



doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcrar.2019.705.010>

An Exploration into Strategies of Teaching Vocabulary Skill using Communicative Language Teaching Approach: Focus on Hobicha Bada Secondary School

Desalegn Youpo Ukute*

Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, Department of English Language and Literature, Wachemo University, Hossana, Ethiopia

**Corresponding author*

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to explore Strategies of Teaching Vocabulary using Communicative Language Teaching Approach at Hobicha Bada Secondary School. It is whispered that without adequate knowledge of vocabulary, one cannot express him/herself appropriately even if he/she master the grammar of the language and if it is implemented effectively when teaching vocabulary using communicative language teaching approach. Communicative language teaching approach was introduced as a main language teaching approach in our country (Ethiopia) two decades ago. However, the vocabulary skill of our high school students is not expected at their level. For example; sometimes students fail to use basic words for communication and even they cannot express themselves clearly. The researcher employed descriptive research design in order to gather the needed information to achieve the stated objective and answer the research question. All of eight teachers were selected for this study through convenience sampling technique. To collect valuable and relevant data, interview, focus group discussions and classroom observation were used. The semi-structured and focus group discussion data transcribed and transformed into textual data form. The observation checklist data were changed to frequency of the numbers. Data was analyzed through cross tabulation and its analysis focused on the thematic expression. The findings of the study divulged that the majority of English language teachers focus on translation, dictionary and guessing as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach rather than communicative ways. Teachers had gap in using vocabulary teaching strategies via CLT. Hence, the concerned bodies should capacitate teachers and students related gaps mitigate through well-built mobilization.

Article Info

*Accepted: 04 April 2019
Available Online: 20 May 2019*

Keywords

Communicative Language Teaching Approach, Vocabulary, Strategies

Introduction

(Richards and Rodgers, 2001) pointed out that vocabulary is the centre of language. It is the tool of thought, self expression and communication. Hence, to improve the vocabulary ability of the students, the teacher must create awareness of the strategies employed in learning vocabulary.

It is said that vocabulary is the heart of the language; which means without some knowledge of vocabulary neither language production nor language comprehension would be possible (Thornbury, 2002). The growth of vocabulary knowledge can only be possible when teachers employ effective vocabulary teaching and learning strategies in real life situation or put it in practice (Nation 2009). In this regard, Thornbury (2002)

noted that ‘ If you spend most of your time studying grammar, your English will not improve very much. You will see most improvement if you learn more words and expressions. You can say very little with grammar, but you can say almost anything with vocabulary.

In addition, Wilkins (1976) verifies the importance of vocabulary teaching in communication. In his opinion, insufficient vocabulary or vocabulary deficiency will result in communicational barriers or failures. Without the mediation of vocabulary, no amount of grammatical or other types of linguistic knowledge can be employed in second language communication or discourse (Wilkins, 1976). Communicative language teaching (CLT) encourages learners to take part in and reflect on communication in as many different contexts as possible. This is because learners need to be given some degree of control over their learning since language is a system of choice. The learners must be given an opportunity to learn how to make choices. This approach gives special attention to the needs and interests of the learners (Richards and Rodgers, 2001; Wallace, 2007).

Problem identified

After many decades of being neglected and given little importance, the teaching and learning of vocabulary has now markedly come into the focus of interest of many applied linguistic researches and language experts (Barcroft, 2004; Decaricco, 2001; Read, 2000). Besides, lexical competence is currently acknowledged to be a core component of communicative competence by many vocabulary specialists, which provides much of the basis for how well learners speak, listen, read and write (Coady and Huckin, 1997; Richards and Renandya, 2002).

In the past, it was thought that vocabulary could simply be learned effortlessly, and received only incidental attention in many textbooks and language programs. However, mastering vocabulary is one of the most challenging tasks that any learner faces when learning a foreign language and, thus, many language learners devote a great deal of time on memorizing lists of foreign language words and rely on their bilingual dictionary as a basic communicative resource. Furthermore, they consider foreign language acquisition as essentially a matter of learning vocabulary.

The lesson plan of the teachers mainly focus on only the areas of grammar translation and techniques of the teaching is not given much room for vocabulary teaching

in an effective and efficient communicative approach. Teachers’ strategies of teaching vocabulary are not scientifically acceptable way, which means their teaching strategy is only focused on teaching vocabulary by using bi-lingual word lists and translating English language into mother tongue, and they didn’t give much room for communicative activities while teaching vocabulary via CLT. They also negatively perceive the importance of teaching vocabulary for communication and perceive teaching vocabulary via CLT as difficult and challenging issue in their school context. Therefore, this study intended to achieve the following objectives of the study: to describe the strategies that teachers use while teaching vocabulary skill via the communicative language teaching approach at Hobicha Bada Secondary School.

Delimitation of the study

The study focused on the strategies of vocabulary teaching through the communicative language teaching approach. In addition, the study was limited to find out the possible constraints that teachers face in strategies of vocabulary teaching through the communicative language teaching approach in the Ethiopian context. To keep the study manageable, the study is delimited only to grade ten English language teachers of Hobicha Bada Secondary School. Accordingly, participants of the study were teachers and their students enrolled in 2007 E.C are the setting of the study.

Materials and Methods

Research design

For this study, the researcher employed descriptive research design in order to gather the needed information to achieve the stated objectives and answer the research questions. This research project is intended to explore the strategies used to teach vocabulary using CLT in Hobicha Bada Secondary School. Besides, the study aimed at describing the challenges of vocabulary teaching via the CLT. The activities to be performed in this study are descriptive in their nature. For this reason, descriptive research design was used to conduct this study.

Research setting

This study was conducted at Hobicha Bada Secondary. Hobicha Bada Secondary School was inaugurated in 1999 E.C. Prior to that, this school was a primary school. The major reason why the researcher selected this school

to conduct his study was that the researcher observed that challenges and problems that teachers face the problems of perception, practice, and strategies of teaching vocabulary through the communicative approach. Besides, the school is newly opened.

So, the extent to which CLT was used to teach vocabulary was not yet studied known. Thus, the researcher took interest to explore the strategies used by teachers to teach vocabulary via communicative language teaching approach.

