

Teachers' Perception in Implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) at Maritime English Class

Nursyam¹, Basri Jafar², Iskandar³ and , Sulaiman⁴

¹ Universitas Negeri Makassar
Jalan Andi Pangerang Pettarani, South Sulawesi, Indonesia.
Email: nursyamrto [AT] gmail.com

² Universitas Negeri Makassar
Jalan Andi Pangerang Pettarani, South Sulawesi, Indonesia.
Email: Muhammadbasri [AT] unn.ac.id

³ Universitas Negeri Makassar
Jalan Andi Pangerang Pettarani, South Sulawesi, Indonesia.

⁴ Universitas Negeri Makassar
Jalan Andi Pangerang Pettarani, South Sulawesi, Indonesia.
Email: essamad.riset [AT] gmail.com

ABSTRACT— *The objectives of this research were to find out the Teachers' perception in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) at Maritime English class.*

This research applied qualitative description. The population were the teachers at Polytechnic Maritime Barombong. The respondent consisted of 14 teachers. The research data were collected by questionnaire and analyzed by using goggle form to see the teachers' perception about the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching at Maritime English class.

The results of the research was: the teachers' perception in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) at Maritime English class result which disclosed familiar and understand communicative language teaching (CLT). They also believed that Communicative language teaching (CLT) can improve the students communicative competence. The Teachers' perception in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) at Maritime English class the researcher conclude that overall the teachers satisfy with communicative language teaching (CLT).

Keywords— CLT, teachers' perception, implementing communicative

1. INTRODUCTION

Becoming an English teacher might be a wonderful job, especially when the teacher is able to transfer their knowledge to the students whose English is the second language successfully. The problem is transferring knowledge is not easy. The teacher should determine strategies, approaches and methods to help students developing English skills. Today, many teachers of English emphasize communicative competence in and out the classroom. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is an approach in teaching language that emphasizes authentic communication from beginning of class (Horwitz, 2008).

Methods are beneficial in connecting thoughts and actions since teaching is about teachers, subject matter, language, culture, who the learners and how the learners learn (Freeman, 2000). The teachers have known several methods in teaching language besides communicative language teaching. Those methods are the grammar-translation method, the direct method, the audio-lingual method, the silent way, the suggestopedia, communicative language learning, total physical response, natural approach, and many more.

There are different methods that are being used to teach English as a foreign language but not all of them help us to reach the desired communicative goals; therefore, the selection and application of the most effective ones is required. In Indonesia, the lack of appropriate methods, techniques, and strategies for teaching English is providing poor results in the oral production of the language. The study conducted by Calle, Argudo, Moscoso, Smith, and Cabrera (2012) indicates that the strategies teachers use in the English classroom are based on traditional methods that do not focus on the Communicative Language Teaching approach as it is established by the Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia. As indicated above, CLT is one of the approaches to second language pedagogy. It is an approach which views that second/foreign language teaching and learning should be based on promoting learners' communicative competence that involves the processes of expression, interpretation, and negotiation of meaning (Savignon, 1997). This indicates that CLT does not belong to any particular method of teaching; rather, it is an approach that can give insights to the incorporation of any methodologies as long as they promote learners' communicative competence. In this regard, Savignon (1991) contends that the main nature of CLT centers on 'the elaboration of programs and methodologies that promote the development of functional language ability through learner participation in communicative events.

Communicative Language Teaching is based on the theory that the primary function of language use is communication. Canale and Swain (1980) assert that communication activities must be as meaningful as possible and be characterized by aspects of genuine communication such as its basis in social interaction, the relative creativity and unpredictability of utterance, its purposefulness and goal-orientation, and its authenticity. Brown (1995) claims that CLT provides opportunities in the EFL/ESL classroom for students to engage in real-life communication using the target language. Students, in unrehearsed context, eventually have to use the language, productively and receptively. Scarcella and Crookall (1990) note that learners acquire language when they are (1) exposed to large quantities of comprehensible input, (2) they are actively involved, and (3) they have positive attitudes and motivation. The dilemma of classroom-based instruction is the lack of reality. Language learning can be most effective when language.

