

# Omani English Teachers' Perspectives on Implementing Communicative Language Teaching in Post-Basic Schools: A Case Study

Amal Salim Alhanashi<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Dr. Tajularipin bin Sulaiman<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PhD Candidate, Faculty of Business, Information and Human Sciences, Kuala Lumpur University of Science & Technology (KLUST), Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>Professor in Pedagogy and Cognitive Development, Department of Foundations of Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

\*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.102100098>

Received: 18 June 2026; Accepted: 30 June 2026; Published: 05 August 2026

## ABSTRACT

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has been widely promoted as an approach emphasizing communicative competence and purposeful language use. Despite its prominence in English language education, a persistent gap exists between teachers' awareness and classroom implementation of CLT principles, particularly in non-native contexts such as Oman. While previous studies have quantified teacher awareness, limited qualitative research has explored how teachers interpret and adapt CLT within their specific classroom contexts. This qualitative case study investigated how six Omani English teachers in government post-basic schools (Grades 11–12) conceptualised and interpreted CLT within their classroom contexts. Semi-structured interviews were conducted and analysed using the Codes–Categories–Themes (CO–CAT) framework to identify patterns in teachers' perspectives. Teachers associated effective implementation of CLT with supportive classroom environments that foster confidence and communication. Teachers also viewed CLT as context-dependent, influenced by learner proficiency, lesson focus, instructional time, and classroom conditions, resulting in selective and adaptive implementation practices. Teachers conceptualised CLT not simply as a collection of communicative techniques, but as a set of interconnected conditions that support classroom communication, including learner participation, authentic language use, emotional support, and contextual adaptation. The study contributes to understanding the theory–practice gap as a process of professional judgement rather than a failure of implementation. The findings may inform teacher professional development, curriculum implementation, and communicative language teaching practices in Oman and similar EFL contexts.

**Keywords:** Communicative Language Teaching, Teacher Perspectives, English Language Teaching, Omani EFL Teachers, Qualitative Study

## INTRODUCTION

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is widely recognised as an approach that emphasises communicative competence and meaningful language use. The primary goal of CLT is the development of communicative competence rather than the mastery of grammatical forms alone (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Savignon, 2002). This perspective marked an important shift in language pedagogy by moving attention from the mastery of linguistic forms toward communication as both the means and the goal of language learning. Earlier approaches, such as the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, and the Audio-Lingual Method, generally placed greater emphasis on linguistic forms and controlled practice, providing comparatively limited opportunities for learners to engage in meaningful communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). As a result, CLT has become a dominant approach within English language education and continues to influence language curricula and classroom practices across diverse educational contexts (Salam & Luksfinanto, 2024).

As CLT gained prominence internationally, its principles were increasingly incorporated into English language curricula in many educational systems, including Oman. Within Oman's national education system, English has held strategic importance since the 1970s, with the government investing substantial resources to support its instruction. English is compulsory from Grade 1 through higher education (Al-Mahrooqi & Denman, 2018), where proficiency is explicitly linked to workforce development and international competitiveness. Aligned with its Vision 2040, Oman has committed to educational transformation emphasizing international standards, student competencies, innovation, and communicative proficiency (Oman Vision 2040, 2020).

Previous studies in Oman have primarily examined teachers' awareness of CLT (Al-Sawafi et al., 2019). However, limited qualitative research has explored how Omani post-basic English teachers conceptualise CLT implementation, the conditions they perceive as necessary for its successful enactment, and how they negotiate communicative principles within the realities of their classroom contexts. Addressing this gap is important because teachers play a central role in shaping classroom practice, and their perspectives can provide valuable insights for policymakers, curriculum developers, and teacher educators seeking to strengthen communicative language teaching in Oman. Such insights may also inform future professional development initiatives aimed at supporting post-basic English teachers in implementing CLT more effectively within their classroom contexts. Accordingly, this qualitative case study addresses the following research question:

What are Omani English teachers' perspectives on implementing Communicative Language Teaching in post-basic schools?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Theoretical Foundations

