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With the advent of globalization and technological development, English has become a necessary tool of international communication in many areas such as education, business, politics, commerce, science, and technology throughout the world. Also, English has become the most widely taught foreign language in the world (Kachru & Nelson, 1996). Moreover, the issue of successful implementation of the English language curriculum has been the focus of a number of studies. In the case of Libya, however, little research has been conducted on teachers’ perceptions of the new English language curriculum in Libyan high schools. Thus, teachers’ voices have not been examined or heard regarding this issue in the TEFL field. This study was conducted in a region of Libya called Tarhuna, southeast of the capital Tripoli, where there has been no study with the scale and scope of this research.

The study showed that there were differences between the degrees of CLT principles practice. The percentage of CLT principles practice was 75.4%, with an average mean score of 3.77. Results also showed a number of factors that are considered as major concerns by the participants. These factors included teacher’s limited time for teaching CLT materials, insufficient funding, students’ low English proficiency, teachers’ lack of training in CLT, few opportunities for in-service training in CLT, large classes, lack of support from colleagues and administrators, a focus on rote memorization in teaching and learning, students’ resistance to a learner-centered classroom, students’ lack
of motivation for developing communicative competence, and students’ resistance to class participation. The mismatch between the realities of the classroom, student resistance, and the principles and goals of the new curriculum created a significant challenge for teachers. The data indicate that there is a gap between what is expected in the new curriculum and what is actually being done in classrooms.

Therefore, I believe the findings of this study provide invaluable information that can be used for the revision and improvement of the English language curriculum in Libyan high schools. The study also sheds some light on the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum, reveals some of the obstacles and barriers that teachers encounter in implementing the curriculum, and provides recommendations to overcome these barriers where they exist. The purpose of this study was to investigate and evaluate the implementation process of the new English language curriculum in Libyan high schools by examining teachers’ perceptions of the curriculum and how it is taught and reflected in their classroom practices.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Study background

“If curriculum innovation is the goal, it is not enough to merely publish a new curriculum or assessment standards, particularly in the context of a developing country. [...] Detailed attention needs to be given to how the curriculum ideals will be realized in practice” (Rogan, 2006, p. 19).

This study has been inspired by my own experiences: first, as a learner of English as a second language; then, as a teacher of English in both high school and university settings; and recently, as a graduate student in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Denver. I have experienced English language curricula as a learner and as a teacher, and now I am investigating it as a doctoral student in the field of curriculum and instruction. In other words, I have experienced the three different types of curricula: intended, operational, and received (Marsh & Willis, 2007). Taking these types of curricula into account is crucial for designing and assessing a new curriculum if the gap between what is planned or intended and what is actually learned by the students is ever to be minimized.

During my middle and high school experiences learning English, I had to memorize the lists of new words and grammatical rules given to me by my teachers on a daily basis. I had to be ready for the pop quizzes my teachers used as a way of evaluating learning. Therefore, the major motive I had to study was examinations and quizzes. I always wondered if there were other ways for me to learn English than by the traditional
memorization process that most teachers at that time adopted. I liked to use English communicatively rather than just memorizing new vocabulary and grammatical rules, which was the dominant approach followed by my teachers. When I entered college, I chose to major in the English language, wishing to be a teacher of English who could and would do something different in teaching this subject. I was also inspired by my negative experiences in high school to be an English teacher. I always wanted to create an environment of learning that was interactive, interesting, constructive, and meaningful where students felt less stressed out and benefited more (Brown, 2003).

As a result, I completed my undergraduate degree in English with a focus in teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) in Libya. It was a theoretically and practically sound program. We learned about different approaches to teaching and learning English as a second/foreign language. I was most interested in communicative, experiential, and constructivist approaches that established a learning atmosphere with plenty of opportunities for learners to interact, explore, and be responsible for their own learning (Flynn, Mesibov, Vermette, & Smith, 2003).

When I finished university in the early 1990s and was appointed as a high school teacher, all my dreams of creating an interactive classroom environment and reducing the monologue classroom discourse started to fade. This disappointment was caused in part by the standards of an educational system where teachers have to follow a scripted, step-by-step curriculum based on a traditional teacher-centered approach to language teaching. As a result, learning was evaluated through standardized tests. As teachers, we were not given room to use our creative thinking and apply what we learned from our university
experiences about how to effectively teach the English language. We were told by people in charge to stick to the prescribed textbook. Although we were restricted by these standards and norms, I and some of my colleagues tried hard to be creative and apply the knowledge we learned about teaching English in a more interactive mode.

I continued teaching English for two years in high schools from 1993 to 1995 when I joined the university as a teaching assistant. Then I completed my master’s degree in applied linguistics from Cardiff University, UK in 2004. From 2004 to 2008, I chaired the English Department at the School of Arts, Almerghib University in Libya. In 2009, I had the chance to join the doctoral program in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Denver. I decided to devote my research toward the investigation of the implementation of English language curricula in Libyan high schools, thereby making me more informed and qualified to participate in the efforts to improve English language curricula and teaching in Libya.

As Rogan (2006) states, “[T]he educational systems in the developing countries may not have the capacity to introduce and sustain deep change” (p. 2). Investigating the curriculum and how it is implemented is of vital importance, so that change is done on a reasonable basis.

Prior to the introduction of a new curriculum in the early 2000s, English was taught through traditional methods of language teaching: the traditional grammar-translation method and audio-lingual method. As a result, students were accustomed to memorization and drill recitation rather than using language communicatively and interactively. As a result, students continue on to university lacking knowledge of how to
use English communicatively. Then, the old Libyan government decided to make a top-down change to most of the school curricula, adopting modern theories and approaches to language teaching and learning. The goal of this change was to update the curricula and help students learn to use language in everyday life instead of just memorizing it and reciting certain drills.

**Statement of the problem**

With the advent of globalization and technological development, English has become a necessary tool of international communication in many areas such as education, business, politics, commerce, science, and technology throughout the world. Also, English has become the most widely taught foreign language in the world (Kachru & Nelson, 1996).

The widespread use of English has had a significant impact on foreign language education, including English education in Libya. Presently, especially since the early 2000s, government and education policies put emphasis on English and technology. Accelerated globalization and easy access to the Internet also promoted English as a major tool for utilizing information resources; therefore, acquiring the skills to speak and write in English has become a necessity.

The need for communication in English has played an important role in curricular restructuring at both the middle and high school levels. English is compulsory for all students in Libyan middle and high schools. While there was no specific method or approach for teaching the English language, teachers followed the traditional grammar-translation method because it fit their own way of managing the class and saved time and
effort. Since teachers were required to finish the entire textbook within the time allotted, they tried to cover the language content regardless of whether students learned the language communicatively. Consequently, most students could not express themselves in English when they started university, even after studying for six years in middle and high school.

With the realization of students’ learning needs and shifts in the field of English language teaching, the English education program in Libya has experienced a paradigm shift since the early 2000s from a focus on receptive skills, such as memorizing new words and repeating grammatical rules, to a focus on productive skills that enable students to use English functionally and communicatively in an appropriate way. To enhance students’ proficiency in the English language, the curriculum shifted from the traditional grammar-translation method to one based on the communicative language approach. The new curriculum encourages learners to acquire the language for communicative purposes rather than memorizing the rules and new words.

Communicative language teaching (CLT) emphasizes the development and growth of students’ communicative competence in the target language. Although CLT has been recognized as a successful approach for English teaching by both researchers and teachers (e.g., Lee & Van Pattern, 1995; Yalden, 1987), and has been widely accepted as a dominant language teaching approach (Kachru, 1992; Phillipson, 1992), difficulties with the implementation of CLT has been identified because of standardized testing, time allocation, and other cultural factors (Anderson, 1993; Burnaby & Son, 1989; Gorsuch, 2000; Liu, 1999).
Little research has been conducted on teachers’ perceptions of this new English language curriculum in Libyan High Schools. Therefore, teachers’ voices have not been examined or heard regarding this issue in the TEFL field. Moreover, as mentioned above, the motivation and interest for this study comes from my personal experiences as a learner, teacher, and researcher in the field of curriculum and instruction. When I worked as a lecturer at the university, I had contact with in-service teachers of English, and I heard them complaining about the curriculum change. Many of them believed that the new curriculum was beyond their knowledge and capabilities to teach and that the authorities did not supply them with the necessary elements for successful instruction, such as CD players, visual aids, and other technology. These teachers also indicated that actual classroom practice did not usually reflect the planned curriculum.

Thus, it is important to evaluate and assess how the new curriculum is implemented, and to determine to what extent the new curriculum is reflected in the pedagogical practices inside the classroom. Moreover, it is vital to know whether the objectives of the new curriculum are being met by these pedagogical practices. In this study, I examine what the teachers think of the new curriculum and how it can best be implemented. The ultimate goal of this study, then, is to look at the relationship between the intended curriculum and teachers’ practices in the classroom in order to make recommendations to the Libyan Ministry of Education to enhance the situation of English language teaching.

**Significance of the study**

This study was conducted in a region of Libya called Tarhuna, southeast of the capital Tripoli, where there has been no study with the scale and scope of this research. Therefore, I believe the findings of this study provide invaluable information for the
The purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate and evaluate the implementation process of the new English language curriculum in Libyan high schools by examining teachers’ perceptions of the curriculum and how it is taught and reflected in their classroom practices. Therefore, the study aims to: a) evaluate and critique the high school English curriculum, b) explore and describe teachers’ perceptions regarding English instruction in high school settings, and c) identify the strengths and weaknesses of the high school English curriculum and how it resonates with teachers’ beliefs about English language teaching and learning. Knowledge of English language instruction is crucial for Libyan high school teachers since some of them will go back to universities and pursue graduate degrees in TEFL; their perceptions may impact not only their current classroom practices but also future curriculum reform and change. This study surveys teachers from urban and suburban areas of the identified region of Libya.

The research questions

This research aims to uncover any barriers teachers may encounter in their instructional practices and help them find a way to facilitate their teaching. The study attempts to answer the following research questions:
• How have English teachers in Libyan high schools implemented the new curriculum?

• What factors facilitate or inhibit the implementation of the new curriculum? What effect do these factors have on the implementation of this curriculum?

• What are teachers’ perceptions of the planned curriculum and the relationship between the operationalized curriculum and the planned curriculum in their classrooms?

• What implications does the relationship between the operational and the planned curriculum have for the English language curriculum in Libya?
Chapter Two: Literature Review

From this point on, the phrase “the researcher” will be used instead of I to keep the objectivity and avoid bias in the research.

The educational system in Libya

Two major factors were influential as far as schooling is concerned in Libya before oil exploration. Prior to the oil reserve discovery in the 1950s, schools were only established in major cities like Tripoli, the capital. These schools were mainly run and sponsored by the Italian administration or by the British administration; the language of instruction was either English or Italian at these institutions, and teachers were mostly British, Italian, or American. Yet, only privileged people and people who had connections with the Italian or British administrations could enroll and be educated.

After the exploration of oil and the enhancement of the economic conditions of the country, the government authorities started to build schools, universities, and technical institutes; middle and high schools spread across the country. According to Chaplin (1987), the number of students increased sharply from 34,000 in 1951 to reach nearly 360,000 by 1969, when a military coup took place. This number kept rising to 1,043,653 students in elementary, middle, and high schools and about 377,823 students in collegial, technical institutes, and universities (Libyan Ministry of Education). The government also increased the number of students sent abroad for graduate and undergraduate studies as a human investment project. According to the Ministry of
Education (2009), the number reached 5,734 students over the past two years. In fact, the Ministry also mentions that the academic year 2009/2010 saw 110,488 students enrolled as first graders. Due to the increased price of oil, Libya invested some of its revenue in education. According to the Ministry, the number of schools throughout the country in 2007 was 4,298, and the number of students in these schools was 1,043,653. Students enrolled in institutes and universities numbered 377,823.

![Figure 1. Increase in student enrollment over time](image)

Education in Libya is free for all citizens from the elementary to university level, and it is compulsory at the elementary stage through secondary stage. Across all these
levels, there is no separation between male and female students, with the exception of all-girl and all-boy schools. In general, Libya supports coeducational schools. The pre-university stages of education are divided into three levels: elementary, middle, and high school. Students are generally 6-12 years old in elementary school; 12-15 years old in middle school; and 15-18 years old in high school. The system has, however, undergone some major changes: the government’s new vision in the mid-1990s was to combine the elementary and middle school levels into a nine year stage, after which time students decided the area of study to engage in for the specialized high school level. Specialized high schools include engineering, medicine, and arts, among other subjects. Higher education is represented by universities, as well as general and polytechnic institutions. Public institutions are all funded by the government.

Compared to other educational systems—such as those in Europe, America, and Japan—and despite the government’s attempts at decentralization, the Libyan educational system is still very standardized, and the Ministry of Education is in charge of everything related to schools. All decisions and policies regarding administrative regulations and curricula are made at the level of the Ministry. Yet, to facilitate the application and follow-through of these decisions and policies, the country is divided into 15 educational regions. The Ministry has direct contact with the regional administrations that are in turn in charge of implementing the policies and decisions.

The Department of Curricula and Instruction at the Ministry is responsible for making all curricular decisions, including setting the goals and objectives. The Department also produces the textbooks, teachers’ guides, and other instructional
materials. These textbooks and guides are sent to the local administration for distribution in the schools. As a result, teachers are required to teach the textbooks and follow the guides as prescribed by the Ministry within a specific period of time. Teachers do not have room to use their own creative capabilities and intuitions in instruction and are restricted by these standards and regulations.

Another example of the centralized policies in the Libyan educational system is the Department of Evaluation and Assessment at the Ministry of Education. The main job of this Department is to decide the assessment and evaluation for all students, as well as the policies that come along with the curricula to be taught. This Department writes and distributes the standardized test that every senior high school student must take at the end of the school year. If students do not pass this test, they have one opportunity to retake it; if they fail again, they have to repeat their senior year. This exam is distributed to all schools at the same time across the country.