Participants of the study

As stated above, Hobicha Badda Secondary School was selected as a research setting. Thus, the participants of the study were English language teachers. There were eight English language teachers in the selected school. All eight English language teachers were selected for this study; the teachers were practically engaged in the teaching of vocabulary. Thus, it was believed that they could provide the data needed for this study. These eight participant teachers had experience in the teaching of English as a foreign language. Their experience ranged from one up to thirty years of age. All of them were first degree holders in English language.

Sampling techniques

The teachers were selected in the convenience sampling technique. According to Dorney (2007) convenience sampling is convenient for the researcher to get information. Thus, all of them were selected for this study through convenience sampling technique.

Data gathering instrument

This research sought to understand the practice, strategies and challenges of teaching vocabulary through the communicative language teaching approach. To collect valuable and relevant data, three important instruments of data collection were employed. These were focus group discussion, semi-structured interview and non-participant observation.

The interview, classroom observation and focus group discussion were developed primarily to meet the objectives of the study; and the items were designed in connection with the objectives of the study, which deals with vocabulary teaching through the communicative approach.

Methods of data analysis

The data collected via semi-structured interview, focus group discussion and classroom observation was analyzed as follows:

Analysis of semi-structured interview data

The semi-structured data transcribed and transformed into textual data form. Analysis was done primarily with thematic expressions of the words; using crosscheck between quantitative and qualitative data.

Closed ended questions data were analyzed through using number and open ended question data were analyzed using words and supplement quantitative data. The researcher read the transcribed data considering the objectives of the study. The data that appeared to be relevant to achieve the purpose of this study were selected for analysis. The selected data were categorized according to related themes. Then, themes were used to describe the perception, practice, strategies and challenges of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

Analysis of focus group discussion data

The data analysis and interpretation of the FGD depends on the emergent of the results. Transform the recordings into a textual data form. Besides, codifications of the themes were made through looking for patterns and making interpretation.

Analysis of classroom observation

Eight English language teachers were observed two times while teaching vocabulary via the CLT and the observation data was analyzed by counting the responses which was pre set observation checklist. The observation checklist data were changed to frequency of the numbers. Data was analyzed through cross tabulation and its analysis focused on the thematic expression.

Analysis and discussions of the results

Strategies used by teachers to teach vocabulary

In this study an attempt was made to identify the strategies used by teachers to teach vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. In response, the teachers' said that they use various strategies to teach vocabulary. For the sake of discussion, the teaching

strategies of vocabulary forwarded by the teachers are grouped into three subcategories based on related theme.

These are words, semantic mapping and audiovisual strategies of the teaching vocabulary.

Table.1 Classification of words strategies of teaching vocabulary used by teachers

No	Items	Responses					
		SSI (A)			FGD (B)		
		Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
1	Do you teach word walls while teaching of vocabulary lesson?	3	5	8	1	7	8
2	Do you use connotation of words while teaching vocabulary?	4	4	8	3	5	8
3	Do you teach associating words while teaching vocabulary?	4	4	8	2	6	8
4	Do you use inflectional affixes while teaching of vocabulary lesson?	3	5	8	3	5	8
5	Do you teach word family while teaching vocabulary?	3	5	8	2	6	8
6	Do you use word cognates while teaching vocabulary?	3	5	8	3	5	8

Table.2 The result of classroom observation of strategies of teaching vocabulary via classifying words

Items	Lessons observed															
	T1		T2		T3		T4		T5		T6		T7		T8	
Use word walls	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Use connotation	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-
associating words	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
inflectional affixes	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-
word families	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-
Word cognates	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1

Key: the blank represents 'Not displayed and 1 represents displayed'

Table.3 Teachers response on semantic mapping as a strategy of teaching vocabulary

No	Items	Responses					
		SSI (A)			FGD (B)		
		Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
1	Do you use contextualization while teaching vocabulary lesson?	1	7	8	1	7	8
2	Do you use meaning relationship or collocation while teaching of vocabulary?	3	5	8	3	5	8
3	Do you teach vocabulary by using translation of bi-lingual word list?	7	1	8	7	1	8
4	Do you teach guessing of meaning while teaching of vocabulary lesson?	5	3	8	4	4	8
5	Do you use defining terms while teaching vocabulary lesson?	5	3	8	5	3	8

Table.4 The result of classroom observation regarding semantic mapping as a strategy of teaching vocabulary

Items	Lessons observed															
	T1		T2		T3		T4		T5		T6		T7		T8	
Contextualization of the lessons	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
meaning relationships	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
translation of bi-lingual word lists	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Guessing meaning	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-
defining terms	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1

Key: Blank represents ‘not displayed’ and 1 represents ‘displayed’

Table.5 Teachers’ response on teaching vocabulary using audiovisual strategies

No	Items	Responses					
		SSI (A)			FGD (B)		
		Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
1	Do you use role play in your (his) vocabulary lesson?	2	6	8	2	6	8
2	Do you use conversation to teach vocabulary lesson?	0	8	8	1	7	8
3	Do you use games while teaching vocabulary lesson?	1	7	8	1	7	8
4	Do you use pictures and drawings while teaching vocabulary lesson?	2	6	8	1	7	8
5	Do you dramatize the lesson while teaching of vocabulary?	1	7	8	2	6	8
6	Do you use realia while teaching vocabulary lesson?	1	7	8	1	7	8

Table.6 The results of classroom observation of audiovisual as a strategy of teaching vocabulary

Items	Lessons observed															
	T1		T2		T3		T4		T5		T6		T7		T8	
Use role play	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Use conversation	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Use game	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Use pictures and drawings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Use drama	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Use realia	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Key: Blank represents ‘Not displayed and 1 represents displayed’

In item 1 (see table 1), three teachers reported that they use word walls strategy to teach vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. On the other hand, five teachers reported that they do not use word walls as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. They added that teaching vocabulary through word walls strategy is alien to their teaching experience. Even positively replied teachers according to the data gathered through FGD were not observed using word walls as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. And this shows that almost all teachers do not use word walls as a strategy of teaching vocabulary.

