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ABSTRACT
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The purpose of this study is to discuss the methods two teachers have used in Saudi Arabia, the training and support is given to the teachers, and what barriers are present in implementing the new curriculum. In Taif, S.A. a new curriculum was adopted to teach English as a foreign language (EFL) students. A new textbook series was introduced that used communicative language teaching (CLT) methods. This study examined how the new curriculum using CLT was implemented. There were three research questions that were asked in this study: 1) What methods and approaches do these high school EFL teachers believe they apply in their classrooms? 2) What, if any, support and training have these high school EFL teachers received before and during implementation of teaching the new curriculum? 3) What barriers do EFL teachers face in implementing the new curriculum?

There were three participants in the study: two EFL teachers and their respective supervisor. The participants were asked to take a preliminary questionnaire, were interviewed twice each, and a member check was conducted for each participant. During the interviews, most of the questions that were asked discussed the teachers’ experiences and opinions about the new curriculum. After the data was collected and coded, the methods, training, support, and barriers to implementing the new curriculum were identified. The textbook series that was implemented along with the new curriculum also was analyzed.

The teachers described using more traditional methods like Grammar-Translation (GT) methods with some CLT methods. Both teachers were identified as “hybrid” teachers that use a combination of GT and CLT methods (Burke, 2006). The teachers’ respective supervisor discussed how most of the EFL teachers he oversees use traditional methods like GT. The results
suggested that the teachers and the supervisor received no training or support concerning the new curriculum. The study identified barriers to implementing the new curriculum properly, including: the students’ environment, lack of training from the textbook developer company, the textbook, the amount of curriculum, varied level or lack of prior knowledge of English for students and teachers, and lack of students’ and teachers’ motivation.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The importance of learning English as a foreign language (EFL) is increasing all over the world. English has become an international language for many purposes such as the Internet, business, and a common language in the field of science (Sharifian, 2009). Academics translate their work into English to make it accessible to others around the world. Some are arguing that this will lead to hegemony, but to others this is a chance to form global relations that may not have existed otherwise (Sharifian, 2009). Presently there are many discussions being held regarding the role and need of a global language, and most of the attention is on English as a global language due to its “tremendously rapid spread…around the globe in recent decades” (Sharifian, 2009, p.2). As the English language grows in prominence around the world, the need for quality EFL teachers, classes, and books are increasing to reach this demand, with students or EFL learners who want to achieve Advanced-level proficiency in English seeking “a high level of accuracy and fluency” (Richards, 2006, p.1).

EFL teachers are using many approaches and methods inside their classrooms to achieve the goals of their students (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014). These approaches vary from traditional methods, such as the grammar-translation method or audio-lingual method, to modern methods, such CLT (Berns, 1984; Burke, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2011, 2013). It is not uncommon for teachers to pick and choose between the various methods as they see fit for the lesson.

Even more problematic is the fact that world language teachers who learn about and experience communicative language teaching (CLT) methods of teaching language, yet they still do not use these methods in their classroom instruction (Burke, 2011). Furthermore, Richards (2006) says that although many language teachers today identify the philosophy that they use in their classrooms as CLT, when Richards investigated these claims he found that the teachers
explained CLT in various ways. Teachers were not able to define CLT correctly, which has led to CLT not being used properly. Richards (2006) states that in recent years language learning has been examined with different perspectives. He explains that researchers believe that teachers should move away from memorization and drills to more interactive activities. Ellis (1997) states “according to the interaction hypothesis, learners can acquire new forms when input is made comprehensible through negotiating for meaning” (p. 209). This means that interactive activities can assist learners in fully understanding the meaning of what they are learning.

As Burke (2011) and Richards (2006) suggest, the implementation of CLT is wide and varied. There are reasons as to why CLT is not used effectively in EFL classrooms. One common issue is the values and beliefs that EFL teachers hold as to how the target language must be taught such as focusing on grammar (Burke, 2011; Tye, 2000). Another common reason is the lack of the training and support that the EFL teachers receive from others, such as qualified EFL teachers, administrators, and language researchers (Burke, 2011, 2012, 2015). According to Goodlad (1974, 2004), teachers who use traditional teaching methods consequently do not promote critical thinking. Goodlad (1974, 2004) and Lortie (1975, 2002) both found that teachers often use the same traditional, less effective methods and approaches that they had experienced as students from elementary school through university. But, I hope this can change and that teachers can change. I believe teachers learn just as students do: they learn by doing, reading, and reflecting; by collaborating with other teachers; looking closely at students; and then by sharing what they find (Burke, 2013; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011).

**Statement of the Problem**

If teachers are not trained in any proper ways or are not provided with professional development as they teach in EFL classrooms, then they likely will use traditional teaching
methods that do not promote the current communication standards of an EFL classroom (Burke, 2012, 2015). This is the case in Taif, Saudi Arabia (SA), as well as other SA cities. There is a strong supply of adequate teachers, but they are not provided the extensive or sufficient training needed for teaching EFL through a CLT curriculum. The curriculum change in Taif took effect between the years of 2010 and 2011, when I was an English teacher there, but teachers were not and still have not been given the proper training to adjust to this new curriculum based on CLT. When the new curriculum was implemented teachers there was no formal notification that the new curriculum used CLT. Classroom instruction still remains mostly traditional with teachers using grammar-translation, direct, and audio-lingual methods as opposed to proficiency-based methods such as CLT. The changing of the teachers’ and students’ roles in CLT classrooms is a further source of misunderstanding. CLT teachers assume the role of facilitator and monitor, and their students participate in student-centered classroom activities that were based on a cooperative rather than individualistic approach to learning (Burke, 2006; Richards, 2006).

*Flying High* textbooks, the curriculum package adopted by most schools in SA, focus on communication throughout the curriculum (Brewster & Davies, 2015). The Ministry of Education developed the textbook series with help from Tatweer Company for Educational Services and the textbook developer company, MacMillan. The textbook series was created specifically for SA with the Ministry of Educations’ guidelines or rules in mind. With the strong traditional background of teachers in Taif, SA, lessons are usually presented with a hybrid of new approaches as well as traditional techniques (Burke, 2006). Without sufficient training, teachers in Taif are unequipped to fulfill the role of a CLT teacher that requires the use of immersion, contextualized lessons, and student-centered learning (Burke, 2006).
Despite the curriculum changes, teachers face serious issues in applying CLT with their students (Burke, 2014). There is a lack of support from the curriculum developers in monitored practical instruction in which teachers demonstrate to their instructors that they can apply the methods that they are learning. Without verification that the teachers understand the approaches, there is no way to know if they are correctly applying lessons in their classrooms. This problem is further heightened by a lack of networking between EFL teachers inside Taif and inside the country as a whole as well as internationally. In the interdisciplinary education programs that currently exist, EFL teachers’ opinions are not considered. This issue is not unique to Taif, but extends to many other cities in SA. Some do not regard world language education as core or essential, and as a result, instructors often “do not participate in decisions about the curriculum or the courses they teach” (Yu, 2008, p.vi). Furthermore, EFL teachers do not have the opportunity to take training courses in English-speaking countries in order to gain valuable experience via communication with native speakers in order to enhance their five “C” goal areas of world-readiness standards for learning languages communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities (World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages, 2015).

**Rationale of the Study**

The English language is the only foreign language taught in Saudi Arabian public schools. It is a required course every semester, beginning in fourth grade. Prior to 2009, English classes were only held on four out of five school days. Now, there are five weekly English classes for students. Throughout the country, students study three different EFL curricula that are provided by the Saudi Arabian Ministry of Education (Tatweer Company for Educational Services, 2016). In 2009, the Ministry of Education in SA established the need for new EFL curriculum for the Saudi Arabian public schools, which is still being developed.
Three educational companies have participated in designing the new curriculum: MacMillan, McGraw-Hill, and MM Publications. Each company is producing its own curriculum and textbook series. Taif schools, in particular, teach using MacMillan textbooks. MacMillan has created its EFL products using the communicative approach. In terms of the communicative approach, MacMillan focuses on speaking and listening skills. *Flying High* is the name of MacMillan’s EFL series of books that are being used in some Saudi Arabian high schools. Their books have many speaking and listening activities that allow students to listen to audio CDs. Their semester-long program also includes two versions of the textbooks for students, a student textbook and a workbook. Students before 2009 did not have their own CDs; they only were able to listen to a few conversations and passages on a cassette that the EFL teacher played inside the classroom. Since there was only one cassette, students could not take it home with them. With the new curriculum, students can use their CDs whenever convenient. These audio tracks are also available online where students can download them if they wish. There are two version of the textbook for the teachers to use. These include the interactive textbook and the teachers’ manual. The textbook is based on the CLT approach. It discusses the use of the “Triple A Approach” (Brewster & Rogers, 2015, p. 4). The textbook explained that, “for easy reference” the use of the CLT approach is called, “The Triple Approach.” “The Triple A Approach concentrates on creating access to a new language, analysis of grammar, and activation through discussion activities” (Brewster & Rogers, 2015, p. 4). To my knowledge, none of these three companies have offered any comprehensive training courses for the EFL teachers to implement the new curriculum. The purpose of this study is to discuss what approaches and methods the teachers use, what training and support is given to the teachers, and what barriers are present in implementing the new curriculum.
Research Questions

This study will investigate two male EFL instructors who teach in high schools classroom and their respective supervisor in Taif, SA. There has been a huge shift between the old and new curricula, both in material and in the roles of both EFL teachers and learners. I would like to see how teachers are adapting to curriculum changes that involve using CLT and in what ways this has changed teachers' roles when the new curriculum was established in Taif, SA in 2010 to 2011. I will also research what training and support those EFL teachers have received. The research questions are:

1. What methods and approaches do these high school EFL teachers believe they apply in their classrooms?
2. What, if any, support and training have these high school EFL teachers received before and during implementation of teaching the new curriculum?
3. What barriers do EFL teachers face in implementing the new curriculum?
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter explains the different types of world language (WL) teaching methodologies that are or have been used in classrooms in Saudi Arabia. These methodologies focus on general approaches and the role of the English language teacher in the classroom. After, the different types of teachers, (Grammar-Translation, hybrid, and Communicative Language Teaching), will be described (Burke, 2006), along with different ways that these teachers can effectively assess a classroom (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Then, effective professional development will be analyzed, including its structure and the new usage of active research, better known as “job embedded learning” (Burke, 2012, 2013). Finally, this chapter will examine two relevant studies, one of which took place in Taif, Saudi Arabia.

World Language Teaching Methodologies

Grammar-Translation Method

Far from a new take on language learning, the grammar-translation method (GT) was created to teach Greek and Latin in the late 19th century and early 20th century (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011), and because of this was better known as the Classical Method (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). All instruction in classes that use this approach is in the native language of the students (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014). The primary goal of GT is mental acuity (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014), meaning that in learning a new language one would be able to develop intellectually, even if they never learned how to actually use the WL that they studied. In addition, when studying WL students would be able to read literature and novels. This can assist the students in understanding their own native languages due to their new knowledge of grammar in the target language (Hadley, 2001).
Under GT there is a stressed importance on translation from a student’s first language to their second/world language, and vice-versa (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). In a GT classroom, the main purpose is to read a text and translate it into either the first language (L1) or the world language (WL) (Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). In doing so, the teacher talks about the language but does not speak in the language (Burke, 2015; Hadley, 2001). This means that the teacher does not have to be able to speak the language fluently (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014). The instructor has absolute control of the classroom and acts as an authoritative figure meaning that all interaction is teacher-student and not student-teacher (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). As Strasheim (1976) mentions in a personal anecdote, this method can be so dull that even the teacher will fall asleep.

**Direct Method**

When world language researchers realized that the GT method was not producing proficient speakers, the Direct Method was developed to teach students how to communicate (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). To achieve this goal, the focus of the lessons are on communication and not on language forms (Hadley, 2001). Students are taught the International Phonetic Alphabet so that they can correctly pronounce words (Hadley, 2001). Grammar is not explicitly taught; it comes implicitly in the usage of the WL (Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011), and only the WL is to be used in the classroom and the L1 is forbidden (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Teachers also discourage thought in the L1 to further remove it from the classroom (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). If the students have difficulty understanding the material, the teacher can use visual aids to help them out (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).
Due to the nature of this method, the teacher must have native or advanced level proficiency in the WL (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014). As this class is directed towards communication, the student’s role is less passive than in GT (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). The relationship between the teacher and students is that of partners, not authoritative. Because of this, students are to self-correct themselves (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). However, some researchers have claimed that little feedback from the instructor will lead to the fossilization of their errors, meaning that their mistakes will be permanently etched in their minds (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001). Classes are relatively unstructured and this technique, according to Rivers (1981), “[clothes] native-language structures in foreign-language vocabulary” (p.33).

