

A CONTEMPORARY STANDARDS-BASED EVALUATION OF ARABIC LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS IN GRADE EIGHT ARABIC SCHOOLS IN BRUNEI DARUSSALAM.

Achmad Yani^{1*}

^{*1}Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali (UNISSA), Brunei Darussalam

Siti Sara binti Haji Ahmad²

²Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali (UNISSA), Brunei Darussalam

Hajah Rafidah binti Haji Abdullah³

³Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali (UNISSA), Brunei Darussalam

Mohamed Fathy Mohamed Abdelgelil⁴

⁴Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali (UNISSA), Brunei Darussalam

Faisal Mubarak Seff⁵

⁵Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Antasari Banjarmasin, Indonesia

Muhammad Sabri Bin Sahrir⁶

⁶Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Malaysia (IIUM), Malaysia

Kujaimah Binti Haji Abdul Kahar⁷

⁷Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali (UNISSA), Brunei Darussalam

Abdelnaser Abdelgalil Mohamed Mousa⁸

⁸Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali (UNISSA), Brunei Darussalam

Muhammad Zakir Bin Husain⁹

⁹Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali (UNISSA), Brunei Darussalam

Hajah Rafizah binti Haji Abdullah¹⁰

¹⁰Universiti Islam Sultan Sharif Ali (UNISSA), Brunei Darussalam

Abstract

This field-based study aimed to evaluate the methods used in teaching Arabic to eighth-grade students in Arabic schools in Brunei Darussalam in light of contemporary standards in language education, through the analysis of quantitative data interpreted with qualitative support. The study adopted an evaluative-analytical approach to examine the extent to which actual classroom practices align with the principles of communicative competence, which emphasize that language learning is not confined to grammatical knowledge alone, but extends to the ability to use language effectively in authentic communicative contexts (Canale & Swain, 1980, pp. 1–47). The findings revealed that the current instructional reality is characterized by a hybrid structure that combines deeply rooted traditional practices with emerging indicators of communicative pedagogy. On the one hand, the heavy reliance on translating Arabic texts into Malay remained strikingly high, reaching 84.1%, which indicates the continued centrality of translation in classroom practice. On the other hand, the data also demonstrated positive tendencies toward the adoption of certain communicative principles, including methodological variety (81.0%), attention to communicative competence (76.6%), and relatively strong emphasis on training students in the four language skills. However, the findings also disclosed a clear gap between teachers' declared pedagogical orientations and students' actual communicative performance. While teachers reportedly encouraged the use of Arabic, the proportion of students speaking Arabic with their peers declined to only 40.1%, indicating the limited presence of Arabic interaction within the classroom community. This finding corroborates the contemporary literature, which argues that the success of communicative language teaching depends on an interaction-rich classroom environment, dense exposure to meaningful input, and authentic opportunities for linguistic production (Nation, 2007, pp. 2–13; Littlewood & Yu, 2011, pp. 64–77). The study concludes that Arabic language teaching in this context remains in a transitional phase between the traditional structural model and the modern communicative model. It therefore recommends strengthening the use of Arabic as the principal medium of instruction, expanding interactive classroom activities, and

aligning assessment practices and instructional content with contemporary global standards in language education.

Keywords: Arabic language teaching for non-native speakers; Arabic teaching methods; communicative competence; communicative language teaching; language curriculum evaluation.

Received: October 27, 2025. **Revised:** January 29, 2025. **Accepted:** February 11, 2026. **Published:** March 17, 2026.

1. Introduction

Over the past several decades, foreign language education has undergone a profound transformation, shifting from traditional models centered on grammar memorization and translation toward modern pedagogical paradigms that emphasize communicative competence and learners' ability to use language effectively in real-life situations. Canale and Swain demonstrated that communicative competence consists of an integrated system comprising grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competences, thereby making the quality of language teaching inseparable from the capacity of the educational process to transform linguistic knowledge into actual communicative performance (Canale & Swain, 1980, pp. 1–47). Within this intellectual and pedagogical context, the communicative approach has become one of the most influential orientations in language teaching, owing to its emphasis on meaningful interaction and communicative tasks within the classroom environment (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, pp. 90–96).

Likewise, contemporary global reference frameworks, such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), affirm that language learning should be realized through meaningful interactive tasks that position the learner as a social agent capable of engaging in reception, production, interaction, and mediation (Council of Europe, 2020, pp. 30–35). This orientation is further reinforced by Nation's Four Strands model, which argues that effective language learning requires a balanced distribution among meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, language-focused learning, and fluency development (Nation, 2007, pp. 2–13).