Based on the above analysis the researcher concluded that vocabulary teaching through word walls strategy

was not practiced by all teachers and all of teachers have the problems with the teaching strategy of vocabulary lesson using this technique of teaching vocabulary. It was confirmed in sixteen vocabulary lessons observations. This means that none of them were observed using word walls strategy to teach vocabulary. The majority of the teachers explained word walls not as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. This finding disagrees with what Pierce and Pierce, Fontaine (2009). They pointed out that the teaching vocabulary using word walls strategy means teaching vocabulary through using sight words, spelling words, concepts of words, content areas words and selecting critical words while teaching vocabulary lesson.

Regarding item 2 (see table1), English language teachers were asked whether they use connotation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. In reply, four teachers reported that they use connotation of words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lessons. Besides, the respondents replied that they teach vocabulary having both negative and positive connotation of words while in the vocabulary class. The remaining four teachers responded that they do not use connotation of words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary and they perceive connotation as a new concept. This indicates that four of teachers have misconception about the concept connotation strategy to teach vocabulary lesson. However, the majority of the teachers were not observed using connotation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. From the above analysis, it is possible to conclude that the majority of teachers do not use connotation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. This was confirmed through classroom observation.

In response to item 3 (see table 1), the English language teachers were asked whether or not they use associating words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. In response to SSI, four teachers replied that they use associating words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. However, they asked how use it in classroom context. Their response is not much satisfactory. This means that they simply said yes and not put any justification. In FGD two teachers replied that teaching vocabulary through associating words strategy means classifying words into different context.

On the other hand, the majority of the teachers replied that they do not use associating word strategy while teaching vocabulary lesson. In response to FGD, the majority of the teachers reported that they do not use associating words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. Besides, they added that teaching vocabulary through word association is similar with the cognate of teaching vocabulary. This shows that the majority of the teachers do not use associating words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This was demonstrated through classroom observation and the majority of the teachers were not observed practicing associating words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. Based on this analysis, it is possible to infer that the majority of the teachers do not use associating words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary.

In item 4 (see table 1), teachers were asked whether or not they use inflectional affixes while teaching of vocabulary. In response, three teachers reported that they

use inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lesson. On the other hand, five of the respondents replied that they do not use inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lesson. They added that inflectional affixes strategy as defining terms strategy of vocabulary teaching but the inflectional affixes strategy is different from this strategy. The inflectional affixes strategy is one of the vocabulary teaching strategies that use prefixes, suffixes and derivation of words.

However, their semi-structured interview and focus group discussion response was different from classroom observation and in classroom observation they used inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary whether knowingly or unknowingly (directly or indirectly). This was verified each class observed sixteen vocabulary lessons. From the above analysis it is possible to conclude that majority of the teachers have misconception about the concept inflectional affixes strategy to teach vocabulary.

Hence, the majority of the English language teachers have misunderstanding about the concept of the inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. Besides, they explained it in wrong way. This finding disconfirmed by what scholars' noted about the concept inflectional affixes (Boulware-Gooden et al, 2007; Harmon, Wood and Kissers', 2009) noted it as a strategy of teaching vocabulary using suffixes, prefixes, phrases and changes derivational affixes.

In item 5 (see table 2), three teachers replied that they use word spider or word family strategies while teaching vocabulary lesson. Some of them pointed out that they teach vocabulary with the word spider, for example they expressed crop, and they raise the issues of wheat, maize, rice, bean, barley and others. On the other hand, five teachers responded that they do not use word spider strategies to teach vocabulary. Besides, the teachers' forwarded different reasons that affect the practical implementation of this strategy: lack of authenticity of text book, availability of text, and shortage of time. In this regard, the researcher concluded that most teachers do not use word spider strategy to teach vocabulary lesson.

From the above data it is possible that the majority of teachers do not use word spider as a strategy of teaching vocabulary through the communicative language teaching approach. The teachers rationalized that the common problem while they were teaching vocabulary

was deficiency of words. In consequence, they do not use word spider as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. Concerning item 6 (see table 1), three of the teachers reported that they use word cognates strategy while teaching vocabulary via CLT. However, in classroom observation none of them were observed practicing this kind of strategy in two classroom observation of each teacher. Contrary to this, the majority of teachers (6) replied that they do not use word cognates strategies to teach vocabulary lesson. The majority of the teachers explained cognates as word collocation. The majority of the teachers were not observed practicing cognates as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. From the above analysis, it is possible to conclude that majority of the teachers forwarded the concept of word cognates strategy of teaching vocabulary in wrong way.

They added that teaching vocabulary using word cognates strategy means describing words based on its origin, for example Greek or Latin and other origin and deriving words from different languages. Besides, it helps both teachers and students to develop multi-lingual vocabulary knowledge. From the above analysis, it is possible to conclude that majority of the teachers forwarded the concept of word cognates strategy of teaching vocabulary in wrong way. This finding disagree with what Ruddell and Shearers(2002) noted. These two scholars pointed out that the teaching vocabulary using word cognates means using origin and derivation of words in teaching vocabulary and it is widely used vocabulary teaching strategy.

As depicted in the table above, sixteen vocabulary teaching lessons were observed whether they practice or not classifying words strategies in their actual classroom context. In response to this each items were analyzed below:

In item 1 (see table 2), the sixteen vocabulary teaching lessons were observed to see whether or not the English language teachers practice word walls as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. With this regard, none of the teachers were observed using word walls as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. From the above data we can deduct that none of the teachers practiced word walls as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This is different from what they stated in SSI and FGD. This shows that their saying is different from practice.

Regarding item 2 (see table 2), sixteen vocabulary lessons were observed whether or not the English language teachers use connotation of words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. The result of classroom observation shows that the majority of the teachers do not observed using connotation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. In contrary to this, three teachers used connotation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. This was verified through six vocabulary teaching lessons. This means that three teachers practiced connotation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching. Therefore, the majority of the teachers do not use connotation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

In item 3 (see table 2), among observed sixteen vocabulary lessons, six were displayed using associating words as a strategy of the teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This means that three teachers were observed teaching associating words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lessons. On the other hand, ten lessons were not observed using associating words as a strategy of the teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This shows that five teachers do not observed practicing associating words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. It is possible to conclude that the majority of the teachers do not observed practicing associating words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

Regarding item 4 (see table 3), teachers were observed whether or not they use inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. To verify this, sixteen vocabulary lessons were observed and some of the teachers were observed using inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This means six vocabulary lessons were observed practicing inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lessons.