Practice occurs in meaningful contexts instead of isolated linguistic settings. CLT is fundamentally learner-centered, focusing on the communicative aspects of language learning. It enables learners to activate participation, generate motivation, and encourage communication in the class. In addition, the simulated "real life" problems help students develop their critical thinking and problem solving skills. The goal of communicative language teaching is to develop students' communicative competence in the target language. The target language is both the means and the goal (Littlewood, 1981; Kumar, Philip & Kalaiselvi, 2013). Common characteristics of CLT include information gap, choice, and feedback (Johnson & Morrow, 1981 as cited in Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Information gap refers to situations of sharing information in which someone knows particular information whereas the interlocutor does not know this information. Choice means that the speaker has options in what to say and how to say it. Meanwhile, feedback refers to a purposeful information exchange, in which the speaker gets her expected feedback from the listener. Other characteristics of CLT activities according to Nunan (1989) are rehearsal to the real world, skill use, and fluency/accuracy. Three principles underlying activities in CLT are communication, task-based and meaningfulness (Littlewood, 1981). In other words, CLT activities must engage students to interact and use the language form they learnt for meaningful communicative purpose.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Historical Background

The emergence of CLT as an approach to second language pedagogy can be traced back to the 1970s when researchers, teachers, and language practitioners began reflecting and discussing the notion of communicative competence. Savignon (1991) highlights some major developments that illustrate the historical background of CLT. At least two types of historical contexts can be seen from Savignon's description, the European context and the American context. In the European context, the language needs of rapidly increasing groups of immigrants and guest workers on the one hand, and the British linguistic tradition whose main tenets originated from Firth and Halliday's notion of language as meaning potential on the other hand, led to the development of *functional-notional syllabus* of second language programs.

2. Communicative Language Teaching Approach

All human beings need to communicate in order to express their ideas, feelings and thoughts, this is the main reason why communicative activities should be integrated into the lesson. Students spoken language is more productive when they are engaged in a dynamic learning environment that encourages them to do their tasks. It is well-known that all people need to understand spoken language in different situations, such as daily life, work, school, community, among others. According to Moss and Ross-Feldman (2003), any activity which requires the learner to speak and listen to others includes the use of communication. Activities with communicative purposes are helpful for breaking down barriers, finding information, expressing ideas about oneself and learning about culture.

Jeyasala (2014) asserts that teachers should encourage students' communicative competence all the time, and besides their limitations to use language fluently and accurately, they should provide them with spaces to interact with others or to immerse them in speaking activities that enhance their ability to use the target language. Providing students with real communicative contexts is the best option teachers can make, because students can exchange real information, so language and phrases will emerge according to the situation. It is also necessary that students have a lot of exposure to the language, the linguistic input they receive should provide them with opportunities to produce and use the language at any situation, motivation then plays a very important role in encouraging students to verbally communicate.

3. Characteristic of CLT classroom

A brief history of CLT indicated above provides some insights about its theoretical and practical backgrounds. CLT has emerged as a theory-and-practice-based approach to second language education. A crucial question might arise here: how does CLT look like in practical classroom situations? To put it another way, what are the main characteristics of CLT in real class-room contexts? Answering this question is of significant importance especially for second language teachers whose profession deals with real challenges in dynamic teaching and learning environments. Brown (2001) outlines inter-connected characteristics of CLT underlying the objective of classroom activities, language techniques, and the role of learners and teachers.

4. Communicative Activities to Teach English

Richards (2006) proposed two methodologies to achieve the goal of communicative language teaching; these process-based methodologies are Content-based instruction (CBI) and Task-based instruction (TBI). CBI is a methodology that favors the acquisition of language through the use of content; in addition, it allows to link and develop different language skills. While in TBI, pedagogical and real-world tasks are used in order to provide learners with opportunities to be involved in meaningful tasks. The former are tasks in which interaction among learners is necessary but the task itself will not be found in the real world while the latter are tasks designed from authentic materials such as listening tasks, problem solving, sharing personal experiences, comparing, among other real life situations.

