functions and language notions. He added that what people do by means of language is considered as verbally performing certain functions. By means of language people assert, question, command, persuade, apologize, etc. To perform such functions, people express, refer to or –to use a more general term-handle certain notions. For example, they would like to apologize for being late such as for being late for a birthday party. Nunan tried to resolve problems of language teachers faced with the terms functions and notions and they don't realize that what difference between functions and notions is. He (1993) defined functions as the communicative purposes for which we use language, while notions are the conceptual meaning (objects, entities, states of affairs, logical relationships and so on) expressed through language. Farhady and Delshad (2007 ,p. 195) "reported that the notional-functional approach is intended to focus on the learners' expected communicative needs rather than on some hypothetically prescribed objectives developed by language teachers". Wilkins (1976) as the first language expert that introduced the notional syllabus in his book" Notional Syllabuses". He mentioned that the national syllabus is contrast with the grammatical and situational syllabuses, because it takes the desired communicative capacity as the starting –point. In doing a notional syllabus, instead of asking how speakers of the language express themselves or when and where they use the language, we ask what it is they communicate through language. We are then able to organize language teaching in terms of the content rather than the form of the language. He added that for this reason that mentioned this is called notional syllabus.

The Role of CLT in Language Teaching

First of all, what we should understand about CLT is that it is an approach, and then we look at it as an approach in language teaching. This part of this paper starts the exploration by looking at the history of CLT in language teaching. This approach was started in the 1970s. Thus CLT as it is called, took off very richly from work done at the Council of Europe in the early seventies, resulting in the publication of the National Syllabus (1976), which talked of functions of language as the unit of categorization in a language syllabus. The great sociolinguistics such as Halliday (1973) Dell Hymes (1972) and others had a vital role in developing this approach. This approach has been developed in both Europe and North America. So far it has effective influenced on language teaching over the world in general and EFL and ESL in particular. Although CLT is known as an approach has been used for the communication of language in language classrooms, but it has never forgotten grammatical competence in its duties. Littlewood (1981, p.1) mentioned 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". Another characteristic of CLT is to focus on the principles of linguistics and psychology in teaching learners in language teaching setting. Farhady and Delshad (2007) emphasized that the characteristic of CLT is to highlight the cooperative rather than the individualistic aspect of language learning. They added that the supports of this approach believe that if communication between two persons fails, it is a joint responsibility and not

the fault of the speaker or the listener alone. Richards (2006) gave several characteristics of CLT as follows:

1) Learners of language learn a language through communication.
2) Learners of language should learn a language best through speaking.
3) Grammar of the target language is no longer important in learning the language.
4) Errors of the target language are not sin and they are not important in speaking the language.
5) CLT is related to teach speaking skill of the target language.
6) The learners of the target language should use real communication as classroom activities.
7) Dialogs are not used as main goal of CLT as classroom activities and the learners should not use the dialogs in their classroom such as grammar traditional approach rules.
8) One of the aims of CLT is to use both accuracy and fluency in language setting.
9) CLT is usually used among the experts of language teaching as the method of teaching.

The concept of CLT relates to the concept of communication. The main aim of CLT is to teach communicative ability to the language learner in language setting. Lynch (2008, p. 4) argued that "communication involves enabling someone else to understand what we want to tell them, what often is referred to as our message". In general, CLT has followed the teaching of communicative competence as its aim. The CLT approach has tried to make distinguish itself from more traditional approaches where the emphasis is heavily on teaching structural competence. According to our discussion in this paper, we realizes that the best vehicle for learning and teaching language is communication itself, the language learners can gain more language proficiency through actual involvement in interaction and communication. Rashtchi and Keyvanfar (2002) supported our discussion in this paragraph and mentioned that the main objective of CLT is to increase the communication ability of the learners in order to enable them to cope with the communicative needs in the target situation. They added that this objective is achieved through a) learning language as a means of expression, b) creating interpersonal relationships with learners and teachers, and c) learning the sociocultural aspects of language. We can conclude that the best aim of CLT in teaching language is communicative competence. It is also known as the goal of CLT in language teaching.