In contrary this, ten vocabulary lessons were observed whether the teachers practice or not inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lessons. In response to this, ten vocabulary lessons were not observed practicing inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lessons. This means five teachers were not observed using inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language

teaching. Therefore, the majority of the teachers were not observed using inflectional affixes as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

In item 5 (see table 2), the English language teachers were observed whether or not they practice word family as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. To confirm this, three teachers were observed using word spider as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This means that six vocabulary lessons were observed practicing word spider as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

On the other hand, ten vocabulary lessons were not observed practicing word spider as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This shows that five teachers were not observed using word spider as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lessons. Therefore, majority of the teachers were not observed using word spider as a strategy of teaching vocabulary.

Regarding item 6 (see table 2), the sixteen vocabulary lessons were observed whether or not teachers use cognates as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. In response to this, six vocabulary lessons were observed practicing cognates as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This means that three teachers were observed practicing cognates as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT.

In contrary to this, ten vocabulary lessons were not observed practicing cognates as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This shows that five teachers do not used cognates as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. From the data, it is possible to deduct that the majority of the teachers were not observed using cognates as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lessons.

Generally, from the overall data obtained via SSI, FGD and classroom observation regarding classifying words strategies of vocabulary teaching, the following points can be said: majority of the teachers (5) pointed out that they do not use classifying words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via CLT. This was confirmed through classroom observation. On the other hand, very

few teachers (3) were observed using classification of words strategies of teaching vocabulary through communicative language teaching approach. However, their practice was not full of confidence. Thus, the teacher's practical engagement of classifying words as the strategies of teaching vocabulary was not as expected from each of them. This shows that most of the teachers have problem of methodological parameters to teach vocabulary via communicative language teaching approach using classification of words as strategy of vocabulary teaching. This was confirmed through classroom observation. This means that the majority of teachers were not observed using words classification as a strategy of teaching vocabulary and they have wrong perception in classifying words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary through the communicative language teaching approach.

This findings disagrees with (Adger, 2000; Oxford, 1990, Boulware-Gooden *et al.*, 2007; Harmon, Wood and Kiser, 2009 and Kindle *et al.*, 2009) noted that classifying words are widely used a strategy of teaching vocabulary and the majority of the ELT used words as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. They added that classifying words strategy as a better to teach foreign language vocabulary.

Teachers' were asked if they use various strategies of semantic mapping to teach vocabulary. The data obtained through semi structured interview, focus group discussion and classroom observation response is interpreted and analyzed below the table 3.

In table 3, item 1, teachers were asked if they use contextualization of the lesson while teaching vocabulary. In response to this, three of the teachers replied that they use contextualizing the vocabulary lesson and added that contextualization is better to teach vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach and it promotes effective classroom chunks. On the other hand, five of the teachers reported that they do not use contextualization while teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. Besides, they replied that contextualizing the lesson means only using structure of language in accuracy of the language rather than function of the language. This means that they focus more on rule based strategy of language use (grammar focused).

For example, commonly observed problems with contextualizing the vocabulary lesson were: one of the teachers was teaching about the human development but

he was observed while teaching English language as biology and history rather than English language. For example, the teacher was observed teaching human development by saying homo hobbles, homo eructs and Homo sapiens. Then after, he asked the students about periods, eras and their stage of development. He expected to do in this lesson was contextualizing the lesson into subject matter which means focusing on the English language. It was observed that none of them were using contextualization while teaching vocabulary via CLT. This contradicts with the data gathered through semi-structured interview and focus group discussion. For example, five of the teachers were observed simply defining the term and rushing to complete the day's vocabulary lesson. This discloses that they do not use contextualization strategy to teach vocabulary. Furthermore, this indicates that they have no deep rooted knowledge about the concept of contextualizing a certain lesson while teaching vocabulary via the CLT. From the above analysis, it is possible to conclude that the majority of the teachers do not use contextualization strategy to teach vocabulary via the CLT. They have problems in practicing contextualization strategy while teaching vocabulary. This finding agrees with Coady (1987) and Nation (2008) stated. In line with this, Coady (1987) and Nation (2008) noted that the majority of the English language teachers do not use contextualization to teach vocabulary in communicative approach.

Regarding item 3 (see table 3); three teachers reported that they use meaning relationship strategy to teach vocabulary lesson. They added that most of the time they use meaning relationship or collocation to teach vocabulary. This was again displayed in the classroom observation. This was confirmed through three times classroom observation while teaching vocabulary. On the other hand, five teachers replied that they do not use meaning relationship strategy to teach vocabulary via CLT. Moreover, they reported that meaning relationship or collocation means teaching word family. And it was confirmed through classroom observation data which indicated the practical engagement of vocabulary teaching using word collocation strategy. However, they mentioned that the lack of relevant word lists was one of the problems to apply collocation strategy while teaching vocabulary. Based on the above data, it is possible to deduct that majority of the teachers do not use collocation strategy of teaching vocabulary in their actual classroom practice. Besides, they have misconception about the concept of meaning relationship strategy of teaching vocabulary lesson. This finding disagrees with Coady (1987) and Nation (2008). In line with this, Coady

(1987) and Nation (2008) pointed out that collocation is widely used teaching strategy of foreign language vocabulary.

In item 4 (see table 3), English language teachers were interviewed whether they teach vocabulary using translation of word lists, in response to this, seven teachers responded that they used to teach vocabulary using translation of bi-lingual word lists strategy. Most of the time they teach vocabulary using translation of foreign language into vernacular language like, ox-bere (*borraa*), sugar- *sekuar* (*laqilaqiyabba*), water- *wuha* (*haattaa*) and others were commonly used to teach vocabulary strategy in their real life teaching practice. This was confirmed through classroom observation. Furthermore, they responded that teaching foreign language vocabulary using this kind of strategy is the most dominant and widely used strategy according to their experience.