Communicative Language Teaching is theoretically grounded in Hymes' (1972) concept of communicative competence, which transcended structural views of language proficiency by incorporating sociolinguistic dimensions of language use. Building on this foundation, Canale and Swain (1980), later expanded by Canale (1983), operationalised communicative competence as encompassing grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic dimensions. This multifaceted conception positions language as a social tool for meaningful communication rather than as a system of isolated structures. Michael Halliday is also a key contributor to the theoretical framework of CLT. His systemic functional linguistics (SFL) emphasises that language is a system for generating meaning rather than merely a set of linguistic structures. In this framework, language serves three main functions: the ideational function (communicating content), the interpersonal function (interacting with others), and the textual function (organising discourse) (Halliday, 1978). This perspective provides an important theoretical foundation for understanding communication as a central purpose of language use in real-life contexts.

Drawing on this theoretical foundation, CLT emphasises purposeful language use and learner agency. Within this approach, grammar is conceptualised as one component of broader communicative competence, requiring learners to express ideas, negotiate meaning, and participate in authentic communicative situations. These principles are commonly realised through activities such as discussion, role play, collaborative tasks, and problem-solving activities that encourage active language use (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Savignon, 1987; Ellis, 2003). This orientation redefines the teacher's role from a transmitter of linguistic knowledge to a facilitator who organises learning opportunities, supports learner participation, and guides meaningful interaction (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Such a shift reflects the recognition that effective communicative language teaching depends not only on well-designed activities but also on teachers' ability to facilitate learner engagement and communication.

### CLT in Context: Reconciling Theory and Implementation Constraints

While communicative competence provides the theoretical foundation for CLT, implementing these pedagogical principles within classroom settings is often influenced by contextual realities. Littlewood's (2007) framework of context-appropriateness is instructive here: pedagogical approaches must align with local linguistic, cultural, and institutional contexts rather than be uniformly imposed. This principle is particularly relevant in EFL settings

where multiple factors constrain implementation. Research across EFL contexts suggests that factors such as examination systems, curriculum requirements, learner proficiency, instructional time, and classroom management can influence the implementation of communicative language teaching (Wei et al., 2018; Dos Santos, 2020). These constraints suggest that the implementation of CLT cannot be understood solely in terms of teachers' knowledge of communicative principles but must also be examined in relation to the contextual conditions that shape classroom practice.

At the same time, studies across diverse EFL contexts indicate that teachers generally endorse the principles of CLT while experiencing difficulties translating these principles into classroom practice. Rather than rejecting communicative approaches, teachers often adapt communicative principles to local educational and classroom contexts (Rahman & Karim, 2019). This pattern suggests that teachers' perspectives on CLT are shaped not only by their pedagogical beliefs but also by the practical conditions within which teaching and learning occur. Consequently, implementation frequently reflects a process of adaptation and negotiation more than the direct application of communicative theory.

Instead of adopting fully interaction-oriented approaches, teachers typically integrate communicative activities within structured instructional frameworks that retain teacher guidance, grammatical scaffolding, and syllabus coherence. This does not represent a failure of CLT but rather a form of pragmatic implementation. Kumaravadivelu (2001) describes this as post-method pedagogy, whereby teachers adapt pedagogical practices to the conditions of their local classrooms. Accordingly, variation in classroom practice may reflect contextually appropriate enactments of communicative teaching rather than unsuccessful implementation (Kumaravadivelu, 2001; Littlewood, 2007).

The Omani educational context exemplifies these implementation dynamics. While national curriculum frameworks and Vision 2040 policy endorse CLT principles, empirical studies reveal selective implementation. Communicative activities are embedded within organised lesson structures shaped by curriculum expectations (Al-Khamisi & Sinha, 2022). This suggests that CLT continues to be negotiated within existing curricular and instructional expectations. Assessment practices continue to prioritise measurable linguistic accuracy over communicative ability (Al Mamari et al., 2018). Similarly, persistent concerns regarding learners' communicative proficiency despite extended exposure to English indicate ongoing challenges in translating communicative objectives into classroom outcomes (Al-Mahrooqi & Denman, 2018). These findings suggest that interactions among policy intentions, institutional conditions, and classroom practice shape CLT implementation in Oman.