The English language curriculum begins in the seventh grade in Libya. The class period for English, as for other subjects, is 45 minutes a day. Prior to the introduction of the new curriculum, schools used a textbook called *English for Libya*, published and produced by the Ministry of Education. This curriculum was based on a teacher-centered approach and was taught by teachers according to the grammar-translation method (Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983). However, students would leave high school lacking knowledge of how to use the English language in communicative settings both orally and in written form. With the advent of information technology and globalization, communicative competence in English became a necessity. Therefore, in 2005, the
government decided to make top-down reforms of all curricula, including English language. The Ministry contracted with a British company called Garnet to produce a new curriculum for Libyan middle and high schools. The new curriculum is based on a commutative approach to language teaching (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). This approach focuses on teaching language in authentic contexts and emphasizes the communicative and social aspects of English. However, as far as I am aware, this large scale reform took place only on the textbook level and ignored other components vital to the success of curricular reform, including technology supply, professional development, teachers’ beliefs, students’ needs, and school structures such as space and time (Uhrmacher, 1997).

Methods and approaches to language teaching

The field of foreign language teaching has been under the influence of educational theories such as behaviorism, functionalism, and cognitivism as has any other discipline in the humanities and social sciences. Specialists have developed different approaches and methods to find more effective ways to teach language. As a result, there have been numerous shifts and changes in classroom practices in the area of foreign language teaching. New approaches and methods are produced every quarter century, with each new method presenting a break from the old (Brown, 1980). Proponents of each new method believe theirs to be more effective than the one’s preceding it. These claims are based on the notion that the newer methods are sounder theories of language teaching and learning than their older counterparts.

These paradigm shifts have been driven partially by variations in the challenges and conditions of foreign language teaching, and also by theoretical advancements in the
areas of linguistics, psychology, and psycholinguistics. However, within foreign language teaching methodology, there is a distinction between methods and approaches. The former refers to fixed teaching methods, while the latter refers to the teaching philosophies that can be interpreted and applied in different ways. The American applied linguist Edward Anthony suggests three hierarchical levels of methodologies: an approach, a method, and a technique. The approach is defined as “a set of assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning” (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p. 16). Thus, the approach is axiomatic because it involves beliefs and principles, while the method is “an overall plan for orderly presentation of language material, no part of which contradicts, and all of which is based upon, the selected approach” (p. 15).

In other words, the approach is broader in notion than the method. As cited in Richards and Rodgers (1986), within one approach, there may be many methods. A technique is implementational—that which takes place in the classroom. It is a particular trick, stratagem, or contrivance which accomplishes an immediate objective. Techniques must be consistent with a method, and therefore in harmony with a given approach. (p. 15)

According to this view, an approach is the level at which beliefs and assumptions about language teaching and learning are identified. On the other hand, a method is the level at which theoretical principles and philosophies about language teaching and learning are experienced and where choices are selected regarding the skills to be taught, the content to be taught, and the organization the content will be presented (Brown, 1980; Richard & Rodgers, 1986). At the technique level, which is identified as the level classroom
procedures and practices are described, the rapid development in theory and the reaction among schools of thought during the period between the 1950s and 1980s is often known as “the age of methods” (Howat, 1984).

Because of the appropriate fit in certain circumstances in the area of language teaching, some methods and their affiliated approaches kept their status long after they had fallen out of general favor. What is taught and how it is taught depends in part on students’ needs and also their previous knowledge and experiences, or simply on other sources. For example, the relative importance of speaking over writing and reading, or grammar over pronunciation, may impact the method chosen by the instructor.

A further distinction between second language learning and foreign language learning is important in this context. Second language is defined as the language “that is learned in a location where that language is typically used as the main vehicle of everyday communication for most people” (Macintyre, 1998, p. 37). Visual and auditory stimulation are usually present in the context of second language. Nonetheless, when learners of a second language happen to be in an informal setting or inaccurate model of language learning, such as in some immigrant communities, focusing on grammatical structure and accurate pronunciation may be important to make them aware of the correct forms.

On the other hand, Baker and Macintyre (1998) define foreign language as the “one that is learned in a place where that language is not typically used as a medium of ordinary communication” (p. 37). In foreign language learning settings, learners are usually found to be missing a lot of elements that would help enhance their learning
conditions. This may be because of the role of the first language in such contexts, as foreign language learning usually takes place in the first language environment. Unlike second language learners, foreign language learners usually receive the target language input in classroom settings and lack opportunities to practice the language and use it in everyday life as second language learners do. In foreign language settings, great emphasis is put on formal usages, accuracy, and correct grammatical structures if the learners want to speak the language fluently and accurately.

In the 1920s, the British applied linguist Harold Palmer gave a summary of the most general principles of language teaching methodology. These principles and concerns are represented in most of the language teaching methods that are described later in this section. These principles include:

- Initial preparation, guiding and encouraging students toward language learning
- Habit formation, creating and establishing correct habits
- Accuracy
- Gradation, each level preparing the learner for the next
- Proportion, each aspect of language receiving equal emphasis
- Concreteness, moving from the concrete to the abstract
- Interest
- Order of progression, building the language skills as babies do in their first language learning, starting with listening and ending with writing (Richard, 2001).

The paradigm shifts over the past century in the area of language teaching reveal how cyclical the field is in terms of methods and approaches used. According to Brown
(1980), these shifts and changes produced various methods. Each new one emerged from the previous one. Common to each new one has been the claim that it is more effective than the old ones, because it is based on sounder theories of language learning and teaching. These paradigm shifts in language teaching have also been influenced by advances in psychology and linguistics.

The rest of this section introduces and explains the four major teaching methods that have dominated the field over the last century. These methods are: the grammar-translation method that emerged from the classical language teaching field; the direct method rooted in modern languages teaching; the audio-lingual method based on the theory of behaviorist psychology and structural linguistics; and the communicative method based on the notions of sociolinguistics.

**Grammar-Translation Method**

The grammar-translation method came to prominence as the Renaissance era approached its end, and when Latin and ancient Greek were no longer learned or taught for communicative purposes in any linguistic community. After World War I, especially in the United States, there was a need for a language teaching method through which a foreign language could be taught effectively. Results of a longitudinal study conducted on the success of modern foreign language teaching in the United States in the year 1924 showed that the short time spent in foreign language classes in both high schools and universities did not give enough opportunities for learners to acquire a minimal proficiency in the target language. This was noticeable in the students’ linguistic capabilities in the four language domains: reading, writing, speaking, and listening.
Consequently, taking into account the paucity of classroom time, it was suggested that educational institutions devoted to language teaching and learning focus on reading skills as the most reasonably learnable skill (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

Based on this theoretical interpretation of foreign language teaching and the recommendations made, the grammar-translation method was adopted and dominated the field of language teaching, especially in the United States, for the first half of the last century. The focus of this language teaching method is on reading skills, and little attention is paid to the communicative aspect of the language. Teachers use translation as the main instructional strategy. They translate the target content and match it with its equivalent in the first language of the learners. Grammatical structures and rules are taught to aid reading comprehension, and pronunciation is only crucial for classroom intelligibility (Oliva, 1969). Students are taught to memorize the rules, errors are not tolerated, and teachers are expected to correct errors every time they occur. Thus, the role of the first language in the process of foreign language acquisition is evident. Stern (1983) states, “[T]he first language is maintained as the reference system in the acquisition of the second language” (p. 455). This explains why teachers adopting this method depend heavily on their first language in their classroom practices.

The main features of grammar-translation, according to Mackey (1965), are as follows: 1) grammar is an outline for the formal grammar and the vocabulary depends on the selected text; 2) the teaching starts with rules, decontextualized vocabulary items, and translation; 3) new vocabulary items and grammatical rules are listed to be memorized out of context; and 4) there is little emphasis on pronunciation and it is taught only
occasionally. Therefore, the major emphasis is on the memorization of new vocabulary items and new grammatical rules. As Mackey (1965) claimed:

In the grammar translation method the rules for grammar to be used are strongly emphasized in order to keep the student aware of why and when he should develop a specific sentence. The problem with this notion is that most of the students are confused with these rules that they have to learn and their interest and desire for language learning are generally decreased. The primary purpose of this method was to teach rules, and the secondary, the application of rules. This method neither stressed accurate pronunciation nor the competence to express oneself in a free conversational exchange. (p. 151)

In addition to the features mentioned above, Richard and Rodgers (1986) identified major characteristics of the grammar-translation method:

- It is a method that approached the target language via a detailed analysis of its grammatical structure; then, teachers are expected to apply knowledge by translating sentences and texts from and to the target language using the learners’ first language in order to understand the morphology and syntax of the foreign language. Reading and writing were out of the focus in this method and little systemic attention was paid to the social and communicative aspect of the language.

- Bilingual vocabulary lists, dictionaries, and memorization are the only strategies used to teach new selected vocabulary items. Students are expected to memorize the new words by translating them to their equivalents in the first language.

- Unlike earlier approaches to language teaching, this method used and depended on grammar extensively, with the idea that it would make language learning easier.

- Accuracy was preferred, and errors are intolerable; grammar was taught deductively, and most syllabi based on grammar-translation had a sequence of grammatical rules and structure in each lesson.

- Teachers depended heavily on the students’ first language as a medium of instruction. (p. 6)

However, this method of language teaching received extensive criticism. Morris (1965) claims the emphasis on forms and the memorization of decontextualized vocabulary in this approach may help build up some knowledge, yet it does not help build
the speaking and listening skills required for communicative purposes in the target language context. Moreover, Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983) noticed that focusing on grammar and ignoring other language skills “led to learning about the language rather than learning to use the language” (p. 5). Contrary to this viewpoint, Hammerly (1982) believes that the grammar-translation method is practically advantageous. This method does not require deep knowledge of the language or of the teaching techniques needed and, therefore, is a less demanding method both physically and emotionally. It was a common method until the middle of the last century, when a new method was introduced in an attempt to fill the gap that the grammar-translation method failed to do.

**The Direct Method**

As a reaction against the grammar-translation method, several alternatives were developed; one of these methods is the direct method. It was described as “… one of the most widely used known and the one has caused the most controversy” (Mackey, 1965, p. 161). The direct method came also as a result of the growing interest in teaching language for speaking purposes. This method focused on communicative practice; however, grammar and vocabulary were taught by the gradation and sequencing of the materials. Adopting this method, teachers experienced their classroom practices in a foreign language without using translation and postponing reading and writing skills to later stages. Teachers using this method were expected to build a communicative classroom environment without a focus on rules and deductive thinking. However, grammar was taught sequentially through artificial contexts, and no authentic natural communicative settings were provided for the learners.
The merit of this method is based on the notion that in order for a person to learn a foreign language easily and effectively, the mechanisms and processes of first language acquisition should be adopted and followed instead of memorizing the rules and new vocabulary items. Although this method emerged in the last century, some claim that its theoretical basis goes back to the year 1880 when Francois Gouin, a French educator and author known for his work in the field of language education, questioned the unsuccessful academic routine of the classical method. Gouin’s ideas, however, were lost in an array of skepticism about the effectiveness of some language teaching methods. Those thoughts of Gouin came back to life and established a foothold in the principles of the direct method (Brown, 1980).

Like other methods, the direct method has its unique features. Some researchers identified these characteristics and listed them as following:

- The use of everyday vocabulary and structure;
- Grammar taught by situation;
- The use of many new items in the same lesson to make the language sound natural and to encourage normal conversation;
- The oral teaching of grammar and vocabulary;
- Concrete meanings taught through object lessons, abstract meanings through the association of ideas;
- Visual presentation used to illustrate grammar;
- The use of extensive listening and imitation until forms become automatic;
- Most work done in the classroom, with much time needed;
- Pronunciation emphasized from the first weeks (Hussein, 1989; Mackey, 1965).
The strength of this method is in its potential to provide learners with the opportunity for intensive immersion into a foreign language, particularly if they have no chance to practice or experience the language in its natural environment. Rivers (1968) states that “the method provides an exciting and interesting way of learning the foreign language through activity” (p. 10). The direct method still has its presence in various forms in today’s language teaching context, a good example being Berlitz language schools (Brown, 1980).

Despite its persistence in the field of language teaching, the good results the method produced, and the popularity this method gained, the direct method received huge criticism. It was criticized for being heavily dependent on skillful teachers and requiring longer classroom time. Further, learning a foreign language is not similar to learning a first language (Hammerly, 1982; Hussein, 1989). Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983) believe that the constructed environment and statements created by teachers in the classroom do not often represent the everyday use of the target language; in other words, there are no authenticities in the classroom practices that reflect the real context of the target language. These critique and observations led researchers to develop a new method that better met the needs of the learners and serve as an effective method of language teaching.

**The Audio-Lingual Method**

With the critiques the previous methods received and with the advancements and developments in the fields of psychology and linguistics, there was a need for an approach that best filled the gap. The two theories were developed in the United States
during World War II because of the ongoing development of foreign language teaching and learning programs. Both behavioral psychology and structural linguistics provided the theoretical baseline for the audio-lingual method. The former provided a model of teaching based on creating behavioral habits by operant conditions, while the latter provided tools for breaking down language into small pieces and contrasting language using a contrastive analysis approach (Brown, 1980). The final fruit of this combination between the merits of structural linguistics and behavioral psychology is what is termed as the audio-lingual method (Met & Galloway, 1992; Valdes, 2001).

Other terms are used to refer to this method, including the oral-aural method and the mimicry-memorization method (Brooks, 1964). In this method, there are no rules to memorize, and language is considered a collection of habits. Therefore, learning a foreign language is viewed as a mechanical process of habit formation. Students are led through a series of stimulus and response situations followed by reinforcement. This is the prominent classroom strategy used by teachers adopting this method. Imitation and memorization are also required to build up the new habits of the target language. The method focuses on speaking and listening by repeating dialogues, through which grammar and vocabulary are also learned. Translation was not a technique used in this method; pattern drills, dialogue memorization, and repetition with an emphasis on pronunciation were evident strategies in this method.

The basic assumption of this method is that learners should learn how to speak before they know how to read and write. Thus, teachers are expected to expose their learners to repeated drills in the target language until it become a habit in the learners’
minds. There is also a great emphasis on accurate pronunciation and intonation; language is viewed from the speech aspect rather than from the writing aspect. According to this method, four language skills are presented in this order: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Rivers (1967) adds, “[B]ecause foreign language is a set of arbitrary symbols adopted by certain community, with an arbitrary standard of acceptable pronunciation, it is obvious that the student should hear it correctly before endeavoring to speak it” (p. 103-104).