Majority of the teachers were observed teaching foreign language vocabulary in their mother tongue. As a result of this, both students and teachers were observed facing deficiency of vocabulary for communication purpose. In contrast to this, only one of the teachers strictly opposed this kind of teaching strategy and he reported that it hinders both students and teachers to communicate effectively in the target language. This was displayed through classroom observation. This means that almost all teachers use translation of foreign language by using bi-lingual word lists.

Hence, from the teachers response it is possible to say that teaching vocabulary via CLT through translating foreign language into mother tongue is not suitable and advisable strategy to improve teachers' and students communication exchange. Based on the above data, it is possible to deduct that the majority of the teachers used translation of words by using bi-lingual word list while teaching foreign language vocabulary. This finding disconfirmed by what scholars pointed out (Chomsky, 1965; Widdowsen, 1978; Hymes, 1972; Brumfit and Johnson, 1979; Savignon, 1983). In connection to this, they stated that teaching foreign language vocabulary via translating foreign language into mother tongue not advisable and it exposes students as well as teachers in foreign language communication barrier or failure.

Regarding item 5 (see table 3), five teachers reported that they use guessing meaning strategy to teach vocabulary and they teach their students before teaching key vocabulary lesson. They added the idea that to

manipulate this strategy by writing key words in the black board and then give chance for students to react. It was observed during classroom observation while the teachers were using guessing meaning strategy to teach vocabulary lesson. Three of the teachers responded that they don't use guessing meaning strategy while teaching vocabulary. They also reported that guessing meaning strategy is one of the strategies of teaching reading skill rather than vocabulary teaching strategy. The teachers underlined their idea that guessing meaning strategy is one of the teaching strategies of reading comprehension. Thus, the majority of the teachers use guessing meaning as a strategy of teaching vocabulary.

In item 6 (see table 3), English language teachers were requested whether they use or not defining terms as a strategy of teaching vocabulary through the communicative language teaching approach. In response to SSI, four teachers replied that they use defining terms as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. But, they asked how use it in their classroom context. In reply, they use vocabulary teaching by giving implicit meaning. On the other hand, in FGD, five teachers responded that they use defining terms strategy of teaching vocabulary. However, in classroom observation their defining term is solely focused on mere definition of terms while teaching vocabulary lesson. In FGD, three of the teachers reported that they don't use defining terms strategy while teaching vocabulary lesson. Hence, the majority of the English language teachers use defining terms while teaching vocabulary lesson. This finding agrees with (Sinclair and Renuof, 1988) stated. With regard to this, (Sinclair and Renuof, 1988) pointed out that most of the time; English Language Teachers were use defining terms while teaching vocabulary lessons.

As depicted in the table above, sixteen vocabulary teaching lessons were observed whether they practice or not semantic mapping as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach in their classroom context. In response to this each items were analyzed below:

In item 1 (see table 4), sixteen vocabulary lessons were observed whether or not they use contextualization as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. In response to this, none of the teachers observed practicing contextualization as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This shows that all teachers were not observed using contextualization as a strategy

of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

The commonly observed problems of teaching foreign language vocabulary: lack of appropriate words and less attention on vocabulary teaching. Consequently, the majority of teachers teach foreign language as History or other subjects. This finding disconfirmed with Coady (1987) and Nation (2008) suggested that contextualizing the vocabulary lesson is the best strategy of teaching vocabulary through the communicative language teaching approach.

In item 3, sixteen vocabulary lessons were observed whether or not English language teachers use meaning relationships (collocation) as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. In response to this, four vocabulary lessons were observed using collocation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. Next, among sixteen vocabulary lessons twelve was not observed using collocation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This showed that the majority of the teachers do not use collocation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching.

Regarding to item 4, sixteen vocabulary lessons were observed whether or not teachers practice translating bi-lingual word lists as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lessons. In response to this, two vocabulary lessons were not observed using translation of bi-lingual word lists as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. The remaining fourteen vocabulary lessons were observed using translation of bi-lingual word lists as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. This shows that almost all English language teachers used translation of bi-lingual word lists as a strategy of teaching vocabulary lessons.

This finding disconfirmed with Wallace (2007) suggested that using translation of bi-lingual word lists is not suitable strategy to teach vocabulary via the communicative language teaching. However, the majority of the teachers used translation of bi-lingual word lists as a dominant strategy of teaching vocabulary throughout their teaching experience. Therefore, the majority of the teachers practically engaged in translation of bi-lingual words strategy as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

Item 5 (see table 4), the English language teachers were observed whether or not they use guessing meaning as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. In response to this, twelve lessons were observed using guessing meaning as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. This shows that the majority of the teachers used guessing meaning as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. The remaining four vocabulary lessons were not observed using guessing meaning as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. Their practice verified through SSI and FGD. This means that some teachers replied this strategy as teaching strategy of pre reading stage rather than vocabulary lesson. Therefore, teachers perception affected by practice.

Regarding item5 (see table 4), sixteen vocabulary lessons were observed whether or not teachers practice defining terms as strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. In response to this, the majority of the teachers were observed practicing define terms as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. It was confirmed that almost all teachers giving mere definition of terms while teaching vocabulary. On the other hand very few teachers were not observed using definition of terms as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. To sum up this, all of the teachers were observed using merely defining of terms to teach vocabulary. Therefore, majority of the teachers use merely defining terms while teaching vocabulary lesson.

Generally, from overall data obtained from SSI, FGD and classroom observation it can be concluded in relation to semantic mapping strategy of teaching vocabulary via CLT and the following conclusions was made: the majority of the teachers reported that they do not use semantic mapping strategy to teach vocabulary via CLT what expected each of them. They emphasize the idea that most of the time they use translation method of using bi-lingual word lists strategy, defining terms and guessing meaning strategy while teaching vocabulary via CLT.

They added that these three strategies are sufficient enough to teach vocabulary in semantic mapping strategies. It was noted in classroom observation that most of the English language teachers were teaching foreign language vocabulary using translation of bi-lingual word lists, giving definition of words and use dictionary as strategy of teaching vocabulary lesson. This

was confirmed through classroom observation. But some of the teachers reported that they use all semantic mapping strategies of teaching vocabulary via CLT. However, among the six strategies, contextualization and collocation or meaning relationship strategies were not confirmed during classroom observation.

