Communicative language teaching methods designed to enhance the interpretation, expression and negotiation of meaning will continue to be explored and adapted.

- Sandra. J. Savignon
9.0 Conclusion:

Since the early 19th century, when English language teaching (ELT) entered into the formal education system in global context, ELT teachers and researchers have been seeking the best method for ELT. Different methods have been introduced, tried out, and found unsatisfactory. Among them, the Direct method in the early decades of the 20th century, the situational method in the 1960s, the audio-lingual method in the 50s, and the communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the 1980s.

In the early 1990s, in most countries in Asia where English is taught as a foreign language, governments pursued the new administrative policies regarding the language education because they realized it was essential for them to master English language as a communication tool in order to play an active role in the political and economic world. For instance, the South Korean Ministry of Education published the new Korean teaching guide in 1992, which clearly states that CLT should replace the audio-lingual method and the Grammar-translation method in middle and high schools in South Korea (Choi et. al, 1996; Lee, 1990). Furthermore, the Japanese Ministry of Education has also emphasized students' communicative competence in a foreign language and introduced team-teaching by native speakers of English and Japanese teachers in English in the classrooms. As a consequence, most teachers in EFL contexts have been encouraged to implement CLT in their classrooms.

In EFL setting, most learners outside the classroom lack daily exposure and inclusion in purposeful exchanges in English medium. These EFL learners are far more dependent upon whatever guided communicative practice they can get in the classroom. It is mainly in the classroom, that they can learn, in the words of Larsen Freeman, D. (2000), "When and how to say what to whom in English." Accordingly, proponents of the CLT approach argued that EFL students are in need of CLT methodology in order to gain facility and confidence in using English. Based on student-centredness, the CLT approach features low profile roles of teachers, frequent use of pair work or small group problem-solving, response of students to authentic
samples of English, extended exchanges on high-interest topics, and the integration of four basic skills, namely speaking, listening, reading and writing. The CLT approach discourages extensive teacher-controlled drills, quizzing of memorized material, and extended commentary on forms of English.

Most teachers as the end-users of CLT have felt the difficulties of implementation of this method in EFL contexts (Li, 1998). Myong-Sook (1995) reported that CLT does not focus on grammar but only on speaking. The misconception of CLT, reported by Medgyes (1986), was that it places greater demands on other traditional, widely-used approaches. Moreover, Li (1998) reported that all teachers who attended in-service training in South Korea considered that the major constraint of implementing CLT is their own deficiencies of spoken English. Finally, Sato and Kleinsasser’s study (1999) showed that Japanese teachers in Australia believed that CLT emphasized communication in the L2; relied heavily on speaking and listening skills; involved less teaching of grammar; used time-consuming activities. Teacher’s reluctance was for implementing it either in interactive way or through innovative practices.

Researchers revealed that lack of systematic training led to a sketchy and usually fragmented understanding of CLT and as a result, they were confused about implementation and this made it rather difficult for teachers in the classroom (Tack-Soo, 1995; Defeng Li, 1998; Sato and Kleinsasser, 1999).

Holliday (1994) found that innovative techniques will succeed only if there is cultural continuity between CLT and more traditional forms. This statement implies how cultural values influence language learning reciprocally. In most Asian countries, although curriculum innovation seems to proceed at government or policy level, traditional education system remains, even now, in particular, in a class at the local level.
For instance, class size is comparatively large, usually with sixty to seventy students in a class, which can be difficult for teachers to manage with communicative instructions. Grammar and reading-based learning and examination are still in common. Furthermore, other subjects are also taught in lecture style, so students are accustomed to rely on the teacher on the matter of providing information. Therefore, this makes it difficult for teachers of English to involve the students in in-class activities. Consequently, teachers in English tend to end up with traditional teaching methods (Li, 1998).

Teachers can facilitate the learning of English by introducing various modes, media and modalities into their teaching. As Joseph, K. S. (1998) notes, if teachers can resort to any of the following ways, many of the difficulties that learners face in the process of learning can be overcome. The teacher may:

i) use visual aids and realia wherever possible;

ii) repeat and paraphrase materials and patterns as often as possible so as to provide opportunity for learners to process them;

iii) speak clearly and slowly with due emphasis on stress and intonation;

iv) use gestures and expressions while giving instructions;

v) resort to such techniques as demonstration, miming and acting;

vi) use language forms that fall within the linguistic repertoire of the learners; and

vii) bring in as many examples as possible.

While interacting with the learners in the classroom, Joseph (1998) believes, if teachers incorporate these modalities into their teaching repertoire, learners would get ample opportunity for not only comprehending the language but also to generate utterances in it. Gradually, this will enable the learners to attain more and more proficiency in English and in the long run, they will turn out to be good communicators in English.
From the study, it was observed that the Functional Communicative approach or the current method of teaching English was effective mostly with some exception. Though previous methods like the Grammar-translation method have still retained their validity, from the analysis, one can see that it is equally effective with the current method. Teachers still feel comfortable with the translation method as it gives positive results.

New methods and new approaches are coming in the field of second language teaching in secondary classrooms like the eclectic method (combination of different methods), but previous methods are not irrelevant or have lost their values. They are still useful in the present scenario.

Through trial and error, experts have realized that no single method is good enough to be universally accepted as the best or the most effective. In teaching practice, many have come in favour of eclecticism, which held that no single method can meet the requirements of teaching and learning process and many ELT methods can be used simultaneously as they have valuable insights. Eclecticism is used in many parts of the world like in China as an alternative to CLT.

Widdowson (1990) argues:

"It is quite common to hear teachers say that they do not subscribe to any particular approach or method in their teaching, but are eclectic.... but if by eclecticism is meant the random and expedient use of whatever technique comes most readily to hand, then it has no merit whatever. It is indeed, professionally irresponsible if it claimed as a pedagogic principle." (p.50)

Johnson (1998) noted that eclecticism's "strength is recognition of diversity, its weakness a tendency to vagueness and lack of principle." (p.104)

So pure eclecticism in language teaching is not convincing and principled eclecticism is needed. Mellow (2000) has used the term 'principled eclecticism' to describe the 'desirable, coherent, and pluralistic' approach, which involves the use of
a variety of language activities in a discriminating manner as required by learners. It is called ‘disciplined eclecticism’ by Rodgers (2001), according to whom this approach is “likely to shape the teaching of second languages in the next decades of the new millennium.”

Xiao-Yun, Y., Zhi-Yang, Z. & Peixing, D. (2007) in a study in China have found that English teachers did not confine themselves to one method/approach, but they were eclectic in approach. In practice, teachers employed methods and approaches with or without one of them as the main construct.

More studies of the foreign language teaching methodology in all kinds of foreign language teaching and learning at all levels should be done in near future, to provide more specific principles for teachers in the classroom.

In conclusion, CLT is not the final answer (Thopson, 1996), and there is no omnipotent teaching method that suits everyone in the classroom. In order to produce effective and efficient learning, teachers are required to take into account and analyze the reality of the different aspects of the classroom like learners’ attitude, language levels, circumstances, expectations and goals. Although there is no doubt that CLT has been hailed as a revolution and adopted globally (Whitely, 1993), EFL teachers may always be moved by such questions within their minds, like, what does communication really mean?

So, as Crystal (1987) observes, it is frequently necessary to introduce an Eclectic approach in which aspects of different methods are selected to meet the demands of particular teaching situations. A teacher who approaches eclectically, Hubbard (1983) argues, is less likely to become fixed in one single method and more likely to keep an eye open for new techniques and approaches.