The influence of behaviorism and structural linguistics on this method is reflected in the approaches and instructional techniques adopted by its proponents. Richards and Rodgers (1986) list the major characteristics of the approaches and instructional techniques of this method:

- Foreign language learning is a process of habit formation. This can be best achieved through dialogue repetition and memorization and giving the correct response;
- Learning should be based on analogy rather than analysis. Thus, an explanation of the rules are not given until students have experienced and been exposed to the patterns in different contextual settings. Drills are also thought to help learners form new correct analogies;
- Speaking should be taught before writing;
- Language should be learned in cultural context. This implies that teaching a foreign language is teaching the culture of that language. The meanings of the words are better understood through a cultural context rather than as isolated items matched with their equivalents in the learners’ first language (p. 52).

However, teachers and proponents of this method started to realize that it did not actually give the desired results and provided little knowledge of the target language as seen in learners’ language use. Furthermore, the development of cognitive psychology and its
influence on the field of foreign language teaching called for a new method that better met the learners’ needs for the use of foreign language for communicative and functional purposes. There was a need for a method that considered learning a target language as a means of acquiring a conscious control of the phonological, grammatical, and lexical patterns of that language. This led to the thinking that language learning happens in interactive situations, where people wish to communicate with one another or each other rather than in situations far removed for everyday life. Problems and drawbacks associated with the audio-lingual method are believed to be due to several factors. Hammerly (1982) describes these problems as: poor professional development programs; lack of detailed explanation of the method’s goals and procedures; and the absence of technology use in classroom practices.

**Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)**

After the failure of the previous methods of language teaching to enable learners to use the language effectively and appropriately in real communicative contexts, linguists called for an alternative approach that would emphasize “communicative competence.” The rationale for this approach stems from the social study of language known as sociolinguistics (Hymes, 1971; Savignon, 1983; Wales cited in Met & Galloway, 1992). Research conducted in the social sciences has had a major role in forming the communicative approach; therefore, the communicative movement in applied linguistics and language teaching is considered to be a multidisciplinary field that involves linguistics, psychology, anthropology, and sociology (Van Pattern et al., 1987; Van Lier, 1988; Savingnon, 1983; Johnson, 1992).
In this approach, the focus shifted away from grammar and structure towards the social aspects of language. The emphasis is on the way language is used by speakers in various communicative contexts. Thus, in communication-based curricula and instruction, the purpose of language learning and the goal of language teaching are communication. Since “one of the characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language” (Littlewood, 1981, p. 1), such a method may be seen as a realistic response to a practical problem in language teaching that both teachers and researchers in the field of foreign language teaching have been raising for some time. Johnsons (1982) defined this problem as “… the problem of the student who may be structurally competent, but who cannot communicate appropriately” (p. 121). Johnson (1992) referred to this problem as “communicative incompetence” which is considered a feature of the structural approach in language teaching.

This, in turn, resulted in linguists’ and teachers’ awareness of the need for this type of competence in language learning. However, “communicative proficiency does not result from mechanical drill and memorization” (Guntermann & Phillips, 1982, p. 1). It seems that building the learner’s structural competence is not enough. Language teaching should develop the learner’s ability to use the language effectively in real communicative contexts. This is specifically the goal of the communicative language approach.

A number of major features were identified in this approach to language teaching. For example, Nunnan (1999) lists the following as major features of this approach:

- Language is a system of the expression of meaning. Its primary function is communication;
- Activities to promote learning involved real communication, carrying out meaningful tasks, and using language that is meaningful to the learner;
- Objectives reflect the needs of the learner and include functional skills as well as linguistic objectives;
- The syllabus includes some or all of the following: structure, functions, notions, and tasks. Ordering will be guided by learner’s needs;
- The primary role of instructional materials is to promote communicative language use that is task-based and authentic. (p. 246)

It seems, thus, that the emphasis in this method is on building the learner’s communicative competence; Savignon (1983) defined the term “communicative competence” as “the expression, the interpretation, and negotiation of meaning involving interaction between two or more persons or between one person and a written text” (p. 303). This knowledge or competence is also referred to as the ability to use the learned language for actual communication purposes. It implies functional language proficiency in both written and spoken form. Communicative-based language curricula often reflect and contain real-world tasks and authentic materials in the target language (Yalden, 1987).

It is also noticeable that there is a shift in classroom practices and the role of teachers in this approach. In previous methods, the teacher was the center of the classroom practice; however, this role is no longer existent in CLT, as it is intended to be more student-centered in its approach. Therefore, students’ involvement in classroom practices is encouraged, and the role of the teacher is as a facilitator and needs analyst rather than a controller and the only knower in the classroom. This more interactive role of students is completely different from the traditional Libyan students’ role as learners. Libyan students have been seen as passive participants, listeners, and followers of their
teachers (Savignon, 2002). Therefore, teachers and students have to adopt the new classroom roles in order to effectively implement CLT-based curricula; this, I believe, is one of the major obstacles to successful implementation of the new English curriculum based on CLT principles in Libyan high schools.

**Theories and models of language learning**

Understanding language theories is crucial for any discussion of foreign language teaching. Studying and understanding language learning theories involves the study of brain mechanisms and the learning process. There has been extensive research in the area of language learning and several theories have been suggested. One of these theories is what referred to as “Behaviorism”, proposed by Skinner (1968), he claimed that certain linguistic behaviors are learned or acquired through a process of operant conditioning and later expanded via response generalization. Proponents of behaviorism viewed learning as habit formation; therefore, acquiring new linguistic behavior can be achieved as any other skills through the process of stimulus, response, and imitation. In this theory of learning explained earlier, mistakes are not tolerated and teachers are considered the model to be followed.

This was the case until the middle of the last century when a new theory of psychology emerged called cognitive psychology. According to this theory, learning is not achieved through a stimulus-response process. Learning, especially of a new linguistic system, is seen as a process of acquiring conscious control of the phonological, grammatical, and lexical items of the target language. In this respect, Chomsky (2000) refers to what he termed innate ability. Chomsky argues that human beings are born with
a mental capability that makes them able to not only learn the language that they are
exposed to on daily basis but also to learn and produce new utterances of their own to
which they haven’t been exposed. Therefore, children are born with this ability to
produce utterances in their first language that they have not been exposed to or
experienced.

Understanding learning in pedagogical and educational settings has been largely
influenced by Roger (1951). Roger established a theory of learning called “Experiential
Learning which is based on the notion that human nature is made up of healthy, positive,
and constructive impulses that are active from birth onward. Roger’s theory of learning is
concerned primarily with the development of human potential. The theory suggests that
to accomplish effective learning of a language a real facilitator of learning is needed;
however, this facilitation can only be established by creating an internal relationship with
the learner. Teachers need to be authentic and genuine in their classroom practice to be
good facilitators for the learning process. Teachers also need to build trust and gain
acceptance in their classrooms and treat their learners as valuable individuals.
Communication with learners should be open and honest. Proponents of this learning
theory claim that teachers need to know and understand that their learners are individuals
who need to communicate openly with others.

A third major theory in the field of language learning was established by Krashen
(1982) and is known as the Natural Language Acquisition Model. According to this
model of language learning, there are two main processes involved in language
performance. The first is the acquisition process, which is referred to as a subconscious
process. A good example is a child’s acquisition of his/her first language. Learning a new linguistic system comes as a result of meaningful interaction in authentic communication settings: communicative settings in which interlocutors are not concerned with errors or formal structures of the language. The second is the learning process, which is referred to as a conscious process. In this process, learners consciously use their minds to monitor their speech production for any errors while they are performing the language. Krashen claimed that acquired and learned knowledge are not the same. He argued that both aptitude and attitude towards language learning have major roles in the learning process, especially for adult learners since they know how to use and exploit the conscious learning as opposed to children who are not at that stage of brain development yet.

The total command of a language comes through both the conscious and unconscious processes of learning. The unconscious process of language learning is referred to as “acquisition” and usually takes place in the natural settings of the target language. Acquisition is inductive, as opposed to formal learning that happens in formal settings, such as classrooms, and which is usually described as a deductive process (Felder & Henriques, 1995). Therefore, formal learning involves learning the language’s syntactic and semantic systems and is followed by teachers who give feedback and correct the wrong forms. Felder and Henriques suggest that these two processes of language learning are not competitive in nature but rather they complement each other. As teachers of foreign language, we need to be aware that facilitating the two processes in classroom settings will benefit learners.
Moreover, these deductive and inductive processes of language learning are reflected in the teaching methods explained earlier. For instance, the grammar-translation method is described as entirely deductive since students are taught the grammatical rules of the foreign language through translation and then asked to apply them to translate and understand texts. And the direct method is considered as an inductive method of language learning because the instruction is carried out almost entirely in the target language (Felder & Henriques, 1995).

Nonetheless, all the methods described above and the models explained either with regard to teaching or learning do not deal with the social aspect of language learning and teaching. Language learning is a human capacity that does not take place in isolation; it is conducted within social settings where different people come into contact with each other in either formal or informal language learning environments. Therefore, the optimal purpose of language learning is social in nature. Yet this aspect of language learning had been ignored until the 1970s when Halliday and Hymes started to bring to the surface the role of social aspects of language in the learning process. For them, the focus of linguistics and linguistic studies should be steered towards the social aspect of language. This focus should be on the social meaning; namely, this includes a close look at what people say in certain social contexts. Within the socio-educational model of language learning, two important factors were identified to be crucial and influential on the language learning process. Gardner (1985) talks about these two factors and refers to them as “motivation and aptitude” (p. 237). He claims that these two elements determine the success of one’s language learning. Therefore, proponents of this model think that it
applies to language teaching situations where learners have a clear vision of the second language group due to their daily contact with them within that linguistic community.

The success of second or foreign language learning has also been the focus of the acculturation model of language learning. Schumann (1978) suggests that the relationship between foreign or second language learners and the speakers of that language is crucial in the success of second language learning. It is similar to Gardner’s (1985) idea of integrativeness, which refers to the learner’s view of the cultural aspects of the language he/she is learning. Thus, Schumann believes that when there is tension between the social groups, it is highly unlikely that inductive learning will take place. On the contrary, when such tension is absent or very low, acquisition happens because of the interaction between the two groups. Schumann also adds that formal or deductive learning happens regardless of the attitudes second language learners may hold toward the culture or speakers of the learned language. This may be due to the fact that students or learners manipulate the second language consciously. With regard to inductive learning, Schumann (1978) explains that providing the learner with authentic, comprehensible linguistic data of the target language forms the ideal environment for successful learning conditions.

Constructivism is also considered a recent theory of language learning. The constructivist views learning as assembling knowledge from pieces rather than assimilating it whole. This theory has a big impact now in the field of language education (Cobb, 2005). In language learning, Cobb claims that psycholinguists believe that the grammar of language is the particular reality language learners should be reconstructing.
Constructivists challenged Chomsky’s belief that each human being is born with innate ability and within that ability exists what Chomsky termed universal grammar, which was considered the precondition for building knowledge out of these data. In the constructivist’s view, grammatical items and knowledge can be constructed and realized by interaction. Cobb (2005) believes that building up language skills can be achieved through interaction, and the claim that all human beings have universal grammar from which new items can be learned is false. Constructivists believe that language learning can happen by exposing learners to more environmental input. However, this theory was challenged in the field of second language acquisition. Cobb (2005) argues that second language learning is known to be unnatural and making use of raw material as constructivists believe is not always a valid claim. Cobb’s claim is supported by studies conducted on learning second language vocabulary. For example, Laufer and Sim (1985) found that learners were unable to make much use of raw data for the purpose of inferring word meaning (p. 7-9). Moreover, second language classroom practice is short. Namely, constructing the meaning and the rules and mastering them requires a longer time (Cobb, 1997).

It is evident from the above explanation of the teaching methods and models of foreign and second language learning and teaching that there is no one specific method that is optimal for second or foreign language teaching and learning. However, it is useful for teachers to be updated periodically about the way learning happens and how learners go through the stages and levels of learning. This will help teachers follow and choose the most appropriate approach or method according to their learners’ needs and their
teaching situations. It is noticeable also that these learning theories complement each other rather than compete or critique each other. Ostensibly, language learning involves most of the mechanisms mentioned along each model of language learning.

**Curriculum definition**

Curriculum definition, like other educational aspects, is believed to have taken several forms and has been influenced by the epistemological and sociopolitical powers that run the educational system of society (Apple, 1990). Curriculum specialists, theoreticians, and practitioners proposed several definitions of the term “curriculum.” Yet, there is no agreed upon definition of the term. For example, Marsh and Willis (2007) define curriculum as “an interrelated set of plans and experiences that a student undertakes under the guidance of the school” (p. 15). This definition is limited to the experiences and plans that students undertake in schools and according to the school structure and rules. This definition doesn’t take into account the types of curricula happening out of school environment.

However, in an attempt to give a broader definition of the term “curriculum,” Hass (1987) stated that a curriculum includes “all of the experiences that individual learners have in a program of education whose purpose is to achieve broad goals and related specific objectives, which is planned in terms of a framework of theory and research or past and present professional practice” (p. 5). Despite Hass’s attempt to give a wider and broader definition to the notion and concept of curriculum, the definition still leaves out major parts, such as the types of curricula that take place in informal settings like work, home, and clubs. Another definition of “curriculum” is presented by Tanner
(1980). Tanner defined curriculum as “the planned and guided learning experiences and intended outcomes, formulated through the systematic reconstruction of knowledge and experiences under the auspices of the school, for the learners’ continuous and willful growth in personal social competence” (p. 13). These definitions, though, make it clear for many that curricula are not only associated with syllabi but also include all the teaching-learning experiences a student encounters while in school.

Marsh and Willis stress the significance of bridging the gap between the three interrelated types of curricula. They particularly emphasize the balance between the planned curriculum (or in the case of Libya the prescribed curriculum that is handed down to teachers to implement), the taught curriculum (what is actually being practiced in the classroom by teachers), and the experienced curriculum (what students actually take). Uhrmacher (1997) refers to these types as intended, operational, and received, respectively. In addition to these three main types of curricula, researchers identified others types as well that teachers sometimes are not aware of or don’t recognize. These are the null curriculum, hidden curriculum, and shadow curriculum (Eisner, 1994). Finding a balance between the three main types of curricula can help make the education process more effective and meaningful; it helps teachers plan and select their materials to meet their learners’ needs and better fit their learning styles. To achieve such success, then, it is crucial to take into account the students’ and teachers’ stance on curriculum design and curriculum change. As Tyler (1969) indicated, students’ participation in organizing the learning experiences for more effective instruction is crucial. In the case of
the new English curriculum in Libyan high schools, such participation does not exist and the change is always conducted as a top down process.