This shows that the majority of the teachers have problems with the practical implementation of contextualization of vocabulary lesson. And they focus only on translation of literal meaning of vocabulary words. To promote communicative language teaching approach while teaching vocabulary lesson using semantic mapping strategy is the most advisable strategy. The majority of the teachers focused on translation, dictionaries and defining terms strategy rather than contextualization of the lesson and meaning relationship or collocation. Among the strategies contextualization of the lesson and word collocation (meaning relationship) strategies were commonly observed problems of almost all the teachers while they were teaching vocabulary lesson. Thus, the majority of the teachers have the problems in practicing semantic mapping as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. This findings disconfirmed by (Coady, 1987 and Nation, 2008) suggested that semantic mapping is the best a strategy of teaching foreign language vocabulary.

Audiovisual strategies are one of the strategies to teach vocabulary via CLT. In this study teachers were asked if they use various audiovisual strategies to teach vocabulary. The obtained data through semi structured interview, focus group discussion and classroom observation analyzed collectively and the validity and reliability of the data cross checked in detail. Below is the summary of the response.

In item 1 table 5, teachers were asked whether they use role play as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via CLT, one teacher reported that he uses role play strategy to teach vocabulary via CLT. Accordingly, no one was practically engaged in role play strategy while teaching vocabulary via CLT. However, the majority of the teachers replied that they do not use role play strategy to teach vocabulary. Besides, they reported that teaching vocabulary through role playing strategy was not acculturated practice in their teaching learning process of vocabulary teaching via CLT. Even they told to the researcher that they do not know the concept of vocabulary teaching through role play strategy. They added that in the vocabulary teaching classroom it is difficult to teach vocabulary by using this kind of

strategy and they considered that role playing strategy means teaching conversation rather than vocabulary teaching in their teaching-learning experience. The majority of the teachers conceived that role play as a strategy of teaching speaking via debating rather than teaching vocabulary lessons.

From the above data, the majority of the teachers are not understanding role play as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. It was confirmed that none of the teachers used role play as a strategy to teach vocabulary. From the above data it is possible to deduct almost all teachers do not use role play while teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

In connection to item 2 (see table 5), none of the teacher replied that they use vocabulary via CLT by using conversation strategy. In reply to SSI, all teachers reported that they do not use conversation to teach vocabulary via CLT and even if they complained that under vocabulary teaching strategy, conversation was not recommended and accepted strategy and it is new idea in their teaching practice. In FGD, one teacher replied that he uses conversation while teaching vocabulary lessons. He rewarded his idea that conversation is important to teach vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This was completely confirmed in classroom observation and no one was using conversation strategy to teach vocabulary.

From the teachers' response, it is possible to conclude that almost all teachers considered teaching conversation as solely focused on speaking class activity rather than vocabulary teaching strategy. Moreover, they considered that teaching vocabulary through conversation strategy is not acculturated practice in teaching vocabulary strategy rather it is teaching spoken English.

In table 5 item3, English language teachers were asked whether or not they use game while teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching. In response one teacher reported that he uses teaching vocabulary using game strategy. In addition, He expressed that it is very important to teach vocabulary via CLT. However in classroom practice he himself does not use games strategy while teaching vocabulary via CLT.

On the other hand, seven of the teachers replied that teaching vocabulary through game strategies is unfamiliar strategy in their school and they do not put it in their classroom situation. They considered that game strategy as bulky activity and it is not possible to use it in

vocabulary lesson rather, it is more suitable in the speaking lessons. The teachers added that teaching games strategy in foreign language is advisable and a mandatory strategy of teaching speaking skill rather than vocabulary lesson. Furthermore, they reported that teaching vocabulary by using games strategy is not applicable in vocabulary lesson. This was confirmed through classroom observation and none of the teachers practiced using game while teaching vocabulary. Therefore, almost all teachers have practical problems of teaching vocabulary by using game strategy.

Regarding item 4 (see table 5), English language teachers were requested to respond whether or not they use pictures and drawings as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. In reply to SSI, two teachers responded that they use pictures and drawings while teaching vocabulary lesson. However, in classroom observation it was not confirmed vocabulary taught through using drawings and picture strategy. In FGD, one teacher replied that he uses pictures and drawings as a strategy of teaching vocabulary.

Nevertheless, all of the teachers were not observed using pictures and drawings while teaching vocabulary. The majority of the teachers (6) replied that they do not use pictures and drawings to teach vocabulary. The majority of the teachers felt that using picture and drawings while teaching vocabulary lessons was problematic and it takes time to draw picture and they considered picture and drawings strategy as a time consuming strategy to practice vocabulary. From the above data, we can deduct that the majority of the teachers do not use pictures and drawings to teach vocabulary. This means that their perception affects drawing and pictures as a strategy of teaching vocabulary.

In item 5 (see table 5), one teacher responded that he uses drama to teach vocabulary via communicative language teaching. However, his response and practical implementation of the vocabulary teaching via communicative language teaching approach was mismatch because it was not displayed in three classroom observations vocabulary lesson. The most teachers (7) reported that they do not use drama while teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. Besides, they replied that dramatizing the lesson was not usual strategy and was challenging to practice vocabulary teaching class. Even they justified that students' level of performance was not suitable to practice this strategy in vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

In FGD and SSI all teachers conceived that teaching vocabulary by using drama strategy is difficult and they considered dramatizing the lesson is the solely teaching for entertainment rather than teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This was confirmed through classroom observation. This means that none of the teachers used drama to teach vocabulary. From the above data it is possible to conclude that all teachers do not use drama as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. The almost all teachers considered dramatizing lesson is not applicable in the teaching vocabulary.

In table 5 item 6, teachers were asked whether or not they use realia to teach vocabulary. In response to this, one teacher responded that he uses realia strategy while teaching vocabulary via CLT in SSI and FGD. However, in classroom observation this strategy was not displayed and his theory and practice was the inverse of his practical engagement. The majority of the teachers (7) reported that they do not use realia to teach vocabulary via CLT in their classroom context or situation. They suggested that using real object strategy is solely possible in natural science and mathematical subject areas rather than foreign language teaching vocabulary lesson. This was confirmed through classroom observation. This means that none of teachers observed using realia while teaching vocabulary.