The Role of Language Grammar in CLT
Earlier, the focus on correct stimuli was made by structuralists, who following behaviorists principles, said that wrong language forms could result in the learning of wrong language habits. This issue of structuralists about language learning has been changed by CLT. But the many great experts had good positions in CLT; they had different positions in teaching language held in CLT. Allwright (1983) who focused on the learners, and said, if learners want grammar, they should get it. Others such as Brumfit (1984) and Johnson (1976) who wanted to teach communication through communication. Prabhu would like to teach the grammar of language through communication. Prabhu (1984) believed that for instance used the notion of deploying language through problem solving to acquire the grammar of English unconsciously. The term 'incubation 'period in language learning came into prominence with CLT, which focused on process and not on product , which meant that immediate production of language did not necessary reflect a good language learner. It is clear that communicative language teaching approach has been influenced by sociolinguistics and applied linguistics. The role of grammar teaching currently held today has been influenced by applied linguistics.

Krashen (1987) for example, posited the Monitor Model, where he distinguishes between acquisition and learning. I mentioned this distinguishes between acquisition and learning in the previous paragraphs in this study, where acquisition is the unconscious assimilation of the grammar of the language, whereas learning is the conscious imbibing of language rules. Learning grammar consciously is useful when the learner uses this knowledge as a self-check or a monitor on mistakes. CLT questioned the teaching of grammar, as an end in itself. Its reluctance to focus on form-based teaching, in fact had resulted in formal grammar not being taught in the communication classroom. Today, however, grammar teaching has come back to its own again. It has come back, moreover, in a different guise, informed as it is with cognitivist ideas, with CLT ideas, and further, with ideas derived from a consideration of bilingualism. In other words, grammar teaching is not the same as it used to be; bilingual education discusses the inclusion of L1 into the teaching of L2.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, the process of communicative classroom language learning has been developed based on CLT in many countries of Europe such as Britain, Germany, France and The United States by great research scholars, linguists, anthropological linguists such as (Hymes ,1972; Chomsky,1965; Habermas, 1970; Candlin, 1978; Pieho,1974; Pieho & Bredella, 1976); Holec, 1979; Halliday, 1973; Savignon, 1972; and Maley & Duff, 1978). The developments of materials, methodology, language courses and teacher–training of teaching language in general and ELT in particular in language classroom have seriously been done by them. From the appeared time of CLT, English teachers, syllabus designers, English language researchers, linguists, and language experts have used this approach to find a solution to the problems of ELT over the world.

REFERENCES

Akmjian, A., Demers, R.A., Farmer, A.K, & Harnish, R. M. (2001). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. England: The MIT Press.

Allen, J.P.B. (1984). *General purpose language learning: a variable focus approach* In C. J. Brumfit (ed). *General English Syllabus Design* . (pp.61-74). Oxford: Pergamon.

Allwright, D. (1983). Classroom-Centered Research on Teaching and Learning. A brief historical over view. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2)-191-204. DOI: 10.2307/3586649.

Birjandi, P., Mosallanejad, P., & Bagheridoust, E. (2006). *Principles of Teaching Foreign Language.* Tehran: Rahrovan publications.

Bloomfield, L. (1942). *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages. Special Publications of the Linguistic Society of America*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.

Brumfit,C.J. (1984).*Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching-The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brumfit,C.J. (1995). *Teacher professionalism and research*; In G.Cook and B. Seidlhofer (eds), *Principles and Practice in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 27-42.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1.

Candlin, C. (1978). *Teaching of English: Principles and an exercise typology*. London: Langenscheidt-Longman.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.

Chomsky, N. (1971). *Selected Reading's* (eds). Allen J.P.B. & Van Buren, Paul. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corder, S.P. (1967). The Significance of Learner's Errors. *IRAL, 5*(1-4), 161-170. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161.