**Audio-Lingual Method**

In response to a need for U.S. soldiers to learn foreign languages during wartime activities, this method was developed by linguists to teach the soldiers and spies how to understand native speakers as well as respond and communicate appropriately (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014). While similar to the Direct Method, the Audio-Lingual Method was also influenced by structural linguistics and Behaviorism. This means that students first learn the phonemes of the language. Afterwards, the instructor teaches the learner how to use these sounds to form meaningful words, phrases, and sentences (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Behaviorism was later added to promote good language habits by positively reinforcing students, known as conditioning (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

Students are taught with repetition drills that are given without explanation (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). The
instructors drill the students without any connection to their L1 (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001). These drills teach the students grammar implicitly by having the students mimic or imitate the language without understanding the structure itself (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). In order to maintain a “cultural island” (Chastain, 1976, as cited in Hadley 2001, pp.111-112), the students’ native language is not allowed in the classroom (Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). If students make mistakes the teacher must correct them immediately, and when the students fix their errors they are given positive reinforcement (Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Thus, students who are visual learners or those who want to understand the grammar will suffer, while those who learn best by ear will succeed. This comes from the method not providing differentiation for the various learner types (Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

Cognitive Method

As a response to the Audio-Lingual method, the goal of this method is to have students use minimal grammar in as many situations as possible (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001). To achieve this, students must have conscious knowledge of the grammar rules that they learn (Hadley, 2001). Even though grammar is important, teachers are not to devote “too much time” in class explaining the structure. For this reason, instructors are expected to be skillful in analyzing the world language, as well as having general proficiency. If need be, the L1 can be briefly used to clarify a point (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014). However, grammar taught must promote meaningful and creative use of the language so that students can be functional with their use of the language (Chastain, 1976; Hadley, 2001). Because the function is what is most important, pronunciation is not stressed in the classroom, but more
importance is placed on vocabulary (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014). So long as the language is functional, mistakes are considered unavoidable and can be used to help students learn the language (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014).

**Affective-Humanistic Approach**

This approach is rooted in the concept of “community language learning,” meaning that the WL is taught to promote conversation and social needs (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Hadley, 2001). While this is a broad term that has many sub-methods such as community language learning, the Silent Way, and Suggestopedia all of these share many of the same characteristics (Hadley, 2001). In an Affective-Humanistic classroom, the relationship between the teacher and the student, as well as between students, is positive and open. This is achieved by great emphasis being placed on the social climate of the classroom (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014). In order to maintain this atmosphere, the teacher acts as a counselor that facilitates the language learning, and not as an authoritative figure (Hadley 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). To strengthen the skills of the students, student to student interaction is critical for their growth in the WL (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001). The language skills that are developed revolve around social and personal needs. However, this can lead to a lack of structure in the classroom, which can be unappealing for some students. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the course will cover various contexts (Hadley, 2001).

**Other Approaches / Methods**

Between 1970s and the 1990s many approaches and methods came to be. Some of these are known as “designer methods” (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014, p. 9) meaning they were created by a single person. Underneath this developer were teachers who incorporated this approach heavily into their classroom (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014). One of these
methods is the “Silent Way,” designed by Caleb Gettegno in 1976 based around the concept that “the mind is an active agent capable of constructing its own inner criteria for learning;” the role of the teacher is to give the students resources, and the students must work independently (Hadley, 2001, p.125). Another designer method is “Total Physical Response,” in which the instructor gives commands to the students and models how they should respond (Asher et al., 1983, 1996; Spiro, 2013). After 10 to 20 hours of class time, the students should have sufficiently developed their listening comprehension to be ready to give commands and directly interact with the teacher (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Focus is put on class environment, ensuring that it is friendly to give students the confidence to actively participate (Hadley, 2001). A third designer method is “Suggestopedia,” created by Lozanov in the late 1970s (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). The goal is to have students be as comfortable as possible so that they are uninhibited by negative emotions, such as anxiety (Hadley, 2001). Texts that are used in class should inspire interaction language usage, such as role-playing, to develop functional proficiency in the WL (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014; Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

**Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)**

The main goal of CLT is for students to develop communicative competence, not just grammatical competence; students should acquire skills to talk *in* a language, not just *about* a language (Burke, 2015; Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Savignon, 2002). This concept was introduced in the early 1970s (Habermas, 1970; Hymes, 1971; Jakobits, 1970, as cited in Savignon, 1971), and it was suggested to be an approach, not a method (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Essentially, CLT is best described as a philosophy that benefits students by focusing on the linguistic needs
of the students, not on grammar checkpoints (Hadley, 2001). All teaching under the umbrella of CLT should be meaningful and within the context of situations (Firth, 1937; Halliday, 1978; Richards, 2006). Many EFL students are learning English specifically for a job or for educational reasons; therefore these students can benefit greatly from CLT as communication that is based on meaning and is learned more efficiently compared to grammar-based approaches (Richards, 2006).

Savignon (2002) refers to communicative competence as a general term affected by various aspects of the language. Communicative competence is composed of a language speaker’s ability to utilize many different aspects of the language such as grammatical competence (the ability to use the language structure), discourse competence (the ability to produce language and cohesiveness of ideas), sociocultural competence (the application of what is being said in a given social context, e.g. use of the formal or informal), and strategic competence (negotiating for meaning; use of circumlocution; asking for help; fear of embarrassment as a factor of how language is used to achieve a particular goal) (Savignon, 2002). As one area grows, that growth should affect other aspects of a student’s communicative competence (Savignon, 2002).

Content-Based Instruction

According to Snow (1991), content-based instruction can best be described “as a method with many faces” (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011, p.130). This means that lessons can have a wide variety of approaches, all of which range from strong to weak (Ellis, 2003; Howatt, 1984; Spiro, 2013). Strong approaches have the language learners figure out the grammar themselves, so long as they have enough time, resources, and input with which to work. A weak approach
explicitly tells the language learner the grammar rules, and gives them “conscious cognitive strategies” to decipher grammar (Ellis, 2003; Howatt, 1984; Spiro, 2013).

Whether a strong approach or a weak approach, teachers must teach the lessons according to the learner’s needs. Adult learners, for example, will learn language skills that are related to their workplace, or read, write, and learn to speak about content that is relevant to their line of work; for students who do not have a specific line of work, they can be taught school subjects in the WL that they are studying (Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Richards, 2006). Not only are students learning language skills, but they also learn about whichever subject is being used to teach the language (Hadley, 2001; Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Richards, 2006). Students in an EFL classroom can learn about U.S. history using English as the medium to teach the subject (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Richards, 2006; Liton, 2013). To get students more involved in the WL, some teachers are promoting Expeditionary Learning, or modified classroom lessons to include physical and active research to promote self-discovery and collaboration (Burke, 2007, forthcoming). By putting importance on using the WL as a vessel to teach the subject alongside the Expeditionary Learning design, the classroom will benefit from a more positive environment, higher student motivation, and an increase in WL usage (Burke, 2007, forthcoming).

An advantage to content-based instruction is that it shows how language can differ when being used to talk about different subjects (Ball & Goffney, 2006; Schleppegrell, Achugar & Oteiza, 2004). Teachers can be successful in a content-based classroom if they provide authentic texts (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011, Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014), or material that was written for the subject, and not for the sole purpose of teaching language forms. EFL learners can be immersed in content-based classrooms after a year of “intensive communication-
based language;” however, some feel that it is most productive after several years of WL study, or in some cases, sooner than one year so that they can have early immersion in the language (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Snow, 2014, p.22).

**Task-Based Instruction**

Similar to content-based instruction, task-based language instruction has language learners acquire grammar or develop their communicative competence by means of interactive tasks (Richards, 2006; Spiro, 2013). According to Willis (1996), there are six linguistic tasks that promote communicative competence: listing (having the students write a grocery list), sorting and ordering (students come up with descriptions for their ideal partner) comparing (students talking about differences between two different pictures), problem solving (students write to future university students and give them recommendations on how to be successful in college), sharing personal experience (relating stories told in class to their own lives), and creative tasks (designing a town). This is most effective when teachers provide brief grammar explanations that are relevant to the task, which is known as a focus on form (Long, 2009). It is important that the teachers do not discuss the grammar extensively; otherwise it is a focus on forms (Larson-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Long, 2009). However, regardless of the task, learners must be given a chance to debate meaning in the task (Ellis, 1982, 1997). There must be a gap of knowledge or opinion in the activity to give students the opportunity to implement personal communicative skills or vocabulary (Ellis, 1997).

**Types of Assessment**

There are two primary types of assessment that can be used by EFL teachers: summative and formative (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). A summative assessment is used at the end of a course to assess the oral proficiency of a student or to evaluate their ability to perform “global linguistic
tasks” (Shrum & Glisan, 2010, pp.401-402). A formative assessment should help to fix language skills as the class progresses (Shohamy, 1990). Some examples of formative assessments can be either short quizzes or have class interaction activities. They can be either ungraded and be objective and formative to the learner, and graded should be a scored performance of the students’ linguistic skills (Shrum & Glisan, 2010).

While they are different, summative and formative assessments both share some characteristics. First, they both must be systematic and planned according to the lesson (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Also, summative and formative assessments have to be both reliable and valid. According to Gay (1987), a reliable test “consistently measures whatever it measures” (Shrum & Glisan, 2010, p. 401). Hughes (2003) defined a valid test as one that “is appropriate for the group of learners” (Shrum & Glisan, 2010, p.401). In addition, assessments must be authentic, meaning that they engage EFL students in realistic situations that can happen outside of the classroom (Wiggins, 2005; Shrum & Glisan, 2010). A good assessment will “empower the students” (Shrum & Glisan, 2010) by making them active in their education.

Current language testing and assessments, both formative and summative, tend to focus on only one aspect of the language at a time (Adair-Hauck, Glisan, Koda, Sandrock & Swender, 2006). A new type of assessment, integrative performance assessment (IPA), is striving to test multiple levels of communication simultaneously. Using a clear rubric, teachers will assess their students’ abilities to use their WL skills to interpret information from an authentic source, interactively negotiate the meaning of what they are interpreting, and summarize what they know by presenting the information discussed.
This mode of assessment is being designed to help teachers answer some issues of single skill testing, such as “am I assessing the same way that the students are learning?” (Adair-Hauck et al., 2006, p.365).

One of the purposes of IPA is to help the teachers and learners understand their strengths and weaknesses when learning world languages (Adair-Hauck et al, 2006, p. 365). A rubric for what constitutes an assessment as IPA was developed and is being used to help showcase the strengths and weaknesses that are mentioned above in readable fashion. Due to the fact that the rubric is being used, feedback is being given to both the learners and teachers (Adair-Hauck et al, 2006, p. 366). This also allows for an understanding of where students need to improve. Knowing this can assist the teacher and learner every day in class (Adair-Hauck et al, 2006, p. 371). IPA has further aided teachers to understand whether or not their teaching methods have been effective (Adair-Hauck et al, 2006, p. 372).

**Teacher Types**

An effective CLT teacher will put strong emphasis on communication in their classroom (Burke, 2006, 2007, 2011). They highly regard the ability for their students to demonstrate communicative competence, or be able to express themselves; grammatical competence, or being able to talk about the language, is not important (Burke, 2006, 2007, 2011, 2015, 2016; Savignon, 1983, 1997). In order to achieve this, a CLT teacher must use comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981). Comprehensible input means that the teacher is able to provide intelligible materials that the students can understand. Also, the lessons much be given in a situation or context so that the EFL students can think about the social context while communicating with their classmates (Berns, 1990; Burke 2006, 2007, 2011; Ellis, 1982, 1997; Finocchairo & Brumfit, 1983). Through these communicative activities, the students will implicitly learn the
grammar. Teaching a WL through meaning-based communication tasks is known as a strong CLT approach; on the other hand, the weak approach is still communication focused but in a fixed environment with a explicit grammar lessons (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011).

A CLT teacher is different from a Grammar-Translation teacher, and different from hybrid teachers who use both CLT and GT elements in their classroom. In both hybrid and GT classrooms, there is more focus placed on grammar, and less of the social context in which the language is used (Burke, 2006). This focus on grammatical forms means that hybrid and GT teachers must dedicate the majority of class time to teaching these forms and neglecting the time needed to address the communicative needs of the students (Burke, 2006, 2011; Ellis, 1997; Lightbown & Spada, 1993). Grammar is taught explicitly and the teacher dominates the classroom. When given activities, the students must use the grammar the way the teacher does, and when they respond to questions, the students must answer in a “prescribed manner” (Burke, 2006, p.158).

**Effective Professional Development**

The main focus of professional development should be centered on improving student learning (Burke, 2013). Effective professional development can best be achieved when there is teamwork and collaboration from inside the same school building; to ensure that everyone is on the same page there has to be a dialogue between the staff instructors and the teachers (Burke, 2013; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009). Both the instructors and the teachers need to understand that professional development is not a solitary process and that there is no need to be embarrassed when seeking training or help (Al-Asmari, 2015; Burke, 2013; Khan, 2011). While working on professional development, teachers should reflect on their teaching with staff instructors or their advisors and find the weak areas of their teaching, afterwards, each party
should research alongside other colleagues on new methods and how to implement them. Each step should always be a team effort (Burke, 2013). As development sessions continue through the semester, teachers need to maintain a “we” mentality, not a “me” mentality (Hanson & Hoyos, 2015, p. 45). Also, it is important that teachers want to learn, or deepen their pedagogical knowledge (Burke, 2013; Hanson & Hoyos, 2015). By working together and continuing professional development, teachers can be students and can better understand the uncertainties or each role (Burke, 2013; McLaughlin, 2011; Richard, 2006).