Curriculum study has been influenced by different theories of learning and teaching. Different approaches and methods claimed to be the most effective for curriculum development and curriculum change. These differences and influences resulted in different curriculum programs associated and impacted by the philosophical premise on which they are based. These theories of learning and teaching have a wide spectrum ranging from behaviorist and structuralist (Skinner), to social and emotional (Freud, Erikson), to constructivist (Piaget; Vygotsky), and most recently to the aesthetic (Uhrmacher).

It appears that the concept of curriculum is beyond these limited definitions and categorizations. Eisner’s (2002) description of curriculum as the set of philosophical, theoretical, and pedagogical approaches to the teaching and learning of learners resonates for the task in Libya. As a result, it is important for curriculum specialists, educators, and teachers to take into account learners’ social, psychological, emotional, cognitive, literacy, and physical development. Thus, active interaction, expedition, experimentation, and authenticity of texts and materials are deemed vital elements for effective curriculum programs across the world. However, these features constitute a tough challenge for curriculum specialists, educators, and teachers.

Panda (2006) suggests that effective curricula should focus on some developmental areas that relate to any learner; these areas are listed as:

- Physical development: development of motor skills and control of body parts;
Social development: who they are and how they should function in relation to others in the society;

Emotional development: ability to express/control their feelings and understand those of others;

Perception and sensory development: the ability to use the different senses to process new information;

Communication and language development: the ability to understand and interact with other people using visual, oral, aural, artistic, etc. stimuli to exchange and express thoughts and feelings;

Cognitive development: how children think and react. (p. 2)

In reference to the ESL curriculum, MacKay (1989) underscores the significance of internal consistency. This involves curriculum guidelines, learning materials, and the assessment procedures that all should be interrelated and consistent with each other. He added that ESL curricula should have five main components: communication, sociocultural awareness, learning-how-to-learn, language and cultural awareness, and general knowledge. Some goals have been presented in different studies. For example, Mackenzie (2002) explains that for English language curriculum reform in Thailand, it was decided that English should be taught starting in first grade instead of fifth grade. The new curriculum focused on communication skills and cultural aspects of English, and it emphasizes the total physical response instructional strategy (TPR).

**Influential factors in curriculum implementation**

What does the word implementation mean? According to Fullan (2007), it means transferring or carrying out ideas, programs, or activities into practice to the people expected to change. In the educational field, implementation can happen at different levels with different degrees. It can be done to curricula, school districts, state policies, or
to the objectives of any educational organization. The implementation process calls for a number of people to be engaged in the process. Fullan adds that implementation in education is not a static process as it consists of interacting variables irrelevant of the analysis type, whether it is factors or themes.

Several studies on curriculum implementation in the field of education have indicated that the manner in which curricula are implemented does not always reflect what curriculum designers have in mind (O’Sullivan, 2004; Smith & Southerland, 2007). As mentioned earlier, this study aims to address the issue of curriculum implementation in Libyan public high schools. It examines the relationship between the intended curriculum and what is being delivered in the actual classroom with reference to English language teaching in Libyan public high schools. A new curriculum based on communicative principles was introduced in 2005 to the Libyan education system. It represented a significant shift, compared to the previous curriculum, in teaching methodology, materials, and the assumptions about language, teaching and learning. The curriculum thus demanded of teachers major adjustments to their thinking, practices, and beliefs. However, the processes involved in introducing the curriculum seem to be limited in their ability to support the scale of the change implied by the curriculum. Additionally, no evaluations of this new curriculum had been conducted on a large scale and with a wider scope. Therefore, little concrete evidence was available about the impact this innovation was having in the classroom. This study comes as a response to these concerns and focuses on how teachers deal with the intended curriculum inside their classrooms. It also seeks to find what extent the taught curriculum reflects the intended
one. I hope by understanding the teachers’ perceptions of the intended curriculum and how they carry it out in the classrooms, I will be able to find out if there are any barriers and the best way to facilitate the teachers’ jobs inside the classrooms.

Curriculum implementation is a reference to what takes place in classrooms. Considering details small or big during the change process is a vital element in achieving the change successfully. However, putting ideas or activities into practice is not an easy task. It requires careful attention, clarity, limiting complexity, and should serve the needs of the targeted people of the change. Elmore as cited in Fullan (2007) summarizes what models of change during the 1970s missed and why they were not as successful as they were expected to be. As mentioned earlier, the process of change is a complex operation and requires full attention and observation. Elmore cited in Fullan (2007) stated:

the complex process by which local curricular decisions get made, the entrenched and institutionalized political and commercial relationships that support existing textbook-driven curricula, the weak incentives operating on teachers to change their practices in their daily work routines, and the extraordinary costs of making large scale, long-standing changes of a fundamental kind in how knowledge is constructed in classroom. (p. 5-6)

McNeil (1996) states, “People often expect that evaluation will solve many pressing problems” (p. 263). In conducting an evaluative study, different evaluation models are used. McNeil makes reference to two models: a consensus model, which requires agreement upon the educational objectives, and the pluralistic view, which
focuses on the activity rather than the intent. Advocates for the latter are more concerned with finding the problem than with offering solutions.

Curriculum innovation and the way it is implemented in the field of education are characterized by extensive literature that examines this phenomenon from multiple perspectives (Fullan, 1996; Markee, 1997). Here we are particularly interested in the relationship between the intended curriculum or the prescribed curriculum and what teachers teach in their classroom, which is usually referred to as the “operational curriculum.” This study also requires an understanding of the factors that may cause differences between the two. This is an issue that has been studied in education generally and, specifically, in the field of English language teaching (Chapman, 1997; Elmore, 1996; Gorsuch, 2000; Li, 2001; Smith & Southerland, 2007; Spillane & Zeuli, 1999).

Outside English language teaching, for example, Smith and Southerland (2007) found that although two science teachers were familiar with the ideas promoted by a reform, their beliefs about teaching and learning were different from these ideas and the latter had minimal impact on their teaching. Similar findings have been reported in English language teaching, often in relation to the introduction of communicative curricula. In Japan, for example, Gorsuch (2000) found that while policy emphasized the development of students’ communicative ability and attention to all four macro skills, “Japanese teachers’ current orientation toward foreign language learning seems to be that strong teacher control is desirable and that students need to memorize, use written mode, and be very accurate” (p. 137). In Taiwan, Wang (2002) also identified a strong tension between
new English language teaching textbooks featuring communicative language teaching activities and established grammar-translation teaching practices.

The literature on educational innovation has identified mismatches between curricular principles and teachers’ beliefs as a major obstacle to the implementation of change. For example, Levitt (2001) argues that “if teachers’ beliefs are incompatible with the philosophy of science education reform, a gap develops between the intended principles of reform and the implemented principle of reform, potentially inhibiting essential change” (p. 1). Similarly in English language teaching, it is clear that curriculum innovations that conflict with teachers’ beliefs are less likely to be adopted as planned in the classroom. This in return will result in the failure of the reform program or at least some aspects of the intended curriculum will not be implemented as planned. Thus, as Breen, Hird, Milton, and Thwaite (2001) argue, “any innovation in classroom practice from the adoption of a new technique or textbook to the implementation of a new curriculum has to be accommodated within the teacher’s own framework of teaching principles” (p. 472). There is also evidence that how teachers interpret, filter, modify, and implement curricula will be influenced by contextual factors in and around their workplaces (Coleman, 1997; Holliday, 1994; Owston, 2007; Tudor, 2001).

Factors such as students’ expectations, resources, and assessment can be crucial in determining how teachers implement innovations. For example, Johnson, Monk, and Swain (2000) report on Egyptian science teachers’ practices after attending a 12 week in-service program in England and indicate that most of the teachers were unable to implement the new ideas learned in the course because of adverse local factors such as
large classes, lack of resources, students’ resistance, and even resistance from the school management.

Waters and Vilches (2008) also conducted a study on the factors influencing the process of English language teaching curriculum reforms. The purpose of their study was to complement the research conducted in this area as they made reference to a number of studies in this respect. They also stated that lessons might be learned about how to increase the efficacy of program implementation. They used a qualitative case study design to investigate the implementation of the Philippines Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) and to answer their research questions, which focused on the features of the implementation strategy and the perceptions about its effectiveness. The data showed two important factors that impact the reform process. First, the classroom-level implementation of the BEC has had numerous barriers that made the implementation process inadequate. These barriers indicated by the authors are: (1) the curriculum design is insufficiently compatible with teaching situations constraints, and (2) the necessary levels of professional support and instructional materials have not been provided (p. 15). The data also showed that the shortcomings can be attributed to the lack of better teaching conditions, resources, and teaching materials.

This study indicated two main factors influencing the implementation in a negative way. Waters and Vilches (2008) believe that the problems identified by their study, as well as by the study of Bureau of Secondary Education, are as follows:

1. Lack of professional development and teaching materials
2. Mismatch between the approach to teaching the curriculum and the realities of the teaching situation. (p. 21)
Additionally the data showed that both lack of funding and logistical problems made the implementation process difficult. For instance, both interviews and focus group data indicated similar problems, such as resources-related problems, which in turn resulted in the shortage of instructional materials and lack of qualified teachers. Waters and Vilches also presented some other factors that affect the implementation process. They mentioned, for instance, that teaching time, student numbers, and their level of proficiency in English was noticed in many occasions as a barrier to create an effective interactive classroom as intended by the innovative curriculum objectives. The study concludes that there is “a persistent, recurrent pattern of implementation difficulties … principally related to shortcomings in curriculum design and inadequate provision of professional support and teaching resources” (p. 21).

Related to the implementation process, Wedell (2003) conducted a study on the importance of the support that teachers need when they implement a new curriculum. Wedell states, “One important reason for such limited success is change planners’ failure to adequately consider what support classroom teachers will need, when, and for how long” (p. 349). The purpose of his study was to present pragmatically some of the questions that curriculum planners might ask before they make any decision related to curriculum reform or curriculum change, hoping that would provide information about teachers and how they are likely to conduct the implementation process. In turn, curriculum planners can then develop a system that supports teachers as they implement new curricula.
The barriers of implementing English curricula, as this study indicates, were noticeable when teachers were trying to implement new classroom practices different from what they are used to do in their classrooms. According to Wedell (2003), because of the lack of English language curriculum planners’ recognition of the fact that teachers are the main players in the reform process, we see few examples where those teachers are effectively involved in the process of change or reform. The study also claims that because not enough attention is paid to the support that teachers need, only a small number of them get engaged positively in the new practices. Thus, it is important that teachers be invited to participate in the change process from the beginning rather than being told about the change late and asked to implement it anyway.

Furthermore, it is important that curriculum planners of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) should have the awareness that teachers need to shift their teaching culture. Curriculum planners also need to be clear about their objectives and what kind of adjustments that teachers and learners need to do. In this respect, the degree of cultural shift the new curriculum presents and what kind of support must be considered. Planners also need to identify any imbalances that the innovative curriculum may create and what types of adjustments are required from the teachers. Therefore, Wedell (2003) presents the following questions that TESOL curriculum planners need to ask before deciding the change process: “What degree of cultural shift does the project objectives as initially articulated imply, and /or what fundamental cultural values might the objectives threaten? What specific support might teachers need, to be able/willing to accommodate such a shift?” (p. 445).
Wedell’s study (2003) consists of three main parts. The first two explain the characteristics of the TESOL curriculum and the third part is about the procedure that might help to identify these features in their own contexts. Wedell concludes by assuming that if nationally planned TESOL curriculum reform is to be effective, then planners and policy makers need to ask and attempt to find answers to their questions about the objectives and how they can be implemented. However, he admits that there are other variables that may influence the implementation process such as school structure, adequate funding support, and the availability of materials for both teachers and learners.

Additionally, Shawer (2010) did a qualitative study that aimed at exploring how teachers in general and English as Foreign Language teachers (EFL) in particular, approach the curriculum and what strategies are attached to each approach. The study focused on answering the research questions: how do teachers approach the curriculum in their classrooms? What strategies do teachers use in each curriculum approach? Shawer used a case study design with purposeful sampling. The results showed that teachers approached the curriculum as developers, makers, or curriculum transmitters.

The findings also indicated that there were three types of strategies used along with one approach rather than the others. Shawer (2010) identifies those strategies as macro- and micro-curriculum development strategies, curriculum-making strategies, and a curriculum-transmission approach involving curriculum-stabilization strategies. However, Shawer admits that the data did not explain why teachers approached the curriculum the way they did in these three different methods. He also adds that it is
beyond the scope of his study to consider the curriculum approaches and their influence on professional development and students’ learning.

Teachers’ instructional practices were the focus of Kirgo’s study (2008). The author carried out a case study extended for two years on teachers’ instructional practices and the impact of the teachers’ understandings and training upon their implementation of the Communicative Oriented Curriculum (COC) initiative in teaching English to young learners in Turkish state schools. The researcher used multidimensional qualitative research procedures, consisting of classroom observations, teacher interviews, and lesson transcripts in order to have a broader picture of how the teachers implement the curriculum. The sample included 32 teachers of grades 4 and 5. Kirgo was trying to answer questions about the teachers’ understanding and familiarity of the COC and whether previous training has any role or impact on the implementation. The data indicated that teachers’ instructional practices varied along the teaching spectrum from transmission to interpretation. The findings also showed that both teachers’ understanding and prior training influenced the implementation process. This study highlights the importance and need for continuous professional development programs, especially during the first years to promote the implementation process in Turkish public schools.

With regard to the Libyan context of English language curriculum implementation in high schools, there has been a lack of enough professional development for the major players in the implementation process. Since it is a top down change process, teachers do not have any idea and have no contribution or participation in curriculum change policies.
Instead, they are told when curriculum materials are ready for distribution and they are handed the textbooks to teach as prescribed by the board of curricula and instruction at the Ministry of Education. Therefore, their classroom practices are affected because of such lack of professional development, along with deterring factors that will be explained in the following parts of this literature review.

Certain conditions seem to create a fertile ground for new innovations in academic curricula in schools. Creating and providing the appropriate infrastructure and establishing the supporting factors seem to have a major role in sustaining new curriculum innovations in educational institutes. Sustainability and support for innovative curriculum also was under research by Owston (2006). The study investigated schools settings in which new curriculum employing technology were successfully sustained. Fifty nine cases were used out of 174 in 28 different countries. The research used a grounded theory approach to help the researcher build up a framework that specifies the relationship between the concepts. The study resulted in a model that can be used as a platform for discussion about why certain programs fail while others succeed.