Hence, they have misconception on realia strategy of vocabulary teaching in foreign language and almost all of the teachers do not use realia to teach vocabulary via CLT. This finding disagrees with Oxford (1990). With this regard Oxford (1990) noted that realia is widely used vocabulary teaching strategy and suitable to teach foreign language into communicative approach.

As depicted in the table above, sixteen vocabulary teaching lessons were observed whether they practice or not audiovisual as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach in their classroom context. In response to this each items were analyzed below:

Regarding item 1 (see table 6), the sixteen vocabulary lessons were observed whether or not English language teachers use role play as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. In reflection to this, none of the English language teachers were observed practicing role play as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative

language teaching approach. This was confirmed through sixteen vocabulary lesson observation. Therefore, this finding disconfirmed with the Adger (2000) suggested that role play is suitable to teach vocabulary through the communicative language teaching approach. In contrary to this, none of teachers used role play as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

In item 2 (see table 6), as aforementioned vocabulary lessons were observed whether or not the English language teachers practice conversation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. In response to this, all teachers were not observed using conversation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. This shows that none of the teachers practiced conversation while teaching vocabulary lessons. Therefore, all teachers have practical problems of using conversation as a strategy of teaching vocabulary.

Concerning item 3 (see table 6), among sixteen vocabulary lessons the only one teacher was observed using games as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. On the other hand, almost all teachers were not observed practicing games as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This shows that almost all teachers do not used games as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the CLT. From above data, almost all teachers were not practicing while teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

In item 4 (see table 6), sixteen vocabulary lessons were observed whether or not the English language teachers use pictures and drawings while teaching vocabulary lessons. In response to this, none of the teachers were observed using pictures and drawings while teaching vocabulary lessons. This means that, all teachers did not use pictures and drawings as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. Therefore, all teachers have the problems of implementing pictures and drawing as a strategy of teaching vocabulary.

Regarding item 5 (see table 6), among sixteen vocabulary lessons, none of the teachers were observed practicing drama as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This means that all teachers giving mere definition of terms while teaching vocabulary rather than dramatizing the lesson in different context. Therefore, all teachers did not use drama as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the

communicative language teaching approach. In item 6 (see table 6), the English language teachers whether or not use realia while teaching vocabulary lessons. In response to this, one teacher was observed using realia as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. When he teaching vocabulary about living and nonliving things. He showed his students flower for living things and stone for non-living things.

On the other hand, almost all teachers were not observed using realia as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. This shows that almost all teachers do not use realia while teaching vocabulary lessons. From the data, it is possible to conclude that almost all teachers do not use realia while teaching vocabulary lessons.

Finally, from overall data obtained from SSI, FGD and classroom observation it can be concluded in relation to audiovisual strategy of teaching vocabulary via CLT and the following conclusions was made: the almost all of the teachers replied that they do not use audiovisual strategies of teaching vocabulary and the most teachers pointed out that teaching vocabulary via audiovisual strategy as time consuming and difficult strategy to put into practice in their actual classroom context.

One teacher responded that he use audio-visual strategies of teaching vocabulary. Their SSI and FGD response was different from their practical engagement of classroom context and it was confirmed in classroom practice of vocabulary lesson. However, some teachers have positive perception towards audio-visual strategy of teaching vocabulary but, their practice was not sufficient enough while teaching vocabulary via CLT by using this strategy. Almost all of the teachers do not conceive using audiovisual as a strategy of teaching vocabulary and they have misconception the concept of audiovisual as a strategy of teaching vocabulary.

However, teachers have wrong conception on the concept of audiovisuals as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. Based up on the above analysis, it is possible to conclude that almost all of the teachers do not use audiovisual strategy to teach vocabulary and they conceived it as difficult to practice in the vocabulary class.

Therefore, this findings disconfirmed with (Adger, 2002; Oxford, 1990; Coady, 1987; Nations", 2001) state that

audiovisual strategy is the suitable and the most convenience strategy to teach vocabulary through the communicative language teaching approach. Open ended question item EFL teachers were asked whether they use or not CLT to teach vocabulary. In reply, three teachers responded that they teach vocabulary via CLT but, when the researcher asked them how they taught vocabulary via CLT their response was not confident enough. They also responded that to some extent they use CLT to teach vocabulary lesson. However, their practice was not confident enough during in classroom observation.

The majority of the teachers (5) reported that they did not use CLT to teach vocabulary and they added that vocabulary couldn't be taught through CLT approach in their teaching experience.

They added the idea that vocabulary teaching via CLT is a time consuming approach so; within 40' minute it is impossible to use the CLT approach to teach vocabulary.

The teachers even, replied that teaching materials were not adequate to use the CLT in the vocabulary teaching and authenticity of instructional materials was also suggested. This was verified through classroom observation; no one used CLT to teach vocabulary lessons. Therefore, communicative language teaching approach was not widely applicable at Hobicha Badda secondary school and the majority of the teachers have a negative attitude towards CLT to teach vocabulary which means they conceive it as strategies of teaching communication rather than vocabulary lesson. This was confirmed through classroom observation. This revealed that almost all teachers do not teach vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.

Furthermore, they also added their opinion that CLT is better approach to teach vocabulary rather than speaking classroom. Accordingly, the majority of the teachers pointed out that the communicative language teaching approach is suitable for teaching speaking skill rather than vocabulary.

Most of the time they felt CLT as new language teaching approach and it is a difficult strategy to put into vocabulary class context. Thus, the most teachers do not use the communicative language teaching approach to teach vocabulary lessons and the majority of the teachers are negatively conceived using the communicative language teaching approach to teach vocabulary. Hence, this finding says the opposite to Widdowsen (1978). With regard to this conclusion, Widdowsen (1978)

pointed out that the communicative language teaching approach is suitable to teach vocabulary effectively.