**Structural Features of Experiential Professional Development**

In order for EFL teachers to make sure they are correctly applying CLT to their classrooms, teachers need “on-going professional development, such as…peer coaching, in-services, and continued support from researcher-consultants” (Burke, 2013, p. 726). As previously mentioned this is best done with an open conversation between staff instructors and teachers. However, if students refuse change in the classroom, they need to be included in the conversation with the staff instructors and teachers (Joyce & Showers, 2002). For the professional development to be most effective, or best enhance the knowledge and skills of the teacher, it must be on going throughout the year to give the teachers time to integrate their new knowledge into their curriculum (Burke, 2013; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman & Yoon, 2001). Hill and Rapp (2012) agree that everyone should work as a team with both long and short-term goals to improve curriculum and instruction.

**Job Embedded Learning / Action Research**

Burke (2013) suggests that we make a change in teacher professional development from lectures or conversations with consultants to experiential learning. By changing to a more hands-on and in the field approach, teachers are better guided in their active research (Elliot, 1984) and

Hadley, 2001 discussed a studio classroom where a teacher invites a colleague into her/his classroom to help with a problem that was brought up by either the student or the teacher. The colleague will watch the student and analyze the problem. Afterwards, the host teacher is given feedback from what the colleague observed and will then consider possible changes. In one-to-one teaching, a teacher will find a problem with the lesson or interaction with the students and a colleague will come in to watch the student-teacher interaction. After the class the colleague will give feedback and will have a conversation with the teacher. The third proposed action research from Hanson and Hoyos (2015) is whole group institutes, where staff members will meet up and learn from issues in their classes as a team. The discussion must be “collaborative, inquisitive, and reflective” (Hanson & Hoyos, 2015, p. 44), and each person should share personal experiences and discuss how to implement new strategies to fix any issues. Finally, adult learning communities features staff members working together using questions to guide teachers in finding mistakes in their methods and to reflect on their teachings. This is best achieved with “real time” student and teacher evidence as the medium for adult learning and helping refine techniques used in the classroom (Hanson & Hoyos, 2015).

Superiors as Staff Developers

When professional development is a conversation, superiors, such as supervisors or staff developers, must take on certain roles while working with teachers (Burke, 2013; Nolan & Hoover, 2004, 2008; Peery, 2004). Some of these roles can range anywhere from “coach,
cheerleader, friend, parent, role model, teacher, and disciplinarian” (Burke, 2013 p. 251). In addition, teachers also have many roles when working with superior staff developers, including “classroom supporter, mentor, school leader, catalyst for change, and learner” (Burke, 2013, p. 251). With superior staff developers and teachers having so many roles, Hanson and Hoyos (2015) ties these roles together by describing how a coaching culture should work. First, it must be an on going use of asking questions to learn how to improve the classroom. It must be inclusive on all levels (teacher and superior), and never hierarchical or selective (Hanson & Hoyos, 2015). When teachers and superiors work together, every person involved has collective ownership of ideas and responsibilities, and every person is equally responsible for applying research into the classroom (Hanson & Hoyos, 2015). With these cultures and diverse roles (not a hierarchy where the superiors are superior to the teachers), there can be driven involvement in the school community and the focus will be on improving student learning (Burke, 2013; Hanson & Hoyos, 2015; Hill & Rapp, 2012).

**Relevant CLT Studies**

In 2013, Shawer conducted a study in two EFL classrooms in United Kingdom. He observed two native English teachers, Andrew and Joseph, who taught international students of different nationalities. Shawer observed those classrooms for 14 weeks, 28 hours for each in general. Andrew had a firm grasp on CLT, but Joseph, despite having thorough knowledge of the theories behind CLT, struggled to apply it. Both teachers defined CLT concepts correctly. Andrew gave students authentic texts and had them work in groups, but Joseph did not. So in Andrew’s class the grammar developed inside the context of the articles. As a result, Andrew’s students significantly improved in communicative competence.
Joseph understood the ideology, but did not put it into practice. He missed opportunities to incorporate CLT features, including overcorrecting students and allowing native language use. More time was spent on teaching grammar out of context. Neither his students’ communicative competence nor the four EFL skills (listening, writing, speaking, reading) improved. Through these examples Shawer (2013) shows that teachers failed in applying the CLT approach; it was not the students nor issues with the approach that failed. Shawer (2013) says that “noncommunicative teachers” in general use unconventional versions of CLT because teachers do not understand CLT or do not want to implement it. In other words, even though teachers understand the CLT approach, this does not mean they can apply it effectively (p. 456). Shawer (2013) states, “CLT has no inherent problems that prevent teachers from grasping it in theory and transforming it into classroom practice” (p.456). CLT did not fail the students, the teacher did.

Al Asmari (2015) conducted a study to examine the challenges faced by teachers using CLT in the classroom. Al Asmari surveyed 100 teachers from Taif University English Language Centre in Taif, Saudi Arabia who have used CLT in their classrooms. The teachers were surveyed with a questionnaire asking about CLT. The questions pertained to the teacher, the student, CLT itself, and the policies surrounding CLT. The teachers explained in this questionnaire that the lack of teacher training was considered to be a challenge ranging anywhere from minor to major (Al Asmari, 2015, p. 979). When asked about the students and CLT, the teachers found that the challenges were: a lack of motivation and interest by the students, overcrowded classes, and low proficiency in English (Al Asmari, 2015, p.980). The teachers also felt that teachers’ and students’ roles are not appropriate for CLT learning or teaching (Al Asmari, 2015,p. 981). Lastly, in regards to CLT in the classroom, the teachers believed that there
were not enough adequate assessment instruments to test CLT (Al Asmari, 2015, p. 981). Even though the teachers spoke of many challenges regarding CLT, they did still feel that CLT should be implemented and used in the classroom (Al Asmari, 2015, p. 982), despite the fact teachers might be embarrassed to be seeking training and help (Al Asmari, 2015).
CHAPTER 3: METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In this chapter, I will discuss the research design, the participants of the study and their vignettes, and the instrumentation used in the study. The procedures, data collection and data analysis, also will be explained. The research questions for this study are:

1. What methods and approaches do these high school EFL teachers believe they apply in their classrooms?

2. What, if any, support and training have the high school EFL teachers received before and during implementation of teaching the new curriculum?

3. What barriers do EFL teachers face in implementing the new curriculum?

The purpose of this research is to investigate teacher training regarding CLT and to improve CLT teaching methods. The hypothesis of this research is that there is not enough teaching training or support about using CLT in the Saudi Arabian classroom.

Methods

Research Design

In this study, I used qualitative research methods for my investigations. Qualitative research can be best defined as “seeking to understand and interpret how the various participants in a social setting construct the world around them” (Glesne, 2006, p. 4). For this study, qualitative research better embodies the data extrapolated due to the need to “better [understand] of social phenomena from the perspectives of those involved, to contextualize issues in their particular socio-culture-political milieu” (Glesne, 2006. p.4). Qualitative research was used for this study because it allowed for a more in-depth perspective into CLT teacher training in Saudi Arabia since the new curriculum was developed in 2009. Erickson (1986) believes that the main
goal of using qualitative research is to elicit interpretation of the actions and words of the participants in the research.

**Participants**

The data was collected from two EFL high school teachers in Taif, Saudi Arabia and their respective supervisor. The EFL teachers were questioned about the training courses that they have completed and the challenges that they faced in teaching the new curriculum. The supervisor was questioned about the teachers themselves, their needs regarding EFL, and teacher training.

I interviewed two male EFL teachers, Ali and Sami, who both teach at an all-male high school in Taif, Saudi Arabia. For purposes of privacy, I referred to all the participants with pseudonyms. I chose the two teacher participants from a high school district where the new MacMillan textbook series had been taught in that school since 2012. Ali and Sami passed a multiple-choice English exam, which was provided by the Education Office in Taif, Saudi Arabia in order to receive their teaching jobs. At the school where the teachers are employed, there are five different levels of EFL classes based on the MacMillan textbooks that are used for the classes. Each of these two teachers has taught at least three different levels of EFL classes based on the MacMillan textbook. The two teachers in this study both have the same EFL supervisor, Fahad. This supervisor oversees the teachers and advises the teachers when needed. Fahad was interviewed in order to gain an in-depth understanding of EFL and CLT teachers’ needs and perspectives.

**Mr. Ali.** Ali has been teaching English at the middle school and high school level for over 13 years. He spent 10 years teaching in seventh, eighth, and ninth grades in two middle schools in Taif, Saudi Arabia. He began teaching high school three years ago and has taught both
tenth and twelfth grades. Most schools in Taif teach EFL classes that encompass four basic skills: grammar, speaking, writing, and listening. Ali teaches at an urban school with approximately 550 all-male students attending the school. He teaches about 105 students each year. A small education office oversees Ali’s school district in Taif, Saudi Arabia. Each class, typically, has between 30-35 students. Ali’s classroom was equipped with a SMART Board and a computer.

In my interactions with Ali, it was clear that he had been teaching for over 10 years. He showed a passion for teaching English and using technology in the classroom. Ali even stated in one of his interviews that he frequently reads English novels and books about the history of the English language. When Ali was asked about whether or not he planned to take the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) proficiency exam he stated, “Yes, I plan to take the IELTS proficiency test because I want to take a master’s degree in education in the future. Ali was happy to share his knowledge and experience with me during my interviews with him. He seemed nervous about the fact that I was the first person who had ever interviewed and recorded him. Nonetheless, Ali was open to discussing any topics I suggested and meeting at any time.

Ali discussed his interest in integrating technology applications like Edmodo and the interactive version of the textbook to his classroom. “We all are using an educational application called Edmodo. It’s a virtual classroom. In this application I usually upload videos, audios, worksheets, homework, and take home quizzes.” His interest in motivating students was apparent through all of the various ways he tried to make learning English more fun. Ali remarked that when students were asked to discuss topics that related to the real world. One lesson discussed a skin care shop called “The Body Shop”, and the students were more motivated and excited to learn about a company’s developments and growth all over the world in this
lesson. Ali explained, “In all my classes I use one of three methods or ways of teaching I generally use cooperative learning, sometimes I use mind storming, and I depend on flipped classroom” (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016).

**Mr. Sami.** Sami began his teaching career while he was employed in the Saudi Arabian Royal Forces. He taught electronics and calibration in English for seven years to other Saudi Arabian Royal Forces members. During these seven years, he completed several teaching courses as well. While he was in the Saudi Arabian Royal Forces, he also completed his bachelor’s degree in English remotely online. Four years prior to teaching in the Saudi Arabian Royal Forces, Sami taught English in two middle schools. Beginning in 2013, Sami started to teach English in a high school setting for all grade levels. Currently, Sami is teaching English to tenth graders. The high school Sami teaches at, which is the same school where Ali teaches, is an urban school with approximately 550 all-male students. He teaches about 105 students each year. Sami also has a SMART Board in his classroom. Sami discussed showing YouTube videos about grammar to the class. In my discussions and interviews with Sami, he was enthusiastic about his students. He cared about trying to encourage students personally and academically.

Sami stated, “I use communicative approach” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). He discussed using communicative methods like student-to-student interactions. He was encouraged by the use of the interactive textbook. During my first interview with Sami, he stated, “The interactive book saves time and motivates students.” Sami felt that using authentic information was increasingly important for his students. He felt that this strategy supported communicative approach. Sami was confident about discussing his teaching methods in the interviews. Sami stated that, “I advise my students to understand every lesson carefully, and to try to look for any information they do not know on the Internet. This will support the learning skills of the
students” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). After the first interview, Sami was extremely open about sharing his views and answering my questions.

**Mr. Fahad.** Fahad was interviewed because he was the teachers’ respective EFL supervisor. Fahad earned his bachelor’s degree in English in 2003 and his master’s degree in Education with a specialization in Curriculum and Teaching Methods in 2016 from Umm Al-Qura University. In addition to the courses he completed in college and at the graduate level, Fahad has completed workshops about providing professional development and another workshop about using portfolios in the classroom. Fahad started teaching as an EFL teacher 15 years ago. He spent 13 years as an English and EFL teacher in mostly high school settings. Fahad was selected two years ago after a written test and multiple interviews to be a supervisor for EFL teachers in a Taif school district. As a supervisor, Fahad oversees 68 EFL teachers at 28 elementary, middle, and high schools. Fahad visits every one of the 68 teachers twice a year, once each semester of the school year. During the two yearly observations of the teachers, Fahad usually spends 45 minutes with the teachers while they are teaching. Fahad stated, “I always focus on the learning process, students’ participation, and full engagement in the lesson” while he observes the teachers (First Interview, April 15th, 2016). In his observations and discussions with the teachers, Fahad feels that most teachers use traditional methods of teaching EFL, such as grammar-translation.

Fahad has begun leading workshops about active learning strategies and professional development for the teachers he supervises. Fahad admits that these workshops have not discussed how to teach the new curriculum specifically. He believes that there should be more training courses and workshops for EFL teachers about the new curriculum. He also feels that any courses taught about the new curriculum need to have a number of sufficient EFL expert
trainers for the teachers to learn from. Fahad explained that there are many other barriers as well for EFL teachers that need to be addressed. Fahad stated that the “limited time for instruction”, “students’ poor English language level”, and the “integrated skills lesson” are all barriers for EFL teachers. In general though, Fahad’s thoughts about teachers are that “…the good teacher is the one who is able to create a safe, creative, and engaging environment for his students” (First Interview, April 15th, 2016). Fahad was especially open with me about the challenges of being a supervisor and the challenges EFL teachers in Taif face during the interviews.