The data showed also that there are two types of factors or conditions that affect sustainability of innovative programs. Owston divided them as crucial conditions and contributing conditions. However, the study suggests that the most important factor is teacher support for the program. In addition, principals and students support are important for teachers to perceive the innovations. The findings indicated that the contributing factors come from parents, administrators, innovation champions, financial factors, supportive policies and plans, and other organizations. Owston (2006) claims that
involving teachers and principals in the curriculum design is essential to help promote the students’ performance. He also adds that it is important that teachers receive regular training before and within the implementation process.

These conditions and factors are then universal and not specific for certain contexts and applicable to any settings where new curriculum innovations are intended to be implemented. As explained above that the change process and decision making in Libyan context is centralized around the department of curricula and instruction at the ministry of education. Thus, community member, parents, teachers, and local school districts have no role or participation in the preparation of curriculum change as Owston (2006) explained in his study. Consequently, there is a gap between the new curriculum innovation and the teachers’ beliefs and perceptions that may hinder the implementation process or at least make it unsuccessful.

Due to the wide spread of English nowadays and the major role English has in our daily lives, learning and teaching English in Libya has been a major agenda for the Ministry of Education. The government has created plans and assigned budgets to develop and improve the conditions and the settings of English language learning. The importance of English language in educational settings has led to a number of studies in this endeavor. For example, Nunan (2003) did a study on the impact of English as global language on the educational policies and practices in the Asian-Pacific area. Nunan’s study was to explore how educational policies and instructional practices are influenced by English. Nunan (2003) states that “… relatively little systematic information has been gathered on its impact on educational policies and practices in educational systems
around the world” (p. 589). The researcher used case study research design to explore
details about educational policy realities of English in each country.

Nunan’s study was an attempt to answer the research questions which were
focusing on the impact of English as global language on educational policies regarding
curriculum and classroom practices. Data were collected at two levels. First, the
researcher examined documents and programs such as books, government reports, and
curriculum documents. Then, Nunan conducted interviews with more specific questions
about English curriculum and teaching with 68 participants.

The findings indicated that there are some impacts on the educational policies in
this area of the world. According to the study, although countries invested huge amounts
of money in this endeavor; the results did not indicate the desired instructional goal.
Therefore, Nunan suggests that these countries review their policies regarding English
language teaching. One of the steps needed to be done, according to Nunan, is that
teachers should be trained well in language teaching techniques and their language skills
should be improved. Students also should have enough exposure to the language
instructional situations. Another theme emerged from this study is the need for
knowledge about the actual use of English and its impact on policies and classroom
practices. Nunan (2008) believes that research on the requirements of English in different
institutions is needed to identify the effective and cost effective ways and means of
meeting these requirements (p. 611). Finally, the results indicated that policy decision
regarding English curriculum in the area of this research are interrelated.
**Curriculum evaluation and assessment**

The preferable type of curriculum evaluation and assessment by many educators is the formative evaluation because of the reliable and valid information it provides (Westbury, 1970). Thus the process of curriculum evaluation is about collecting evidence for the decision makers and providing reasons behind the selection of certain program. Westbury defined curriculum evaluation as “the body of techniques, methodologies, and principles created deliberately to give some systematic form to the ways in which the assertion can be made to work” (p. 240). Murphy (1991) adds a new definition of curriculum evaluation in terms of the outcome value of a program; other definitions for the process of curriculum evaluation were made by (Taylor-Powell, Steele, & Douglah, 1996; McKay, 1989). Taylor-Powel, Steele, Douglah and McKay all believe that curriculum evaluation has to be systemic and thoughtful to answer specific questions and give accurate reliable information. Curriculum evaluation as a systemic process is also the focus of Chen’s (2005) definition of the process, he states that curriculum evaluation is “the application of evaluation approaches, techniques, and knowledge to systematically assess and improve the planning, implantation, and effectiveness of programs” (p. 3).

Therefore, collecting valid and accurate information about curriculum implementation is at the heart of curriculum evaluation studies. This applies to the current study as a means to evaluate and assess English language curriculum implementation in Libyan high schools by measuring the teacher’s perception in order to arrive at results that identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program, so that can be used considered in future decision making regarding curriculum change. A number of benefits of
McNamara (2012) presents the rationale and the reasons behind curriculum evaluation as follows:

- Understand, verify or increase the impact of products or services on customers or clients
- Improve delivery mechanisms to be more efficient and less costly
- Identify program strengths and weaknesses to improve the program
- Verify that you're doing what you think you're doing. Evaluations can verify if the program is really running as originally planned
- Produce valid comparisons between programs to decide which should be retained
- Fully examine and describe effective programs for duplication elsewhere

Most of these reasons are the core of this study. By understanding and identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the English language curriculum in Libyan high schools, recommendations can be made and remedies of needed can be established. It will also help sustain the program and enhance its effectiveness. Therefore, curriculum evaluation is more than statistical data that shows where the program is headed; it rather gives information that can be used in wider spectrum.

Different approaches and models have been used in curriculum evaluation programs, for example, the Diachronic Coherence Model by Ross (2003) and the Context-Adaptive by Lynch (1990). However, the selection and use of any approach is determined and influenced by some factors. Chen (2005) identified five of these factors:

- The stage or stages of program cycle that will be the focus of the evaluation;
- The need of stakeholders to such an evaluation for assessment-based information, improvement-based information, or for both;
• Evaluation options that fit the programs environment and conditions;
• The benefits and profits expected from such evaluation. (p. 80)

Thus applying CLT to compensate for the insufficiency of the traditional methods which did not cultivate students’ communicative competence is crucial in EFL contexts if the target is to improve and develop the communicative competence of the learners. However, the literature indicates that the CLT approach cannot be adopted without adaptation. Various factors need to be taken into account to make this approach contextually and culturally responsive (Bax, 1997, 2003).

With regard to this study, the focus will be on the stage of implementation of the curriculum and how that is carried out as classroom practices. The data and the findings can be used for several purposes such as improvement, remedy, sustainability of the program in the future and other instructional and decision making procedures. The different evaluation studies presented in this chapter that took place in different contexts other than Libya and the lack of systematic and deep examination of the new English curriculum in Libyan high schools dictate the need for a systematic and deep investigation of a given program in order to create a positive change in the planning, implementation of that program. The literature presented gives the researcher insights on how the study should be conducted. Therefore, this study aims to apply a mixed methods research to look at how Libyan EFL teachers practice and adapt CLT to EFL classrooms in Libyan high schools.
Chapter Three: Research Methodology

This chapter deals with the description of the procedures and methods used in collecting and analyzing the data, the sample size, and the way the participants were selected. It also describes how the survey was administered and how data were collected. This study aimed at studying teachers’ perceptions of the English language curriculum in Libyan high schools. It aimed at investigating teachers’ perceptions and evaluation of English language curriculum implementation in Libyan high schools.

This study was conducted in a region of Libya called Tarhuna, southeast of the capital Tripoli. The researcher believes that the findings of this study provide invaluable information that can be used for the revision and improvement of English language curriculum in Libyan high schools. The study also shed some light on the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and revealed some of the obstacles and barriers that encountered teachers in implementing the curriculum and provide them with recommendations to overcome these barriers should they exist.

The purpose of this study was to investigate and evaluate the implementation process of the new English language curriculum in Libyan high schools by examining teachers’ perceptions of the curriculum and how it is taught and reflected in their classroom practices. Therefore, the study aims were: a) exploring and describing the teachers’ perceptions regarding English instruction in Libyan high school settings, and b) identifying the strengths
and weaknesses of the high school English language curriculum and how that resonates with teachers’ beliefs about English language teaching and learning.

English language instruction and proficiency is crucial for Libyan high school teachers since some of them will go back to universities and pursue graduate studies in TESOL. Their perceptions may have an impact not only on their current classroom practices but also on future curriculum reforms and change.

Research questions

The study was an attempt to answer the following research questions:

- How have Libyan high school English teachers implemented the new curriculum?
- What factors facilitate or inhibit the implementation of the new curriculum? What effects are these factors seen to have on the implementation process?
- What are teachers’ perceptions of the planned curriculum and the relationship between the operationalized curriculum and the planned curriculum in their classrooms?
- What implications does the relationship between the operationalized and the planned curricula have for the English language curriculum in Libya?

Research design and instrument

The purpose of this study was to investigate and evaluate the implementation process of the new English language curriculum in Libyan high schools by examining
teachers’ perceptions of the curriculum and how it is taught and reflected in their classroom practices. The study also sought to identify barriers that teachers may encounter in their implementation of the curriculum. A mixed method approach was used in order to answer the research questions. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) define this research approach as “the class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study” (p. 17). The strength of this approach is that this research method can provide stronger evidence and a wider picture about the subject of the study from which to draw conclusions. Moreover, Gay (1996) claims that combining the quantitative and qualitative approaches in one study helps the researcher to collect data that are more valid and reliable. Therefore, the research problem can be best understood and explained when using qualitative data to explain the quantitative results (Creswell & Piano Clark, 2007). This kind of research approach has three different techniques used in mixed method design studies (Creswell, 2003). These strategies are known as

- Sequential procedures where a study starts with a quantitative method followed by a qualitative or vice versa;
- Concurrent procedures where quantitative and qualitative methods are used simultaneously;
- Transformative procedures where the researcher uses either the sequential or concurrent procedures to anticipate the outcomes. (p. 216-218)

This study adopted the first technique. The researcher started with the quantitative part by distributing the survey and collecting the data in order to have results generalizable to the population. Then in the second phase, the researcher used a detailed open-ended, semi-structured interview technique. The second stage data were used to explain some of the
quantitative data collected in the first phase of this study. This approach or technique of data collection allows the researcher to start with data generalizable to the population, then followed by more detailed data that best explain the participants’ views and opinions regarding the subject of the study.

Participants

This study involved the participation of English language teachers in Libyan high schools. The participants were in-service teachers. They were all Libyans who either hold a bachelor’s degree in English from the university or a diploma from a higher education institute. The study took place in an area southeast of the capitol Tripoli called Tarhuna. The reason behind choosing this geographical area was that, first, the researcher is native to the area and has some background information about the conditions of curriculum implementation in this area of the country. Second, the researcher has personal connections with many teachers, administrators, and principals and so could access a research sample. The total number of high schools in this region is 31, with 104 teachers and 4,814 students in addition to 4 English language inspectors (Department of Education, 2012).

The purpose of this study was to investigate Libyan high school teachers’ perceptions of the new curriculum in Libyan high schools to identify any barriers that teachers may encounter in their classroom practices. However, considering the time factor and the effort and funds needed, the researcher adopted cluster sampling for the quantitative part of the study. Cluster sampling is defined as “the selection of groups rather than individuals” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996, p. 79). Therefore, the researcher
began the quantitative part by identifying the schools in the area. The teachers in each school were considered as a cluster and all teachers identified constituted the sample. The sample included all teachers in all schools in the region. Thus the total sample size for this study was 104 teachers in 31 schools. The researcher distributed the survey to the participants in person as it was not possible to do it electronically due to accessibility issues and technical difficulties.

In the qualitative part of the study, which aimed at explaining the qualitative data collected from the survey, the researcher used a follow-up interview approach. A purposive sample was selected from the participants. Patton (1990) states that qualitative inquiry usually uses small samples selected purposefully. This type of sampling in qualitative inquiries refers to the selection of a sample of participants who are knowledgeable and informative about the topic of the research and the setting (Gay & Airasian, 2003; Patton, 1990). In order to have a deeper and broader picture about the teachers’ perceptions of the new curriculum, the researcher invited willing teachers to participate in the follow-up interview. To have various viewpoints from the teachers about the curriculum implementation, the sample included experienced and less experienced teachers. Experienced teachers would be those with 10 years or more of experience in teaching the English language.

**The survey**

A survey is defined as “a method of getting information on certain selected topics from a number of people – usually a large number and often chosen at random” (Wallace, 1998, p. 260). Gay and Airasian (2003) define a questionnaire as a “written collection of
self-report questions to be answered by elected group of research participants” (p. 590). For the convenience of the participants, the survey used in this study was written in both English and Arabic and developed through a literature review, a pilot questionnaire, and back translation techniques.

The advantage of the survey method is its easy administration because many subjects can be contacted simultaneously, and subjects in remote or distant areas can also be reached. In particular, a mailed survey has the advantage of confidentiality, which is very important in order to maintain ethics in the research. Also, the survey method is an important technique when the purpose of research is to describe and explore phenomena, which matches this study’s aims: to explore implications and to describe actual situations in high school English classrooms in Libya from the teachers’ perspectives. The methods and procedures for the study, including the subjects (population and sample), instrumentation, study settings, and data collection and data analysis are presented in this chapter.

Each copy of the survey had a cover letter including the invitation to the participants and explanation of the purpose of the study. The survey consisted of three main sections (see Appendices A & B) and contained 32 items. The first section included questions seeking participants’ background information. Questions in this section asked about age, gender, years of experience in teaching English as a foreign language, level of education, level of students taught, and the subjects they teach. The second section of the survey was concerned with the teachers’ experiences of the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach, both as learners and teachers. Questions 7-9 were related to the
first research question, “How have Libyan high school English teachers implemented the new curriculum?” Question 7 asked whether the participants learned about CLT in their teacher preparation program. Question 8 asked about the participants’ practice of CLT. Question 9 asked the teachers on a rating scale to what extent, from rarely to fully, they practice the principles of CLT. The principles listed in question 9 were drawn from previous studies (Canale & Swain, 1980; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richard, 1986). For example, principles related to teaching materials and evaluation was drawn from Canale and Swain (1980). Canale and Swain’s study was an attempt to determine the practicality and feasibility of measuring the student’s communicative competence by examining the currently accepted principles of communicative approaches to foreign language to discover to what extent these principles are grounded in theory. Canale and Swain concluded their study with a modified set of principles of which some are included in this survey. Other principles listed in question 9 were taken and developed out of Larsen-Freeman (2000) and Richard (1986).

