Very rare
Sometimes
Mostly
Always
Almost Always

6. How often do you integrate " focus on form " (grammar) activities within communicative contexts, rather than teaching grammar in isolation from the context?
Very rare
Sometime
Mostly
Always
Almost Always

7. How often do you feel successful in creating a supportive classroom environment that
encourages students to take language risks without fear of mistakes?
Very rare
Sometime
Mostly
Always
Almost Always

8. How satisfied are you with the level of student participation in
communication activities in general in your class?
Very rare
Sometimes
Mostly
Always
Almost Always

9. To what extent do you feel that systematic time constraints affect your ability to adequately implement communication activities?
Very rare
Sometime
Mostly
Always
Almost Always

10. How much do you think a large class size affects your ability to facilitate effective
communication interactions?
Very rare
Sometime
Mostly
Always
Almost Always

a significant challenge to fostering communication in your class?
[Yes / No]
5. Do you employ specific strategies to engage students who are reluctant to participate in communicative activities?
[Yes / No]
6. Do you believe you need more training to apply the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach more effectively?
[Yes / No]
7. Do you feel your role as a teacher has changed or evolved with the emphasis on communication in English language teaching?
[Yes / No]
8. Do you think focusing on communication increases students' confidence in using English outside the classroom?
[Yes / No]
9. Do you believe the current English language curricula at the university adequately support the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach?
[Yes / No]
10. Do you think students generally prefer communicative activities over grammar-focused ones? [Yes / No]

Part two :English Professor Survey: very rare/sometimes/Mostly Questions

1. How often do you use group discussions or couple activities to encourage students to speak English?
Very rare
Sometime
Mostly
Always
Almost Always
2. How often are you assigned problem-solving or role-playing tasks that require
students to communicate to achieve a goal?
Very rare
Sometime
Mostly
Always
Almost Always
3. How often do you provide communicative feedback (which focuses on the message
and meaning) instead of focusing only on grammatical errors?
Very rare
Sometime
Mostly
Always
Almost Always
4. How often do you encourage students to interact with each other without direct interference from you?
Very rare
Sometime
Mostly
Always
Almost Always
5. How often do you use authentic material (such as videos, news articles, or music) to create real communication contexts?

Legal Deposit Number 313/2023 E-ISSN 3007-4495 ISSN-L 3007-4495
DOI : https://doi.org/10.37376/ajhas.vi5

14. I understand lessons better through interaction.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

15. Interaction with classmates improves my understanding of the English language.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

16. Teachers encourage all students to participate.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

17. Interactive lessons leave a longer-lasting impression on me.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

18. I feel that my voice is heard in class.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

19. I enjoy expressing my opinions during class activities.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

20. Teachers use modern teaching methods that promote participation.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

Teachers questionnaires

Questionnaire: Exploring Communicative Language Teaching in the Classroom Dear Esteemed Faculty Member, We are currently conducting a research study to gain a deeper understanding of the roles of both teachers and learners in the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, specifically within the Department of English at the Faculty of Arts and Science – Al Abyar. As you know, CLT emphasizes the importance of interaction and communication for effective language learning.

Your insights as a faculty member are central to this study, which aims to investigate how you implement CLT strategies in your classrooms and how learners respond to these methods. Your honest responses to the following questions will help us form a comprehensive understanding of current practices and their impact on students' language learning journeys. This information will contribute significantly to enhancing the teaching and learning experience for everyone.

Thank you very much for your valuable participation. Your feedback is highly appreciated and will be kept strictly confidential.

Part one : Yes/No Questions

Instructions: Please answer the following questions with Yes or No.

1. Do you believe students' prior educational background (e.g., grammar-focused schooling) affects their readiness for communicative activities?

[Yes / No]

2. Do you feel confident in your ability to assess students' communicative competence

rather than just grammatical knowledge?

[Yes / No]

3. Do you believe students in your class feel comfortable enough to take linguistic risks (e.g., trying new words or complex structures)?