## METHODOLOGY

### Study Context and Research Design

This study was conducted in government post-basic schools in Oman. The study focused on English language teachers teaching Grades 11 and 12 in post-basic education schools. These schools represent an important stage within the Omani education system, where students prepare for tertiary education and future employment. The study explored teachers' perspectives on implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) within Omani EFL classroom contexts. A qualitative case study design was employed to explore Omani English teachers' perspectives on implementing CLT in post-basic schools. This design was considered appropriate because it allowed an in-depth exploration of participants' perspectives within real educational contexts (Yin, 2018). The case was bounded by educational level, school type, participant role, and national context; specifically, it focused on Omani English teachers working in government post-basic schools. Establishing these boundaries helped define the scope of the case and ensured that the analysis remained focused on teachers' perspectives within a specific educational setting.

### Participants

The participants in this study were six Omani English teachers working in government post-basic schools. Participants were selected purposively based on their teaching experience, with a minimum requirement of more than five years in English language teaching. This sampling strategy was adopted because it enables the

identification of participants who possess direct experience and knowledge relevant to the phenomenon under investigation (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The participants' teaching experience and sustained involvement in post-basic English language teaching positioned them to provide rich and detailed insights into the implementation of CLT within their classroom contexts.

The participants were referred to as T01, T02, T03, T04, T05, and T06 to maintain confidentiality and anonymity. All participants taught English language subjects in Grades 11 and 12. T01, T02, and T03 taught Grade 12 students and held master's degrees in English Language Teaching, with teaching experience ranging from 9 to 19 years. T04, T05, and T06 taught Grade 11 students and held bachelor's degrees, with teaching experience ranging from 8 to 11 years. All participants reported having no specific professional development related to the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

### **Data Collection Tools and Procedures**

Data were collected through six semi-structured interviews conducted individually with each participant. Semi-structured interviews were selected because they allow participants to express their perspectives and experiences in depth while enabling the researcher to maintain focus on the purpose of the study (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The interview questions were developed following a review of the literature on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and English language teaching in EFL contexts. The interviews focused on teachers' perspectives and experiences regarding the implementation of CLT in their classrooms. The interview protocol consisted primarily of open-ended questions designed to encourage participants to reflect on their perspective of CLT implementation. Follow-up and probing questions were used when necessary to clarify responses and obtain richer descriptions of participants' perspectives (DeJonckheere & Vaughn, 2019). This flexible interview structure enabled participants to elaborate on issues they considered important while ensuring the discussion remained aligned with the study's purpose. Each interview lasted approximately forty minutes and was conducted individually with the participants. The interviews were conducted in English because all participants were English language teachers and were able to express their perspectives comfortably in English. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study before data collection, and all interviews were audio-recorded with participants' consent to support accurate transcription and analysis. The audio recordings were transcribed using Otter.ai, an AI-assisted transcription tool that facilitated the conversion of recorded interviews into text. To ensure accuracy, all transcripts were manually reviewed against the original audio recordings and revised where necessary before analysis. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained using participant codes such as T01–T06, and all responses were used only for research purposes.

### **Data Analysis**

To facilitate data management and maintain participant anonymity, interview transcripts were labelled as (INT, T01), (INT, T02), (INT, T03), (INT, T04), (INT, T05), and (INT, T06). The transcripts were then read repeatedly to facilitate familiarity with the data and support the identification of meaningful patterns across participants' responses. The transcripts were subsequently analysed using the Codes–Categories–Themes (CO–CAT) framework. The analysis involved identifying recurring patterns and meanings within participants' responses, developing initial codes, grouping related codes into categories, and interpreting these categories to develop broader themes that reflected teachers' perspectives on implementing CLT. Coding was conducted through continuous engagement with the data, allowing codes to be refined and organised into categories as patterns became more evident. The categories were subsequently interpreted to develop broader themes that captured teachers' shared perspectives on implementing CLT. This iterative process supported the development of coherent thematic interpretations while maintaining close alignment with the interview data (Nowell et al., 2017).

To enhance transparency and analytic rigour, an audit trail was maintained throughout the analysis process. The progression from interview extracts to codes, categories, and themes was systematically documented to ensure that interpretations remained grounded in the data. Credibility was further strengthened through continuous comparison of recurring patterns across participants' responses to identify shared meanings and ensure consistency in theme development (Creswell & Poth, 2018).