Question 10 was developed to answer the research question related to the factors that facilitated or inhibited the implementation process of the curriculum. Twenty two problems were listed that are related to five areas of concerns in CLT implementation: 1) Teacher Insufficient Communicative Competence/Teacher Preparation, 2) Time, Resources, Support and Class Size Concerns, 3) Testing and Teaching Philosophy Concerns, 4) Student Resistance, and 5) Classroom Practice Concerns. The problems listed were drawn from related literature. For example Burnaby and Sun (1989) reported in their study, which was conducted on 24 Chinese teachers of English, that some of the
constraints on implementing the communicative curriculum of English were related to “class size, traditional teaching methods, and resources and equipment” (p. 219). These problems were listed in this survey to explore whether the Libyan teachers encounter the same problems in their implementation of the new curriculum. Participants are asked on a scale rating whether any of the listed items are considered a problem, potential problem, or not a problem. The problems were also drawn from other sources (Kuo, 1995; Li, 1998; LoCastro, 1996; Miller, 1998; Rao, 2002; Sato, 2002; Sato & Kleinsasser, 1999; Su, 2002; Sugiyama, 2003).

The last part of the survey consisted of a set of open-ended questions that provide information about the teacher’s opinions regarding their implementation of the curriculum and the barriers and obstacles they may encounter and what can be done to facilitate their practice in the classroom. At the end of the questionnaire in both versions, each participant was asked to provide a phone number and email if he/she was willing to be interviewed. It was explained that the interview would ask for more in-depth insights into the meaning of information given by the participant in his/her questionnaire responses.

A similar survey was developed and used in Taiwan by Hung (2009) in a study to identify the barriers and the obstacles that university teachers of English face in their implementation of CLT-based curricula. Hung’s study indicated that Taiwanese university teachers encountered various barriers in their teaching of CLT-based curriculum. The barriers were related to teaching approaches, students’ heterogeneous levels of proficiency, teachers’ beliefs about teaching English language, and school structure in terms of time, class size, and testing. The utility of the survey has been
supported since it was used in similar contexts of CLT implementation in three countries where English is taught as a foreign language. However, the researcher double checked the reliability of the survey by piloting the study in the same setting where the actual study was conducted.

All the statements of the survey cover the principles of the CLT and ask about the barriers that may inhibit successful implementation of the curriculum. The statements and the problems expected and listed in this survey were drawn from related literature as mentioned early (Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Kuo, 1995; Li, 1998; LoCastro, 1996; Rao, 2002; Sato, 2002; Su, 2002).

The interview

For the qualitative part of this study the researcher used an interview (for the interview protocol, see Appendix E). Denzin and Lincoln (2003) believe that qualitative research such as the interview is “the favorite methodological tool” (p. 36). The researcher conducted face-to-face and semi-structured phone interviews to investigate the participants’ opinions and beliefs about CLT-based curriculum and their practice of the curriculum in classrooms. Using email for the interviews was not feasible because of the accessibility issue, as most of the teachers did not have internet access and some of them were novice to computer use. Therefore, the interview approach served as a tool to enable the teachers to voice their experiences and perceptions regarding their implementation of the new curriculum. Interviews allow researchers to elicit subjects’ responses in their own words to express their personal perspectives (Patton, 1990).
In addition, interviews provide opportunities for clarification and discussion and help in discovering and resolving methodological and ethical dilemmas (Reinharz, 1992). The reason for choosing in-depth interviews as a tool for collecting data in this study is because this qualitative research method can be used to study a phenomenon about which we know little (Hamersley & Atkinson, 1995). The interviews were conducted after obtaining the participants’ permission. The researcher followed the interview guidelines suggested by Atkinson (1998). Some of these guidelines are as follows:

- Decide who you want to interview
- Explain your purpose
- Take time to prepare
- Create the right setting
- [Consider that] an interview is not a conversation
- Be responsive and flexible
- Listen well
- Be grateful. (p.27)

The researcher developed the interview protocol based on the quantitative results; a version of the interview protocol is attached as Appendix E. Based on the results of the quantitative data, the researcher developed the questions used in the interview. For example, interviewees were asked to give more details about the factors that inhibited or facilitated their teaching. Interviewees were also asked to give details about what can be done to make their teaching of the new curriculum more successful. Interview questions also ask about the barriers that teachers encounter in implementing the curriculum and
which of these barriers are most difficult to address and how they can be overcome. The interview gives the participants the chance to explain in detail their experience with the new curriculum. The goal is to explain or elaborate on the results from the first-phase survey study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The researcher asked the interviewees predetermined guided, open-ended questions; however, there was flexibility for follow up questions.

**Procedure**

The researcher first contacted the Department of Education in the area where the study was conducted to obtain permission. The researcher provided details about the study, including its purpose and aims, and asked for permission to conduct the study. The researcher then identified the number of high schools in the area and the total number of English language teachers who are in service. Based on the cluster sampling, all teachers in the area constituted the sample; therefore, the total sample for this study was 104 teachers of the English language. The request for the study was approved by the Department of Education, and they issued a letter stating their permission and inviting schools to cooperate with me. Prior to that, and in order to keep the research ethical, the researcher sought and obtained permission from the University of Denver IRB (Appendix G). Then, I went to the schools and met with the principals and the teachers to explain to them the purpose and the aims of the study. Both the principals and the teachers were helpful and cooperative. For the quantitative part of the study, I distributed the consent forms to the targeted sample of this study to participate in the survey. Participants were made aware that their participation was voluntary and they had the right to quit at any
time without any penalty. Then I distributed the survey to the participants in person for their convenience. As I mentioned earlier, using the electronic version of the survey was not feasible because of the accessibility issues and Internet connection problems. Participants were also provided with my contact information for any questions or further explanations regarding the survey items. For the participants’ convenience, the survey was administered in both Arabic and English.

For the qualitative part of the study, the researcher conducted semi-structured individual interviews with the participants. The researcher invited five teachers from five different schools with different years of experience in teaching. Three of the interviewees had ten years or more experience in teaching English and two of them had from one to less than ten years of experience in teaching. Face-to-face interviews were held in the teachers’ offices and lasted between 30 to 45 minutes each. However, all the participants declined to be audio recorded or videotaped. Thus the researcher took notes and asked the interviewees to review them for accuracy and reliability.

The interviews were conducted in Arabic, which is the native language for both the interviewees and the researcher, to ease communication and avoid any misunderstanding. The interviews were conducted according to the participants’ availability and convenience. The researcher began the interviews by welcoming the interviewee. Then, the researcher explained to the interviewee the purpose and the aim of the study and made sure that the interviewee understood the terms to be used in the interview. During the interview, the researcher talked less and listened more to give the interviewees a chance to express their thoughts. The interviewees were made aware that
they have the right to withdraw at any time without any penalty. The researcher also explained to the interviewees that they could choose not to answer any question that made them uncomfortable. Interview questions focused on the factors that either facilitate or inhibit the implementation of the curriculum. There were also questions regarding teachers’ perceptions and thoughts about the curriculum. All questions were open-ended. After each interview, the researcher transcribed and translated the interviews into English. Then the translated scripts were reviewed by two people who have masters’ degrees in Translation. The qualitative data were used to help explain the teachers’ thoughts and opinions about the curriculum and the way it is implemented. Sixty seven teachers returned the questionnaire, which resulted in response rate of 64.42%.
Chapter Four: Results

The researcher began the analysis of the quantitative data using the SPSS statistical package for Windows after coding the questionnaires to keep confidentiality and to protect the participants’ privacy. Descriptive statistics—such as percentages, means, frequencies, skewness, and kurtosis—were computed to report the participants’ rating scores on the survey. Data for all the survey items except the open-ended questions were transferred to SPSS.

For the qualitative data, the researcher followed the five steps suggested by Creswell and Clark (2007): “preparing the data for analysis, exploring the data, analyzing the data, representing the data analysis, and validating the data” (p. 129). Major themes were identified and classified. Codes were used in the qualitative data analysis. Coding is defined as the process of “disassembling and reassembling the data” (Ezzy, 2002, p. 94). Namely, the data are broken into parts and rearranged according to common meanings to understand the data.

The quantitative data comprise 67 questionnaire responses in addition to 5 interviews which were used to answer the research questions. For the questionnaire items, descriptive statistics were applied to report the results. For the demographic questions 1-9, total numbers, percentages, and means were computed and reported. Question 10, which asks about the practice of CLT principles, was coded as 1 (rarely practiced) to 5 (fully practiced). Question 11, related to the difficulties encountered by the teachers in
practicing CLT, was coded as 1= MP (Major Problem), 2= PP (Potential Problem), and 3= NP (Not Problem). All average scores, means, and other descriptive statistics were tabulated and rankings are presented.

**Quantitative data analysis**

A total of 104 surveys were distributed to English language teachers in Libyan High Schools. Sixty seven surveys were returned with a response rate of 64.42%. The average age of respondent teachers was 32.28 years (N=61, SD=6.02, range=22-49). Age data for all respondents appear to be approximately normally distributed with skewness of .43 and kurtosis of .16. The average age of female teachers responding to this questionnaire was 32.29 years (N=41, SD=6.12, range=22-45), and the average age of male teachers responding to this questionnaire was 32.25 years (N=20, SD=5.96, range=22-49). There was no significant difference in the reported age by gender in this respondent sample pool: $t(59)=-0.03$, $p=0.98$.

In terms of years of experience, the data showed that the average number of years of experience reported by respondent teachers was 8.98 years (N=64, SD=4.18, range=1-17). Data on the average years of experience for all respondents appear to be normally distributed with skewness of .26 and kurtosis of .63. The average years of experience reported by female teachers responding to this questionnaire was 9.07 years (N=43, SD=4.45, range=1-17) as indicated in Figure 2, and the average years of experience reported by male teachers responding to this questionnaire as explained in Figure 3 was 8.71 years (N=21, SD=3.65, range=1-13). There was no significant difference in the reported years of experience by gender in this respondent sample pool: $t(62)=-0.32$, $p=0.75$. 
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$p = 0.75$. However, there was a significant correlation between teacher age and reported years of experience: $r = 0.85, p < 0.01$.

**Figure 2. Female Teachers’ Experience in Years**

**Histogram for Gender= Female**

Mean = 9.67
Std. Dev. = 4.448
N = 43
Sixty of the respondent teachers provided information on their highest level of education attained. Ten teachers obtained a higher diploma; 48 teachers held a bachelor’s degree, and two had completed a master’s degree. No teachers included in this sample pool and as shown in Figure 4 hold a PhD. There was no significant difference in the level of education achieved by gender: $\chi^2(2)=1.05, p=0.59$. 
The data also showed that 66 of the respondent teachers provided information on the type of student they instruct (Figure 5). Fifteen teachers instruct students who are majoring in English; 23 teachers instruct students who are not majoring in English; and 28 teachers report instructing students who are both English majors and non-English majors. There was a significant difference in the type of student instructed by teacher gender: $\chi^2(2)=8.39$, $p=0.015$. Female teachers reported instructing significantly more English major students. There was no significant difference in the type of student instructed by teacher’s level of education attained: $\chi^2(4) =1.72$, $p=0.79$. 

Figure 4. Teachers’ Attained Level of Education
Question 6 of the questionnaire asked the participants about the subjects they teach. The participants’ responses are reflected in Table 1, with no significant difference associated with gender.
Table 1. Instructional Subjects by Teacher Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, writing, speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantitative data also showed that the majority of the participants (n=42, 62.7%) learned about CLT in their teacher education programs and 25 participants (37.3%) did not, as presented in Table 2 below. The researcher noted no significant difference associated with gender though more female teachers reported to have learned about CLT in their teacher education program: $\chi^2 = .18, p = .67$.

Table 2. Did you learn about CLT in your teacher education program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you learn about CLT in your teacher education program?</th>
<th>Teacher Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to Question 9 presented whether the participants claimed to have practiced CLT in their classrooms. The numbers and percentages of the participants who
were currently using CLT, the ones who were not using CLT at the time, and the ones who never used CLT were computed. Table 3 below shows the response numbers and percentages.

Table 3. Have you tried CLT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you tried CLT?</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, and I am still using it now.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, but I am not using it now.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no, never.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question one

Research question one asked how Libyan high school English teachers have implemented the new curriculum. To evaluate the implementation of CLT principles and to answer the first research question, the participants were asked to rate their responses to items addressing CLT practice on a Likert scale. The mean for each item was calculated. The following table (Table 4) displays the participants’ ratings of CLT practice in classrooms. The total responses were 54 out of the total number of the sample (N=67): 80.59%. Thirteen teachers answered with “never” to Question 8, which means they neither learned about CLT in their teacher education program nor practiced it in their teaching. A t-test was applied to check and evaluate any significant differences
associated with gender, level of education, or years of experience. The tests showed no difference between the groups or association with education or experience.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The objective is to develop students' communicative competence.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the student is a communicator.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four skills &quot;listening, speaking, reading, and writing&quot; are integrated in the classroom practice.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials may include thematic development materials, task-based materials, and authentic, real-life materials.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are evaluated both on fluency and accuracy by being asked to perform a real communicative function (i.e., to assess students' writing skill, they are asked to write a letter to a friend).</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N (listwise) 54

Note. Scale was 1= rarely practiced to 5= fully practiced

The data showed that the five principles of CLT were perceived by teachers to be practiced as intended in the curriculum.
Research question two

However, teachers encountered many barriers and obstacles in achieving the goals of the intended curriculum in classroom practice, as indicated in the following part of the quantitative data that was used along with the qualitative data to answer the second research question: What factors facilitate or inhibit the implementation of the new curriculum? What effects do these factors have on the implementation process? The data were drawn from Question 11 on the questionnaire. The analysis began by reporting the participants’ responses to each factor as a major problem, potential problem, or not a problem. Responses were calculated to identity which factors were facilitating and which ones were inhibiting to the process of implementation.