[Yes / No]

4. Do you find that "quiet students" present

☐ Yes ☐No

12. Is the classroom environment conducive to interaction?

☐ Yes ☐No

13. Do you prefer interactive lessons over traditional lectures?

☐ Yes ☐No

14. Do you apply what you learn in class in real-life situations?

☐ Yes ☐No

15. Do you feel your teacher listens to your feedback?

☐ Yes ☐No

16. Does the teaching method affect your motivation to learn?

☐ Yes ☐No

17. Are you encouraged to think critically during lessons?

☐ Yes ☐No

18. Do you participate in class activities without hesitation?

☐ Yes ☐No

19. Do your classmates encourage you to interact?

☐ Yes ☐No

20. Do you think in-class interaction directly improves your language skills?

☐ Yes ☐No

Part Two: Agreement Scale Questions

1. Interactive activities in class help me improve my language skills .

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

2. I feel more confident when working in a group.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

3. Teachers provide genuine opportunities to practice speaking

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

4. Feedback from the teacher helps me improve my communication skills.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

5. I prefer practical activities over theoretical explanations.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

6. Group activities make learning more enjoyable.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

7. Group work helps strengthen my language skills.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

8. Our English classes are taught in a way that encourages communication.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

9. I feel motivated when participating in discussions.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

10. Interactive tasks help me improve my listening skills.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

11. My learning style matches the interactive teaching approach.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

12. I feel comfortable making mistakes in an interactive environment.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

13. The content presented in class relates to my personal interests.

☐ Disagree ☐Agree ☐Strongly Agree

University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190

13. Sato, T. (2023). Technology-mediated task-based language teaching and learner motivation. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 36(2), 234–249. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1965614

APPENDICES

Questionnaire: Exploring Communicative Language Teaching in the Classroom Dear Students, We are conducting a research study to better understand the roles of both teachers and learners in the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, specifically within the Department of English at the Faculty of Arts and Science – Al Abyar. As you know, CLT emphasizes the importance of interaction and communication for effective language learning.

Your insights are crucial to this study, which aims to examine how CLT strategies are implemented in your classrooms and how you, as learners, respond to these methods. Your honest responses to the following questions will help us gain a comprehensive understanding of the current practices and their impact on your language learning journey. This information will contribute to enhancing the teaching and learning experience for everyone. Thank you for your valuable participation. Your feedback is greatly appreciated and will be kept confidential.

1. Students questionnaire

Part One: Yes / No Questions

1. Do you feel comfortable speaking English in class?

☐ Yes ☐No

2. Does your teacher encourage class participation?

☐ Yes ☐No

3. Do you prefer working in groups rather than individually?

☐ Yes ☐No

4. Do group activities help you improve your language skills?

☐ Yes ☐No

5. Do you get enough opportunities to speak English in class?

. ☐Yes ☐No

6. Do role-play activities help you practice the language?

☐ Yes ☐No

7. Do you think communicating with your teacher increases your participation?

☐ Yes ☐No

8. Do you use English outside the classroom?

☐ Yes ☐No

9. Do interactive activities boost your confidence?

☐ Yes ☐No

10. Do you face difficulties interacting with peers in English?

☐ Yes ☐No

11. Does your teacher give you enough time to participate?

insights into interaction patterns and learner experiences. Longitudinal studies may also examine how sustained exposure to Communicative Language Teaching influences learner confidence and proficiency over time. These steps would contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how communicative approaches can be optimized in higher education contexts

REFERENCES

1. Alrabai, F. (2014). A model of foreign language anxiety in the Saudi EFL context. English Language Teaching, 7(7), 82–101. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n7p82

2. Al-Busaidi, S., & Tuzlukova, V. (2018). Challenges and opportunities in adopting CLT in the Arab world. International Journal of Instruction, 11(4), 75–90. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.1146a

3. Ahmed, H. (2022). Implementing communicative language teaching in Arab EFL classrooms: Issues and solutions. Arab World English Journal, 13(2), 33–49. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no2.3

Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching (5th ed.). Pearson Education.

4. 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

5. El-Sakka, S. (2016). EFL learners' oral communication problems and strategies to overcome them. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7(2), 285–291. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0702.09

6. Fernández, M. (2021). Revisiting accuracy in communicative language teaching: A critical perspective. Applied Linguistics Review, 12(3), 456–470. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0007

7. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics: Selected readings (pp. 269–293). Penguin.

8. Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). Techniques & principles in language teaching (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

9. López, A. (2023). Decolonial approaches to communicative language teaching. Journal of Critical Language Studies, 1(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/critical.2023.001

10. Nguyen, T. (2020). Communicative language teaching in the digital age: Enhancing pragmatic and intercultural competence. Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching, 23(2), 78–92.

11. Park, J. (2023). Standardized testing and communicative language teaching: A challenging reconciliation. Language Assessment Quarterly, 20(1), 89–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2022.2154563

12. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). Cambridge

porting the development of communicative competence. Both students and teachers generally viewed communicative activities as beneficial, particularly in enhancing speaking confidence, learner engagement, and practical language use.

However, the results also reveal clear limitations in the practical implementation of Communicative Language Teaching. Although interaction is encouraged in principle, opportunities for sustained and meaningful learner talk remain restricted. A notable proportion of students experience discomfort when speaking English and face difficulties during peer interaction. These challenges indicate that communicative classrooms do not equally support all learners, especially those with limited proficiency or prior exposure to learner-centered instruction. Teacher responses further highlight structural constraints, including large class sizes, limited instructional time, and the need for additional professional training.

Overall, the study concludes that the effectiveness of Communicative Language Teaching depends not only on methodological adoption but also on the quality of implementation. Without adequate scaffolding, consistent encouragement, and supportive institutional conditions, communicative practices risk becoming superficial rather than transformative. The roles of teachers and learners must therefore be viewed as dynamic and context-sensitive, requiring continuous adjustment to classroom realities.

8.2. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations are proposed. Teachers should adopt more systematic strategies to ensure balanced participation and to support learners who experience anxiety or reluctance during communicative tasks. Greater emphasis should be placed on structuring group work, providing clear task objectives, and creating a classroom climate that normalizes error as a part of the learning process.

Teacher training programs should include focused professional development on communicative classroom management, assessment of communicative competence, and inclusive interaction strategies. Such training would support instructors in moving beyond theoretical understanding toward consistent and effective practice.

At the institutional level, curriculum designers and policymakers should align course objectives, assessment practices, and class sizes with communicative goals. Reducing overcrowded classrooms and allowing sufficient time for interaction would significantly enhance the quality of communicative learning.

Finally, future research should incorporate qualitative methods such as classroom observation and interviews to capture deeper

ings introduce a more critical perspective. Although group activities were generally viewed as helpful, a notable proportion of students reported difficulties interacting with peers and expressed limited confidence in collaborative tasks. This challenges the widely cited view that peer interaction automatically promotes fluency and motivation. The results suggest that group work, when insufficiently structured, may reproduce anxiety and uneven participation rather than resolve it.

The teacher data further support critiques raised in recent literature regarding contextual constraints. Similar to previous research identifying class size, time limitations, and assessment pressures as barriers, instructors in this study reported these factors as significant obstacles to consistent communicative practice. Notably, the frequent acknowledgment of the need for additional training reinforces arguments that successful implementation of Communicative Language Teaching depends on professional development rather than methodological adoption alone.

Overall, this study contributes to ongoing debates by highlighting a gap between the theoretical promises of Communicative Language Teaching and its practical outcomes. While earlier research often emphasizes effectiveness, the present findings argue for a more cautious interpretation.

Communicative Language Teaching does not fail, but it does not function uniformly across all learners or contexts. Its success depends on institutional conditions, teacher preparation, and sensitivity to learner diversity. These results support calls in the literature for adaptive and context-sensitive models that balance communicative interaction with structured support, ensuring that communicative classrooms remain both effective and equitable.

In summary, this study contributes to the growing body of literature on CLT by offering empirical evidence from a Libyan university context. It highlights the dual responsibility of teachers and institutions in promoting communicative competence and suggests that sustainable change requires a collaborative effort that addresses both pedagogical practices and systemic barriers. These findings have implications for curriculum design, teacher education, and educational policy, providing a foundation for future research aimed at enhancing the quality of EFL instruction in similar contexts.