## FINDINGS

The interviews with the six Omani English teachers revealed four major themes related to teachers' perspectives on implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in post-basic schools. These themes were learner-centred interaction, authentic use of language for real-life communication, supportive learning climate for communication, and CLT as a context-dependent practice. Collectively, the themes reflect how teachers perceive their implementation of CLT within their classrooms.

### Learner-Centred Interaction

Across all teachers, CLT was primarily understood as learner-centred interaction characterised by active student participation, peer collaboration, and shared responsibility for classroom communication. Teachers described CLT in which students actively engaged in learning rather than passively receiving instruction. In contrast, the teacher functioned as a facilitator who supported learner engagement rather than serving as the primary source of classroom discourse. Teachers' descriptions emphasised the central role of learners in classroom interaction and communication. T02 referred to CLT as "more of a student-centred one", while T03 and T06 noted that students "do most of the work in the classroom" and "guide all of the lesson" (INT, T02; INT, T03; INT, T06). Learner participation extended beyond involvement in activities to include active contribution to lesson direction and classroom organisation. T04 and T01 associated CLT specifically with collaborative discussion and group-based tasks involving presentations and proposals (INT, T04; INT, T01). Similarly, T05 described CLT as "an approach that aims to enhance students' interaction in the classroom" (INT, T05), further emphasising the centrality of learner interaction within teachers' understandings of CLT.

However, teachers' perspectives revealed that learner-centred interaction remained structured, not autonomous. Teachers provided organisational frameworks, criteria, task structure, and guidance within which learners engaged in communication. Learner participation was facilitated and supported through teacher direction, suggesting that teachers implemented CLT as learner-centred within structured classroom routines and established instructional expectations rather than as unrestricted learner autonomy. In this way, teachers balanced communicative learner engagement with classroom management and instructional coherence.

### Authentic Use of Language for Real-Life Communication

Across teachers, CLT was perceived as an effective approach for meaningful language use, contextual communication, and interaction beyond examination-focused instruction. This perspective contrasts with examination-focused instruction; teachers viewed CLT as reorienting English from a test subject toward functional communication applicable to learners' lives beyond school. T01 conceptualised CLT as "teaching a language within a context in real situations", while T02 explicitly distinguished this from test-driven approaches: "not for a purpose of test" but "to use the language in real situations" (INT, T01; INT, T02). T02 further reinforced this perspective by describing English as "a language... it's not just merely a subject" and emphasising that classroom learning should be transferable beyond the classroom context, where "the knowledge... inside the class can be used outside of the class" (INT, T02). This distinction reveals teachers' understanding that CLT prioritises communicative function over grammatical precision, evident in T03's assertion that "fluency over accuracy" characterises authentic communication (INT, T03).

Teachers further connected authenticity with communicative tasks linked to everyday and socially relevant contexts. T02 and T03 referred to activities related to situations such as "the cafe... petrol station... market" and "apply for a job" (INT, T02; INT, T03), while T06 associated CLT activities with "our culture" and described inviting "different teachers to listen to them," (INT, T06). These examples suggest that teachers viewed authenticity as creating meaningful and contextually relevant communicative situations within classroom activities rather than relying on isolated language practice. Authenticity was therefore grounded in the use of realistic and socially relevant communication as part of classroom learning.

Teachers also associated CLT with task- and project-based learning that promotes collaboration and sustained interaction. T01 described activities where students "create a dialogue between two people" in simulated real-life situations, while T06 referred to collaborative project work where learners "plan a project" together (INT,

T01; INT, T06). These activities varied in duration and structure, ranging from role-play tasks to extended project work that required learners to communicate and collaborate to complete shared tasks. In synthesis, teachers perceived authentic communication as essential to CLT, characterised by meaningful context and functional language use. However, this perception was tempered by recognition that classroom authenticity required structure, with teachers designing role play, project-based tasks, and other communicative activities to connect classroom learning with real-life communication