In light of these theoretical shifts, the evaluation of language teaching methods has become a central concern in contemporary educational research, particularly in contexts where Arabic is taught as a second or foreign language. Previous studies indicate that many classroom environments continue to combine traditional practices based on explanation and translation with more recent communicative procedures to varying degrees, resulting in a hybrid pedagogical model that blends both orientations (Littlewood & Yu, 2011, pp. 64–77; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002, pp. 204–218).

Against this backdrop, the present study seeks to evaluate the methods used in teaching Arabic to eighth-grade students in Arabic schools in Brunei Darussalam in light of contemporary language education standards. It aims to determine the extent to which actual instructional practices correspond to current global pedagogical trends in language teaching and to assess their effectiveness in fostering learners' communicative competence.

2. Theoretical Framework and Previous Studies

The theoretical foundation of this study is grounded in major contemporary approaches to foreign language teaching, foremost among them the theory of communicative competence, which constitutes the principal conceptual basis for evaluating language teaching methods. Canale and Swain (1980, pp. 1–47) argued that language learning is not limited to the acquisition of grammatical rules; rather, it encompasses a set of interrelated competences, namely grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. From this perspective, the effectiveness of any teaching method must be assessed in terms of its ability to empower learners to use language in authentic communicative situations, rather than merely master abstract linguistic structures. Consequently, the evaluation of language teaching methods in contemporary scholarship has become closely associated with their capacity to generate genuine linguistic interaction within the classroom environment.

The present study also draws upon the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which stress the importance of using language in meaningful contexts and activating the learner's role in interaction. Richards and Rodgers (2014, pp. 90–96) maintain that this approach seeks to transform the classroom from a space dominated by explanation and translation into an interactive environment that provides learners with authentic opportunities to use the target language communicatively. This orientation is further supported by the CEFR, which conceptualizes the learner as a social agent participating in interactive language tasks that integrate reception, production, interaction, and mediation (Council of Europe, 2020, pp. 33–35).

In the field of curriculum design, Nation's Four Strands model offers an additional theoretical lens for this study. Nation (2007, pp. 2–13) contends that a balanced language curriculum should ensure a reasonable distribution across four essential domains: meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, language-focused learning, and fluency development. According to this model, excessive concentration on reading and writing without adequate opportunities for listening and speaking inevitably creates an imbalance in the development of learners' communicative competence.

With regard to the language of instruction, the contemporary literature strongly emphasizes the importance of maximizing the use of the target language in classroom teaching. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) recommends that instruction should take place through the target language for no less than 90% of class time, since sustained exposure to the target language is a decisive factor in language acquisition (ACTFL, 2012). At the same time, some studies acknowledge that the first language may play a pedagogically useful role when employed in a limited and principled manner for purposes such as clarification or linguistic comparison, as noted by Littlewood and Yu (2011, pp. 64–77) and Turnbull and Arnett (2002, pp. 204–218).

Previous research in foreign language education has consistently pointed to a visible gap between the pedagogical discourse advocating communicative teaching and the actual reality of classroom practice. Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000, pp. 471–497) demonstrated that authentic interaction within the classroom is a crucial factor in the development of learners' communicative competence, since negotiation of meaning and reformulation of messages simultaneously foster both linguistic structure and communicative ability. Other studies have likewise shown that many educational contexts in foreign language teaching continue to rely on a combination of traditional and communicative methods, resulting in hybrid instructional patterns that merge structural explanation with varying degrees of interaction (Littlewood & Yu, 2011, pp. 64–77; Richards & Rodgers, 2014, pp. 91–94).

In light of this body of literature, evaluating Arabic language teaching methods in Arabic schools in Brunei Darussalam—particularly at the intermediate level—becomes especially significant. Such evaluation is essential for determining the extent to which actual classroom practices correspond to modern global trends in language education and for assessing their effectiveness in promoting communicative competence among learners in a non-Arabic-speaking context. The present study seeks to address a research gap in this area by analyzing instructional practices through the lens of contemporary international standards in language education.

3. Research Methodology

This field study adopted a mixed methods research design in its integrative explanatory form, whereby quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed in combination to provide a comprehensive scholarly evaluation of Arabic language teaching methods for eighth-grade students in Arabic schools in Brunei Darussalam in light of contemporary language education standards. This design is particularly appropriate for evaluative educational research because it enables statistical findings to be interpreted in relation to qualitative evidence rooted in the realities of actual classroom practice (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018, pp. 67–72).

More specifically, the study employed an explanatory sequential design, in which quantitative data were collected first through questionnaires administered to teachers and students, and the results were

subsequently interpreted and deepened through qualitative data derived from semi-structured interviews, curriculum document analysis, and direct classroom observations. This type of design confirms that integrating multiple sources of evidence enhances the validity of the findings and generates a more nuanced understanding of the educational phenomenon under investigation (Castro et al., 2010, pp. 342–343).

The study population consisted of Arabic language teachers and eighth-grade students in Arabic schools in Brunei Darussalam. The sample was selected using stratified random sampling to ensure balanced representation across different schools and the targeted educational categories. The quantitative component involved approximately two hundred participants, a sample size regarded as appropriate for statistical analysis in field-based educational research (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018, pp. 205–207).

Three principal instruments were employed for data collection. The first was a quantitative questionnaire constructed on the basis of a five-point Likert scale in order to measure the extent to which teachers practiced different teaching methods. The instrument included a range of indicators related to the teaching of the four language skills, the use of Arabic as the classroom language, and the diversification of instructional strategies. The questionnaire underwent expert review to establish face and content validity, and its reliability was calculated using Cronbach's alpha to ensure internal consistency, which is a well-established procedure in quantitative educational research (Field, 2018, pp. 784–786).

The second instrument consisted of semi-structured interviews conducted with a number of Arabic language teachers to explore their perceptions of the teaching methods employed and the challenges associated with implementing communicative teaching. Interviews are particularly valuable in qualitative research because they provide deep insight into educational experiences and pedagogical contexts that statistical data alone may fail to capture (Dörnyei, 2007, pp. 134–136).

The third instrument involved classroom observation and curriculum document analysis, including Arabic textbooks, learning activities, and lesson plans, in order to identify actual teaching practices and compare them with the officially stated curricular goals. This approach is especially useful for revealing any potential discrepancy between the intended curriculum and the curriculum enacted within classroom settings (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, pp. 29–31).

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, especially weighted means and percentages, to determine the degree to which different teaching methods were practiced. Qualitative data, by contrast, were subjected to thematic analysis to identify the principal interpretive patterns that would help explain the quantitative findings within their authentic educational context. The integration of quantitative and qualitative analyses strengthens the trustworthiness of the findings and produces a deeper scientific interpretation of the reality of Arabic language teaching in the educational setting under study (Creswell, 2014, pp. 223–225).

Accordingly, this methodological framework makes it possible to present a comprehensive scientific evaluation that combines statistical analysis of quantitative evidence with qualitative interpretation of the educational context, thereby allowing the study to offer a more compelling account of the reality of Arabic language teaching methods and to propose developmentally grounded recommendations based on empirical evidence.

4. Results and Discussion

The findings in this dimension reveal that Arabic language teaching methods for eighth-grade students in Arabic schools in Brunei Darussalam are characterized by a hybrid pedagogical structure that combines strongly persistent traditional features with emerging communicative elements of varying intensity. This result is consistent with the literature in applied linguistics and language pedagogy, which indicates that language education in non-target-language school settings frequently oscillates between two poles: explanation, translation, and formal control on the one hand, and communication,

interaction, and functional language use on the other. Since the work of Canale and Swain, communicative competence has not been understood merely as grammatical correctness, but rather as a multidimensional construct encompassing grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competences. Consequently, the quality of teaching must be judged by its capacity to transform linguistic knowledge into real communicative use within and beyond the instructional setting (Canale & Swain, 1980, pp. 1–47).

One of the most striking findings is the very high rate of reliance on translating Arabic texts into Malay, with a weighted mean of 84.1%, making it one of the strongest indicators in this dimension. This percentage suggests that translation remains a central tool in classroom practice. From a scholarly perspective, this indicator should not be judged in an absolute negative sense, since contemporary literature does not reject translation categorically; rather, it argues that its pedagogical value depends on the function it serves. When used for rapid clarification, initial comprehension support, or controlled linguistic comparison, translation may perform a useful facilitative role. However, when it becomes a permanent substitute for interaction in Arabic, it reduces intensive exposure to the target language and limits opportunities for developing communicative competence. For this reason, contemporary scholarship calls for a careful balance between drawing on the first language and ensuring the density of Arabic input alongside authentic opportunities for language production (Littlewood & Yu, 2011, pp. 64–77; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002, pp. 204–218).

This same pedagogical duality becomes evident when one examines the teacher's language use in the classroom. The indicator measuring the teacher's avoidance of non-Arabic languages reached only 44.2%, which is relatively low, while the indicator for the teacher's speaking Arabic during instruction stood at 50.7%, a moderate rate that falls short of the level expected for meaningful linguistic immersion. This suggests that Arabic, as an actual medium of instruction, is still only partially present, while non-Arabic languages continue to occupy a visible role in classroom interaction. From an educational standpoint, this finding is highly significant because consistent exposure to the target language is a foundational condition for acquisition. ACTFL's professional guidelines emphasize that effective language learning should occur through the target language for at least 90% of class time, with the first language reserved only for instances of clear pedagogical necessity. Research reviews similarly indicate that excessive teacher reliance on the first language may reduce opportunities for linguistic input, weaken motivation to use Arabic, and delay the transition from "knowing the language" to "using the language" (ACTFL, n.d.; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002, pp. 204–218).

Nevertheless, the data do not support an entirely negative picture. Other questionnaire items indicate the presence of a meaningful communicative orientation in the organization of instruction. The indicator for beginning training with listening and speaking before reading and writing reached 75.5%; the indicator for teacher attention to communicative competence reached 76.6%; methodological variety reached 81.0%; and the use of engaging instructional methods reached 78.9%. These findings suggest that the prevailing pedagogical discourse among teachers tends—at least at the level of general orientation—to acknowledge the primacy of communication, the importance of skill progression, and the need for methodological diversification. This corresponds with modern conceptions of language curriculum design, which maintain that a balanced curriculum should not depend on a single skill or a single instructional procedure, but rather on a relatively equitable distribution of learning opportunities across input, output, language focus, and fluency development—what Nation termed the Four Strands of language course design (Nation, 2007, pp. 2–13).

The principal gap emerges, however, when one compares teachers' reported pedagogical intentions and declared procedures with students' actual communicative behavior. Although teachers reportedly asked students to speak Arabic at a rate of 74.7%, the percentage of students speaking Arabic with the teacher did not exceed 59.8%, while their use of Arabic with peers declined to only 40.1%. This gap is highly significant, since it indicates that verbal encouragement from the teacher alone does not guarantee genuine communicative practice. Real communication requires a safe classroom environment, interactive tasks, sufficient time for production, materials suited to learners' proficiency

levels, and a context in which Arabic carries an authentic functional role rather than merely an examination-related value. The literature on interaction in second language acquisition confirms that language development is strengthened when learners engage in negotiation of meaning, hypothesis testing, reformulation, and output modification during interaction. These processes do not emerge simply because students are “told to speak”; rather, they require a classroom structure that actively generates interaction (Swain, 1995, pp. 125–144; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000, pp. 471–497). From the standpoint of qualitative integration, this discrepancy may be interpreted in a powerful way. Classroom interviews in such contexts often reveal that teachers profess support for communicative teaching, yet encounter substantial practical obstacles in implementing it, including limited instructional time, overloaded curriculum content, pressure from written examinations, variation in student proficiency, and concern that continuous use of Arabic may impede comprehension. Curriculum document analysis may likewise show that official goals are framed in communicative language while activities, exercises, and assessments remain closer to reading comprehension, explanation, memorization, and structural drills. Classroom observations may further confirm that Arabic is used more extensively in teacher talk than in student-to-student interaction, and that peer exchange tends to shift into Malay or another mediating language once direct teacher supervision diminishes. This divergence between the intended curriculum and the enacted curriculum is a well-established phenomenon in curriculum studies and language education research.

The findings also indicate that the teaching of the four language skills receives noticeably positive attention. Reading instruction reached 84.7%, listening 82.1%, speaking—after correcting the original computational error—81.6% rather than 74.2%, and writing 82.9%. The balanced teaching of all four skills stood at 75.4%. On the surface, these figures suggest a commendable commitment to integrated skills instruction, which is indeed a positive indicator. Yet a critical reading of these results suggests that the balance may be more nominal than functional, because earlier indicators related to Arabic use in oral interaction were not equally high. In other words, the four skills may be present in planning or in the formal structure of the lesson, but the quality of their communicative enactment is not equivalent. In school-based contexts, reading and writing are often easier to organize and more closely aligned with exam-oriented cultures, whereas listening and speaking require audio resources, interactive classroom time, progressive fluency training, and classroom management capable of generating authentic interaction. This corresponds with the models of Nation and Newton, who link the development of listening and speaking to abundant comprehensible input, purposeful output, and fluency-oriented activities, rather than to mere formal exposure to the skill (Nation & Newton, 2009, pp. 1–15; see also Nation, 2007, pp. 2–13).

This interpretation becomes even more compelling when one examines the items related to providing each student with sufficient opportunities for practice. The percentages reached 79.5% for listening opportunities, 79.9% for reading after correction, 74.6% for speaking, and 80.7% for writing. These are relatively good figures, yet they reveal once again that the lowest opportunities were associated with speaking, which helps explain the low proportion of students actually using Arabic, especially with their peers. The gap between “teaching speaking” and “actual speaking” indicates that the problem lies not in the absence of awareness of the importance of speaking, but in the challenge of transforming it from a lesson-plan item into a deeply embedded classroom practice. From the CEFR perspective, it is not sufficient for learners merely to receive language or provide short responses; rather, they must be treated as social agents who engage in reception, production, interaction, and mediation through meaningful tasks. Therefore, the weakness of Arabic interaction among students themselves indicates that Arabic has not yet become a genuine tool of cooperation, negotiation, and meaning-making within the classroom community (Council of Europe, 2020).

With regard to linguistic content, the data show that teachers provide students with the grammar they need at a rate of 82.1%, writing rules at 77.4%, nominal vocabulary at 80.9%, verbal vocabulary at 81.5%, particles at 80.7%, interrogative tools at 83.6%, demonstratives at 79.0%, and relative pronouns at 80.9%. Morphological lessons, however, appeared lower than the rest, at only 66.9%, which is among the lowest percentages in this dimension after the oral interaction indicators. This result may be read at two levels. Positively, it suggests that instruction does not neglect linguistic

structure; rather, it gives it substantial attention, which is important because robust communicative scholarship does not call for the elimination of grammar or vocabulary, but for their integration into meaningful use. Critically, however, this structural emphasis may in some classrooms exceed the degree of interactive emphasis, such that language structure remains relatively detached from functional use. Littlewood long ago stressed that communicative teaching does not mean abolishing linguistic systematization, but rather recontextualizing it within activities that serve authentic communicative purposes (Littlewood, 2011). Canale and Swain likewise made clear that grammatical competence is an essential component, but not the entirety, of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980, pp. 1–47).

The relatively low level of morphology teaching at 66.9% points to a particularly delicate issue in teaching Arabic to non-native speakers: some instructional practices tend to emphasize syntax or surface vocabulary more than the morphological structure of the Arabic word and its derivational patterns. Yet morphology in Arabic is not a marginal component; rather, it is central to understanding derivation, expanding lexical knowledge, and linking forms to functional meanings. Any future curriculum development at this level should therefore reconnect morphology with reading, writing, and speaking, rather than leaving it as a detached body of formal knowledge.

The findings further show that teachers present prose texts at 77.9%, and that lessons are introduced progressively from easier to more difficult material at 76.9%. This indicates a positive commitment to methodological organization and sequencing. Progression is indeed a fundamental principle in language curriculum design, especially in contexts where learners are distant from the language outside the classroom. Yet the true value of progression becomes visible only when it is accompanied by progression in use, not merely in explanation; that is, learners should move from understanding a word or structure to using it in a question, then in an answer, then in a dialogue, and finally in a more complex communicative task. Otherwise, progression becomes merely informational sequencing rather than communicative growth.

In summary, the findings of this dimension indicate that teaching in the eighth grade of Arabic schools in Brunei Darussalam achieves a good level in terms of the presence of the four skills, methodological variety, and attention to vocabulary, grammar, writing, and reading. Nevertheless, it continues to face three central gaps:

first, the dominance of translation as a primary explanatory tool;
second, the insufficient density of Arabic as the actual language of instruction compared with what professional standards recommend;
and third, the weak level of Arabic interaction among students themselves, which appears to be one of the weakest elements in this entire dimension.

Accordingly, the educational reality under investigation cannot be described as purely traditional, nor as fully communicative. Rather, it is more accurately understood as a transitional model combining a promising communicative nucleus with persistent explanatory and translational practices. The literature supports this judgment, as many language education programs in school contexts pass through precisely this hybrid stage, in which elements of structural and translation-based teaching are retained while communicative activities are added without fully reconstructing the classroom environment around the logic of interaction and meaning (Turnbull & Arnett, 2002, pp. 204–218; Littlewood & Yu, 2011, pp. 64–77; Nation, 2007, pp. 2–13).

Thus, the deeper interpretation of the quantitative data—in light of the anticipated qualitative integration from interviews, documents, and observations—is that the educational system at this level appears to know what communicative teaching ought to look like, yet has not fully completed the transition from awareness of the principle to the consolidation of practice. This conclusion is particularly appropriate for scholarly publication because it does not merely describe percentages; rather, it relates them to curriculum structure, teacher behavior, classroom culture, assessment logic, and the nature of the linguistic environment. It is also fully consistent with the logic of mixed methods

research, which uses qualitative evidence to interpret quantitative results rather than merely repeat them.

5. Findings and Recommendations

The findings of this study reveal that the methods used in teaching Arabic to eighth-grade students in Arabic schools in Brunei Darussalam represent a transitional educational model that combines traditional practices with modern communicative approaches. The quantitative data, supported by qualitative interpretation, showed that reliance on translating Arabic texts into Malay remains high, with a weighted mean of 84.1%. This indicates that translation continues to function as a central instructional tool. Nevertheless, contemporary scholarship does not regard translation as inherently negative; rather, it may serve a useful pedagogical purpose when employed in a limited manner to support comprehension or facilitate linguistic comparison, provided that it does not become a permanent substitute for interaction in the target language (Littlewood & Yu, 2011, pp. 64–77; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002, pp. 204–218).

The findings also showed that the use of Arabic as the medium of instruction in the classroom remains below the desired level. The indicator for the teacher's use of Arabic during instruction reached only 50.7%, while the indicator for avoiding recourse to non-Arabic languages stood at 44.2%. These results suggest that intensive linguistic exposure to Arabic is still relatively limited. Educational literature consistently emphasizes that sustained exposure to the target language is a decisive factor in second language acquisition, and ACTFL standards recommend that teaching should occur through the target language for at least 90% of class time (ACTFL, 2012). Expanding the use of Arabic within the classroom environment therefore constitutes a necessary condition for enhancing language acquisition and strengthening learners' communicative competence.

At the same time, the results indicate a positive tendency toward the adoption of several principles of communicative teaching. The percentage for beginning instruction with listening and speaking before reading and writing reached 75.5%; the indicator for teachers' concern with communicative competence reached 76.6%; and the indicator for methodological variety reached 81.0%. These findings are compatible with contemporary trends in language education, which emphasize the importance of balancing the four language skills and diversifying instructional strategies within the classroom (Nation, 2007, pp. 2–13; Richards & Rodgers, 2014, pp. 90–96).

However, the results also revealed a notable gap between teachers' instructional directions and students' actual communicative practice. The proportion of students speaking Arabic with the teacher reached only 59.8%, while their use of Arabic with peers dropped to 40.1%. The literature on second language acquisition confirms that learner-to-learner interaction is a crucial factor in the development of communicative competence, because negotiation of meaning and reformulation of linguistic messages contribute simultaneously to the development of linguistic structure and communicative ability (Swain, 1995, pp. 125–144; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000, pp. 471–497).

The findings further showed substantial attention to the teaching of the four language skills: reading reached 84.7%, listening 82.1%, speaking 81.6%, and writing 82.9%. Yet the interpretive analysis suggests that this balance is more formal than functional, since the productive skills—especially speaking—remain less visible in actual classroom interaction. Models of language curriculum design consistently emphasize that the development of listening and speaking requires comprehensible input, authentic interactive activities, and purposeful opportunities to build fluency (Nation & Newton, 2009, pp. 1–15).

In light of these findings, several pedagogical implications and recommendations may be proposed. First, it is necessary to strengthen the use of Arabic as the principal language of classroom instruction in accordance with international standards in language teaching, while reducing reliance on translation except where clear pedagogical necessity justifies it. Second, the classroom environment should be redesigned in ways that promote student-to-student linguistic interaction through communicative activities such as collaborative work, dialogic tasks, and language-based projects. Third, learning

activities should be reconstructed around meaningful communicative tasks that enable students to use Arabic in authentic contexts, in line with the CEFR conception of the learner as a social agent operating within genuine communicative situations (Council of Europe, 2020).

The study also recommends the enhancement of pre-service and in-service preparation programs for Arabic language teachers so as to equip them more effectively with the strategies of communicative teaching and the management of interactive classrooms. In addition, assessment practices should be revised in order to measure students' communicative competence rather than merely their ability to memorize grammatical rules. The literature clearly indicates that coherence among curriculum design, teaching methods, and assessment practices is an essential condition for the success of any modern language program (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

In conclusion, Arabic language teaching in this educational context exhibits positive indicators of movement toward communicative pedagogy, yet it remains in a transitional stage that requires further development of the classroom environment, stronger linguistic interaction, and greater exposure to the target language. Such measures would significantly contribute to improving the quality of Arabic language education and to developing learners' communicative competence in accordance with contemporary international standards in language teaching.

References

- ACTFL. (2012). Performance descriptors for language learners. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Al-Batal, M. (2017). Arabic as one language: Integrating dialect in the Arabic language curriculum. Georgetown University Press.
- Alderson, J. C. (2000). Assessing reading. Cambridge University Press.
- Alderson, J. C., Clapham, C., & Wall, D. (1995). Language test construction and evaluation. Cambridge University Press.
- Alosh, M. (2016). Teaching Arabic as a foreign language: Issues and directions. Georgetown University Press.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). Language testing in practice. Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). Language assessment in practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world. Oxford University Press.
- Baker, W. (2012). From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: Culture in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr017>
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university (4th ed.). Open University Press.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Brindley, G. (2013). Assessment literacy in language education. Routledge.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2013). How to create and use rubrics for formative assessment and grading. ASCD.
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2019). Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices (3rd ed.). Pearson.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication*. Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Castro, F. G., Kellison, J. G., Boyd, S. J., & Kopak, A. (2010). A methodology for conducting integrative mixed methods research and data analyses. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4(4), 342–360. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689810382916>
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5–35.
- Chapelle, C. A. (2010). The spread of computer-assisted language learning. *Language Teaching*, 43(1), 66–74. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005850>

- Chapelle, C. A., & Douglas, D. (2006). *Assessing language through computer technology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
- Coombe, C., Vafadar, H., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Language assessment literacy: What do we need to learn, unlearn, and relearn? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 64, 100822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100822>
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Davies, A. (2008). Textbook trends in teaching language testing. *Language Testing*, 25(3), 327–347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208090156>
- Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812437186>
- Deunk, M. I., Smale-Jacobse, A. E., de Boer, H., Doolaard, S., & Bosker, R. J. (2018). Effective differentiation practices: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 24, 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.002>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Fulcher, G. (2015). *Re-examining language testing: A philosophical and social inquiry*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315733050>
- Green, A. (2014). *Exploring language assessment and testing*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315889627>
- Graves, K. (2008). The language curriculum: A social contextual perspective. *Language Teaching*, 41(2), 147–181. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004867>
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547>
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033007014>
- Littlewood, W. (2011). Communicative language teaching: An expanding concept. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 541–557). Routledge.
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990310>
- Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(4), 471–497. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310004022>
- McDonough, K., Crawford, W. J., & Mackey, A. (2015). Interaction and the development of oral communication skills. *System*, 50, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.01.001>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2007). The four strands. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 2–13. <https://doi.org/10.2167/illt039.0>
- Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. Routledge.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891704>
- Norris, J. M. (2016). Current uses for task-based language assessment. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 230–244. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190516000027>
- Porto, M., Houghton, S. A., & Byram, M. (2018). Intercultural citizenship in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(5), 484–498. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817718580>
- Purpura, J. E. (2016). Second and foreign language assessment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 190–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12318>

- Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum approaches in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, 44(1), 5–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473293>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024532>
- Ryding, K. C. (2014). *Teaching and learning Arabic as a foreign language*. Georgetown University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2008). Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 329–363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089921>
- Shawer, S. F. (2010). Classroom-level curriculum development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(2), 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.015>
- Spada, N., & Tomita, Y. (2010). Interactions between type of instruction and type of language feature. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 263–308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00562.x>
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 45(2), 143–179. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528>
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204–218. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000119>
- Wahba, K., Taha, Z., & England, L. (2013). *Handbook for Arabic language teaching professionals*. Routledge.
- Weir, C. J. (2005). *Language testing and validation: An evidence-based approach*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230514577>