Item 11 in the questionnaire and the interview questions were used to explore and identify the factors and sources of difficulties that teachers encounter in implementing the CLT curriculum in Libyan high schools. Research question two asked the participants which factors inhibited or facilitated the implementation process and what impact these factors have on the teaching process of the CLT curriculum. The researcher computed the percentage of each item response as a major problem, potential problem, and not a problem (Table 5). Then, the total number of responses to each item was tabulated and ranked from being problematic to less problematic (Table 6). Each factor that had more than 50% of the responses as a major problem is considered an inhibitive factor to the implementation process of the curriculum. Therefore, these factors and others that emerged from the interview are discussed in the next chapter.
Table 5. Items perceived as major problems, potential problems, or not a problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M. problem</th>
<th>P. problem</th>
<th>Not-problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' limited proficiency in spoken English.</td>
<td>27. 40.3%</td>
<td>31 46.3%</td>
<td>9 13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' limited sociolinguistic/cultural competence</td>
<td>16 24.0%</td>
<td>37 55.2%</td>
<td>14 21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' lack of training in CLT.</td>
<td>54 80.6%</td>
<td>11 16.4%</td>
<td>2 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have few opportunities for in-service training in CLT</td>
<td>52 79.0%</td>
<td>10 15.2%</td>
<td>4 6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have little time for teaching materials for CLT classes.</td>
<td>59 88.1%</td>
<td>3 4.5%</td>
<td>5 7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of authentic teaching materials</td>
<td>25 37.3%</td>
<td>26 39.0%</td>
<td>16 24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large classes</td>
<td>51 76.1%</td>
<td>11 16.4%</td>
<td>5 7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding, school facilities (few language labs, technology equipment)</td>
<td>58 88.0%</td>
<td>3 4.5%</td>
<td>5 7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from colleagues and administrators.</td>
<td>44 67%</td>
<td>17 26%</td>
<td>5 7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar-based examinations</td>
<td>11 16.4%</td>
<td>21 31.3%</td>
<td>35 52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of assessment instruments.</td>
<td>15 24.4%</td>
<td>31 46.3%</td>
<td>21 31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' low English proficiency.</td>
<td>56 84.0%</td>
<td>9 13.4%</td>
<td>2 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' lack of motivation for developing communicative competence.</td>
<td>36 54.0%</td>
<td>25 37.3%</td>
<td>6 9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' resistance to class participation.</td>
<td>34 51.0%</td>
<td>30 45.0%</td>
<td>3 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' resistance because teacher is central and knowledge transmitter.</td>
<td>39 58.2%</td>
<td>25 37.3%</td>
<td>3 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' resistance because of the concept that learning should be serious, not playing games.</td>
<td>13 19.4%</td>
<td>45 67.2%</td>
<td>9 13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the prescribed textbooks in teaching.</td>
<td>12 18.2%</td>
<td>16 24.2%</td>
<td>38 58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using English language to teach CLT curriculum.</td>
<td>30 45.5%</td>
<td>18 27.3%</td>
<td>18 27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizing the process or the product.</td>
<td>9 14.0%</td>
<td>31 48.0%</td>
<td>25 38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conflict of doing grammar explanation and error correction.</td>
<td>12 19.0%</td>
<td>24 37.5%</td>
<td>28 44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on memorization and repetition.</td>
<td>42 67.6%</td>
<td>16 24.6%</td>
<td>7 11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6. Inhibitive factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitive factor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have little time for teaching materials for CLT classes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding, school facilities (few language labs, technology equipment).</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' low English proficiency</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' lack of training in CLT</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have few opportunities for in-service training in CLT</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large classes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from colleagues and administrator.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on rote memorization and repetition</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' resistance because teacher is central and knowledge transmitter.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' lack of motivation for developing communicative competence</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' resistance to class participation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to the open-ended questions were categorized according to the coding scheme used for the qualitative data. The responses were grouped into categories based on shared meaning and relatedness to the research questions. Five main categories were established to report the data. The categories included external factors, school factors, teacher factors, student factors, and other factors.
Qualitative data analysis

As mentioned earlier, the goal of the qualitative study was to explore in depth the results of the quantitative data the participants provided. The researcher followed the five steps suggested by Creswell and Clark (2007): “preparing the data for analysis, exploring the data, analyzing the data, representing the data analysis, and validating the data” (p. 129). Following the transcription and translation of the interview data, the transcripts were coded based on two main categories: inhibitive or facilitative factors and current implementation of CLT principles. Qualitative data can be analyzed manually or using a computer program (Creswell, 2002). The qualitative data of this study were analyzed manually. The researcher started by translating the interviewees’ answers into English. For accuracy, the translated scripts were reviewed by two people holding degrees in translation. Then, the data were marked to identify recurrent, consistent, and emerging themes that were closely related to the research questions. Two major categories were used in the beginning to identify the most common themes among the participants’ responses. Thematic analysis was applied to identify main themes (Ezzy, 2002). Then, the researcher divided the data into small units that shared the same semantics. Next, these units were rearranged into categories to better understand the data. The researcher started the coding by reading and rereading the interviewees’ scripts to form general understanding of the data. Then, key phrases that reflected the participants’ views and perceptions about the curriculum implementation process were labeled and marked. After that, recurrent and consistent ideas were identified and categorized based on meaning and relativity to the research questions. And finally, similar ideas were coded based on shared
meaning. The following table presents the most common themes identified by the researcher. These themes reflect the teachers’ perceptions of curriculum implementation and the obstacles teachers encounter in their classroom practices.

**Table 7. Summary of factors affecting CLT implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External factors</th>
<th>funding, resources</th>
<th>Professional support and training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School factors</td>
<td>School leadership &amp; Support, school structure</td>
<td>Equipment (labs, furniture, friendly environment, teaching situation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student factor</td>
<td>proficiency</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers factor</td>
<td>training, collaboration</td>
<td>Workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors</td>
<td>Inspectors demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion of the data drawn from the survey and the interview data is the focus of the next chapter.
Chapter Five: Discussion

The study was designed to answer four main research questions regarding English language curriculum implementation in Libyan public high schools. The researcher collected quantitative and qualitative data in an effort to answer those questions. In this chapter, the answers to the study’s research questions are presented through discussion of the results related to each question. For each question, the appropriate data are first presented and then discussed.

Research question one

Research question one asked the participants about the way they practiced the new curriculum. How has the CLT curriculum been practiced in classrooms? To answer this research question and to identify the way the curriculum was implemented; two sets of data were used. The research used two sets of questions in the questionnaire: one is whether the participants practiced CLT in their classrooms, and the other question was about their rating of the five principles of CLT. The other source of data used to answer the first research question was the interview. The focus of the first two questions was about the way the new curriculum was implemented.

The quantitative data showed that not all the participants practiced CLT in their classrooms. Fifty-six out of 67 respondents indicated that they have practiced CLT. Eleven of the participants reported that they never practiced CLT, although the curriculum they used was based on CLT principles. Table 8 presents participants’
responses regarding CLT practice in their classrooms. The quantitative data showed that not all the participants practiced CLT in their classrooms.

**Table 8. Have you tried CLT?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you tried CLT?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes, and I am still using it now.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, but I am not using it now.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no, never.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, participants were asked to rate their practice of each principle of the CLT curriculum. Five principles were used in this question (Table 9). However, due to the incomplete answers in this part of the questionnaire, the number of responses in Table 9 is different from the one in Table 8. Participants were asked to rate their responses to each principle on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is rarely practiced and 5 is fully practiced. On the 5-point scale, each principle receiving a 3 or higher on the scale was considered practiced.

**Table 9. Practice of CLT principles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of CLT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objective is to develop students' communicative competence.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The role of the student is a communicator.

Four skills "listening, speaking, reading, and writing" are integrated in the classroom practice.

Instructional materials may include thematic development materials, task-based materials, and authentic, real-life materials.

Students are evaluated both on fluency and accuracy by being asked to perform a real communicative function (i.e., to assess students' writing skill, they are asked to write a letter to a friend).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid N (listwise)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The role of the student is a communicator.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four skills &quot;listening, speaking, reading, and writing&quot; are integrated in the classroom practice.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials may include thematic development materials, task-based materials, and authentic, real-life materials.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are evaluated both on fluency and accuracy by being asked to perform a real communicative function (i.e., to assess students' writing skill, they are asked to write a letter to a friend).</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, 54 of the participants claimed to have practiced CLT principles. However, differences between the degrees of practice among these principles are noticeable. The percentage of CLT principles practice was 75.4%, with an average mean score of 3.77. The results also showed that developing communicative competence and creating communicative roles for learners were perceived positively as these two principles received higher means, which indicated they were practiced in classrooms.
However, the participants showed in the interviews that they needed support to fully accomplish the goals of the curriculum and to attain full practice of the five principles.

All the interviewees expressed that they had difficulties in implementing CLT principles in their classrooms. Although participants rated their practice of the five principles toward fully practiced, they expressed their concerns about the obstacles they encountered, and they demanded support from policy makers, principals, and administrators. Teacher A told the researcher the following when asked about the kind of obstacles she encountered in practicing the CLT principles:

Even when I try to teach the textbook units communicatively, difficulties and obstacles pop up. For example, I always try to create a communicative environment in the class, however; students’ proficiency level, class equipment and setting all don’t help my friend, you know! My classroom does not have any visual or audio facilities. I teach first year English major students, they came to high schools without any basics in English and when I try to make them independent learners, it is difficult to achieve. In addition, practicing CLT needs time and we as teachers are required by principals and inspectors to finish the prescribed book within the school year. All in all, what I want to tell you is although teachers try hard to implement the new curriculum as planned and prescribed but many problems stand in the way of achieving this goal.

Another teacher (Teacher E), who teaches senior English major students and non-major students, expressed his concerns about the time-consuming nature of CLT
principles in the classroom, which class time limited to a 45-minute session four times a week. All the interviewees believed that the shift in the teaching approach from teacher–centered to learned–centered is crucial for the learning process to achieve the goals of the CLT curriculum. The interviewees claimed that giving the students the opportunities to take responsibility and initiative in class discussion and participation will enhance and improve their learning and increase their knowledge. It is a feature of the CLT curriculum that learners become independent, and their participation is encouraged in the classroom to enrich their learning experience. However, the interviewees expressed their frustration and concerns about the preparation of teachers, the facilities of schools, and the readiness to implement the principles of CLT to have interactive classrooms where learners become communicators and the whole setting is in a communicative mood.

Although teachers expressed the importance and the necessity to apply the principles of CLT to have better results and to improve learners’ performance, they did not hide their fear and concerns about the conditions of their schools and classrooms, which do not meet the minimal requirements needed to implement the curriculum successfully. When the researcher asked Teacher C, who has been teaching English for 12 years, about his practice of CLT principles in classrooms, the teacher replied with the following:

I learned about CLT in my undergraduate program. It was very interesting and I was very enthusiastic to implement once I finished my study. Yet, when I started teaching 12 years ago, the assigned curriculum was based on rote learning, so I had no chance to practice the principles of CLT till
the new curriculum replaced the old one. But to be honest with you implementing the CLT principles is like swimming against the tide, my friend….aaaah. It is very exhausting and difficult to achieve. You know to have interactive classroom you need to have the supporting agents. I mean by supporting agents are: labs, small classes, time, students are good and cooperative. But unfortunately, we lack these things in our school. We are limited by time and we are as teachers pressured by the principals and inspectors to focus on quantity and exams, they are priority for them.

The other three teachers’ responses and comments in the interviews (Teacher B, Teacher D, Teacher E) regarding their practice of CLT principles and how they have been implementing the curriculum expressed the same concerns their colleagues did in the interviews. Most of the interviewees agreed strongly on the importance of creating a communicative environment and developing the communicative competence of the learners. The interviewees also referred to the fact that when they practiced communicative activities, class time was not enough and their teaching practice was negatively impacted; consequently, they used little CLT or as one stated in the interview: “We sometimes had to give up teaching CLT principles completely.”

The quantitative data drawn from items 9 and 10 in the survey and the first question of the interview showed that although teachers tried to implement the CLT principles and attempted to create interactive environments needed for CLT implementation, inhibiting factors were more prominent than facilitative ones. As presented in Table 9, communicative competence and developing the interactive roles of
learners topped teachers’ ratings of practicing CLT principles. Yet, participants expressed their dissatisfaction about the conditions and the settings where they teach. These results were not different from other studies conducted in similar contexts where English is taught as a second language (Al-Darwish, 2006; Alharrasi, 2009; Chang, 2009; Hung, 2009). Although the goals and means of the curriculum change in Libya lack full clarity, all interviewees expressed that they were aware of what was expected from the change. However, the means and the infrastructure of schools were not helping teachers to implement the curriculum successfully and effectively. Altrichter (2005) talked about “contextual suitability” (p. 8), and the results of this study indicated that the suitability of conditions to change is important. If the contextual settings and conditions do not meet the requirements for change, then it is believed that the difficulty of change will prevail. Thus, it must be stressed that administrators and policy makers need to be aware of the contextual conditions and their suitability to the new change. It has frequently been reported that “innovation proposals must fit to available funds, specific student characteristics, the communities’ language patterns, teachers’ abilities, parents’ expectations, cultural values and much more” (Thomas, 1994, p.1853).

With regard to authentic materials, all interviewees indicated that although there are activities in the textbook that require students to listen to authentic conversations on CD and watch movies on DVD, those CDs or DVDs are not provided with the books nor is there audio or visual equipment in schools.

These inhibiting factors have a negative influence on the implementation process of the CLT curriculum. Policy makers, curriculum specialists, administrators, and school
principals need to recognize these factors and need to find solutions for these problems to help teachers improve their teaching and achieve successful implementation of CLT.

**Research question two**

What factors facilitate or inhibit the implementation of CLT? What effects do these factors have on CLT implementation as enacted? To answer this research question and to identify the obstacles that teachers encounter and how the inhibitive factors affect the implementation process, the study used quantitative and qualitative data. Item 11 in the survey asked the participants to rate the items as a major problem, a potential problem, or not a problem. Moreover, question three of the interview focused on the difficulties and obstacles that teachers encounter when they implement CLT, with qualitative themes summarized in Table 10.

**Table 10. Summary of factors affecting CLT implementation (qualitative data)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External factors</th>
<th>funding, resources</th>
<th>Professional support and training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School factors</strong></td>
<td>School leadership &amp; Support, school structure</td>
<td>Equipment (labs, furniture, friendly environment, teaching situation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student factor</strong></td>
<td>proficiency</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers factor</strong></td>
<td>training, collaboration</td>
<td>Workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other factors</strong></td>
<td>Inspectors demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results showed a number of factors that are considered as major concerns by the participants. Eleven of these factors were identified in the quantitative data, and they included teacher’s limited time for teaching CLT materials, insufficient funding,
students’ low English proficiency, teachers’ lack of training in CLT, few opportunities for in-service training in CLT, large classes, lack of support from colleagues and administrators, a focus on rote memorization in teaching and learning, students’ resistance to a learner-centered classroom, students’ lack of motivation for developing communicative competence, and students’ resistance to class participation. In addition, qualitative data supported the quantitative findings by considering these factors as major concerns for the teachers, as presented in Table 10.