Data Collection

Seidman (2006) claimed, “The primary way a researcher can investigate an education organization, institution, or process is through experience of the individual people, the “others” who make up the organization or carry out the process” (p. 4). The experience of the teachers and supervisor were examined through the use of interviews. Before the interviews and surveys began, I received permission from the Taif Education Office, which oversees the supervisors, teachers, and schools. This permission document is included at the end of the thesis (APPENDIX A). Then, I contacted the teachers and supervisor and emailed all the participants preliminary questions to answer.

The questions used for the preliminary questionnaire and the interviews were adapted from Burke’s (2012) study about experimental professional development for world language teachers. The questions that were asked during the questionnaire and the interviews were also adapted knowing the participants were EFL teachers and a supervisor in Saudi Arabia. During the interviews, follow-up questions were developed after hearing the participants’ responses to the initial questions. None of the developed questions that were used during the interviews were leading questions. Leading questions often lead participants to have a biased viewpoint before
answering a question (Glense, 2006). The two teacher participants received the same preliminary questions and scripted interviews questions. Follow-up questions, however, were different for the two teacher participants based on their answers to the initial scripted questions. The supervisor participant received similar preliminary questions and scripted interview questions, but some questions were adapted to ask the supervisor more about his role as a supervisor. Follow-up questions were also asked in the supervisor’s interviews.

The textbook was analyzed keeping in mind the four goals of communicative competence in the lessons that were given to the students: strategic, grammatical, discourse, and socio-cultural (Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Savignon, 2002). Two lessons that were mentioned by the participants were analyzed looking for the four goals of communicative competence.

**Interviews.** After the participants were initially contacted, explained the purpose of the study and their rights as participants, and agreed to participate in the study, all participants received the Human Review Subject Board (HRSB) consent form. After about the consent forms were collected and signed, already constructed preliminary questions were emailed to all of the participants three or four days before each participant’s first interview. After this, the first interview began separately with each participant. The first interview lasted for 25-40 minutes. The questions asked during the first interview were mainly questions that were already adapted and scripted before the interview. A week after each participant’s first interview, the second interview was conducted. This interview also lasted for 25-40 minutes. The questions in the second interview, however, contained questions that were already scripted, but many questions were added after understanding the participants’ responses to the questions in the first interview.
I interviewed the teacher participants with open-ended questions in order to collect more information. I also asked my teacher participants’ preliminary questions. The questions from the teacher interviews and the preliminary questionnaire are included at the end of the thesis (APPENDIX B). During the interview process, I ensured that I gave the participants time to answer my questions. All of the correspondence and interviews were conducted in English. The open-ended questions were followed up by yes or no questions depending on each participant’s answers during the interviews. First, I asked the two teachers individually to answer general questions about their age, experience in teaching, and their academic degrees. Then, I asked them specific questions about teaching methodology, training received, and the barriers that prevent them from applying the CLT-based curriculum. The teachers were interviewed individually and in two different interviews so that their responses were not influenced by each other’s. I interviewed them in two separate interviews. Every interview took between 25-40 minutes. The consent form for the teacher participants is included at the end of this thesis as well (APPENDIX C). Each teacher was asked the same questions in order to keep the study reliable. The interviews were recorded and transcribed. Field notes were also taken during the interview process. Member checks were also performed for both teachers after the interviews were completed. The importance of a member check is to validate, clarify, and correct any misconceptions that were found in the interviews or questionnaires (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). Ali and Sami were both asked questions during their member checks. The questions developed and used during the member checks related to the answers the participants gave during their interviews and about the textbook versions used as well in the classroom. At times, the participants’ answers during the interviews needed clarification. Therefore, member check questions provided to the participants via e-mail were used to clarify answers and to ask for additional information. The questions for
Ali and Sami, respectively, are included at the end of this thesis (APPENDIX D & APPENDIX E).

Next, I interviewed the supervisor of the two teachers. First, I asked the supervisor to answer general questions regarding his experience in teaching, age, academic degrees, etc. Then, I asked more in-depth questions about his observations of the two teachers and any support that is given to the teachers about the new curriculum. The supervisor was interviewed two separate times. Each interview took about 25-40 minutes. A full list of questions is included at the end of the thesis (APPENDIX F). The interviews were recorded and transcribed. Field notes were also taken during the interview process. The consent form for the supervisor is included at the end of the thesis (APPENDIX G). Fahad’s member check is also included (APPENDIX H). APPENDIX I provides the dates of each interview.

**Data Analysis**

After I interviewed the teachers and their respective supervisor, I transcribed their recorded responses. I transcribed the participants’ interpretations and perspectives into rich and thick descriptions in order to achieve credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I compared the participants’ answers and coded them accordingly. Important main ideas and themes were coded and categorized. After the main ideas and themes were found in the transcribed interviews, these main ideas and themes were further examined and coded as categories and sub-categories. Similarities and differences of collected data was classified in categories and sub-categories; then it was compared, coded, and finally filed. The three main categories were: methods and approaches, training and support, and barriers to teaching. Each category was divided into sub-categories. The methods and approaches category included target language use, CLT methods (task facilitator, student-to-student interaction, brainstorming, and technology integration) and
grammar teaching. The training and support category included lack of practical training and varied types of support from supervisors and other administrators. The last category, barriers, included the environment, lack of practical training from the textbook developer company, the textbook, the amount of curriculum, varied level or lack of prior knowledge of English for students and teachers, and lack of student and teacher motivation.

Next, an analysis was completed of the textbook. This analysis was completely independently from the interviews of the teachers and the supervisor. There are four variations or companions of the textbook that were analyzed: the printed version, the interactive version, the teachers’ manual, and the workbook. The textbook variations were acquired through The Tatweer Company for Educational Service’s website. Teachers are able to login to their website in order to download the textbooks. The textbooks were reviewed while keeping in mind the goals of communicative competence, which is the main goal of CLT (Savignon, 2002, p. 9). The four goals of communicative competence are to have the ability to use the language structure, the ability to produce language and cohesiveness of ideas, the application of what is being said in a given social context, (e.g. use of the formal or informal language, and negotiating for meaning); use of circumlocution; asking for help; fear of embarrassment as a factor of how language is used to achieve a particular goal (Savignon, 2002).

The textbook variations that were analyzed included eight units with four lessons in each unit. The fourth lesson in each unit addresses Saudi Arabia and some aspect of how Saudi students relate to the world. The 2016 edition of the textbook for teachers includes an interactive version of the textbook. The interactive textbook gives teachers the opportunity to play audio tracks, enlarge parts of the textbook, and easily present lesson from the textbook to students. This
textbook is preferable for some teachers because they can integrate the content with any technology already in their classrooms (e.g. Smart Board) rather than use a printed version.

The qualitative research approach allows researchers to better understand in-depth the relationship between people and social institutions. Researchers are able to have long-term interactions with people and see patterns that develop during these interactions (Glense, 2006, p. 5). Credibility in qualitative research is similar to interior validity in quantitative research. Credibility is developed via triangulation by analyzing different data collected from more than one participant (Richards, 2003; Glense, 2006). Triangulation is considered the best approach for verifying the credibility and reliability of data collected in qualitative research. It assists in providing credible information by collecting the information in different settings and at different times (Guion, 2011). Triangulation is necessary in order to validate data independently of each source as well (Glesne, 2006, p. 36). The purpose of interviewing the teachers, the supervisor, and the analysis of the textbooks is to allow for triangulation of the data collected. Having multiple data sources (e.g. students, teachers, textbook, administrator) increases credibility of data (Berg, 1995; Glense, 2006, p. 36). So, in order to bring reliability and credibility, data from the teachers and supervisor was collected in two separate and different interviews for each participant. An initial questionnaire was also given and subsequently member checks and were completed. Validity is an important part of qualitative research as it increases trustworthiness of the data collected and the overall results (Creswell, 1998; Glense, 2006, p. 37). Typically multiple “verification processes” are completed to ensure validity. These may include: member checking, triangulation, confirmation of researcher bias, external auditing, etc. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Creswell, 1998, Glense, 2006, p. 37).
Summary

In this chapter, research methods were explained. The research design, participants, and data collection that was used for this study were mentioned in general. The data collection of this study provided a better understanding of which EFL approaches and methods the participants use inside their classrooms as well as the training that they received, if any. Credibility, validity, and reliability were also explained. Triangulation of the data and member checks were performed to ensure validity.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

In this chapter, I present the results according to the categories and subcategories that were identified in the data. Concerning methods and approaches, the categories were: target language use, CLT methods (task facilitator, student-to-student interaction, brainstorming, and technology integration), and teaching and use of grammar-translation. When discussing training and support the sub-categories included: lack of practical training and varied types of support from supervisors and other administrators. The teachers and supervisor mentioned barriers to implementing the new curriculum, these included: environment, lack of practical training from the textbook developer company, the textbook, the amount of curriculum, varied level or lack of prior knowledge of English for students and teachers, and lack of students’ and teachers’ motivation.

Methods and Approaches

The methods and approaches used by the two teacher participants are discussed next in this section. The supervisor’s opinions about the methods and approaches used by his two teacher participants and his other teacher supervisees in his district are also discussed in this section. World language teachers typically use a variety of approaches and methods in their classrooms; CLT and grammar-translation is discussed. The teachers’ and supervisor’s opinions on their target language use is also discussed.

Target Language Use

Both teachers believed they used a mix of English and Arabic in their classrooms. Each teacher mentioned what percentage of English and what percentage of Arabic they believed they used typically in their classrooms. Sami stated, “I often speak in English around 70% to explain the lessons and discuss some information about the lessons” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016).
He also stated in reference to his students, “They use about 30% (English) to answer questions, read passages and articles (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). On the other hand, Ali stated that for both his students and for himself, 30% of the time English is used in the classroom (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). Specifically, English was used for “classroom instructions and for repeating sentences (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). Target language use differed with each teacher participant, and Fahad, the teachers’ respective supervisor, also confirmed this.

Teaching and Use of Grammar-translation Methods

In my interviews with Ali, I found that he spoke most often about teaching grammar lessons. Ali explained that he focused on grammar practice in almost all of his lessons for a lengthy period of time. In the interview, Ali highlighted that he spends “two or three” classes out of five on grammar (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). At the beginning of the interview, Ali admitted that he only uses 30% English for “classroom instruction and repeating sentences (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). Fahad discussed Ali’s use of grammar-translation methods, “Ali spent a considerable amount of time translating the sentences in Arabic and focused much on the form” (First Interview, April 15th, 2016). In both of my interviews with Fahad, he explained that he believes that most of the teachers whom he oversees use grammar-translation methods. In my member check with Sami, he mentioned that in his classroom he focuses on grammar 35% of the time, and on reading 35% of the time. Sami did not mention that he used grammar-translation methods in his classes, but he did say in his interviews that he wanted students to focus on grammar (First Interview, April 15th, 2016; Second Interview, April 25th, 2016).

CLT Methods

Teachers use communicative language teaching (CLT) in order to increase communicative competence of the learners (Burke, 2015; Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Savignon,
Teachers that use CLT create social contexts around what the students are learning in order to facilitate a better understanding of world language (Savignon, 2002). CLT uses many different methods, including: task facilitating, student-to-student interaction, activating prior knowledge through brainstorming, and technology integration.

**Task Facilitator.** During the interviews, both teachers mentioned being task facilitators. Sami explained an example of a lesson where he acted as a teacher/task facilitator (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). He discussed how he gave his students time individually to think about the answers to his questions. Then, he asked the students to give him their answers to his questions. Next, he wrote the best answers on the board. Sami highlighted being a facilitator during another lesson as well, “[During a lesson], I asked the students to predict the meaning of these two words” (Second Interview, April 22nd, 2016). Sami acted as a facilitator for his students in these examples he provided. Ali addressed a similar example in his interview where he asked the students to work in groups (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). He then facilitated the students to find the correct answers. Both Sami and Ali discussed being facilitators frequently in their classrooms. They did not discuss, however, why they felt it was important to be facilitators in their classrooms.

**Student-to-Student Interaction.** Student-to-student interaction was a common topic during interviews with all participants. In both interviews with the teachers, Sami admitted that he uses pair groups for many of his lessons. In two specific lesson examples, he explained to me that he asked the students to work in pairs for each lesson. Ali discussed group work in his classroom as well. “I usually divide students to six groups…. Each group has six students” (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). Then, he gave students time to work in groups to choose the correct answers to his questions. Fahad, Sami and Ali’s supervisor, stated that Sami does indeed
“encourage student pair work” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). Fahad also mentioned that he believes cooperative learning is an important method to use in world language classrooms. Even though all of the participants did believe that cooperative learning, pair work, and student-to-student was important in their classrooms, none of the participants gave any reason to why they believed this.

**Activating Prior Knowledge through Brainstorming.** Ali explained his use of “mindstorming” in the classroom (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). Ali used “mindstorming” or brainstorming in his classroom regularly. He explained that he asks students to use this strategy when he wants them to “imagine” something (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016). The specific example he gave me was that he asked students to imagine a bookstore in the future (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016). He gave students three to five minutes to think about what this would be like. Then, he asked each student to share their opinions about what they had brainstormed. He stated, “In this exercise, there were no true or false answers” (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016). This exercise motivates the students to think about something strange or unique, and “helps them to practice their English language to express their ideas” (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016). In one of the lessons mentioned by Sami, the students learned about the inventors of tires (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). They read a story about the inventors, Hankook and Goodyear, and they were encouraged by the story because they felt a connection to the inventors. Sami asked his students to brainstorm other inventors and what they would be like if they were inventors. Sami believed that it was important to allow students to connect with what they were learning (First Interview, April 13th, 2016).