Summary, conclusions and recommendations

Summary of the major findings

Regarding teachers' strategies of teaching vocabulary via CLT the following findings were obtained:

- ❖ The study revealed that the majority of the English language teachers do not use word classification strategy to teach vocabulary. Besides, the majority of the teachers perceived that the classification of words strategy wrongly. As a result of the findings the majority of the teachers' practical engagement of classifying words as one of the strategies of teaching vocabulary was not as expected from each of them. This shows that the majority of the teachers have problems in practicing words classification strategy of vocabulary teaching in their actual classroom context.
- ❖ The result of the study disclosed that the majority of English language teachers do not use semantic mapping strategy for teaching vocabulary lessons. In variance to this, some teachers use semantic mapping as a strategy of vocabulary teaching via the communicative language teaching approach. However, among semantic mapping strategies, the teachers were not observed using contextualization and collocation while teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach. Concerning this, it was noted that the majority of the teachers gave more attention to translation of bi-lingual word lists, dictionaries and guessing meaning as a strategy of teaching vocabulary. This shows that the majority of the teachers have problems with the practical implementation of the teaching of vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.
- ❖ The findings of the study divulged that the majority of English language teachers focus on translation, dictionary and guessing as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach.
- ❖ It was also noted that the majority of English language teachers do not use audiovisual as a strategy of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching. The findings of

the study showed that the majority of the teachers reported that the use of audiovisual strategy is as time consuming and a difficult strategy to put into practice in the classroom context. Hence, the teachers were not observed using audiovisual strategy for the teaching of vocabulary lessons. Furthermore, the majority of the respondents do not use the communicative language teaching approach to teach vocabulary lessons. In this regard, the majority of the teachers pointed out that the communicative language teaching approach is not conducive for teaching vocabulary lessons. As a result, the majority of the teachers consider that the communicative language teaching is better to teach the speaking lessons rather than vocabulary lessons. Therefore, the majority of the teachers wrongly conceived the communicative language teaching approach to teach vocabulary lessons.

Conclusions

Owing to the analysis of data and the major findings of the study, the following conclusions were derived.

Besides, the English language teachers imagined that to communicate effectively, one needs to have sufficient grammar knowledge and many of the teachers give more attention to grammar while teaching foreign language rather than vocabulary lessons. To communicate effectively in foreign language, vocabulary is the heart of language. But the majority of teachers had the wrong perception on the importance of teaching vocabulary for communication.

Furthermore, the majority of the teachers do not use strategies of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach while they are practically teaching vocabulary. This shows that the majority of English language teachers do not clearly know the strategies of teaching vocabulary skill. But some teachers know the concept of each strategies however, none of the teachers effective in carrying out their classroom context. In addition, the study shows that majority of the teachers have misconception the concept of vocabulary teaching strategy.

As result of this, teachers are not practicing strategies of teaching vocabulary via the communicative language teaching approach which is expected from them. Furthermore, the majority of teachers have deficiency of vocabulary. In this regard, the majority of the teachers do not use the communicative language teaching approach

to teach vocabulary lessons. The teachers' teaching method dominated in a teacher centered, exam based and grammar translation way.

Recommendations

Teaching vocabulary through the communicative language teaching approach is important to improve students and teachers communication exchange in the target language. Specifically, it should get great attention from EFL teachers, students, parents, school directors and educational experts.

The study revealed that the majority of the teachers do not use the communicative language teaching approach to teach vocabulary. They conceived communicative language teaching as difficult to teach vocabulary lessons. With this regard, the majority of English language teachers have the wrong perception about CLT to teach vocabulary. As a result, awareness creation and capacitating teachers in the areas of the communicative language teaching approach.

References

- Adger, C.T. (2002). What teachers need to know about language: Mc Henry IL Centre For Applied Linguistics. London: Longman Press.
- Aebersold, J.A. and Field, M.L. (1997). From reader to reading teacher: Issues and Strategies for second language classroom. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Beck, L.L. Mc Keown, M.G. and Kucan, L. (2002). Bring words to life: Robust Vocabulary Instruction. New York: Guilford.
- Blachowicz, C. L. Z., Fisher, P. J. L., Ogle, D. and Watts-Taffe, S. (2006). Vocabulary: Question from the classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(4), 524-539.
- Blachowicz, C.L. and Filler, P. (2000). Vocabulary process in Hand Book of Reading Research. Manwan, New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates.
- Boulware-Gooden, R., Carreker, S., Thornhill, A., and Joshi, R. M. (2007). Instruction of Meta cognitive strategies enhances reading comprehension and vocabulary achievement of third-grade students. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 70-77.
- Cameron, L. (2002). Measuring Vocabulary Size in English as an additional language. *Journal on Language Teaching*, 6(2), 145-148.
- Coady, J. and Huckin, T. (1997). Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A rationale for Pedagogy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coady. (1993). Research on ESL\EFL Vocabulary acquisition: Putting it in context. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dorneyi, Z. (2007). Research Methods in Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harmon, J. M., Wood, K. D. and Kiser, K. (2009). Promoting vocabulary learning with the Interactive Word Wall. *Middle School Journal*, 40(3), 58-63.
- Nation I.S.P. (2001). Learning Vocabulary in another language. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University press.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2008). Teaching Vocabulary: Strategies and Techniques. Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Oxford, R.R. and Crookau, D (1990). Vocabulary Learning; a critical analysis of techniques. *TESL Canada Journal*.
- Oxford. (1990). Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know. New York: Newbury House.
- Pierce, M. E. and Fontaine, M. (2009). Designing vocabulary instruction in mathematics. *The Reading Teacher* 63(3), 239-243.
- Pierce, M. E., and Fontaine, L. M. (2009). Designing vocabulary instruction in mathematics, *The Reading Teacher*, 63(3), 239-243.
- Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. (2001). Approaches and Methods in language teaching Second Edition. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (2002). How to Teach Vocabulary. London: Longman Press.
- Wallace, M. (1982). Teaching Vocabulary. London: Heine man Educational Books.
- Wallace. (2007). Vocabulary: The Key to Teaching English Language Learners to Reading Improvement, 44(4), 189.190.
- Widdowsen, H.G. (1978). Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford University Press.
- Willkins, D.A. (1972). Linguistics in Language Teaching. London: Longman Press.

How to cite this article:

Markos Mathewos Alaro. 2019. The Current Role of Students to Engage in Learner Centered Teaching Method in Humbo Tebela Secondary Schools. *Int.J.Curr.Res.Aca.Rev.* 7(5), 71-86.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcrar.2019.705.010>