5. Models of communicative competence

It can be explicitly seen from the above discussion of the historical background and characteristics of CLT classroom activities that the conceptualization and implementation of CLT should be based on some model of communicative competence. However, before dealing with models of communicative competence, it is worth understanding the notion of competence and communication. The term *competence* has been widely used by researchers and experts referring to different concepts. Celce Murcia, et al., (1995) summarize some conceptual differences of the term as used by several linguists and applied linguists.

6. Role relationship in CLT

A classroom practice based on the principles of communicative language teaching suggests a redefining of role relationship of learner and teacher vis-à-vis traditional approach. The role of the learner in the CLT is central and teacher is a facilitator, guide and manager of learning. The analogy of learning driving can again be aptly applied here. To learn driving the learner has to be in the driving seat and not the instructor, the instructor gets involved by using the dual control under his feet only when there is a need to do so. It is the learner doing things most of the times, under the guidance of the instructor. Same is the role relationship in the CLT language classroom. The role of the learner in a CLT classroom is envisaged in the following way: „the role of the learner as negotiator- between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning- emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an independent way (Breen & Candlin 2001:19).

7. Implementation of CLT

Despite the fact that CLT captures the essence of language use for communicative situations of everyday life and having the development of communicative competence as its goal and to enable the learners to deal with the demands made by communicative situations, and despite all the favourable characteristics listed in the previous paragraph, its implementation in certain contexts has not been without problems. Apart from other factors, such as political reasons, language policy, attitude towards modernity, administrative, logistical, infrastructural, and economic considerations, responsible for these problems, probably a fundamental problem in the implementation of CLT is its conflict with local culture of learning (Tudor 1996:129).

3. METHODOLOGY

This research used qualitative research method with a case study designs. Case studies are in-depth contextual analyses of one of a few instances of a naturalistic phenomenon, such as a person, an organization, a program, an event, a geographical location, or a decision (Tracy, 2020:61). The aims of this case study to explain some contemporary circumstance and requires an extensive and in-depth description of some social phenomenon (Yin, 2018:35). In this case The researcher will collect data in the class where the issue existed in order to gain thick data. The data will be about the teachers' perception the implementation of communicative language teaching at Maritime English class.

4. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Finding

Considering each item, the teachers agree that in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) at Maritime English class, communicative language teaching (CLT) is familiar and understand for the teacher, the data shows that 71,4% agree and 7,1% strongly agree, another question delivered to the teachers about communicative language teaching (CLT) improve the communicative competence, the data shows that 57,1% agree and 42,9% strongly agree. To know the teachers' perception about communicative language teaching (CLT) from written perspective the researcher delivered a question about communicative language teaching (CLT) entirely influence students written score, from the data shows that 35,7% agree, 35,7% disagree and 28,6% neutral. To know teacher perception about communicative language teaching (CLT) about students with low participation will discourage in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT), and the result is 42,9 % disagree, 14,3% neutral, 21,4% agree, 14,3% totally disagree and 7,1% strongly agree. The students are difficult to follow communicative language teaching (CLT) activity, and the result shows that 64,3% neutral, 28,65 disagree and 7,1% agree, class time will limit the application of communicative language teaching (CLT), the data shows that 50% neutral, 21,4% disagree, 21,4% agree and 7,1% strongly agree. Communicative language teaching (CLT) emphasize fluency over accuracy and the data shows that 57,1% agree, 21,4% neutral, 14,3% strongly agree and 7,1% disagree. CLT emphasizes communication in target language and the data shows that 64,3% agree, 28,6% strongly agree and 7,1% neutral. CLT relies heavily on speaking and listening skills and the data shows that 78,6% agree, 14,3% strongly agree and 7,1% neutral. CLT requires the teacher to have high proficiency in English and the data shows that 78,6% agree and 21,4% strongly agree. CLT means only group work or pair work and the data shows that 50% neutral, 28,6% disagree and 21,4% agree. CLT means not teaching grammar and the result shows that 50% neutral, 28,6% disagree, 14,3% agree and 7,1% totally disagree. CLT means teaching speaking only and the result shows that 50% disagree, 21,4% neutral, 21,4% agree and 7,1% totally disagree. CLT puts too much pressure on teachers and the result shows that 50% neutral, 28,6% disagree and 21,4% agree. CLT is basically an ESL methodology, not EFL and the data shows that 42,9% neutral, 35,7% disagree and 21,4% agree.

4.2 Finding

In order to find out deeply to the teachers' perception in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) at Maritime English class. The researcher conducted the last evaluation to find teachers' perception in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) at Maritime English class through distribution of questionnaire. In analyzing the questionnaire with the regard of the result of the questionnaire we can refer that the teachers have positive perception in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) at Maritime English class since they believed that Communicative language teaching (CLT) can improve students communicative competence.

The positive perception of the teachers was developed by the teachers understanding about the CLT approach. This is supported by (Richard, J.C, and Schmidht, 2002) who stated that perception is the cognition and understanding of events, objects and stimuli through the use of senses. Most of the data revealed that the teachers were able to differentiate between CLT and non CLT approach. One of the principle of CLT is student centered which is in line with the Graduate Competency Standards stated by the National Standard of Education in Indonesia. It was supported by the finding of Iskandar,2018, the teachers need to develop teaching materials based on the students' need. To summarize the Teachers' perception in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) at Maritime English class the researcher conclude that overall the teachers satisfy with communicative language teaching (CLT) shown from the response of the teachers that Overall.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1. Finding

Based on the finding and discussion in the previous chapter the researcher has come to the conclusion that the findings of tabulated data show that Teachers' perception in implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) at Maritime English class is acceptable and most of the teacher with 14 respondents agree to the implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) with positive response with agreement rate 71,4%

5.2. Suggestion

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher addressed the following suggestion and recommendation:

1. In Polytechnic Maritime Barombong, the orientation of teaching and learning process must be communicative and functional; particularly in teaching speaking. That is why, the English teachers should apply the various speaking activities in presenting the teaching materials and one of them is communicative language teaching (CLT).
2. Communicative language teaching (CLT) is one of communicative activities that allow students to perform how to use English in the real situation. It's provided the students with a realistic environment in which they can develop a range of communicative and interactive skill, particularly in speaking.

6. REFERENCES

- [1]. Abe, E. (2013). Communicative language teaching in Japan: Current practices and future prospects: Investigating students' experiences of current communicative approaches to English language teaching in schools in Japan. *English Today*, 29(2), 46-53. https://doi.org/10.1017/S02660784_13000163
- [2]. Alderson, J.C. & Banerjee, J. 2001. Language Testing and Assessment (Part 1). *Language Teaching*, 34: 213-236.
- [3]. Bachman, L.F. & Palmer, A.S. 1996. *Language Testing in Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [4]. Bax, S. (2003). „The end of CLT: a context approach to language teaching“. *English Language Teaching Journal*. 57/3, 278-28.
- [5]. Breen, M.P. & Candlin, C. (2001). „The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching“. In Hall, D.R. & Hewings, A. (eds.) *Innovation in English Language Teaching*. London: Routledge. 9-26.
- [6]. Brown, J. D. (1995). The elements of language curriculum. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- [7]. Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- [8]. Burnaby, B. & Y. Sun. (1989). „Chinese Teachers' Views Of Western Language Teaching: Context Informs Paradigms“. *TESOL Quarterly*. 23/ 2, 219-38.
- [9]. Canale, M. 1983. From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2-27). New York: Longman.
- [10]. Canale, M., Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- [11]. Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). „Language teaching approaches: An overview“. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. London: Heinle & Heinle
- [12]. Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z. & Thurrell,
- [13]. S. 1995. Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6 (2): 5-35.
- [14]. Colker, L.J. (2007). *Hand-on Learning*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- [15]. Cortazzi, M. & L. Jin. (1996). „English teaching and learning in China“. *Language Teaching*. 29/1, 61-80
- [16]. Ellis, G. (1996). „How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach?“ *English Language Teaching Journal*. 50/3, 213–18
- [17]. Freeman, D.L. 2000. Techniques and principles in language teaching (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- [18]. Hiep, P.H. (2007). „Communicative language teaching: unity within diversity“. *English Language Teaching Journal*. 61/3, 193-201
- [19]. Holliday, A. (1994a). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- [20]. Holliday, A. (1994). „The house of TESEP and the communicative approach; the special needs of state English language education“. *English Language Teaching Journal*. 48/1, 3-11.
- [21]. Horwitz, E.K. 2008. *Becoming a language teacher; practical guide to second language learning and teaching*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- [22]. Iskandar, (2018). School-Based EFL Curriculum Implementation in Indonesian Primary Schools: A Perspective of Bernstein’s Pedagogic Device. *The Asian EFL Journal October 2018 Volume 20, Issue 10*.
- [23]. Jeyasala, V. R. (2014). A prelude to practice: Interactive activities for effective communication in English. *Alternative pedagogies in the English language & communication classroom*, 164-170.
- [24]. Lange, D.L. 1990. Sketching the Crisis and Exploring Different Perspectives in Foreign Language Curriculum. In D.W. Brickbichler (Ed.), *New Perspectives and New Directions in Foreign Language Education* (pp. 77-109). Lincolnwood, Ill: National Textbook Co.
- [25]. Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [26]. Littlewood, W. 2000. Do Asian students really want to listen and obey? *ELT Journal* 54 (1), 31–36.
- [27]. Littlewood, W. 2007. Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language teaching* 40 (3), 243–249.
- [28]. McCarthy, M. 2001. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [29]. McKay, S.L. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- [30]. Medgyes, P. (1986). „Queries from a communicative teacher“. *English Language Teaching Journal*. 40/2, 107-112
- [31]. Moss, D., & Ross-Feldman, L. (2003). Second language acquisition in adults: From research to practice. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/CAELA/esl_resources/digests/SLA.html
- [32]. Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative Language Teaching: Making it work. *ELT Journal*, 38(2), 136-145.
- [33]. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/41.2.136> Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- [34]. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [35]. Sato, K. & Kleinsasser, R.C. 1999. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Practical Understandings. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83 (4): 494-517.
- [36]. Savignon, S.J. 1991. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): State of Art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (2): 261-277.
- [37]. Savignon, S.J. 1997. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- [38]. Savignon, S. J. (2001). „Communicative Language Teaching for the Twenty-first Century“, In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 13-28). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- [39]. Scarcella, R. & Crookall, D. (1990). Simulation/gaming and language acquisition. In D. Crookall & R. L. Oxford (Eds.), *Simulation, gaming, and language learning* (pp. 223- 230). New York: Newbury House.
- [40]. Schubert, W.H. 1986. *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
- [41]. Shamim, F. (1996). „Learner resistance to innovation in classroom methodology“. In Coleman, H. (ed.) *Society and the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University. 105-121
- [42]. Shohamy, E. 2001. *The Power of Tests: A Critical Perspective on the Uses of Language Tests*. New York: Longman Pearson Education.
- [43]. Stern, H. 1983. *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [44]. Sumardi, M. 1989. Pendekatan Humanistik dalam Pengajaran Bahasa. In B.K. Purwo (Ed.), *PELLBA 2 Pertemuan Linguistik Lembaga Bahasa Atma Jaya: Kedua* (pp. 209-223). Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- [45]. Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centredness as Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [46]. Waters, A. & M.L.C. Vilches. (2001). Implementing ELT innovations: a needs analysis framework“. *English Language Teaching Journal*. 55/2,133-141