### **Supportive Learning Climate for Communication**

Teachers perceived supportive emotional conditions as essential to CLT implementation, not merely as a contextual feature. CLT was understood as dependent on learners feeling psychologically safe to express ideas, attempt communication, and risk making mistakes without excessive fear of error. This reflects teachers' perception that emotional safety directly enables communicative participation. Teachers emphasised confidence-building as central to CLT. T06 described developing "confident students" through graduated participation: "pairs first, group and then class" interaction (INT, T06), indicating teachers understood confidence as constructed progressively, allowing learners to communicate in smaller groups before larger audiences. T03 characterised CLT as a "stress-free environment" where teachers "focus on ideas" rather than grammar mistakes (INT, T03). This approach reveals teachers' perception that reducing performance pressure allows learners to prioritise meaning-making over error avoidance, a fundamental condition for participatory CLT.

Teachers further perceived error tolerance as integral to CLT conditions. By emphasising students' ideas over grammatical accuracy, teachers understood error as non-threatening, thereby creating conditions for sustained participation. Emotional support was not peripheral to CLT; teachers viewed it as constitutive of how CLT becomes possible in practice.

Teacher support itself was perceived as facilitative. T06 described the teacher role as "only a helper... monitoring... and explaining if needed" (INT, T06), while T02 characterised support as "moving around... checking their work... helping when they need" (INT, T02). A similar perspective was expressed by T05, who explained, "Sometimes I help them with ideas... but I let them continue speaking" (INT, T05). This illustrates how teachers described providing support while allowing learners to maintain responsibility for communication. These perspectives indicate teachers understood their role in supporting CLT through guidance without domination, monitoring, encouragement, and selective assistance that preserved learner agency. Overall, teachers perceived supportive conditions, psychological safety, confidence-building, error tolerance, and facilitative guidance as integral to CLT implementation.

### **CLT as a Context-Dependent Practice**

Teachers conceptualised CLT as a context-dependent practice that requires adaptation to classroom realities rather than uniform implementation. CLT was constructed as selectively integrated according to lesson focus, learner level, time, and instructional demands. Teachers distinguished between lessons and language skills suited to communicative approaches. T04 explained CLT "can be applicable in some lessons, but not in all lessons" depending on "students' level... time... and the type of lesson" (INT, T04). T01 associated CLT primarily with speaking and listening rather than across all language areas (INT, T01), indicating that teachers perceived CLT as more feasible for oral skills than others. T01 further described reading and grammar as "difficult to make... in authentic context" (INT, T01). She further estimated that a considerable proportion of lessons cannot easily be implemented communicatively: "Around 60 or 40% we cannot do them in a communicative way." (INT, T01). This indicates that teachers associated the feasibility of communicative activities with the nature of lesson content. These perspectives reveal teachers' pragmatic assessment of where communicative approaches are most viable, a selective rather than universal application of CLT.

Learner proficiency critically shaped teachers' perceptions of CLT feasibility. T04 viewed CLT as more suitable "with high achievers" than lower-achieving learners (INT, T04). Teachers did not perceive this as a limitation of CLT. Instead, they viewed learner ability as determining the appropriate level of communicative implementation. This suggests that teachers perceived CLT as contingent on learners' linguistic readiness rather than as a deficiency of the approach itself.

Significantly, teachers did not frame contextual constraints as justifications for abandoning CLT. They perceived CLT as adaptable through continuous effort and adjustment. T05 stated that she was "trying all the time to apply it" (INT, T05), while T06 explained that she was "trying my best to make it daily" through smaller classroom activities (INT, T06). This perspective was also reflected in T05's answer, "reality forced me... plan B" (INT, T05), suggesting that teachers modified planned communicative activities in response to classroom circumstances. Furthermore, T01 highlighted that communicative elements remain present across units even when they are not equally distributed: "It doesn't mean the other units lack activities." (INT, T01). This suggests that teachers perceived communication as incorporated across lessons with varying levels of emphasis. These accounts suggest that teachers perceived CLT as flexible and adaptable within existing classroom constraints, maintaining communicative principles through gradual adjustment and selective integration. Overall, teachers viewed CLT as a context-dependent practice shaped by lesson demands, learner proficiency, and practical classroom expectations. Teachers perceived these conditions as factors requiring professional judgement and adaptation when implementing communicative principles in classroom practice.