8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1. Conclusion

This study examined the roles of teachers and learners within the Communicative Language Teaching framework in a university English language context. The findings demonstrate that Communicative Language Teaching plays a significant role in promoting classroom interaction and sup-

6. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Overall, both students and teachers expressed positive attitudes towards CLT. Students enjoyed group work, interaction, and relevance to real life. Teachers acknowledged the importance of communicative competence. Students were aware of barriers related to speaking, the size of the class, students who did not want to participate, and teacher training. Teachers also identified barriers to CLT, which included limited speaking opportunities, size of classes, students feeling reluctant, and a lack of teacher training.

7. DISCUSSION

This study set out to examine the roles of teachers and learners within the framework of Communicative Language Teaching in a university English language context. The findings both support and problematize claims made in previous research, suggesting that while Communicative Language Teaching remains pedagogically influential, its classroom realization is more complex and context dependent than often presented in the literature.

Previous studies frequently argue that Communicative Language Teaching enhances learner confidence and increases oral participation by reducing anxiety and shifting responsibility to learners. The present findings partially support this claim, as a clear majority of students reported feeling comfortable speaking English and perceived communicative activities as beneficial for language development. This aligns with earlier research emphasizing the positive relationship between interaction and communicative competence. However, the persistence of a substantial minority of students who reported discomfort and reluctance to participate challenges the assumption that communicative environments are inherently inclusive. Unlike studies that portray learner engagement as a natural outcome of communicative tasks, the present results suggest that such engagement is uneven and shaped by learner background and classroom conditions.

The findings also extend previous discussions on teacher roles in Communicative Language Teaching. Much of the literature positions teachers as effective facilitators who successfully guide interaction while minimizing direct control. While teachers in this study largely perceived themselves in this role, student responses reveal inconsistency in how encouragement and participation opportunities are experienced. This discrepancy complicates earlier claims that teacher facilitation alone ensures equitable interaction. Instead, the results indicate that facilitation must be sustained, explicit, and responsive to individual learner needs in order to be effective.

In contrast to studies that celebrate group work as a central strength of Communicative Language Teaching, the present find-

a considerable number of students indicated challenges during collaborative tasks. These challenges included hesitation to speak English with peers, reliance on stronger students during group work, and limited contribution to discussions. Such responses reflect differences in learners' language proficiency and willingness to participate.

A thematic analysis of both student and teacher responses revealed several shared challenges that impede the full implementation of CLT. Table 3 provides a comparative overview of these barriers, highlighting that systemic issues such as large class sizes and lack of specialized training are recognized by both groups. Interestingly, teachers specifically noted time constraints and exam pressures as significant institutional hurdles

Table (3) Comparison of Perceived Barriers to CLT Implementation

Barrier Category	Reported by Students	Reported by Teachers
Large Class Sizes	Yes	Yes
Limited Speaking Opportunities	Yes	Yes
Learner Reluctance / Anxiety	Yes	Yes
Lack of Professional Teacher Training	Yes	Yes
Time Constraints & Exam Pressure	No	Yes

As shown in Table 3 regarding the perceived impact of communicative activities, a substantial proportion of students reported improvement in speaking and listening skills. These students associated progress with regular exposure to interaction and opportunities to use English for meaningful communication. In contrast, some students reported minimal improvement, suggesting that communicative activities alone do not guarantee equal learning outcomes for all participants.

Teacher responses provide further insight into classroom practices. Most instructors reported frequent use of communicative activities and identified their primary role as facilitators of interaction. Teachers indicated that they guide activities, monitor group work, and provide feedback during tasks rather than focusing exclusively on direct explanation. However, several instructors reported practical constraints that affect implementation. These constraints included large class sizes, limited lesson time, and the need to prepare students for examinations.

Overall, the results demonstrate that Communicative Language Teaching is present and actively practiced in the studied context. Student engagement and teacher facilitation are evident across most classrooms. At the same time, differences in learner confidence, participation levels, and perceived skill development indicate variability in how communicative practices are experienced. These findings offer a detailed empirical foundation for understanding the current state of communicative language teaching and inform the interpretation presented in the subsequent discussion section.

percent of students reported discomfort when speaking English, indicating variation in learners' emotional readiness to participate orally. This variation highlights differences in learner confidence within the same instructional environment.

To answer the research questions regarding learner participation and perception of CLT, descriptive statistics were calculated for the student questionnaire. As illustrated in Table 1, the majority of students (77.5%) expressed a high level of comfort when using English in communicative contexts, while 75% recognized the active role of their teachers in facilitating interaction. These figures suggest a generally positive environment for communicative practice, although a significant minority still faces emotional and participation barriers.

Table (1) Students' Perceptions of Classroom Interaction and Teacher Support (N=80)

Item No.	Question Statement	Yes (%)	No (%)
1	Do you feel comfortable speaking English in class?	77.5%	22.5%
2	Does your teacher encourage class participation?	75%	25%
3	Do group activities help you improve your language skills?	80%	20%
4	Is the classroom environment conducive to interaction?	75%	25%

As shown in Table 1 teacher support for interaction, 75 percent of students stated that their teachers actively encouraged participation during lessons. This includes prompting students to speak, organizing interactive activities, and allowing opportunities for discussion. However, 25 percent of students reported limited encouragement, suggesting that the level of teacher support is not consistently perceived across all classes. These responses point to differences in classroom management practices and degrees of emphasis placed on student participation.

The teacher questionnaire aimed to identify the frequency of communicative strategies employed during instruction. The data summarized in Table 2 indicate that teachers predominantly view themselves as facilitators, with a high frequency of group-based activities and real-time feedback. However, the integration of authentic materials remains less frequent, reflecting potential resource or time limitations

Table (2) Frequency of Communicative Practices as Reported by Teachers (N=7)

Instructional Practice	Frequency	Primary Role
Use of pair and the group work	Always / Mostly	Facilitator
Monitoring and guiding tasks	Always / Mostly	Facilitator
Providing feedback on meaning	Sometimes / Mostly	Facilitator
Integrating authentic materials	Sometimes	Facilitator

Table 2 illustrates the results related to learner participation show that a majority of students frequently engaged in pair work and group work activities. Many students reported that these activities provided opportunities to practice speaking and to exchange ideas with peers. Nevertheless,

Legal Deposit Number 313/2023 E-ISSN 3007-4495 ISSN-L 3007-4495
DOI : https://doi.org/10.37376/ajhas.vi5

perceptions of their students' readiness for CLT, the extent to which they integrate communicative teaching techniques into their instruction, challenges they face in implementing these techniques, and their professional development needs.

To ensure content validity, both instruments were reviewed by two experts in applied linguistics. A pilot study involving 10 students and two instructors was conducted to check the clarity and structure of the items, as well as to test the instruments' reliability. Feedback from the pilot phase led to minor adjustments to improve wording and item organization. The reliability of the questionnaires was measured using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded coefficients of 0.82 for the student questionnaire and 0.85 for the teacher questionnaire, indicating a high level of internal consistency.

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Department of English at the Faculty of Arts and Science – Al-Abyar. After approval, printed copies of the questionnaires were distributed to students during their regular class sessions and to instructors in their offices. A brief explanation of the study's purpose and procedures was provided to all participants, with assurances of anonymity and confidentiality. No personal identifying information was collected. The data collection process was carried out over a two-week period to avoid disruption to the participants' academic schedules and to ensure that all targeted respondents had adequate time to complete the questionnaires. Upon completion of data collection, the responses were coded and entered into a statistical software program for analysis. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, were used to summarize the data and present the findings in structured tables for clarity. In addition, responses to open-ended questions were analyzed thematically to generate qualitative insights that complemented the quantitative results and provided a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities associated with implementing CLT in the EFL classroom.

5. RESULTS

This section provides a detailed analytical account of the quantitative findings obtained from the student and teacher questionnaires. The results are presented descriptively through percentages to reflect patterns of classroom practice and participants` perceptions, without visual aids or evaluative debate.

The findings indicate that communicative practices are a regular feature of English language instruction in the investigated context. A clear majority of students, 77.5 percent, reported feeling comfortable speaking English during classroom activities. This suggests that many learners perceive the classroom as a space that allows oral language use. At the same time, 22.5

flexible and context-sensitive approaches that integrate communicative interaction with focused language instruction.

Overall, the literature confirms the theoretical value of Communicative Language Teaching while revealing gaps between theory and practice. These studies underline the importance of examining how teacher and learner roles are enacted in real classroom settings. Such investigating is necessary to understand the conditions under which communicative approaches can effectively support language development in higher education.

4. METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a quantitative descriptive research design to explore the roles of teachers and learners in the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. A quantitative approach was considered appropriate because it allows for the systematic collection and statistical analysis of data to objectively measure participants' perceptions, attitudes, and practices. By employing structured questionnaires, this design enabled the identification of patterns and trends related to CLT implementation, ensuring both reliability and replicability of the findings.

The study was conducted at the Faculty of Arts and Sciences – Al-Abyar , University of Benghazi, during the academic year 2024–2025. The participants consisted of two groups: 80 undergraduate EFL students enrolled in the Department of English and seven English language instructors teaching in the same department. A purposive sampling technique was employed to ensure that participants were directly engaged in the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language. This sampling method was selected to guarantee the relevance of the data collected to the study's objectives. Participation was entirely voluntary, and all participants were fully informed about the purpose of the study, the procedures involved, and their right to withdraw at any point without facing any consequences.

Two separate but complementary questionnaires were developed to collect data from both students and teachers. The student questionnaire consisted of Likert-scale items, yes/no questions, and multiple-choice questions designed to measure students' comfort level in speaking English, their willingness to engage in communicative activities, preferences for group work, perceptions of teacher support, and the barriers they encounter in interactive learning settings. For example, items included statements such as "I feel confident participating in group discussions conducted in English" and "My teacher provides sufficient opportunities for oral practice." The teacher questionnaire, on the other hand, included both frequency-based items and open-ended questions. It aimed to explore teachers'

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Communicative Language Teaching has been widely discussed as a response to limitations found in traditional grammar-based approaches to language instruction. Early language teaching methods emphasized accuracy, memorization, and teacher control, often resulting in limited opportunities for learners to use language meaningfully. In contrast, Communicative Language Teaching views language as a functional system used for interaction and meaning-making, with communicative competence as the primary goal of instruction.

Scholars define communicative competence as the ability to use language accurately, fluently, and appropriately in different social contexts. This concept extends beyond grammatical knowledge to include sociolinguistic awareness, discourse skills, and strategic competence. Research suggests that learners develop these competencies more effectively when they engage in authentic communication rather than mechanical practice. As a result, interaction has become a central component of communicative classrooms.

Within this framework, the role of the teacher has undergone a significant transformation. Teachers are no longer seen solely as transmitters of linguistic knowledge but as facilitators who design communicative tasks, manage interaction, and provide feedback that supports meaning as well as form. Studies indicate that teachers who successfully adopt this role create environments that encourage learner participation, reduce anxiety, and promote risk-taking in language use. However, several researchers note that teachers often struggle to balance communicative activities with institutional demands such as syllabus coverage and assessment requirements.

Equally important is the role of the learner in Communicative Language Teaching. Learners are expected to take an active role in the learning process by participating in discussions, collaborating with peers, and negotiating meaning. Research shows that learner-centered environments increase motivation and autonomy and lead to greater confidence in using the target language. Nevertheless, prior educational experiences that emphasize accuracy and teacher authority may limit learners' willingness to participate orally, especially in university contexts.

Recent studies also highlight contextual challenges that affect the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching. Large class sizes, limited instructional time, and insufficient teacher training are frequently identified as obstacles to sustained communicative practice. Some scholars argue that an uncritical application of communicative principles may marginalize learners who require more structured support. As a result, current literature emphasizes the need for

Legal Deposit Number 313/2023 E-ISSN 3007-4495 ISSN-L 3007-4495
DOI : https://doi.org/10.37376/ajhas.vi5

How do learners participate in communicative activities within a Communicative Language Teaching environment?

What roles do teachers assume when implementing the Communicative Language Teaching approach at the university level?

The significance of this study is twofold. First, at the pedagogical level, it provides empirical insight into how Communicative Language Teaching is implemented in university English classrooms and how teacher and learner roles shape classroom interaction. By identifying effective communicative practices and common challenges, the study supports teachers in refining instructional strategies that increase learner participation and meaningful language use. It also informs curriculum designers and teacher trainers about areas that require greater support, particularly in creating interaction-focused and learner-centered classroom environments.

Second, at the academic level, the study contributes to the growing body of research on Communicative Language Teaching in higher education contexts. It adds context-specific evidence from university English programs and highlights the relationship between communicative practices and learner engagement. This contribution helps bridge the gap between theoretical principles of CLT and actual classroom practice, offering a foundation for future research on communicative approaches and teacher development in similar educational settings.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Despite the wide theoretical support for Communicative Language Teaching and its reported effectiveness in developing communicative competence, there remains a clear gap between theory and classroom practice in many higher education contexts. Previous research has largely focused on the pedagogical principles of CLT or on teachers' practices in isolation, while fewer empirical studies have examined the negotiated and complementary roles of both teachers and learners within the same instructional context. In addition, limited attention has been given to university-level English programs in the Libyan context, particularly studies that rely on quantitative data collected from both instructors and students. As a result, there is insufficient empirical evidence explaining how CLT is actually implemented in Libyan higher education classrooms and how teacher facilitation and learner participation interact to shape classroom communication. This study addresses this gap by investigating the roles of teachers and learners in implementing CLT at the University of Benghazi, using quantitative data from both groups to provide a context-specific understanding of communicative practices and their challenges.

Legal Deposit Number 313/2023 E-ISSN 3007-4495 ISSN-L 3007-4495
DOI : https://doi.org/10.37376/ajhas.vi5

1. INTRODUCTION

English language teaching has undergone a clear shift from an emphasis on grammatical accuracy toward the use of language for meaningful communication. This shift reflects a growing recognition that language functions primarily as a tool for interaction rather than as a set of isolated rules. Within this perspective, Communicative Language Teaching has emerged as a central approach in modern language education, particularly in higher education contexts.

Communicative Language Teaching promotes active learner engagement through tasks that resemble real-life communication. Activities such as group discussions, role-play, and problem-solving encourage learners to use language purposefully and collaboratively. Within this approach, the teacher's role changes from knowledge transmitter to facilitator of learning, while learners assume greater responsibility for participating, negotiating meaning, and constructing knowledge through interaction.

Despite its theoretical prominence, the practical implementation of Communicative Language Teaching remains inconsistent across classrooms. Factors such as class size, students' prior grammar-focused learning experiences, and limited opportunities for oral practice can reduce the effectiveness of communicative activities. In some contexts, learners show reluctance to participate orally due to low confidence or fear of making errors, which restricts authentic communication.

Against this background, examining the roles of teachers and learners within the Communicative Language Teaching framework becomes essential. Understanding how these roles are enacted in actual classroom settings provides insights into the conditions that support or hinder communicative learning. Therefore, this study focuses on analyzing teacher and learner`s roles in university-level English language classrooms, with the aim of clarifying their impact on classroom interaction and the development of communicative competence.

Communicative Language Teaching places interaction at the center of English language learning and requires active involvement from both teachers and learners. The effectiveness of this approach depends largely on how teachers organize communicative activities and how learners respond to them inside the classroom. Examining these roles helps clarify whether communicative principles are applied in practice and how they influence classroom interaction and language development. Based on the focus of this study, the following research questions were formulated. The research is guided by three central questions:

How do English language teachers promote interaction and communication in a Communicative Language Teaching classroom?

ISSUE : 5 March 2026
Faculty of Arts and Sciences ALAbyar University of Benghazi
Afaq Journal for Human and Applied Studies
العـــدد : الخـــامس مـــــارس 2026
كلية الآداب والعلوم الإبيار - جامعة بنغازي
مجلـــة آفاق للدراسات الإنسانية والتطبيقية

أدوار المعلمين والمتعلمين في تطبيق منهج تعليم اللغة التواصلي (CLT) دراسة حالة بجامعة بنغازي – فرع الأبيار

أ. أسماء محمد صالح إبراهيم الوادي*، أ. أسماء عوض نوح عبد السلام**، أ. إيمان يونس بدر عبد الحميد***.