**Technology Integration.** Ali, Sami, and Fahad all discussed technology integration in the classroom. Each of the interviewees mentioned a different way of integrating technology in
their classrooms. Ali discussed using the flipped classroom method (First Interview, April 12th, 2016), (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016). In this method, the website and application Edmodo was used in his classroom. He also mentioned that not all students have the ability to connect to the Internet at home. For the students that do though, they are able to access the Edmodo application, which is a “virtual classroom.” He then stated that, “students study these materials in their homes and during next class we discuss and practice them” (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). Discussing Edmodo, Ali also stated, “Then, I upload it on the app, I mean the Edmodo app, as well as the worksheets, homework, and take home quizzes are made by me to make the students practice English and it lets me evaluate them perfectly.” Ali explained that he integrates videos into his classroom to facilitate learning in certain sections that he teaches. He stated that he uses certain videos for students often at the end of a section to explain parts of the lessons that the students did not understand.

Sami also explained that he integrated technology into his classroom regularly. Sami stated, “My current EFL supervisor told me to download the interactive textbook, before that I haven’t any idea about it” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). Sami then discussed the use of interactive textbook (Second Interview, April 22nd, 2016). He explained, “During the lesson, I also show the answers of questions through the interactive book on the SMART Board to help students comparing their answer with the interactive textbook” (Second Interview, April 22nd, 2016). Sami emphasized the importance of the interactive textbook throughout both of my interviews with him. He explained that he is able to play audio for students with the interactive textbook and that the interactive textbook allows for better presentation of lessons. The teacher can display the interactive textbook answers so that students can check their work in class. Sami
felt that the interactive textbook “saves time and motivates students” (Second Interview, April 22nd, 2016).

In my member check with Fahad, he mentioned the use of technology in his teachers’ classrooms. He believed that his high school teachers have “very equipped” classrooms which includes, computers, projectors, SMART Boards, and digital cameras. However, he felt, “Unfortunately, very few numbers of teachers use it efficiently.” Technology was highlighted by all of the participants in their interviews and each participant used or promoted the use of technology in varying ways.

Training and Support

In this section, I will discuss lack of practical training and varied types of support that the EFL teachers either do or not have. Lack of practical training included prior training received at the university and current or past short workshops offered to the teachers. All three of the participants offered opinions about what kind of practical training they lacked or that they would like to receive. Next, support that is given to the teachers and supervisor from various experts, including colleagues, the supervisor, and other administrators, is discussed. Each participant explained their viewpoints about who either supports or does not support their teaching or supervising.

Lack of Practical Training

It was clear in the interviews, that both Sami and Ali felt like they were lacking the necessary practical training to teach the way they wanted to teach. Sami and Ali both admitted that they did not receive sufficient practical training in CLT methods. Sami discussed how he was asked by Fahad to observe a CLT lesson in a private school (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). Yet, once Sami observed this lesson in a private school, he said that grammar-translation
methods were being used. He stated about the lesson, “the teacher explained the grammar separately from the passages being read” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016).

In the interviews, it was clear that there was a discrepancy between what Fahad believed the teachers knew and used concerning CLT approaches and what methods they actually used in the classroom. Fahad discussed that there was a two-day training workshop when the new textbook was introduced, which promotes use of CLT (First Interview, April 15th, 2016). However, Fahad admitted that none of the teachers in Taif that he oversees were able to attend these workshops, because they were only offered in two other cities in Saudi Arabia, Jeddah and Riyadh. The new textbook was assigned to teachers for them to teach with, assuming that they would use CLT methods when teaching with it. Sami stated, “What we need from the curriculum developer is for them to give us typical training courses about the new curriculum” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). He also stated about the new curriculum, “I need to observe and get practical training to improve my way of teaching the new curriculum” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). He had a sense of urgency in his voice when discussing the training he wanted. Sami suggested, “They can invite us to typical lessons or make some recorded videotapes of typical lessons from the actual classroom” (Second Interview, April 22nd, 2016). This provided him and the other teachers the opportunity to study and re-watch the videos whenever needed. Both Sami and Ali agreed that practical training with the new textbook, the new curriculum, and CLT were necessary in order for them to teach in a communicative manner. Without the practical training or knowledge about CLT, Sami and Ali were left to attempt to teach using CLT methods on their own.
Varied Types of Support

In their first interviews, Sami and Ali both discussed the support they receive from their supervisor, Fahad. They concluded that Fahad was helpful in providing workshops, articles, resources, and advice about their teaching and about teaching EFL students. Fahad has conducted workshops that relate to EFL teaching. Sami mentioned that, he attended a workshop taught by Fahad and found it helpful, but it did not help him in implementing CLT methods (Second Interview, April 22nd, 2016). He also mentioned that he attended another workshop about the new textbook that all EFL teachers use in their classrooms. He explained though, that only the teacher’s manual version of the textbook was discussed in this workshop.

Ali mentioned that, he did attempt to participate in some workshops too, but that he felt that the new curriculum was not focused on in those workshops (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016). When Ali was asked about whether or not the new curriculum using CLT was explained in the workshop, he stated, “I did not get anything useful about the new curriculum approach” (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). Fahad discussed the workshop he provides for all of his EFL teachers and the advice he gave to both Sami and Ali (First Interview, April 15th, 2016). Fahad explained that he provided two workshops about professional development and one about active learning strategies. Fahad admitted that education and resources about new approaches and methods have not been given to Sami, Ali, or any of the other teachers he oversees (Second Interview, April 25th, 2016).

Fahad mentioned that there are no training courses that he or other administrators can provide teachers about CLT. Fahad felt that his EFL teachers need more support from the administrators of their schools and from their districts (Second Interview, April 25th, 2016). Sami explained that the principal of his school has yet to provide information about CLT and the
new curriculum for him or other teachers (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). As shown in my second interview with Ali, he has a stronger opinion about the lack of support from his principal. He stated, “They do not care about what methods or approaches we use….they just want us to come to the class and explain the lessons, nothing more” (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016). In relation to colleagues, Sami stated that he only rarely meets other teachers to discuss implementing the new curriculum (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). He felt that there should be more scheduled time for the teachers to meet together and collaborate.

Ali shared his experience that he has had with his colleagues (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). He explained that teachers meet to discuss issues or methods in the classroom, both in and out of the classroom. He shared an example of meeting with EFL teaching outside the classroom in an Internet forum(s). Ali stated that, “Some EFL teachers gather on Internet forums to exchange their experiences and share the worksheet and other papers… They are helpful, but nothing about techniques, pedagogies, and approaches nothing at all” (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). All of the participants highlighted the general lack of support they had received when implementing the new curriculum.

**Barriers**

In my interviews with the three participants, each participant mentioned at least two barriers or difficulties they have had when teaching English as a world language. In this section, six barriers that were mentioned by the three participants will be discussed. These include: student environment, lack of training from the textbook developer company, the textbook, the amount of curriculum to teach in each level, lack of prior knowledge for students and teachers, and lack of student and teacher motivation. As each barrier is discussed, the participants’ opinions and viewpoints will be shared.
Environment

The environment students live in (e.g. home, community, neighborhood, family) can impact how they learn and how much knowledge they retain in the classroom (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014; Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 2012). Parents are especially important for teachers and students in the learning process. When I asked Sami in his first interview about the support that he received from parents to implement the new curriculum he said, “Nothing until now, because my school doesn’t have any meeting programs to communicate with parents” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). Ali stated about parent support, “parents just care about their kid’s grade” (First Interview, April 12th, 2016).

In the home environment, Sami explained that, “the student life in Saudi Arabia and their environment does not give them the chance to practice English language” (Second Interview, April 22nd, 2016). Ali also expressed that he felt that some students do not have Internet at home, which can be a potential barrier to the learning process (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016). He also stated, “the students are not able to use English as the developer has suggested.” In my member check with Ali he explained, that students in Saudi Arabia have “no need to use English in their daily lives.” He stated, “I think the students don’t know the basics of English language and even if they do know these basics, their ability to use it is so weak.” Ali also highlighted the fact that many of his students were not able to practice English, therefore their English language skills are weak due, in part, to the environment in which they live.

Lack of Training from Textbook Developer Company

All three interviewees were disappointed with the level of training and support they received from the textbook developer company on how to use the textbook. They all felt that the developer company did not provide teachers or supervisors with hands-on training or experiential
professional development. Sami stated, “I hope I can get practical training courses from EFL experts who developed the new curriculum who know the needs of EFL teachers in Saudi and the students, too” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). He also explained that the curriculum developer “…provided us with the interactive book and teacher book. This is only what they provide.” In his answer to my next question, Sami highlighted that fact that, “The interactive textbook and the teacher book are great support, but I need to watch a typical lesson that has implementation of communicative approach.” Sami stated that, “We as EFL teachers need to attend field visits to learn from each other and get feedback from EFL experts who know how to apply the new curriculum” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). He explained that this would help him because an expert trainer could evaluate him on the “advantages and disadvantages of our teaching” (First Interview, April 13th, 2016).

The Textbook

The teacher’s version of the textbook explained the approach, goals, structure, topics, and methods that are used in the textbook. The textbook discussed the use of the “Triple A Approach” (Brewster & Rogers, 2015, p. 4). The textbook explained that, “for easy reference” the use of the CLT, the editors/authors recommended using “The Triple A Approach.” In the textbook, The Triple A Approach explains that the curriculum allows teachers to help students access to a new language through analysis of grammar and activation through discussion activities. “The textbook prompts the teachers to establish English as the main classroom language,” stated the textbook (p. 4). The textbook discussed how important it is for teachers to motivate their students to learn English. In the introduction of the textbook, the difference between EFL and ESL classrooms is also explained. ESL students are taught English in native speaking countries versus EFL students that are taught English in non-native English speaking
countries. EFL teachers need to focus more on trying to motivate students and creating cultural connections to learning English. The companion workbook “contains extra grammar activities to give students further opportunity to practice language” (p. 4). The workbook is used at end of every lesson. The exercises in the workbook can be collected by the teachers and graded, if the teacher wishes. The interactive book is the same as the students’ textbook, but it allows teachers to better present lessons. They are able to enlarge images, use audio tracks, and view answers to questions in the students’ textbook. The interactive book is only for teachers to use and students do not have access to this book. In general, the textbook, the teachers’ manual, the interactive version, and the workbook, do follow the four communicative competence goals.

Sami and Ali both understood that the textbook was designed to promote use of the communicative approach, yet they both admit they are not able to fully integrate this approach in the classroom. Sami stated, about the textbook, “Although the interactive book and the teacher book are great support, but I need to watch a typical lesson that has implementation of communicative approach so I can realize the correct way of applying the communicative approach” (Second Interview, April 22nd, 2016). Ali also stated, “The teacher book concentrates on the communicative approach, but I think this approach does not fit my student level.” Later in my interview with Sami, as mentioned earlier, he also explained that even though communicative methods are used in the textbook, he has “no idea about it, so he cannot” teach it. The workbook is used as a companion book to the students’ textbook. In my member check with Fahad, he explained that teachers ask the students to complete the workbook exercises on their own. In my member check with Sami, he stated that he asks the students to use workbook during the last lesson of the week. He believed that this gives the students opportunity to practice what they have learned during the week.
Amount of Curriculum to Teach

Ali and Sami had similar opinions on how challenging it was to implement the new curriculum in their classrooms. Both teachers felt pressured to teach all eight units, including the four lessons in each unit. Fahad, he mentioned three major barriers that he believes his EFL teachers face. He stated, “Teachers have five periods with 45 minutes per week. They have to cover one lesson in each period in order to complete the entire book by the end of the semester. Unfortunately, the time is insufficient for achieving effective language teaching” (First Interview, April 15th, 2016). He discussed that the teachers face pressure to finish the textbook quickly, without being able to take the time they need to teach using CLT methods. Ali stated that he agreed with Fahad and explained, “The curriculum length is not fitting the weeks of the semester” (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). Ali explained that he must teach the entire curriculum in 16 weeks. He also has not able to organize the lessons that he wanted to teach according to his or his students’ needs. In my member check with Ali, he stated, “This is considered to be a problem to me as a teacher, but I have to cover the whole textbook in this period of time.” Sami, in his member check, believed that the amount of curriculum being taught is only a barrier if the students’ language skills are below average.

Lack of Prior Knowledge for Students and Teachers

Prior knowledge that students and teachers enter the classroom with is an important element to any classroom. In a subject like EFL, students above the novice level, and teachers should have a certain level of English in order to proceed in learning and teaching English. Fahad explained that he believed that many students arrive in EFL high school classrooms with a “poor English language level” (First Interview, April 15th, 2016). He considered this one of the three main barriers to teachers teaching EFL students. He stated, “Students are supposed to be up
to level of the textbooks taught in this stage, but they are not.” He also stated, “…besides other reasons, students find it difficult to cope with the secondary stage textbooks’ content” (First Interview, April 15th, 2016). In my member check with Fahad, he mentioned that it is important that students are able to use their prior knowledge when learning vocabulary and guessing the meaning of words. Fahad explained that teachers need prior knowledge of English as well, “Teachers should also have a good level in English in order to be able to manage the class efficiently and create real situations where students need to use English.”

**Lack of Student and Teacher Motivation**

Both teachers and students need to be motivated in the classroom for a classroom to be successful. All three participants believed that motivation is needed in teachers and students. Fahad had the strongest feelings about motivating students and teachers. When discussing the needs of teachers with Fahad stated “This requires the ability to apply various active learning strategies as well as using a wide range of motivational techniques” (Second Interview, April 25th, 2016). Concerning Ali and Sami, Fahad stated, “…They need to understand their students’ needs and find ways to motivate them.” One suggestion Fahad gave is for the teachers to create “real and interesting situations.”

Discussing potential barriers, like lack of motivation by students, Ali and Sami both concurred that they felt they either could not either meet the goals of the lessons or teach properly with the CLT approach. Sami stated, “… One of the barriers is my way of teaching. I don’t really know how to deal with some lessons to reach their goals” (Second Interview, April 22nd, 2016). Sami was discussing the barriers he faces implementing the new curriculum that promotes CLT. Ali also said that he felt that he is not able to teach using CLT or communicative approach because he has “no idea about it, so I cannot” (First Interview, April 12th, 2016). Both
of these statements highlighted the teachers’ lack of motivation for learning communicative approach or CLT and learning other approaches or methods. Ali discussed his students’ motivational level with the new curriculum. He explained about students, “…I think some students have difficulties to study the new curriculum, as a result, they don’t like” (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016).

Summary

In this chapter, the results from the interactions with the participants were discussed. Patterns were recognized in these interactions, which were then coded and classified. The teachers discussed target language use, CLT methods (task facilitator, student-to-student interaction, brainstorming, and technology integration) and teaching and use of grammar-translation in their classrooms. They also discussed lack of practical training and varied types of support from supervisors and other administrators. Lastly, the teachers and supervisor highlighted barriers to implementing the new curriculum, these included: environment, lack of practical training from the textbook developer company, the textbook, the amount of curriculum, varied level or lack of prior knowledge of English for students and teachers, and lack of students’ and teachers’ motivation which were all addressed in this chapter.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I will discuss the research questions in this study and examine the answers to each question. After the research questions are answered, literature will be highlighted that discuss each research question that was answered. Literature and research connects what the findings presented in the research questions. Suggestions are then made to solve many of the issues that were found at the end of this chapter. The suggestions discuss improvements concerning training, support, teaching methods, etc. that all parties could implement to better teach EFL teachers and the new curriculum.

**Research Question 1: What methods and approaches do these high school EFL teachers believe they apply in their classrooms?**

Ali and Sami had differing opinions on what methods and approaches they use in the classroom. Sami believed he uses only the communicative approach in the classroom. Ali did not state that he was using one approach over another, but he claimed he does not use the communicative approach at all. After reviewing the findings, it was shown that Sami and Ali were what Burke (2006) refers to as hybrid teachers. According to Burke (2006), Ali would be considered as a hybrid teacher closer to GT, and Sami is more of hybrid teacher closer to CLT. Even though both Ali and Sami used grammar-translation methods, both were successful in implementing some CLT methods in their classrooms. Ali highlighted his emphasis on grammar-translation in both his interviews. He also admitted his reliance on having a teacher-centered classroom. This is associated with more traditional ways of teaching world language, like the grammar-translation. Modern classrooms that use more communicative methods typically allow the learners more independence (Spiro, 2013, p. 22). The supervisor confirmed Ali’s emphasis of
the grammar-translation in my discussions with him stating that Ali focused on grammar and the
form of words.

Even though Ali mentioned that he was not using communicative methods, it did seem
apparent that some of his techniques and methods were using this approach. He gave more than
one example in his interviews of using CLT methods such as: technology integration, task
facilitating, and student-to-student learning. He mentioned student-to-student interaction in both
his interviews. He felt there were many benefits to using this method in his classroom. Sami felt
this way as well. This is confirmed Richards (2006) and Burke (2006) explanations that CLT
teachers promote student-to-student interaction because it motivates students, allows students to
work on their fluency, and gives students the chance to hear English spoken by other students.
Student-to-student interaction is central to the CLT approach and should be used in every CLT
classroom (Burke, 2006; Richards, 2006). Ali also felt that technology integration was important
in his classroom when he used the flipped classroom applications or websites like Edmodo. Spiro
(2013) and Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) discuss the use of technology in English
classrooms. Spiro (2013) believes technology in English classrooms should be adapted to the
needs of the learner and the student. Ali also mentioned using brainstorming to activate prior
knowledge in both of his interviews. He felt that giving students time to think about answers or
ideas helps to facilitate learning in general. He mentioned that he acts as a task facilitator when
he asks students to brainstorm. Buehl (2014) discusses how the use of brainstorming activities to
elicit prior knowledge can assist learners to comprehend what they are learning.

Sami stated in his interviews and member check, that he tried to use the CLT approach in his
classroom. In the member check with Sami he admitted that he focuses 70% of the time on
reading and grammar in his classroom. Usually, if teachers spend most of the time in the
classroom focusing on reading and grammar, they are thought of as using mostly grammar-translation methods (Burke, 2006). Additionally, Sami stated that he spoke English 70% of time in his classes (First Interview, April 13th, 2016). Burke (2006) would consider Sami to be a “hybrid” teacher as he uses both grammar-translation and with emphasis on CLT methods (p. 155).

Sami did confirm in my discussions with him, that he uses CLT methods, many similar to Ali, in his classrooms daily. Sami believed that he is using CLT methods in his classroom and not using any grammar-translation methods. CLT methods that Sami used in his classroom included: task facilitating, student-to-student interaction, and technology integration. He felt that being a task facilitator is important during group work and student activities. This was important because the teacher can then assist the students when needed, see student progress, and evaluate prior knowledge. CLT asks teachers to be facilitators, rather than have a teacher-centered classroom (Spiro, 2013, p. 20). Burke (2006) and Finocchairo & Burumfit (1983) “CLT teachers allow students time to create languages through trial and error with the teacher acting as an observer and facilitator” (p. 156).

Sami discussed his use of student-to-student interaction including pair and group work in his classrooms in both of his interviews. CLT often used student-centered learning over teacher-centered learning. Student-centered learning provided students more time to be immersed in the language, along with other benefits like reducing anxiety and promoting discussion of ideas (Hadley, 2001; Larsent-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

Sami’s overall viewpoint was that it was important for students to connect with what they were learning. This could be facilitated during brainstorming activities or group work. Sami highlighted the use of lessons in the textbook that connects his students to their culture and the
world. Culture and language are entwined together and CLT recognizes this. Most CLT teachers introduced communicative activities that focused on culture, while still remaining focused on language (Burke, 2006). Giving students authentic cultural experiences is a primary goal of CLT and it should be put to use in any successful EFL classroom (Richards, 2006).

Sami also discussed, in both of his interviews, his frequent use of technology in the classroom like the interactive textbook and YouTube videos. He felt that the use of technology helped to motivate the students and made the students more active learners. Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) discussed the use of technology in EFL classrooms, specifically the use of YouTube to enhance the learning process (p. 202). Overall, Sami included his use of CLT methods in his interviews. He did not admit that he used any grammar-translation methods during any of his interviews.

Fahad, the supervisor for 68 world language teachers, believed that most of his teachers use traditional approaches and methods when teaching world language. Usually in world language classrooms that use more traditional approaches and methods, the native language is spoken more often the target language (Burke, 2006, 2011). In the findings, Fahad stated that most of his world language teachers spoke English only 30% of the time in the classroom, and students spoke the target language in the classrooms he observed only 20% of the time. In reference to Ali and Sami, he stated that Ali spoke English 30% of the time and Sami spoke English 50% of the time. In both of my interviews with Fahad, he also discussed that Ali and Sami both focus on grammar heavily during their lessons. He admitted that Sami tries to use CLT methods more often than Ali. Current research has focused on having teachers and students maximizing the use of the target language in the classroom (Burke, 2014; Cook, 2001; Levine, 2003, 2012; Turnbull, 2001). The American Council of Teaching of Foreign Language
recommends that world language teachers and their students use the target language 90% of the
time in the classroom (ACTFL, 2010). World language educators and applied linguists
worldwide favor more modern proficiency-based methods like CLT to improve students’
communicative and cultural proficiency (Burke, 2014; Cook, 2001; Levine, 2003, 2012;
Turnbull, 2001).

Research Question 2: What, if any, support and training have the high school EFL teachers
received before and during implementation of teaching the new curriculum?

According to the results, these two EFL teachers have not received proper training or support
concerning the new curriculum. Each of the participants had strong opinions about the lack of
support and training they have been given. In regards to practical training, all of the participants
have attended professional development workshops about the four basic skills in learning
language. Yet none of them have had the opportunity to attend any workshops regarding CLT
and the new curriculum. Practical training has been given to some of the teachers, including
Sami and Ali, in the form of workshops from their supervisors and the textbook developer
company. This practical training does not focus on CLT or the new curriculum. Therefore, there
has been no practical training for Ali or Sami or Fahad regarding the new curriculum or CLT.
All three of my participants were frustrated with the lack of practical training they had received,
especially from the textbook developer company.

Teachers need a proper education about how to teach and have knowledge about the
methods they should use when teaching. Teachers, who want to teach EFL students and/or use
CLT, need training if they want to be successful EFL teachers (Burke, 2015; Savignon, 2002).
Often in Saudi Arabia, teachers have not experienced CLT in any classroom setting as teachers
or students. This can lead to a misunderstanding or lack of information about how to properly put
CLT into practice (Burke, 2012). Many of the conclusions given in current research about CLT highlighted the need for hands-on professional development and training regarding CLT methods (Burke, 2006, 2012, 2014, 2015; Savignon, 2002). Sami and Ali both expressed their wishes to have this kind of practical training available to learn CLT and other methods.

In regards to support for the teachers about the new curriculum and CLT, the teachers expressed their frustration over the lack of support for their teaching. Ali and Sami both mentioned in their first interviews that parents offered no support of the new curriculum. Administrators and principals of their schools, they believed, also offered no support. Ali showed extreme concern over the fact that the administrators of their schools did not even give them guidelines about how to teach or what methods they should use (Second Interview, April 20th, 2016). Ali and Sami mentioned in both of their interviews that their EFL colleagues have not received support either. They both did state that, sometimes, teachers meet in-person or online to discuss problems or methods they may have used in the classroom. Ali stated in his first interview that teachers only meet rarely though these ways. One type of support that Ali and Sami did say was helpful was their supervisor, Fahad. As mentioned earlier, Fahad has made an effort to give Sami and Ali support, especially when they ask for support regarding CLT. All three participants cited in their interviews Fahad’s offering of workshops to his EFL teachers. Unfortunately, these workshops do not offer advice about CLT or the new curriculum.

Teachers need support from administrators, colleagues, parents, the learners, the community, and curriculum developers in order to fully engage students in learning language in the classroom. Support is needed, especially, when teachers are using a new method of teaching language like CLT. If teachers do not have support in using CLT, teachers will not be able to properly integrate CLT into their classrooms (Burke, 2012, 2015; Savignon, 2002). Murcia,
Brinton, & Snow (2014) also believe that colleagues can offer support by mentoring other teachers and offering criticism when needed. This gave the teachers an opportunity to receive first hand experiences of other teachers using CLT. Administrators, including principals and supervisors, need to provide teachers with the financial resources, materials, permission to integrate culture, and practical training in order for teachers to teach the new curriculum properly. This support was clearly not provided to the EFL teachers or to their respective supervisor.

*Research Question 3: What barriers do EFL teachers face in implementing the new curriculum?*

There were many barriers to implementing the new curriculum that were mentioned by the teachers and supervisor in the discussions with them. These include student environment, lack of training from the textbook developer company, the textbook, the amount of curriculum to teach in each level, lack of prior knowledge for students and teachers, and lack of student motivation. The students’ environment was one barrier that the teachers and supervisor mentioned during their interviews. The teachers and supervisor all believed that many students go home and are not able to speak English in the way that will help them in the classroom. This creates a barrier because the students are not able to practice English at home or in their communities. Therefore, the teachers both believed that the students’ English level was lower because of this barrier. The teachers stated in their first interviews that parents have not given the teachers or students the support they need. Zemelman, Daniels and Hyde (2012) suggested that parents should support teachers in facilitating what is being learned in the classroom at home. They also encouraged teachers need to communicate openly with parents in order for this to be successful.
Another barrier that the teachers and supervisor discussed was the lack of training from the textbook developer company. The teachers and supervisor felt that the textbook developer company should offer an EFL expert trainer for the teachers to learn from. This would include the developer company offering practical training and observations of classrooms that use CLT. Sami, in his first interview, felt that an expert trainer could provide him with feedback in order to improve his own teaching. All three participants believed that the needs of Saudi EFL teachers and students are not well known to the textbook developer company. Burke (2014, 2015) explained that researchers and consultants need to help support EFL teachers. But, she also points out that teachers need to train their students to understand CLT methods.

The textbook was the third barrier that was mentioned by all the participants. The textbook itself was not considered a barrier, but the overall methods and the way the textbook was written was a barrier for the participants. Ali and Sami discussed how the textbook was written for teachers to teach using CLT. However, Sami in his first interview admitted that he did not know how to teach using CLT. Sami explained that he was confused by some lessons or just did not know how to teach some of the lessons in the textbook. Ali explained that the students’ English level was not good enough for him to teach using CLT.

Two lessons mentioned by the teacher participants were chosen from the textbook to be analyzed. The 2016 version of the textbook was used in the analysis of the lessons. The second lesson in unit two (p. 16-17) focused on inventors, like the inventors of the tire. This lesson was mentioned by Sami in his interview. The textbook writers believed aspects of speaking, writing, and grammar were integrated in that lesson. Using Savignon’s (2002) goals of communicative competence, the lesson did include aspects of all four goals. Grammatical competence was focused on because there are grammar problems for the students to solve that highlight using
past tense. Discourse competence was included in the lesson because the lesson asks students to communicate like they would in everyday life while understanding sentence structure. The lesson also focused on sociocultural competence due to the fact that the students were asked to formally and informally communicate their ideas and experiences to one another. Lastly, strategic competence was shown in the lesson because students needed to understand meaning, similarities, and ask for help when needed.

The next lesson that was analyzed was the lesson that included discussion of The Body Shop. Ali mentioned this lesson in his first interview. This was the third lesson in the fifth unit of the 2016 version of the textbook. The lesson included aspects of speaking, reading, writing, and listening. Savignon’s (2002) four goals of communicative competence were all included in this lesson. First, grammatical competence was addressed because the students were asked to work on problems that included grammar clauses and reason within sentences. Next, discourse competence was found in the lesson because the students needed to understand passages or what was being spoken aloud. Then, sociocultural competence was also highlighted in the lesson because the lesson focused on students discussing ideas in real life settings. Strategic competence was included in this lesson as well because the students were asked to understand the main ideas and dialogues in the lesson. The purpose of the textbook analysis was to triangulate the data that was collected from the interviews. Since only two textbook lessons were discussed during the interviews, it is difficult to make claims at this time about whether or not these teachers believed they could promote communicative competence during lessons or not. It is unclear to what extent the textbook lessons affect the teachers’ methods. However, they do believe that the textbook affects the amount of time that they spend on different topics.
Celce-Murcia, Brinton, and Snow (2014) discussed three scenarios in which textbooks are chosen for schools. Saudi Arabia followed the second scenario where the textbook developer company (MacMillan) works with the Ministry of Education and The Tatweer Company for Educational Services to develop the textbook series following the rules that the Ministry of Education provides. This means that the textbook is fully developed to follow whatever approach, methodology, guidelines, and social standards that the Ministry of Education wants included in the textbook. All three participants acknowledged the pivotal role the textbook plays in Saudi EFL classrooms. The textbook was written following CLT methodology, yet the participants were confused about how to properly implement this. They were not even told by a supervisor or any administrators that they were supposed to teach using CLT methodology either. This has created a major barrier for teachers wanting to implement the new curriculum because there is a serious lack of knowledge about the new curriculum.

Relating to the textbook, the participants discussed the amount of curriculum they were supposed to teach within a semester. The textbook and subsequent versions of the textbook were the only form of curriculum that the teachers were asked to follow and teach by the Ministry of Education. The textbook was given to the teachers with the intention that they were supposed to teach all eight units with four lessons in each unit. Ali and Sami acknowledged in both of their interviews the struggle they have had in trying to teach the entire textbook in one semester. Fahad recognized this in his first interview. He discussed this as one of the three main barriers his EFL teachers face. Celce-Murcia, Brinton, and Snow (2014) discussed the need for textbooks used in English learning classrooms to be “reasonable and have an achievable goal” (p. 383). The participants did not believe that the amount of curriculum was achievable in one semester. Therefore, this did create a barrier for the teachers when implementing the new curriculum.
When Ali and Sami discussed how much curriculum they needed to teach, both teachers recognized how this related to their students’ prior knowledge. All three of the participants felt that the curriculum length was even more of a challenge to complete due to the lack of students’ prior knowledge. For example, Ali and Sami both mentioned in their second interviews how students’ knowledge of grammar could facilitate learning lessons quicker and make learning a more active experience. Both teachers recognized, though, that most students did not have proper prior knowledge of English. Fahad felt that this was one of the three main barriers for his EFL teachers, too. He felt that it was important that teachers have proper prior knowledge of English as well.

The new curriculum textbooks were organized so that they are six levels for high school English (10th-12th grade). For each semester one level was taught for the students. As long as students received a passing grade (50% or above), the students were allowed to move to the next level of English. This does mean that there are students that have a below average level of prior knowledge in English who are advancing to the next level of EFL course. Celce-Murcia, Brinton, and Snow (2014) discussed the need for students to have adequate prior knowledge when learning language. If students do not have this knowledge, it makes teachers’ jobs much more difficult.

The last barrier that was discussed by the participants was the lack of student and teacher motivation. Fahad explained this in each of his interviews by explaining how teachers and students both lacked motivation. Fahad felt that the teachers are partially responsible for motivating the students. Ali even highlighted his lack of knowledge about CLT and felt that since he does not understand it, he cannot teach it. Yet, he did not explain that he was attempting to learn about CLT or even trying to implement it. Sami had similar feelings as well about trying
to implement some of the CLT lessons in his classrooms. Sami and Ali both acknowledged their need for practical training, support, and general knowledge in order to motivate students using CLT and the new curriculum. Celce-Murcia, Brinton, and Snow (2014) discussed the general need for teachers to learn motivational strategies that work well in EFL classrooms. As Fahad stated, the teachers do need to learn motivational strategies in order to motivate their students. They need to focus on learning EFL strategies and general CLT methodology in order to properly implement the new curriculum.

**Conclusion**

Implementing a new curriculum in any classroom can present multiple challenges. In the participants’ classrooms and other EFL classrooms in Saudi Arabia, implementing the new curriculum has shown to have many challenges and barriers. When the new curriculum was implemented in Saudi Arabia, the teachers and supervisors were given a new textbook. The new textbook/new curriculum follows CLT and communicative approach guidelines. However, the teachers were not told to teach using CLT and were not instructed or given practical training about CLT methodology. This left the teachers to decide on their own what approach they would use to teach. The two teachers in this study used grammar-translation and CLT methods to varying extents. Their respective supervisor also was not given guidelines or rules about how to instruct their teachers to use the CLT methods with the new curriculum.

The lack of support and training concerning the new curriculum contributed to the teachers being hesitant about using the CLT methods. There is little, if any, support or training given to EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia concerning the new curriculum. Teachers who have perfected teaching using CLT could also provide training and support for other teachers. In an instance where Fahad had Ali visit an “expert” teacher who used CLT in their classroom, Ali
arrived to a classroom where the teacher was using the grammar-translation instead of CLT. Fahad felt that the teacher he sent Ali to watch would be using CLT well enough for Ali to learn from the teacher. Yet, as mentioned earlier, Fahad was mistaken on what methods that teacher was using in his EFL classroom.

Other barriers also presented themselves for teachers instructing with the new curriculum. These include: student environment, lack of training from the textbook developer company, the textbook, the amount of curriculum to teach in each level, lack of prior knowledge for students and teachers, and lack of student motivation. All of these barriers contributed to the issue of implementing the new curriculum.

Possible Solutions and Suggestions for Future

There are many possible solutions to these barriers, including offering teachers support and practical training. Practical training, professional development, and observations of successful CLT classrooms can provide teachers with deeper background knowledge about how to use CLT in their classrooms. Burke (2006, 2011, 2012, 2014, 2015) has advocated for experiential professional development for language teachers to learn CLT, as teachers in the U.S. also have struggles with implementing CLT methods into their curriculum and instruction. Teachers can learn through experience and with support from consultants how to use CLT in the classroom with this kind of professional development (Burke, 2012, 2014, 2015). Burke (2011) found that the teachers trained in that manner were still using CLT five years later. Experiential professional development should be offered to Saudi EFL teachers so they can experience practical training in CLT. A suggestion would be to begin this when the teachers are completing their undergraduate degree. The universities in Saudi Arabia also should provide student teachers with the opportunity to learn CLT in real life classroom settings. The professors in university
settings who are teaching student teachers should be asked to use CLT in their classrooms as well.

EFL teachers should be asked to take professional development refresher courses that focus on the new curriculum, CLT, and English language. These courses could be a requirement for teachers to complete them regularly in order to keep their license. Teachers should have access to videos or courses online through their teachers’ manual textbook about how to teach lessons in the textbook modeling/applying CLT methods. This would help eliminate the confusion the participants felt about how to teach some lessons in the textbook.

Teachers should not only receive practical training, but they should also take time to learn about English language culture and real life situations. EFL teachers should take the opportunity to study and live in English speaking countries. Then, teachers can be immersed in English language culture, communities, schools, and communicate with native English speakers. This would provide the teachers with a better understanding when teaching English, offer the teacher real-situations to emulate, and they could learn general English language skills.

In Saudi Arabian EFL classrooms, usually the classroom is very teacher-centered. I experienced this while teaching in Saudi Arabia as well. When using CLT, students need to be allowed more responsibility in the classroom. In Saudi Arabia, teachers do not discuss why they are using certain methods with students. This means that the students cannot offer support to the teacher or help improve the use of CLT in the classroom. Burke (2012, 2014) suggested that students be encouraged by teachers to take an active role in improving EFL education. Burke (2014) also explained 10 practical ways that teachers, while using CLT, can assist learners in communicating in the language being taught. Some of these include “integrating communicative activities, engaging students in strategy talks, evaluating participation, and teaching explicit
grammar lessons in the target language” (p. 120). These ways provided learners with the chance to engage more fully in the lesson and to support teacher’s use of CLT.

All three of the participants felt that students do not have the chance to practice English at home. Savignon (2002) suggested that the classroom should be thought of as a “social context” (p. 21). Teachers should facilitate the use of e-mail, online forums, and video conferencing (p. 21). Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) mentioned the use of an electronic text corpus that allows students to see how words are used in a sentence. Students then are able to practice the skills they are learning in the classroom even outside of the classroom in other environments. Student-to-student interaction outside of the classroom could also be integrated into regular lessons as well if the teachers want (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2013, p. 209). Teachers should be able to receive e-mail notifications from the textbook developer company and the Ministry of Education about any updates to the curriculum as well. This would provide teachers with a more direct line of communication from the textbook developer and the Ministry of Education.

In the future, I plan to use the knowledge I learned from this study to better my own teaching methods when teaching EFL. I want to assist other EFL teachers in understanding CLT and the barriers that are present when implementing CLT in an EFL classroom. With my colleagues, I would like to create teacher groups, for teachers to observe other EFL classrooms together. Here, teachers can provide feedback to one another and learn about teaching CLT and EFL students. I would also like to arrange field visits to English speaking countries where CLT is being used to teach world language. I believe this could provide teachers with a better understanding of CLT and student management in EFL classrooms. I would also encourage any of my colleagues that teach EFL to study in an English speaking country. There, they can learn
more about English culture, practice English with native speakers, and learn from EFL and, possibly, CLT experts.

I believe that Saudi Arabian EFL teachers should be monitored more thoroughly and given support beginning when the teachers are student teachers during their undergraduate education. Student teachers should have to take proficiency tests about English and EFL methods. These proficiency tests should continue after the student teachers become teachers. Teachers would need to achieve certain scores to remain licensed. The teachers should be tested regularly and be required to take refresher courses if they fail these tests. There should be some reward or incentive given to teachers that continually test well.

Communication methods, in general, need to be improved between the teachers, their respective supervisor, the school and district administrators, the Ministry of Education, and the textbook developer companies. This could include creating an online forum where teachers can receive notifications via e-mail or through the forum about new developments and decisions that impact them. The Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia should also create well-known standards and guidelines for all teachers, administrators, parents, and students concerning what should be taught and why. These guidelines or standards could be listed on a website. The website should have different versions where teachers, parents, students, etc. can all see what should be taught, why, and the long-term goals in the classroom. A secure login could be provided to teachers. Researchers could also use this website to conduct surveys, questionnaires, etc. with the teachers or parents.
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APPENDIX A. PERMISSION DOCUMENT FROM TAIF EDUCATION OFFICE

الرقم: ١٧٨
التاريخ: ١١/٠٤/١٤٣٣
المشغولات: تصميم

الموضوع: تمهيد مهام الباحث/محمد بن عبد الله محمد السفياني

بتوافق دراسة علمية (ماجستير).

المكررم مدير الثانوية: 

وفقه الله

المكررم مدير مكتب التعليم: 

وفقه الله

اسم الباحث: محمد بن عبد الله محمد السفياني.

المكتبة: مبتكاً قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس/كلية التربية.

الدرجة العلمية: ماجستير

جامعة بولينغ فريعت/ولاية أوهايو، Ohıo

"وجوهات نظر معلم اللغة الإنجليزية عن التدريب على تدريس منهج اللغة

الجديد بمدينة الطائف.

عنوان الدراسة: "

أداة الدراسة: • مقابلاً
• معلمة اللغة الإنجليزية في المرحلة الثانوية.
• مشرف اللغة الإنجليزية المباشر لـ.
• عينة الدراسة

المجلس: "شاكرين لحكم وممكنين تعاونكم

الطائف: محمد بن حسن السليماني

web site: www.taifedu.gov.sa
الهاتف: ١٢٧٣٦٩٤٥٥ - ١٢٧٣٦٩٤٥٤ - ١٢٧٣٦٩٤٥٣ - ١٢٧٣٦٩٤٥٢
الفاكس: ١٢٧٣٦٩٤٥٤ - ١٢٧٣٦٩٤٥٣
### APPENDIX B. TEACHERS’ INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Research Questions</th>
<th>The teachers Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What methods and approaches do these high school EFL teachers believe they apply in their classrooms? | 1) How do you explain your curriculum to others (parents, supervisors)?
2) How often (total=100%) do you use English language when teaching and for what purpose?
3) How often (total=100%) do your students use English language and for what purpose?
4) What are the various components of world language that you address in your instruction on a weekly basis (e.g. Reading)? How much time per week (total=100%) do you focus on each component?
5) What methods do you use to teach the curriculum? |
| 2. What, if any, support and training have these high school EFL teachers received before and during implementation of teaching the new curriculum? | 6) Do you have support from others (curriculum developer, supervisors, teachers, administrators, parents, etc.) with the implementation of communicative language teaching? Please explain.
7) What type of support would help you implement the new curriculum? |
| 3. What barriers do EFL teachers face in implementing the new curriculum? | 8) Have you studied abroad at a university? If, so where and how long?
9) What do you do to maintain your competence in English language?
10) Have you taken any educational courses that have addressed any of EFL approaches and methods?
11) How did you apply EFL methods?
12) How did you assess students? |
APPENDIX B. Continued

EFL Teachers Preliminary Questionnaire

1. Name:

2. Age:

3. World language(s) you teach:

4. World language(s) you can speak:

5. How long have you been an EFL teacher

6. Levels of EFL you currently teach:

7. What degree(s) do you hold?
APPENDIX C. TEACHERS CONSENT FORM

Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
Bowling Green State University

Title of Project: EFL Teachers’ Perspectives of the New Curriculum Training in Taif, Saudi Arabia
Principal Investigator: Muhammad Alsufyani
Contact Information: 529 Education Building, Bowling Green, OH 43403 mlasufy@bgsu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: I will investigate methods and approaches that you use when teaching English. I would like to investigate how you are adapting to the curriculum changes made by the Saudi Arabian government. I also will ask you what training and support you have received to adjust to using the new curriculum. The research questions for my study are:

   1. What methods and approaches do these high school EFL teachers believe they apply in their classrooms?
   2. What, if any, support and training have these high school EFL teachers received before and during implementation of teaching the new curriculum?
   3. What barriers do EFL teachers face in implementing the new curriculum?

2. Procedures to be followed: I will interview you with open-ended questions in order to collect more information about methods and approaches that you use in your classroom and the training you may have received when the English curriculum changed, and if you were required to use the new textbook series. First, I will ask you individually to answer general questions about your age, experience in teaching, and academic degrees. Then, I will ask you specific questions about your teaching methodology, training received, and then any barriers that prevent you from applying the new curriculum. You will be interviewed individually twice within two weeks. Each interview will take around 45 minutes. I would like to record the interviews and take notes during the interview. I will use my iphone to record the interviews. I will save every file under the respondent’s pseudonym after every interview. For security, I will send the recorded files to my BGSU’s mail mlasufy@bgsu.edu and then delete them from the iphone. I will transcribe the recorded interviews after each meeting. I will also interview your English as a Foreign Language supervisor who advises you after I interview you. I will not interview any English as a Foreign Language supervisors who do not advise and oversee you. Your English as a Foreign Language supervisor will be asked about what he observed in your classroom and if there were any given, offered supports from him, MacMillan (the new curriculum developer) or from any other resources. During the supervisor’s interview, I will not discuss any of your responses nor your pseudonyms for the study.

3. Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Any risks associated with the supervisors knowing the participants would be minor because in Saudi Arabia, the education system works on a national level, where an individual supervisor does not have the authority to affect teachers’ employment or salary. The Minister of Education and The Taif Education Office Director, not supervisors nor principals, are the only people who have the direct authority to investigate the actions of teachers.
Participant responses will be confidential. Your name and the names of the participants will be removed from all documents and replaced with pseudonyms. The supervisor will not be provided with your pseudonym or responses.

4. Benefits: The findings of this study may benefit you as an English as a Foreign Language teacher by discovering the common methods and/or approaches used by other world language teachers. I hope that by interviewing you, I can better understand English as a Foreign Language teachers’ needs and perspectives in Taif high schools. I want to understand how your and other English as a Foreign Language teachers’ values and beliefs impact daily instruction. I also want to learn about barriers that English as a Second Language teachers face with instruction. You and each participant will receive a copy of my thesis, after it has been submitted to the university.

5. Duration/Time: You and the other two participants will be interviewed individually and during two different interviews. Every interview will take around 45 minutes. The interviews will take place during a two-week period.

6. Statement of Confidentiality: Only I will know your identity. Information from this study will not be given to identify you or your school. The focus of my study is the common methods and/or approaches English as a Foreign Language teachers use in general, and their general values and beliefs about world language pedagogy. Your names will be removed from the data and replaced with pseudonyms.

7. Right to Ask Questions: You have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. You can ask me questions about the research. You can contact me via email at malsufy@bgsu.edu or by phone at +966504705250, or contact my thesis advisor via email at bburke@bgsu.edu or by phone at +1 419-372-7324. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, contact Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at +1(419) 372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu.

8. Voluntary Participation: Participation is voluntary. You can withdraw from the study at any time by notifying me. You can decline to answer specific questions if you wish. If you decide not to participate in this study, your relationship with Bowling Green State University will not be impacted. You must be at least 18 years or older to participate in this study.

If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records if you would like one.

Participant Signature __________________________ Date ______________

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

Investigator Signature __________________________ Date ______________
APPENDIX D. ALI'S MEMBER CHECK

1. Could you give me a specific example about “mind storming”? Give me an example of a lesson that you used “mind storming” in perhaps? What type of questions did you use in this lesson to facilitate the “mind storming”?  

2. What did you do with the selected videos that mentioned you used during your interview? How did you teach “the body shop” reading lesson? How did you approach the reading lesson in general? How do you explain the new words to students? Did you translate, how much of L1 and L2 did you use out of 100%? Did you have a discussion during this lesson with the students?  

3. How many nationalities do you teach?  

4. Are you allowed as an EFL teacher to choose and organize the textbooks’ lessons according to your and your students’ interests?  

5. Do you have to cover the entire textbooks for each level?  

6. Did you attend any workshops that were presented by your current supervisor?  

7. Why do you believe your students are not able to use English as the textbook developer suggested?  

8. Do you use the workbook, how often? How do you use it in the classroom?  

9. Do students have access to the interactive book? How is the interactive textbook useful for the students?  

10. What do your students think about the new curriculum?  

11. Do you think it’s important to visit an English-speaking country? If yes, why?  

12. How is prior knowledge important for teachers and students? Give an example please.
APPENDIX E. SAMI’S MEMBER CHECK

1. What are the various components of world language that you address in your instruction on a weekly basis (e.g. Reading)? How much time per week (total=100%) do you focus on each component?

2. How do you approach a reading lesson? How do you explain the new words to your students? Do you translate, how much, out of 100%, do you use L1 or L2? Do you facilitate discussion in this lesson? You can refer to the “Saving Money” lesson or other lessons.

3. How many nationalities do you teach?

4. Do you think the length of the EFL curriculum you need to teach in a semester is a barrier to implementing the new curriculum?

5. What do your students think about the new curriculum?

6. Is it allowed for you as an EFL teacher to choose and organize the textbooks’ lessons according to your and/or your students’ interests?

7. Do you have to cover the entire textbook for each level?

8. Do you think it’s important to visit English-speaking country? If yes, explain why.

9. How is prior knowledge important for teachers and students? Give an example please.

10. Do you use the workbook in your classroom? How often and how do you use it? Is there an interactive version of workbook?

11. Do students have access to the interactive textbook? If yes, how the interactive textbook is useful for the students?
### APPENDIX F. SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Research Questions</th>
<th>The supervisor Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.** What methods and approaches do these high school EFL teachers believe they apply in their classrooms? | 1. How often do you visit the EFL teachers inside their classrooms?  
2. During your field visits, what do you usually look for and notice in the EFL classrooms? Explain? |
| **2.** What, if any, support and training have these high school EFL teachers received before and during implementation of teaching the new curriculum? | 3. When did you meet the two teachers you are supervising?  
4. Did the Ministry of Education/Education Office at Taif offer EFL courses for those teachers in your district? If yes, explain?  
5. Did the EFL teachers receive any training courses in dealing with the new curriculum? Who offered the training, if any was offered? |
| **3.** What barriers do EFL teachers face in implementing the new curriculum? | 6. How do EFL teachers assess their students?  
7. From your experience, what do you think the EFL teachers’ needs in dealing with the new curriculum? |

#### EFL Supervisor Preliminary Questionnaire

1. Name:  
2. Age:  
3. World language(s) you can speak:  
4. How long have you been an EFL supervisor?  
5. Levels of EFL classrooms you observe:  
6. What degree(s) do you hold?
Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
Bowling Green State University

Title of Project: EFL Teachers’ Perspectives of the New Curriculum Training in Taif, Saudi Arabia

Principal Investigator: Muhammad Alsufyani
Contact Information: 529 Education Building, Bowling Green, OH 43403 mlasufy@bgsu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: I will investigate methods and approaches that you observe in the two chosen teachers’ classrooms. I would like to investigate how they adapted to the curriculum changes made by the Saudi Arabian government. I also will ask you what training and support they have received and you have offered to adjust to using the new curriculum. The research questions for my study are:

   1. What methods and approaches do these high school EFL teachers believe they apply in their classrooms?
   2. What, if any, support and training have these high school EFL teachers received before and during implementation of teaching the new curriculum?
   3. What barriers do EFL teachers face in implementing the new curriculum?

2. Procedures to be followed: I will interview you with open-ended questions in order to collect more information about methods and approaches that you observed in the teachers’ classrooms and the training that they may have received after the English curriculum changed, and if they were required to use the new textbook series. First, I will ask you individually to answer general questions about your age, experience in teaching and supervising, and academic degrees. Then, I will ask you specific questions about your teachers’ methodologies, training received, and any barriers that prevent them from applying the new curriculum. You will be interviewed individually twice within two weeks. Each interview will take around 45 minutes. I would like to record the interviews and take notes during the interview. I will use my iphone to record the interviews. I will save every file under the respondent’s pseudonym after every interview. For security, I will send the recorded files to my BGSU’s mail mlasufy@bgsu.edu and then delete them from the iphone. I will transcribe the recorded interviews after each meeting. I will not discuss any of your responses with the other participants of the study.

3. Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Participant responses will be confidential. Your name and the names of the participants will be removed from all documents and replaced with pseudonyms.

4. Benefits: The findings of this study may benefit you as an English as a Foreign Language supervisor by discovering the common methods and/or approaches used by world language teachers. I hope that by interviewing you, I can better understand English as a Foreign Language teachers’ needs and perspectives in Taif high schools. I want to understand how your English as a Foreign Language teachers’ values and beliefs impact their daily instruction. I also want to learn about
barriers that English as a Second Language teachers face with instruction. You and each participant will receive a copy of my thesis, after it has been submitted to the university.

5. **Duration/Time:** You and the other two participants will be interviewed individually and during two different interviews. Every interview will take around 45 minutes. The interviews will take place during a two-week period.

6. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Only I will know your identity. Information from this study will not be given to identify you or your school. The focus of my study is the common methods and/or approaches English as a Foreign Language teachers use in general, and their general values and beliefs about world language pedagogy. Your names will be removed from the data and replaced with pseudonyms.

7. **Right to Ask Questions:** You have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. You can ask me questions about the research. You can contact me via email at malsufy@bgsu.edu or by phone at +966504705250, or contact my thesis advisor via email at bburke@bgsu.edu or by phone at +1 419-372-7324. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, contact Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at +1(419) 372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu.

8. **Voluntary Participation:** Participation is voluntary. You can withdraw from the study at any time by notifying me. You can decline to answer specific questions if you wish. If you decide not to participate in this study, your relationship with Bowling Green State University will not be impacted. You must be at least 18 years or older to participate in this study.

If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records if you would like one.

__________________________  _____________________  
Participant Signature  Date

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

__________________________  _____________________  
Investigator Signature  Date
APPENDIX H. FAHAD'S MEMBER CHECK

1. How do the two participant teachers or other EFL teachers you oversee approach reading lessons?

2. How many nationalities are the EFL teachers’ that you oversee? Are all of them native Arabic speakers?

3. One of the barriers you mentioned in your interview was that, EFL teachers should also have a good level in English in order to be able to manage the class efficiently and crate real situations where students need to use English. From your perspective, what are the main reasons for their current English level? What are your suggestions or solutions to improve their English level? If the EFL teachers’ level has improved, do you think this would help to improve students’ levels?

4. Do EFL teachers have to cover the entire textbooks for each level?

5. How do your teachers integrate technology in their classrooms? If any, please explain.

6. Do the participant teachers and other teachers you observe use the workbook. If so, how often and how do they use it?

7. Do the students have access to the interactive textbook? If yes, how is the interactive textbook useful for students?

8. Do you think it’s important to visit an English-speaking country? If yes, please explain.

9. How is prior knowledge important for teachers and students? Give an example please.
# APPENDIX I. DATES OF INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>First Interview Date</th>
<th>Second Interview Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>April 12th, 2016</td>
<td>April 20th, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sami</td>
<td>April 13th, 2016</td>
<td>April 22nd, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fahad</td>
<td>April 15th, 2016</td>
<td>April 25th, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>