Crystal, D. (1992). *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages.* USA: Black Well Publishers.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farhady, H., & Delshad, S. (2007). *An Introduction to Methodology for TEFL/TESL.* Iran: Tehran , SAMT.

Finch, G. (2000). *Linguistics Terms and Concepts.* London: MACMILLAN Press Ltd.

Fries, C.C. (1945). *Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language.* Ann Avbor: University of Michigan Press.

Habermas, J. (1970). Toward to theory of communicative competence. *Inquiry*, 13 (1-4), 360-375. https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747008601597.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1973). *Explorations in Functions of Language.* London: Edward Arnold.

Holec, H. (1979). *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Howatt, A.P.R.& Smith,R. (2014). The History of Teaching English as a Foreign Language, from a British and European Perspective. *language and history*, 57 (1), 75–95. DOI: 10.1179/1759753614Z.00000000028.

Hymes, D. (1971). *on communicative competence.* In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Soci linguistics: Selected Readings* (pp. 269-285). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Johnson, K. (1976). The production of functional materials and their integration within existing language- teaching programs. *ELT Documents,* 76 (1),16-25.

Khansir, A.A., (2012). Error Analysis and Second Language Acquisition. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2 (5), 1027-1032. doi:10.4304/tpls.2.5.1027-1032.

Khansir, A.A., (2013). Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research,15 (8)*,1140-1146. DOI: 10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.15.8.11238.

Khansir, A.A. (2014a). TRENDS OF LANGUAGE METHODS IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW),* 6(2): 259-268.

Khansir, A.A. (2014b). THE PLACE OF HYPOTHESES OF KRASHEN IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW),* 7(2): 136-142.

Khansir, A.A. & Pakdel, F. (2016). Place of Linguistics in English Language Teaching. Arab World English Journal,7(3), 373-384.

Khansir, A.A. & Pakdel, F.(2018). Study of Errors and English Language Teaching: A Systematic Review. The Journal of Social Sciences Research, 4(12), 531-538. https://doi.org/10.32861/jssr.412.531.538

Khansir, A.A. & Pakdel, F. (2019). Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis and Second Language Learning. *Journal of ELT Research,*4(1), 35-43. DOI: 10.22236/JER_Vol4Issue1.

Krashen, S.D. (1987). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* UK: Prentice-Hall International.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistic across culture.* University of Michigan Press: Annrbor.

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, T. (2008*). Communication in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maley, A, & Duff, A. (1978). *Drama techniques in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nagaraj, G. (1996). *ENGLISH LANGAUGE TEACHING*. Calcutta: India.

Nunan, D. (1993). *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Piepho, H.E. (1974). *Kommunicative Kompetence als ubergeornete lernziel des Englischunterrichls.* Dornburg-Frickhofen, West Germany: Frankonius.

Pieho,H.E & Bredella, L. (1976). *Contacts: Integrirtes Englischlehrwerk Fur Rlassen 5-10.* Bochum, West Germany: Kamp.

Prabhu, N.S. (1984). *Communicative Teaching: "Communicative*" in what Sense? *In the RELC Seminar on "Communicative Language Teaching*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Rashtchi, M., & Keyvanfar, A. (2002). *ELT*. IRAN: Tehran, Rahnama Publications.

Richards, JC. Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.* Essex: Longman.

Richards, J.C, & Rodgers , T.S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge.* Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W. (1973). "From Linguistic Competence to Communicative Competence," *TESOL Quarterly,* 7(I),1-11. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3585507.

Savignon, S.J. (1972). *Communicative Competence*: An experiment in foreign language teaching. Philadelphia, PA: Center for Curriculum Development.

Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trask, R.L. (1996). *Historical Linguistics*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Van Ek, J.A. (1976). *The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in Schools*. London: Longman.

Varshney, R.L. (1998). *An Introductory Text Book of Linguistics and Phonetics*. India: Student Store, Rampur Bagh, BAREILLY-243001.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D.A. (1976). *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.