## DISCUSSION

This study aimed to explore Omani English teachers' perspectives on implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in post-basic schools. The findings suggest that teachers understood CLT less as a fixed teaching method and more as a communication-oriented approach shaped by learner participation, meaningful interaction, and classroom realities. Teachers consistently associated CLT with creating opportunities for learners to participate actively in communication through collaborative activities, group discussion, and structured interaction, reflecting a shift away from teacher-dominated classroom discourse. Similar awareness of learner-centred communicative principles among Omani English teachers was also reported by Al-Sawafi et al. (2019), who found that teachers demonstrated positive orientations toward communicative teaching despite moderate classroom implementation. These perspectives are consistent with communicative views of language learning that position interaction and meaningful communication as central to developing communicative competence (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Savignon, 2002). Taken together, the findings suggest that teachers defined CLT primarily through the communicative roles learners assume during classroom interaction rather than through the adoption of particular instructional techniques.

At the same time, learner-centredness within teachers' perspectives did not reflect unrestricted learner autonomy. Classroom interaction remained strongly organised through teacher guidance, structured activities, and planned classroom participation. This interpretation is consistent with Littlewood's (2007) discussion of communicative teaching in Asian EFL contexts, where communicative interaction often remains pedagogically structured rather than completely learner-directed. Teachers' emphasis on facilitation, gradual participation, and collaborative support also reflects sociocultural perspectives that view learning as developing through guided social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978). The findings therefore suggest that learner-centred CLT was understood as participation supported through teacher facilitation rather than as independent learner control of classroom communication. Such an interpretation remained compatible with existing instructional organisation and classroom management expectations.

Teachers perceived authentic language use as an important dimension of CLT implementation, particularly through connecting classroom activities to meaningful and realistic communication. Teachers' emphasis on meaningful communication and functional language use also reflects Halliday's (1978) view of language as a resource for creating meaning in social contexts. However, authenticity was mainly realised through structured communicative tasks, role play, guided discussion, and collaborative classroom interaction, not just through fully spontaneous communication. The findings suggest that teachers adapted communicative activities into manageable classroom forms that aligned with learner readiness, lesson objectives, and classroom organisation. Similar tensions between communicative interaction and instructional demands have been identified in communicative language teaching research, particularly in examination-oriented educational contexts where curriculum expectations and classroom management continue to shape classroom communication (Littlewood, 2007). Within the Omani context, Al-Issa and Al-Bulushi (2012) similarly argue that communicative principles are often recognised theoretically but negotiated practically within classroom realities and instructional expectations. Such findings also align with Al-Khamisi and Sinha (2022), who note that communicative teaching

in Omani post-basic schools continues to operate within structured curricular and instructional expectations. Taken together, these findings suggest that teachers interpreted authenticity through communicative activities that connected classroom learning to meaningful and realistic contexts while remaining pedagogically structured. Another important interpretation emerging from the findings is that teachers viewed emotional support and confidence-building as necessary conditions for successful CLT implementation. Teachers associated CLT with reducing fear of mistakes, encouraging gradual learner participation, and maintaining supportive classroom interaction. This suggests that communicative participation was influenced by learners' emotional willingness to engage in communication. Teachers' emphasis on reducing anxiety and focusing on meaning rather than constant grammatical correction is consistent with Krashen's (1982) affective filter perspective, which proposes that lower anxiety and supportive learning conditions facilitate language acquisition and learner participation. Within this perspective, teacher support was understood as facilitating participation and confidence rather than controlling classroom interaction. The findings therefore suggest that teachers' understandings of CLT extended beyond communicative activities to include the emotional conditions perceived as necessary for sustaining learner participation.