الملخص:

يشهد تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية تحولًا متزايدًا من التركيز على القواعد إلى التركيز على التواصل بوصفه جوهر الكفاءة اللغوية. يضع منهج تعليم اللغة التواصلي المتعلم في مركز العملية التعليمية ويعيد تعريف دور المعلم داخل الصف الجامعي. رغم انتشار هذا المنهج ما زالت أدوار المعلمين والمتعلمين في تطبيقه الفعلي غير واضحة في بعض السياقات التعليمية. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى فحص كيفية تطبيق منهج تعليم اللغة التواصلي ودراسة أدوار كل من المعلمين والمتعلمين في هذا الإطار. اعتمدت الدراسة المنهج الكمي من خلال استبيانات وُزعت على ثمانين طالبًا وسبعة من مدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية في كلية الآداب والعلوم بالأبيار. تُظهر النتائج أن المعلمين يتبنون استراتيجيات تفاعلية مثل العمل الجماعي ولعب الأدوار بينما أشار الطلاب إلى تحسن مهاراتهم اللغوية وزيادة ثقتهم عند المشاركة الفاعلة. تخلص الدراسة إلى أن نجاح تعليم اللغة يعتمد على التفاعل المتبادل بين المعلم والمتعلم وتبرز الحاجة إلى بيئة صفية تواصلية تدعم الاستخدام الحقيقي للغة وتسهم في تطوير ممارسات تعليمية أكثر فاعلية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: دور المعلم، دور المتعلم، التفاعل الصفي، تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية.

*. محاضر مساعد، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب والعلوم الأبيار جامعة بنغازي.
**. محاضر مساعد، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب والعلوم الأبيار جامعة بنغازي.
***. محاضر مساعد، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب والعلوم الأبيار جامعة بنغازي.

ISSUE : 5 March 2026
Faculty of Arts and Sciences ALAbyar University of Benghazi
Afaq Journal for Human and Applied Studies

العـدد : الخـامس مـــارس 2026
كلية الآداب والعلوم الإبيار - جامعة بنغازي
مجلـــة آفاق للدراسات الإنسانية والتطبيقية

Teachers and Learners' Roles in Implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): A Case Study at the University of Benghazi – Al-Abyar Campus .

*. Mrs. Asmaa Mohammed Saleh Ibrahim Alwadi, **Mrs. Asmaa Awad Noah Abdelsalam, ***Mrs. Eman Younis Badr Abdelhamid

Date of Receipt: 05/10/2025 | **Date of Acceptance:** 25/01/2026 | **Date of Publication:** June 2026

ABSTRACT:

English language teaching has shifted from rule-based instruction toward communication as the core of language use. Communicative Language Teaching places interaction at the center of learning and reshapes the roles of teachers and learners. Yet classroom implementation remains uneven in many university contexts. This study examines how CLT is applied and how teachers and learners enact their roles in practice. The study used a quantitative design based on structured questionnaires administered to 80 undergraduate students and seven English language instructors at the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in Al-Abyar.

Here we show that teachers report frequent use of interactive practices such as group work and role-play, while students associate these practices with improved language use and higher participation. The findings indicate that effective language learning depends on shared responsibility between teachers and learners. The study highlights the need for supportive classroom environments that increase speaking opportunities and strengthen communicative competence in higher education contexts.

KEYWORDS: Communicative Language Teaching, Teacher role, Learner role, Classroom Interaction, English Language Teaching.

* *Assistant Lecturer, Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Science – Al-Abyar University of Benghazi.*

** *Assistant Lecturer, Department of English Faculty of Arts and Science – Al-Abyar, University of Benghazi.*

*** *Assistant Lecturer, Department of English Faculty of Arts and Science – Al-Abyar University of Benghazi.*

* ***corresponding author:*** *Mrs. Asmaa Alwadi.* Asmaa.abraheem@uob.edu.ly

DOI:https://doi.org/10.37376/ajhas.vi5.7660

Copyright©C2024University of Benghazi.
This.open.Access.article.is Distributed under a CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 licens.