

EFL Education And Teacher Developments: The Implementation Of CLC And Teachers' Teaching Style Preference

Nasmah Riyani

³University of Sembilanbelas November, Kolaka, Indonesia
nasmahriyani@ymail.com

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Accepted: August 10, 2017 | Reviewed: September 5, 2017 | Published: November 20, 2017 |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Abstract: Teachers' teaching style preferences is undoubtedly being an essential thing in dynamic classroom language teaching. This study aimed to investigate Indonesian EFL teachers' teaching style and their beliefs in the implementation of communicative language competence. Additionally, this study also explored students' speaking competence. Fifty teachers were involved based on purposive sampling from one of regency of the Capital city, Kolaka Indonesia. The respondents cooperatively supported the study, then they filled Grasha (1996) Teaching Style Inventory (TSI). The descriptive statistic showed that the respondents mostly implement formal authority styles and personal model respectively. The students' speaking competence was still categorized low. Regarding the nominal preference of authority styles, since the purpose of language teaching on basis of curriculum based teaching, the teacher believed that giving students space to explore their flexibility in communicating would not help them to pass the national examination.

Keywords: Teaching Style, Formal Authority, Curriculum, Personal Model

INTRODUCTION

The educational concept nowadays is linked to be more meaningful rather than overwhelming linguistic competence as the target. The notion of communication lies to on how communication naturally flows to the learning peripheral environment. The communication process deals with all spectrums of teaching and learning context. Since learning a target language is a complex thing, which involving psychomotor, cognitive and affective, it demands the practitioners to lead communication beyond the complexity of enabling learners to actively participate using target language as medium to communicate. Focusing interaction as the priority, the practitioner readiness in setting up the teaching and learning process and devices. Yet impromptu TCL will probably affect negative interpretation of the earners of what the language input is about¹.

Stimulating and guiding the students are expected to maintain effective communication among students and also students to teachers, they are undoubtedly put as the center of attention of learning in which most of learning activities are dominated by them. For high motivated

¹ Muh Barid Nizarudin Wajdi, "Metamorfosa Perguruan Tinggi Agama Islam," *AT-Tabdzib: Jurnal Studi Islam dan Muamalah* 4, no. 1 (2016): 92–109.

teachers, they will be brave to take risks creating activities which are sometimes beyond of their lesson plan, to construct good environment for students to explore their ideas. What comes as the fact, that the intensity and motivation of students to learn is needed to be foster. As a result, the CTL input is more focus on natural setting with pedagogical means for communication in real life context². Then, the shifted of the teacher center approach into learners centered interaction is meant to develop specific purposes. Teaching English across difference cultures and backgrounds needs to consider students level. The issues of student difficulties in learning continually grow hence the teachers not only feed them with the materials but also need to seek problem solving of severe conditions. To the optimal self-performance, Richard and Farrel (2005) assert four frames of the developmental process in terms of “conceptualization” of teaching learning; skill learning, cognitive process, personal construction and reflective practice.³

Furthermore, the good language teachers consider the quality of their professionalism in teaching. In 1980, Harold B. Allen in Brown (2007)⁴ suggest the characteristics of good language teachers; competent in deciding preparation on a degree in English teaching, have passion in language learning, critical thinking upgrade their knowledge, self-subordination, readiness to teach in multi situations, cultural adaptability, professional characters being goo, the teacher also doffers on their beliefs and styles. Therefore, it affects their successfulness in teaching and even in reaching the goal of communicative competence. Often, the teachers tend to rely on their own teaching style based on their context without attempting to reach the professionalism purpose that is the development of their teaching and the objectivity of their teaching. Accordingly, this study would be provided description on the development of teaching style on EFL context in terms of communicative language competence.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

The CTL in formal education is designed as curriculum-based learning in which the indicator of successfulness of teaching learning is on basis of what has been set up in curriculum. Consequently, the teachers’ teaching creativity is restricted based on the system instruction. Some of previous related studies showed from some EFL countries, the teachers’ teaching styles were different in terms of different gender, age or experience, preference and beliefs. In Indonesia itself, since the curriculum was changed over years it probably affecting teachers’ teaching styles. Unfortunately, this changed of curriculum and teaching’ styles might not meet students’ need, and teachers’ teaching styles on basis of their preference and students’ speaking competence is needed to provide the description of teacher of how their teaching styles affect students’ speaking competence, whether they really fulfill the students’ needs for being capable to communicate or not. This also important to make them notice and analyze their own teaching development⁵.