Despite positive perspectives toward communicative teaching, teachers consistently perceived CLT as a context-dependent practice requiring adaptation to classroom realities rather than uniform implementation across all lessons and learner groups. The implementation of CLT was viewed as shaped by learner proficiency, lesson focus, classroom time, and instructional demands. Similar findings were reported by Al-Sawafi et al. (2019), who found that although Omani English teachers demonstrated awareness of communicative teaching principles, classroom implementation remained selective and moderate. The findings suggest that teachers negotiated communicative practices according to what they considered manageable within their classroom contexts. This supports Bax's (2003) argument that communicative language teaching should not be treated as a context-free methodology because language pedagogy remains closely shaped by the classroom conditions in which it is implemented. Taken together, the findings suggest that teachers conceptualised CLT as a context-dependent practice in which learner participation, authentic language use, emotional support, and contextual adaptation were understood as interconnected conditions supporting classroom communication. This interpretation contributes to CLT literature by highlighting how teachers' understandings of CLT extend beyond classroom techniques to include the conditions perceived as necessary for sustaining learner communication. The findings have implications for teacher education and professional development. Supporting communicative language teaching may require greater attention to how teachers adapt communicative principles to learner needs, lesson demands, and classroom conditions rather than focusing solely on communicative techniques. However, the study is limited to teachers' reported perspectives within a specific educational context. Future research could examine how these perspectives are enacted in classroom practice through classroom observation and incorporate learner perspectives and instructional documents to provide a more comprehensive understanding of communicative language teaching in post-basic schools.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the participating teachers for their time and cooperation. Special thanks are also extended to the research supervisor, Prof. Dr Tajularipin bin Sulaiman, for his invaluable guidance, constructive feedback, and continuous support throughout the research process.

## REFERENCES

1. Al Mamari, M. R. H., Al-Mekhlafi, A. M., & Al-Barwani, T. A. (2018). Is communicative language teaching being tested communicatively? An analysis of English tests in Oman. *English Language Teaching*, 11(11), 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n11p83>
2. Al-Issa, A., & Al-Bulushi, A. (2012). English language teaching reform in Sultanate of Oman: The case of theory and practice disparity. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 11(2), 141–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-011-9110-0>
3. Al-Khamisi, K. M., & Sinha, Y. K. (2022). Communicative language teaching methodologies in Omani EFL context. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 12(4), 547–561. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2022.124035>



4. Al-Mahrooqi, R., & Denman, C. J. (2018). Introduction: English education in Oman: Current scenarios and future trajectories. In R. Al-Mahrooqi & C. J. Denman (Eds.), *English education in Oman: Current scenarios and future trajectories* (pp. 1–8). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0265-7\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0265-7_1)
5. Al-Sawafi, A., Al-Humaidi, S., & Al-Mekhlafi, A. M. (2019). EFL teachers' awareness, practices and challenges of teaching English communicatively in Oman post-basic education schools. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 7(3), 289–304. <https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v7n3p289>
6. Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 278–287. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.3.278>
7. Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2–27). Longman.
8. 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/1.1.1>
9. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
10. DeJonckheere, M., & Vaughn, L. M. (2019). Semistructured interviewing in primary care research: A balance of relationship and rigor. *Family Medicine and Community Health*, 7(2), e000057. <https://doi.org/10.1136/fmch-2018-000057>
11. Dos Santos, L. M. (2020). The discussion of communicative language teaching approach in language classrooms. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 7(2), 104–109. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2020.72.104.109>
12. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
13. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.
14. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
15. Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
16. Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 537–560. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588427>
17. Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243–249. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004363>
18. Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
19. Oman Vision 2040. (2020). *Oman Vision 2040*. Government of Oman. <https://fm-oman.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/reports/Oman2040-en.pdf>
20. Rahman, M. M., & Karim, A. (2019). Secondary school teachers' and students' perceptions and practices of communicative language teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh. *Qualitative Research in Education*, 8(2), 181–204. <https://doi.org/10.17583/qre.2019.4093>
21. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024532>
22. Salam, M. Y., & Luksfinanto, Y. (2024). A comprehensive review of communicative language teaching (CLT) in modern classrooms. *Lingeduca: Journal of Language and Education Studies*, 3(1), 58–70. <https://doi.org/10.70177/lingeduca.v3i1.1338>
23. Savignon, S. J. (1987). Communicative language teaching. *Theory Into Practice*, 26(4), 235–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405848709543281>
24. Savignon, S. J. (2002). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2), 191–210.
25. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
26. Wei, L., Lin, H.-H., & Litton, F. (2018). Communicative language teaching (CLT) in EFL context in Asia. *Asian Culture and History*, 10(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ach.v10n2p1>
27. Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage