

AN INVESTIGATION OF CHALLENGES RELATED TO COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING PRACTICES IN INDONESIAN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Puput Arfiandhani

Introduction

Communicative Approach is so appealing that it has been implemented in many countries for more than four decades. However, many issues in implementing CLT have been reported in many Asian countries.

In Indonesia, particularly, CLT has been implemented since early 1980s. Since then on, communicative competence has been the goal of English language teaching. Communicative approach and many of its trainings show government attempt to foster communicative competence within students. In short, CLT helps permeating communicative approach within English language teaching in Indonesia. However, many high school graduates still find difficulties in engaging in real life communication. This is in line with what is stated by Lie (2007) that regardless of the length of English exposure for Indonesian students, only few Indonesian high school graduates can actively use the languages they have learned for at least 6 years in secondary schools. This condition shows that CLT implementation in Indonesia has not yet bared its optimum results.

To find out what can be improved in the implementation of CLT in Indonesia, many researchers have investigated the challenges and practices of CLT including the consequences of an in-service training towards teachers' belief (Lamb, 1995), reviewing CLT from theoretical perspectives (Musthafa, 2001), observing classroom interactions (Marcellino, 2009) to reviewing the issues of CLT as well as proposing post-methods (Adi, 2012). However only a few give the teachers' perspectives. To add to this discussion, this small-scale research paper was conducted to investigate challenges in implementing CLT faced by Senior

High Schools (Grade 9 – 12) teachers in Indonesia through presenting a descriptive statistics methodology.

The organization of this paper is as follows. To make the case of why CLT is a prominent method in Indonesia; the development of CLT, communicative approach, communicative competence, and ‘strong’ vs. ‘weak CLT will be critically reviewed. After that, the research methodology will be explained and the research finding and the discussions will be presented.

Literature Review

Background of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Emergence

As people from different countries need to connect with each other for various reasons, from trade to war, and from business to personal reasons, English language teaching needs to facilitate this communicative demand through a system of approach, methodology and technique. These three key terms are often confused with each other. Brown (2000) distinguished these three concepts as follows. An approach is a theoretical framework of the applicability of a position about language and language learning in pedagogical settings. A technique is a set of various language-learning activities to realize the instructional aims. Meanwhile, methodology bridges between the two concepts by providing a set of specifications of how to teach the language. Even though in many cases, researchers sometimes tend to use the terms interchangeably, in this paper, CLT will be referred as an approach. As Richards (2006) defines it, communicative language teaching (CLT) specifies the goals of language teaching, how learners learn a language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning, and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom within communicative approach.

The emergence of CLT is a response of dissatisfaction towards Audiolingualism (ALM) in North America and Structural-Situational Approach in the United Kingdom which both had been widely used up to the late 1960s. Both methods were similar in terms of their emphasis on engaging in oral communication through structured teaching with extensive target language exposure. However, many criticisms were addressed to both ALM and SLA. These criticisms spin around the notion that while giving extensive exposure to grammar and vocabulary, they disregard meaningfulness of the language itself. As stated in Brandl (2008), within both

methodologies, learners lacked creative engagement in meaningful language use. This is in line with what is stated by Howatt (1984 in Richards and Rogers, 2001) that by the end of 1960s, there is an urge to return to the traditional concepts that language is unique and carry its own meanings as well as the speakers' or writers' intents. This condition triggers the emergence of CLT as a methodology that focuses on meaningfulness and communicativeness within the language teaching.

The Development of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

CLT came in early 1970s to accommodate the need for meaningful communicativeness aspects of language learning that were not facilitated in Structural-Situational Approach (SSA) and Audiolingualism (ALM). According to Nunan (1999), since then on, language started to be seen as concrete system of meaning negotiation instead of abstract syntactic rules. Further elaborated in Richards (2006), while syntactic grammatical rules provides information for learners to produce grammatically accurate languages, there is a shift of focus towards appropriate grammar and other aspects of language for different communicative purposes such as making requests, giving advice, making suggestions, describing wishes and needs. This resonates the idea suggested by Wilkins (1976 in Larsen-Freeman, 1986), that this meaning negotiation process can be achieved through performing some functions in social contexts. What is required in this negotiation process, which is fostered through English language teaching, is what Hymes (1972), in Richards and Rodgers (2001), called as communicative competence.

Communicative competence has been the subject of evolving definitions. Throughout its development, communicative competence is defined as the ability to perform an appropriate social behavior through learners' appropriate communicative target language production (Canale and Swain (1980), Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), and Hymes (1972 in Brandl, 2008). The term is first coined by Hymes as a counter-argument towards Chomsky's definition of competence, which considers linguistic competence as an isolated individual ability to process language (linguistic competence) and disregards the social and cultural aspects of language communication (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). According to Hymes (1972 in Larsen-Freeman and DeCaricco, 2010), communicative competence includes both the linguistics knowledge (linguistic competence) and the ability to appropriately use it in contexts (sociolinguistic

competence). A decade later, a more pedagogically widely applied communicative competence model was developed by Canale and Swain (1980 in Richards and Rodgers, 2001), suggested the addition of the ability to hinder communication breakdown, or known as strategic competence, and the ability to interpret the interconnectedness of how meanings are presented as a part of a larger discourse, or known as discourse competence, to supplement the previous two competences. In pedagogical settings, the emphasis on communicative competence through communicative approach permeates in the implementation of CLT.

Definition and Principles of CLT

Larsen-Freeman (1986) suggested that CLT aims at achieving communicative competence through applying communicative approach and acknowledging the two-way relationship between language and communication within classroom practices. This is inline with Richards and Rodgers (2001) who defined CLT as a set of language teaching and learning principles that foster communicative classroom practices and aim at achieving authentic and meaningful communication. In short, CLT can be defined as a set of principles that promotes communicative approach within its language teaching and learning classroom practices and aims at achieving communicative competence.

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), there are five principles of CLT to be applied into classroom practices as follows.

a.) Learning by Doing

In CLT, classroom activities should facilitate learners to be actively involved in the learning process that they get more target language exposure by practicing the language learned. In the field of second language acquisition, Munoz' (2011) study on 159 college learners in Spain showed that there is a positive correlation between language exposure and their language proficiency. Therefore, exposing learners to language use could positively contribute towards their communicative competence.

b.) Authentic and Meaningful communication orientation

Authenticity and meaningfulness are two fundamental elements for effective learning mastery. As stated in Brandl (2008), activity meaningfulness is what allows the information to be retained and the learning process to be taken place. Authenticity and meaningfulness can happen when the practices facilitates genuine real life communicative

needs in the classrooms. Additionally, while the activities should reflect real-life genuine communication purpose, learners' competence level should be given attention.

c.) *Focusing on Fluency*

CLT focuses on fostering fluency in language learning. According to Richards (2006), fluency is defined as the ability to perform natural language use in communication. Further, he explained that fluency could be achieved by facilitating learners to be able to perform meaning negotiation, to avoid communication breakdown, to correct misunderstanding and to communicate their intent.

d.) *Integrating different language skills in communication*

According to Savignon (1991), within this methodology, all four skills, speaking, listening, reading and writing are considered to be equally contributing towards the successful negotiation of meaning. Larsen-Freeman (1986) explained this context by exemplifying how in language learning, variety of activities that focuses on different skills should be added in language classrooms. Therefore, while oral communication should be practice a lot, activities like reading that allows intent communication between the authors and the readers should also be promoted as well.

e.) *Learning is a creative process, and errors and mistakes are parts of learning process*

Rather than showing a lack of cognitive skill, errors and mistakes might also be a sign of learners' affective situation. In the field of educational psychology, MacIntyre and Gardner (1994), in Dornyei (2010), observed the performance of 71 students of French with and without camera. The result showed that some students' lack of performance, rather than a sign of cognitive deficit, it relates more to learners' anxiety. Therefore, CLT considers making errors in practicing language as a positive sign for a learning process to occur.

The Idea of 'Strong' and Weak' CLT

The notion of 'strong' and 'weak' CLT has been extensively discussed along with the growing popularity of CLT. Both versions concern with the idea of whether supporting language components like grammar and other non-communicative activities should be part of CLT or not.

Howatt (1984), in Richards and Rodgers (2001), suggested that the 'weak' version of CLT, which have been widely practiced, concern with the idea that classroom practices should

provide opportunities to practice English for communicative purposes. Littlewood (1981) in Hunan (1987) proposed that 'weak' CLT acknowledged the importance of non-communicative activities such as drills and controlled practices for the skills it provide in enabling communicative language practice to happen. In short, 'weak' version of CLT proposes that non-communicative activities which promotes supporting language components like grammar is an important part of CLT because it allows seemingly non-related skills to support communicative competence.

Howatt (1984), in Richards and Rodgers (2001) explained that within 'strong' version of CLT, learning language is a stimulating process of language development, in other words 'using English to learn it'. Beretta (1989), in Thornbury (1998), mentioned that within 'strong' version of CLT, linguistic information would be deliberately acquired when learners focused on meaning as opposed to explicit form focused. In conclusion, within the 'strong' version of CLT, there is no focus on non-communicative activities, because in the long term, the linguistic information and other skills will be deliberately incorporated into learners' language and will bare communicative competence. According to Nunan (2000), the 'strong' version of CLT permeates in the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT).

While both versions aim at communicative competence, 'weak' version of CLT is applied in Indonesia and will be referred throughout the paper. Henceforth, when CLT is mentioned here, it will be within the boundary of 'weak' CLT.

Issues around CLT

While still being implemented in many countries, there have been many issues around CLT because language-learning results have not yet optimally well attained. The issues and criticisms revolve around the five core principles within CLT that were previously reviewed.

a.) Issues around 'Learning by Doing' Principle

While CLT attempts to promote language practice through its classroom activities, these may limit the language production level only to minimum level of being able to complete the activity. Lee's (1995) study, in Littlewood (2007), on South Korean classes indicated that the students tend to keep their performance at the minimum level of being able to complete the tasks. The issue in conclusion lies on how the activity should be able to

expose students' creativity in using the language while also fulfilling the communicative tasks.

b.) Issues around 'Authentic and meaningful communication orientation' Principle

The concept of authentic and meaningful communication orientation in the classroom practice is often challenged as being impractical. Widdowson (1990), in Kumaravadivelu (2006), mentioned that what constitute communicativeness in real world is an abstract concept, thus Kumaravadivelu (2006) suggested that practicing something abstract may not bear any close to what is to be achieved in real world. That being said, that however meaningful the classroom practices are designed, there are elements in real world that cannot be situated in the classrooms.

c.) Issues around 'Focusing on fluency' Principle

One of the widespread misconceptions of CLT is that CLT disregards grammar teaching. One of the cases is shown in Sakui's (2004) longitudinal study of 30 secondary school teachers in Japan. The study showed that their reluctance in applying CLT is rooted on their misconceptions that the CLT does not facilitate grammar teaching, which is heavily focused on the university entrance examination. This finding resonates Thompson's (1996) study on misconceptions in CLT.

d.) Issues around 'Integrating different language skills in communication' Principle

Brandl (2008) stated that teaching all language skills as an integrated rather than isolated skills has faced many challenges in its implication. One of the challenges is that there has been misconception that CLT only emphasizes on oral communication. Mitchell's (1988) study on GLAFL/Éclair/ Tour de France indicated that teachers find it hard to distinguish between communicative activities and oral interaction. They also find difficulties in distinguishing whether they aimed at the communication (providing information) or merely facilitating the experience of speaking. This misconception is inline with the finding of D. F. Li's (1998) and C. Y. Li' (2003) in Littlewood (2007) about teachers in Mainland China and Thompson's (1996) critical review.

e.) Issues around 'Learning is a creative process, and errors and mistakes are parts of learning process' Principle

This notion of tolerating errors and mistakes is often addressed with many criticisms. As argued by Lightown and Spada (2013), when too many errors are tolerated, this may lead to errors fossilization. In regards to this possibility, Brandl (2008) suggested that rather

than not giving feedback, CLT facilitates a more effective error corrective feedback by considering learners' readiness.

The other issues concerning CLT deal with external factors outside the methodological components, but affecting the CLT practices in the classrooms. These factors related to educational system, teachers and students (Li, 1998). The issues related to educational systems consist of large classroom size (in Japan (Nishino, 2008)), insufficient lesson hours (in China (Burnaby and Sun (1989), and Hongkong (Chau and Chung (1987) in Li (1998))) and high-stake standardized exams (in Japan (Nishino, 2008)). The issues related to teachers often deals with language proficiency and instructional competence (in China (Burnaby and Sun (1989); Anderson (1993) in Li (1998))). Whereas, issues related to students concern with students' proficiency and motivation (Littlewood, 2007).

Among all these issues, it is interesting to take a closer look at Indonesian context to find out, after three decades of implementing CLT, what have become the challenges of its implementation.

Methods of The Investigation

Research Participants

The research participants in this small-scale research are 19 English teachers of senior high schools (Grade 9-12) in Indonesia. Among these 11 female and 8 male teachers, 15 (79%) of them are 21-29 years old. They were all contacted and recruited through social media of Facebook and Twitter. All of the participants hold bachelor degree (89%) or master degree (11%) in English language teaching or English literature. That being said, all of them have some sort of relevant educational background necessary for the classroom teaching. Additionally, 53% of them teach in urban areas while the other 47% in rural settings and 42% are in public schools while 58% are in private schools with typically 31-35 students in one class. As far as the schools settings concern, the research participants have proportionate balance.

Research Method

To find out the challenges faced by English language teachers of secondary schools (Grade 9-12) in Indonesia, a quantitative methodology is employed. An electronic survey questionnaire had been distributed from 17 to 24 January 2015. This Likert 5-scale questionnaire is divided into 5 sections exploring background information, school information, understanding about teaching methodology including CLT, and challenges in implementing CLT. The challenges in implementing CLT are categorized into challenges related to teachers, students, educational systems and methodology, especially CLT.

The interpretation of the statistical data is descriptive in nature. According to Thomas (2013), descriptive statistics are about organizing, summarizing, and simplifying numerical data into a meaningful number and tells people what the data tells. Throughout the data, to gain information about the typical answer and thus revealing typical situation among the participants, the median of the data is used. That being said, when the finding is referred as being typical, it is drawn from the median of the data, unless stated otherwise.

Finding and Discussion

The data gathered from the questionnaire is analyzed and discussed to identify challenges faced by teachers in implementing CLT based on teachers' understanding of CLT principles, and challenges related to the implementation of methodology, teachers, students and educational systems.

Teachers' Understanding of CLT Principles

The data reveals teachers' tendency to use various methods in the classrooms. While Silent Way is typically never used, the other methodologies, such as Audiolingual Method (ALM), Direct Method (DM), Natural Approach (NA) and Total Physical Response (TPR) are typically applied in the classrooms sometimes. Interestingly, besides Communicative Approach (CA), reportedly, Grammar Translation Method is also typically often implemented in the classrooms. This shows that teachers regard communicative principles highly by using it more frequently in comparison to other methodology and approaches. However, as GTM is significantly also frequently used, there is a tendency that the participants consider grammar teaching, which is emphasized in GTM, to be not compatible and not facilitated through CA.

When participants were asked to define CLT in their own words, interestingly, only one out of 21 participants who mentioned that CLT focuses on both student-teacher interaction and student-student interaction. The rest of the participants either did not mention about which interaction to focus or only mention that the communication should be two ways or should facilitate student-teachers interaction without indicating interaction among students themselves. For example, two of the participants mentioned,

“... a more interesting and effective teaching method in which student-teacher interaction can be well-facilitated.”

“... a reciprocal interaction between teachers and students.”

It shows that there is a tendency among teachers to acknowledge student-teacher interaction more than student-student interaction in CLT implementation. This situation potentially might facilitate less student-student interaction that may lead to less opportunity for more L2 exposure. As stated in Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983 in Li, 1998), student-student interactions are expected, to maximize the time for the students to practice the language in the classroom.

When teachers were asked to give their opinion about why they use CLT, it due to some features of CLT like dynamics, vibrant, opportunities given for students, students will not get bored, and they also acknowledge that it is still hard to motivate passive students through CLT. This shows that CLT is widely considered to be effective, motivating, and engaging methods despite the fact that some of the participants found a hard time to implement it.

Methodology-Related Challenges

There is a clear-cut understanding of CLT among teachers as indicated by their inline understanding with that of the principles. The data shows that teachers understand that CLT is learner-centered approach, does not emphasize fluency over accuracy, emphasizes communication in a second language (L2), does not rely heavily on speaking and listening skills, requires teachers to have a high proficiency in English, involves grammar teaching, and does not only involve teaching speaking.

Teachers' opinions differ on three points. Firstly, generally speaking, they are typically neutral on the notion that CLT involves only group work or pair work. However, there is an equally higher percentage between those who agree and disagree on this notion. This shows that potentially, among those who consider that CLT involves only group work or pair work, there is a chance that they may over-use and overemphasize group work or pair work. Consequently, there are chances that other more individual activities are not accommodated.

This provides a contradicting view with the previous point. This situation reflects in which while some participants tend to disregard student-student interaction, some others reversely overemphasize classroom interaction. These contradicting views indicate that there are misconceptions of CLT among teachers.

Secondly, there is a mixed opinion on the point that there is a lack of effective and efficient instruments to assess communicative competence. This shows that some participants consider current examination system is enough and coherent in measuring communicative competence achieved, while some others do not.

Thirdly, participants' opinions also differ on the point that CLT does not take into account the differences between EFL and ESL teaching contexts. This shows there are teachers who see CLT does not facilitate learners' need.

Teachers-Related Challenges

This subsection made attempts to uncover challenges dealing with the teachers themselves. Interestingly, the participants have unanimous typical opinions on all five challenges. They found the challenge lie on the points that teachers need more knowledge about the appropriate use of language in context and about the target language (English) culture; there are few opportunities for teachers to get CLT training; teachers have little time to develop materials for communicative classes and that teachers have misconceptions about CLT.

Surprisingly, this resonates the finding Martin Lamb's review on a professional upgrading program in Indonesia which was carried two decades ago in 1995. His study on the program review one year after it was conducted shows that the participants already forgot what had

been taught, faced confusion, and dissatisfaction towards the educational system. This relevance even after two decades shows that, a more effective training programs and review need to be conducted by the government so that the progress and measurable attainment level of the program can be revealed.

Drawing from his experience directing some short-in service programs in Indonesia, Tomlinson (1988 in Lamb, 1995) suggested that one-off training that is not sustained might cause teachers' frustration. This frustration is rooted in teachers' new understanding as well as inability to implement the understanding into their classroom practices due to other factors like incompatible national exams, big classroom size, and less lesson hours. Therefore, to improve the effectiveness of the trainings, unless of being a one off training session, more training session on regular basis is still needed. Meanwhile, other factors are also needed to maximize the success of CLT implementation.

Students-Related Challenges

Participants unanimously typically agree on these points that students have low-level English proficiency; students have a passive style of learning; students resist participating in communicative class activities; and students lack motivation for developing communicative competence. These findings are in support for the previous finding in Marcellino's (2009) study that shows that Indonesian students are lack of motivation due to not getting lack of target language exposure and not being in target language environment. This shows that the students-related challenges have not yet been sufficiently addressed.

Educational System-Related Challenges

Participants agree on all points of these challenges: more support dealing with administration is needed; teachers need more authentic materials such as newspapers, magazines, movies etc; traditional view on teachers and learners' role is not compatible with CLT; classes are too large for the effective use of CLT; and that grammar-based examinations have a negative impact on the use of CLT. Particularly for the challenge dealing with grammar-based examination, it is the most unanimous decision. These findings are in line with Musthafa's (2001) exploratory study that highlights challenges in implementing CLT in Indonesia consisting all five aspects. This indicates that even after the same challenges had been

highlighted since a decade ago, the problems related with the educational systems are still on the same things and not yet well tackled.

Conclusion

Through this discussion, it reveals that challenges faced by Senior High School teachers in Indonesia are multifaceted. These challenges range from teachers' misconceptions, to challenges related to teachers, learners, methodology and educational system. Interestingly, these findings are similar to and resonates what both senior and junior teachers in both urban and rural schools faced, one to two decades ago. As a response to these challenges, many reformative attempts have been deliberately done by the government such as lowering the stake of national exams by not making it as an exit school program anymore, decreasing classroom size, adding lesson hours, continually improving the curriculum as well as providing trainings for teachers. Thus, this paper made attempt to keep the spotlight on the challenges to provide an overview that the government efforts should be continually made and reviewed to increase its effectiveness.

Another interesting thing that was found and should also be highlighted is the way professional enhancement trainings have not bared optimum results as indicated by many misconceptions and confusion of CLT. Lamb (1995) explained that this confusion happens because teachers' upgraded theoretical framework does not fit the classroom situation with those multifaceted challenges. For sure, 'reformative' classroom changes made by the government needs to be taken and may take a long time to take place. The least that could be done to tackle misconceptions and confusion of CLT is reforming how the trainings are carried out. Long term oriented trainings, instead of one-off sessions should be conducted. Additionally, emphasizing how CLT can be principally conducted within non-ideal CLT condition and how teachers should manage their expectation and be creative in dealing with the situational problems might be one of the ways to succeed CLT.

This paper, rather than bringing up generalizability, is an attempt to enrich the discussion of challenges of CLT perceived by teachers. Additionally, as stated by Karavas-Doukas (1996), there is a chance of potential discrepancy between teachers' framework and classroom implementation. That being said, it is acknowledged that teachers' perspectives may not

provide total classroom overview. Thus, more future research which ethnographically investigating classroom practices of CLT is needed to give a more holistic overview of challenges faced in implementing CLT in Indonesia.

Reference

- Adi, S. S. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching: Is it appropriate for Indonesian context?. *Instructional Technology*, 51.
- Brandl, K. (2007). *Communicative language teaching in action: Putting principles to work*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language teaching and learning*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, M. , Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching?. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 141-152.
- Chang, M., & Goswami, J. S. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college English classes. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), p3.
- Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT journal*, 50(3), 187-198.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 59-81.
- Lamb, M. (1995). The consequences of INSET. *ELT journal*, 49(1), 72-80.
- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in East Asian Classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(03), 243-249.
- Marcellino, M. (2009). English Language Teaching in Indonesia: A Continuous Challenge in Education and Cultural Diversity. *TEFLIN Journal: A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 19(1).
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative Language Teaching in Practice*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

- Musthafa, B. (2001). Communicative language teaching in Indonesia: Issues of theoretical assumptions and challenges in classroom practice. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 2(2).
- Nishino, T. (2008). Japanese secondary school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding communicative language teaching: An exploratory survey. *JALT Journal*, 30(1), 27.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: Making it work. *ELT journal*, 41(2), 136-145.
- Nunan, D. (2000). An introduction to task-based teaching. *ELT Advantage*, Cengage Learning.
- Ozsevik, Z. (2010). The Use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL Teachers' Perceived Difficulties in Implementing CLT in Turkey (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sakui, K. (2004). Wearing two pairs of shoes: Language teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 155-163.
- Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative Language Teaching: State of The Art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 261-278.
- Savignon, S. J., & Wang, C. (2003). Communicative Language Teaching in EFL contexts: Learner attitudes and perceptions. *IRAL*, 41(3), 223-250.
- Sun, G., & Cheng, L. (2000). From Context to Curriculum: A Case Study of Communicative Language Teaching in China.
- Thompson, G. (1996). Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT journal*, 50(1), 9-15.

APPENDIX 1

Survey Questionnaire

**Survey Questionnaire on
Teachers' Perceived Challenges of Implementing Communicative Language Teaching
(CLT) Methodology in Senior High Schools, Indonesian Context**

Adapted from a survey questionnaire developed by Zekariya Ozsevik

(MA TESL Graduate at Department of Linguistics,

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

and Randall W. Sadler

(Asst. Prof. Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).

in Ozsevik's dissertation entitled The Use Of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT):

Turkish EFL Teachers' Perceived Difficulties In Implementing CLT in Turkey.

I. Background Information

1. What is your age?
 - a. 21 – 29
 - b. 30 – 39
 - c. 40 – 49
 - d. 50 or more
2. What is your gender?
 - a. female
 - b. male
 - c. N/A, or I refuse to reveal
3. What is the highest academic degree you earned?
 - a. Bachelor of Arts (BA) / S1 (*Indonesian Term*)
 - b. Master of Arts (MA) or Master of Education (M.Ed.) / S2
 - c. Doctorate Degree (PhD) / S3
 - d. Other, ...
4. Which university and department did you graduate from?
5. How many years have you been teaching English?
 - a. less than 5 years
 - b. 5 – 10 years
 - c. more than 10 years

II. School Information

6. What type of setting is your school located at?
 - a. Urban
 - b. Rural
7. Are you working for a public or private school? If you teach in both private and public schools, please choose one in which you teach more hours.
 - a. Public School
 - b. Private School
8. What grade(s) are you presently teaching?
9. How many classes are you teaching this year? How many hours of class do you teach a week?
10. What is the average number of students in your class?
 - a. Less than 10
 - b. 10 – 15
 - c. 16 – 20
 - d. 21 – 25
 - e. 26 – 30
 - f. 31 – 35
 - g. 36 – 40
 - h. 41 or more

III. Language Teaching Methodology, Specifically CLT

For more information about the teaching methods listed in this section, visit the following website: <http://moramodules.com/ALMMMethods.htm>

11. What teaching methods are you implementing in your classes? *Please specify how frequently you are using a particular method.*

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Audio-lingual Method					
Communicative Approach					
Direct Method					

Grammar-translation					
Natural Approach					
Silent Way					
Total Physical Response					

12. What methods did you experience as a language learner? *Please specify the degree to which you experienced a particular method.*

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Audio-lingual Method					
Communicative Approach					
Direct Method					
Grammar-translation					
Natural Approach					
Silent Way					
Total Physical Response					

13. Have you tried Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in your classes? Why?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Please give reasons to your answer.

...

14. If you have tried CLT, what kinds of CLT activities to use in class? (e.g. role play, information gap spot the difference)? (If you haven't tried CLT, please skip this question.)

15. If you have tried CLT, how effective do you think they are? (If you haven't tried CLT, please skip this question.)

16. If you have tried CLT, do the students enjoy these activities? (If you haven't tried CLT, please skip this question.)

- a. Yes
- b. No

17. How do you define CLT in your own words?

18. What is involved in CLT methodology in your view? (Please check one.)

- 5 = Strongly agree
- 4 = Agree
- 3 = Neutral
- 2 = Disagree
- 1 = Strongly disagree

		1	2	3	4	5
a.	CLT is student/learner-centered approach.					
b.	CLT emphasizes fluency over accuracy.					
c.	CLT emphasizes communication in a second language (L2)					
d.	CLT relies heavily on speaking and listening skills.					
e.	CLT requires teachers to have a high proficiency in English.					
f.	CLT involves only group work or pair work.					
g.	CLT involves no grammar teaching.					
h.	CLT involves teaching speaking only.					
i.	CLT is basically an ESL methodology, not EFL.					
j.	CLT requires higher knowledge of the target language culture.					

19. CLT-Related Difficulties & Challenges

- 5 = Strongly agree
- 4 = Agree
- 3 = Neutral
- 2 = Disagree
- 1 = Strongly disagree

	1	2	3	4	5
There is a lack of effective and efficient instruments to assess communicative competence.					
CLT doesn't take into account the differences between EFL and ESL teaching contexts.					

20. Have you ever participated in any kinds of programs such as workshops, special training programs devoted to CLT?

- a. Yes
- b. No

21. If yes,

- a. When?
- b. Where?
- c. How long?

22. How did you benefit from the program? What did you learn from it? (If you said no, then you can skip this question.)

IV. Difficulties / Challenges in Applying CLT

The following are some difficulties that other EFL teachers encountered in adopting CLT. Did you come across these difficulties or do you think they might be difficulties for you in implementing CLT in Indonesia? Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statements regarding the challenges in implementing CLT.

Please indicate how big an issue these challenges are by circling the following response scale (Please give a thick):

5 = Strongly agree

4 = Agree

3 = Neutral

2 = Disagree

1 = Strongly disagree

23. Teacher-Related Difficulties & Challenges

	1	2	3	4	5
In general, teachers' proficiency in spoken English needs to be improved.					
Teachers need more knowledge about the appropriate use of language in context.					
Teachers need more knowledge about the target language (English) culture.					
There are few opportunities for teachers to get CLT training.					
Teachers have little time to develop materials for communicative classes.					
Teachers have misconceptions about CLT.					

24. Student-Related Difficulties & Challenges

	1	2	3	4	5
Students have low-level English proficiency.					
Students have a passive style of learning.					
Students resist participating in communicative class activities.					
Students lack motivation for developing communicative competence.					

25. Difficulties & Challenges Related to Educational System

	1	2	3	4	5
More support dealing with administration is needed.					
Teachers need more authentic materials such as newspapers, magazines, movies etc.					
Traditional view on teachers and learners' role is not compatible with CLT.					
Classes are too large for the effective use of CLT.					
Grammar-based examinations have a negative impact on the use of CLT.					

26. Please list any other potential problems and difficulties you might encounter in adopting CLT in Indonesia.

End of questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Puput Arfiandhani, Graduate Student of MA in TESOL,

School of Education, University of Nottingham,

E-mail: ttxpa5@nottingham.ac.uk, Tel: +447448247690

Academic Tutor: Ann Smith

School of Education, University of Nottingham,

E-mail: ann.smith@nottingham.ac.uk

APPENDIX 2

Research Results

Research results can be found here <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/19Iz-g1OH9TtKtBO0rSrAr--g6HMKaQHKZNILse6n-iU/viewanalytics>