² Muh Barid Nizarudin Wajdi, “Paradigma Pergeseran Educational Technology Menuju Instructional Technology” (2017).

³ J. Richards and T. Farrel, *Professional Development for Language Teachers: Strategies for Teacher Learning* (Cambridge: UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁴ H. Douglas Brown, *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive to Language Pedagogy (3rd Ed)* (White Plains, New York: Pearson Education, 2007).

⁵ Muh Barid Nizarudin Wajdi, “Kawasan Teknologi Pembelajaran” (2017).

Based on the issue elaborated before, the following questions were formulated:

1. What are teachers' teaching styles I teaching speaking?
2. How do teachers' belief in their teaching styles?

Teaching development is an essential issue in nowadays that needs to be considered. However, the teachers' perspective o their own teaching development and professionalism are differ. Analysis of teachers teaching development is important to be done. The development is generally associated on how the teachers carry out their classroom teaching and management. The reason why this study worthwhile is to provide description on how teacher teaching styles preference in teaching dynamic might be affect students' speaking competence. The quality of teaching process is a key to successful classroom environment. Accordingly, the findings of this research will provide new concept on teacher awareness on their teaching development and the adaptation of their teaching styles basis of the purpose of TCL focusing on CLC⁶.

RESEARCH METHOD

The population of this study was the English teachers who teach English in different schools in one of regency of the capital city, Kolaka, South east Sulawesi, Indonesia. The total population is 100. To be the sample of this study, they were purposively selected, hence 50 teachers from the total of population were involved.

To obtain the personal information related to background of their study, age, teaching experience and so on and schools that they teach, the questionnaire were designed and distributed. After identifying their personal data, the inventory of Grasha (1996)⁷ covering 5 subscales of teaching styles; formal authority teaching, expert, personal model, delegator and facilitator were distributed. The teachers' belief on theirs was also qualitatively e analyzed.

The design of this research used mix method research design, the combination of descriptive quantitative and qualitative analysis. Data obtained from inventory Grasha (1996) based on original instruction was rated on 5 points Likert scale to determine level of agreement of each statement. Furthermore, the result of Grasha inventory was tabulated using SPSS; frequency counts, percentage, mean scores and standard deviation.

Conducting classroom based research focused on teacher teaching style or teaching process was hoped to contribute to the development of language teaching. Practically, the result of this study would provide the descriptions of teaching pedagogy on how mostly EFL teachers adopted the knowledge, materials, activities, strategy, methodology and approach to their classroom teaching. The exploration of this study would show the implication of curriculum based teaching on teaching dynamic how the teachers dealt with the curriculum. The result of this study would also guide teachers on how they develop to be the good practitioners.

⁶ Muh Barid Nizarudin Wajdi, "Landasan Historis Perkembangan Teknologi" (2017).

⁷ A. F. Grasha, *Teaching with Styles: A Practical Guide to Enhance Learning by Understanding Learning and Teaching Styles* (New York: Alliance Publisher, 1996).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The descriptive statistics were used to examine the dominant of EFL teachers' teaching styles preference. In output of descriptive statistics which is tabulated using SPSS, the data revealed that teachers were predominantly categorized as formal authority (M=4.26), personal style (M=3.6), expert (M=3.7), delegator (M=2.6), and facilitator (M=2.2).

Table. 1 The Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Teaching Styles

Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Range | Minimum | Maximum | Sum | Mean | | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------------|-----------|
| | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic | Std. error | Statistic | Statistic |
| Expert | 50 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 137.00 | 2.7400 | .12717 | .89921 | .809 |
| Formal-authority | 50 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 5.00 | 213.00 | 4.2600 | .10618 | .75078 | .564 |
| Personal-style | 50 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 182.00 | 3.6400 | .13018 | .92051 | .847 |
| Facilitator | 50 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 110.00 | 2.2000 | .12778 | .90351 | .816 |
| Delegator | 50 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 132.00 | 2.6400 | .16601 | 1.17387 | 1.378 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 50 | | | | | | | | |

From the interview, the teacher mainly believes that teacher-centered approach was more applicable to direct students in gaining the specific goals. The learning goals itself was generally not coming from students' own ideas but more than the indicator of overall learning process based on syllabus and curriculum. Therefore, the students' creativity in doing the task was restricted on the instruction of each teaching process. Compatible with the description of teaching style based on the data, the interview results also displayed that the teacher were less in terms of facilitating interaction among students to students also teacher to students. They rigidly concerned on how to cultivate reading comprehension and grammatical aspects on writing in teaching language. Then, accuracy in all subject matters was being the central focused. Although, the concept of teaching language must be integrated in all of skills and communicative competence was still being one of the objective written in syllabus. However, reading skill was likely taking a part to the entire learning process and practices. Consequently, the students' speaking competence was identified still low.

This study defined the EFL teacher developments in terms of their teaching style preference aimed at fulfilling the students' needs. The objective of teaching language was not originally based on the students' needs but most for the standardized result which requires students to pass the national examination.

The pedagogy of teaching language and all the compulsory subjects was the same in nature. Furthermore, the practice of language teaching was then being over generalized as the same as teaching the other subjects. The development of teachers in teaching remains the same, since their perspective in teaching the language was affected by the curriculum and national examination demand.

From the data and interview result, it highlights the fact that the teachers mostly created such dependent teaching learning environment and goals to students. As the result, the material and learning process were designed to be more inflexible. They also assumed that teaching speaking was not really important since speaking was not considered as one of the subjects which was examined in national examination. On the other hand, there were still some teachers who believe that the principle of teaching language was to enable students to communicate using target language in meaningful way. Therefore, they facilitate students to interact in natural setting. For further study, it needed to put lots of emphasize on examining the overall teaching styles and students' speaking competence to get the absolute conclusion on this field.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. Douglas. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive to Language Pedagogy* (3rd Ed). White Plains, New York: Pearson Education, 2007.
- Dogruer, N., Menevis, I. and Eyyam, R. "EFL Teachers' Beliefs on Learning English and Their Teaching Styles." *ELT Journal* 3 (2010): 83-87.
- Grasha, A. F. *Teaching with Styles: A Practical Guide to Enhance Learning by Understanding Learning and Teaching Styles*. New York: Alliance Publisher, 1996.
- _____. *The Dynamic of One-on-One Teaching, College Teaching*, 50 (4th Ed). 2002.
- Heaton, J. B. *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Longman Handbooks for Language Teachers, 1998.
- Kazemi, A. and Soleimani, N. "On Iranian EFL Teachers' Dominant Teaching Styles in Private Language Centers: Teacher-Centered or Students-Centered." *Language Learning and Applied Linguistics* 1, no. 4 (2013): 193-202.
- Rahimi, M. and Asadollahi, F. "Teaching style of Iranian EFL Teachers: Do Gender, Age, and Experience Make Difference." *Journal of English Linguistics* 2, no. 2 (2012): 157-161.
- Richards, J. and Farrel, T. *Professional Development for Language Teachers: Strategies for Teacher Learning*. Cambridge: UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Sheikh, A. and Mahmmod, N. "Effect of Different Teaching Styles on Students' Motivation Towards English Language Learning at econdary Level. *EFL" Journal* 26, no. 2 (2014): 825-830.
- Wajdi, Muh Barid Nizarudin. "Kawasan Teknologi Pembelajaran" (2017).
- Zhou, M. "Learning Styles and Teaching Styles in College English Teaching." *Canadian ELT Journal* 1, no. 4 (2011): 73-77.
- _____. "Landasan Historis Perkembangan Teknologi" (2017).
- _____. "Metamorfosa Perguruan Tinggi Agama Islam." *AT-Tahdzib: Jurnal Studi Islam dan Muamalah* 4, no. 1 (2016): 92-109.
- _____. "Paradigma Pergeseran Educational Technology Menuju Instructional Technology" (2017).