Both sets of data indicated that the implementation process was negatively influenced by these factors, as they were rated as major or potential problems by the participants with high percentages. For example, the teachers’ limited time for teaching CLT materials and funding came on the top of the ranked barriers in teaching the new curriculum. This finding is supported by the participants’ responses in the interviews. Four out of five interviewees stated that teachers do not have enough time to practice and teach CLT fully and effectively. Interviewees indicated that teaching the CLT curriculum and adopting communicative methods require time, and opportunities should be given to every single learner to participate. This was hard to achieve in large classes with limited time, in addition to the pressure teachers’ perceived from principals and inspectors to cover the whole curriculum in the time allocated (Teacher E interview). Thus, it is important that the school structure or organizational structure meets the features of the new innovation. Altrichter (2005) states that

An innovation usually aims at directly transforming some organizational structures and processes, e.g. new material for collaborative learning) and in the process of doing so, also indirectly puts pressure on other
organizational structures and processes, e.g. teachers’ work organization, time tabling, decision making procedures. (p. 13)

This incompatibility between the innovation and the school structure is supported by one of the interviewee’s comments. Teacher B, who has been teaching English for English majors and non-major students for 7 years, expressed her view about time slots in the schedules and the demands of the new curriculum as follows:

I just could not teach every single lesson as I was supposed to. You know it is not that I did not want to but the conditions especially time was not a helping me at all you know when you have only 45 minutes and you meet your students 4 times a week. It is so hard to teach the curriculum communicatively because the simple equation is this, ummm pause … I mean give me enough time I can teach it effectively without the pressures to cover it in full. (Teacher B interview)

Another teacher expressed the following in regards to the time factor in teaching the CLT curriculum:

I am handling 55 students in my class and we meet four times a week for about 45 minutes each session. I am required to take absence and call every student out loud, so about 5 to 7 minutes gone, then I need to arrange them trying to create group work session sometimes. All this takes time so, about half of the class time is spent in preparation and the other half is not enough to teach the lessons completely. I sometimes ask students to do the rest at home but their proficiency levels and competence
do not help also. I feel I am in a big problem with this curriculum.

(Teacher A interview)

Insufficient funding was the second most inhibitive factor, with 88% of the participants rating funding a major concern. There was a consensus among the participants that funding was an issue for them. This finding is also supported by a study conducted in Hong Kong by Cheung and Wong (2012) to identify the most helpful and inhibitive factors in implementing a communicative curriculum. Cheung and Wong indicated that constant funding from the government was a big help in implementing the CLT curriculum because it enabled their schools to employ teaching assistants to reduce teachers’ workloads and hire special teachers to organize activities for students. Continuous funding also helped school principals and districts buy equipment and labs necessary for teaching.

Lack of funding causes several problems for teachers. When schools lack funding, teachers encounter difficulties in implementing innovation, particularly if the innovation implementation requires facilities. In the case of Libyan high schools, teachers indicated that the new innovation requires language labs and audio and visual equipment; and classrooms need to be provided with comfortable moving chairs so that students can more easily work in groups. All this will help the learners experience authentic materials that will enhance their learning. In her comments about lack of funding and the negative results this can have on schools and on teaching, one teacher expressed the following:

My school lacks language labs, visual and audio aids, appropriate classrooms, all these influence my teaching in away it makes it
implausible to implement the curriculum as intended and sometimes I find myself enforced to skip parts of the book or just touch upon them so quickly and not in details because some of the topics require language lab, theater and other supplies. Also, the desks do not help students to be in groups as those desks fit more row class setting rather than circle and square shapes. I mean the chairs and desks that students sit on in classes are large and heavy to move, so they take more space in class and it is impractical to move them into groups. (Teacher F interview)

Lack of funding has also been reported as a determining factor for program success or failure in Waters and Vilches (2008). They indicated that lack of funding hampered the implementation of new programs in teaching English as a second language in the Philippines. Waters and Vilches reported that resource-related problems affected the ability of teachers to implement the new innovation. The authors stated that “a primary factor was shortage of resources. As a result, the necessary teacher development and provision of teaching materials did not occur” (p. 17). Thus it is hard to imagine a successful implementation feasible sustainable funding and support. When teachers and students lack materials and equipment, it is difficult for both of them to learn and teach.

Students’ low proficiency and the lack of professional training programs for teachers were also perceived by the participants as major barriers to the implementation process. As presented in Table 9, 83.6% of the participants perceived students’ low proficiency in English as a major problem, while 79.6% considered lack of professional training as a barrier to CLT implementation. Developing learners’ communicative
competence is one of CLT principles that participants feel necessary to apply; however, when it comes to practice, teachers encountered problems. One of these problems is the students’ low proficiency level. Catering to large classes with great diversity in proficiency is implausible. It is a challenge that teachers encounter in implementing CLT. One of the respondents stated in the interview that “students’ different abilities in English have caused us a big problem. Thus this leads to overload work and as teachers we need to work extra hard to cater to individual differences in terms of learning ability development” (Teacher C interview).

Students’ low proficiency has its own impact on learners too. Most of the respondents indicated that their students either could not or did not want to talk because of their low English proficiency. Students usually stayed silent and did not respond to their instructors’ questions, which “created passive classroom atmosphere and wasted class time” (Teacher F Interview). Practicing CLT requires all participants to talk and share in dialogues and conversation. CLT class has to be interactive and learner-centered. Yet, this can be hard to achieve when you have students with low proficiency levels. This was the case in Libyan high school English language classes as indicated below by one of the participants in the interview:

Another issue or problem that I encountered in teaching the curriculum is the students’ low proficiency. As you may recall Mr. Altaieb this curriculum is imported from outside and it is intended to be taught to students who have basics and reasonable background in English. Students who come from villages and studied in schools where they had no access
to English language learning actually created me a big challenge. If you ask me how they passed middle schools without studying English, I would tell you to go and ask their principals and teachers. ummm I mean they passed by cheating, they helped them in exams that is the story. And now I am stuck with them. So, I think teaching CLT curriculum to such students is big mistake. (Teacher A interview)

As Table 9 shows, lack of professional training was perceived as a barrier to curriculum implementation. The data showed that teachers were concerned about their professional development. The new curriculum requires competent teachers. Most of the respondents believed that their own level of academic knowledge has not been enhanced in the way it would have been if they were preparing lessons for the CLT curriculum. One of the interviewees stated the following:

I studied here and learned English here in Libya; there is always a limitation to improving my English. If I keep on to teach here in Tarhuna High School without training or courses, my English will go down. I’d like to join graduate school but I do not have time and resources, so it is a big problem for me. (Teacher C interview)

Professional development programs are crucial to curriculum implementation. Cheung and Wong (2012) claim that “teachers should be provided with sufficient professional development training in various areas, especially in critical thinking skills training, learner diversity, and inclusive education” (p. 51). It is noticeable from the
participants’ responses in the interviews as well as in the survey that they as teachers lack the appropriate professional development that would enhance their knowledge and help them implement the curriculum effectively. As indicated in one of the interviewee’s responses, the need for professional development was crucial because it is a facilitating factor for the implementation process:

I have encountered problems related to the curriculum especially books assigned to the non-specialists such as engineering high school books, medical high school books, etc. those books contain terms related to each field. For example, those books contain terminology about banking, production, economics, engineering, medicine and so on with other fields in high schools. Those books require knowledgeable, competent, and hard-working teachers; however, without training, support from colleagues and administration, and lack of professional development, it is hard and difficult to implement the curriculum effectively. (Teacher B interview)

However, professional development programs need to be well prepared and managed and take into consideration teachers’ schedule and load. If these programs do not consider these factors, teachers end up overloaded and the program results could not be effective as they are intended to be. Therefore, what matters is the quality of the programs and not the quantity.

Another issue that participants raised as a barrier to their implementation of CLT is class size. Large classes were also addressed as a hindering factor to CLT implementation in a number of other studies (Cheung & Wong, 2011; Hung, 2009;
Burnaby & Sun 1989; Waters & Vilches, 2008). Class size was reported as one of the top problems when the instructors implemented the CLT curriculum. As presented in Table 9, over 75% of the participants perceived large classes as a problem. The average class size in the schools visited in this study was between 45-55 students, and the time allocated for English class is 45 minutes four times a week. Teaching communicative activities takes time and students need to be participants. Teachers engaged with such classes expressed their concern about the difficulty of teaching the CLT curriculum in large classes. Large classes with diversity in learning abilities in English make effective teaching of the new curriculum hard to achieve.

Thus, Cheung and Wong (2011) suggest that “teaching smaller class could help teachers to deal with the increasing learning diversity in the classroom” (p. 51). When teachers have smaller classes, the chance that all students participate and communicate with each other or with the teacher is high.

The findings of the qualitative data supported the quantitative data. Most of the interviewees expressed their concern about the difficulties of practicing communicative activities in large classes. Their concern was based on the fact that it was unfeasible to have all learners participate in such activities. Moreover, it is difficult to monitor and manage large classes when teaching communicative lessons and activities. It is time consuming and labor intensive. The following is a script of one of the interviewees in response to the researcher’s question about the factors that hinder or impede successful implementation of the new curriculum in Libya:

First, large classes, large number of students in one class definitely leads to the outcome that not all students have the chance to participate. Large
classes also impact the teacher-student communication. I teach classes which have more than 50 students. How do you think that I would be able to communicate with every single student in a limited time of 45 minutes?

(Teacher C interview)

Teacher B was also concerned about class size and its negative impact on her classroom practice. She teaches a conversation class to English major students. Her class has 47 students. She believed that unless her class is divided or an assistant teacher could be recruited to help her, it would be very hard to implement the curriculum successfully. The following is her response in the interview:

I think schools need plans, strategies, and professional development programs that help teachers adapt their teaching approaches with the curriculum. Differences among students in terms of capabilities of learning and contribution can be a problem especially in large classes where the teachers has to check with all students to make sure they understand what is being said or explained in the classroom. So, I think that teachers of English language should be considered when it comes to class size, number of subjects to be taught. I am saying these things because I believe that class size and number of subjects in addition to other factors influence teachers’ performance in teaching CLT. (Teacher B interview)
The goal of the CLT curriculum is communication; however, achieving this goal in a classroom full of students is implausible given the fact that teachers have only 45 minutes allocated for their classes. To overcome this problem, policy makers and educators need to realize that sustainable funding can help. When schools and teachers are supported, more teachers and assistant teachers can be recruited to reduce pressure on English language teachers. Funding also helps schools to invest in smaller class sizes, which consequently can be handled and managed by the teachers in more effective ways.

The data also revealed that support from colleagues and administrators is crucial for the implementation process to be effective. Such support was also presented in the literature as an important factor. For example, Altrichter (2005) states that “without support of regional administrators change may happen with individual teachers or single schools but it will most likely remain isolated in some innovative pockets without affecting the broader system” (p. 44). However, this support has to be inclusive and comprehensive, and not only praising the teachers’ work with words.

In addition to the moral support, teachers need to recognize that their implementation has to be real and that change is a fact. In other words, districts and principals have to demonstrate to the teachers through actions that the change is a must and a necessity (Fullan, 1994). Lack of such active support from administrators and colleagues can impact the implementation negatively. In this study, both sets of data supported this claim. As illustrated in Table 9, 66% of the participants perceived lack of support from colleagues and administrators as a barrier when they teach the CLT curriculum.

The qualitative data also indicated that comprehensive support from administrators and colleagues is important as it helps teachers to achieve the goals of the
new innovation. Nonetheless, the close follow up by administrators should not be
discouraging to the teachers. Namely, teachers need to be supported in ways that help
them implement the curriculum effectively and with high quality, not by putting pressure
on them to finish the curriculum within the time allocated regardless of the outcomes.
These concerns came in one of the interviewee’s comments and responses on the
questions related to the difficulties encountered while teaching the new innovation. The
participant was worried that the pressure from administrators focused on the issue of the
quantity and not quality of the innovation. Inspectors wanted the teachers to finish the
assigned textbooks within the school year, no matter what.
The following is the participant’s comments in the interview:

Inspectors also push hard on teachers to finish the curriculum within the
school year. For example, the inspector asked me to finish the books with
8 units in each unit there are 12 topics in addition to the books of training
and workshops for students which is hard to implement if I want to
implement all the principles of CLT fully and effectively. In addition,
teachers are required to do extra work for the school without any
motivation or encouragement. Other problems are associated with school
environment in general, very rarely that teachers have place or offices
where to stay in their breaks. (Teacher A interview)

Another interviewee expressed the same concerns about the absence of support and the
increasing pressure from administrators and inspectors. Another teacher’s response was
as follows:
In addition, I have encountered many problems that are related to the inspectors. Inspectors usually conclude their reports upon the students’ achievement and performance. This is unfair judgment. If the students have low achievement or weak performance, teachers shouldn’t be blamed for that. Unfortunately our inspectors conclude and write their reports about their visits to schools based on the idea that if students’ performance and achievement is low then the level and competence of the teacher is low too. If they find out that the students’ level is low they directly blame teachers. I am here asking those inspectors what they provided schools and teachers with to help them implement the curriculum effectively? The teacher goes on in her questioning to the inspectors as follow: why do not they create and provide training courses and professional development programs. Why do not they send English language teachers abroad to learn more? Sending them to English speaking countries as training course will benefit teachers a lot. (Teacher C interview)

Most of the respondents confirmed the claim that support from colleagues and administrators is necessary to help teachers through their implementation process. As the literature revealed, when active and positive support is given to the real players of curriculum implementation, the results usually tend to be positive. Participants also complained about the lack of rewards and their low salaries, despite the hard work they do in schools. Teacher B describes her dissatisfaction about teachers’ condition and salaries as follows:
Other problems are related to the absence of teacher’s motivation and rewards. Teachers are looked at as working class people. Their low salary and low socioeconomic status made many teachers look for other jobs to improve their living conditions. As a result their academic performance and teaching is affected because of the time and effort factors spent in things other than teaching.

Moreover, respondents talked about the absence of team spirit, cooperation, and collaboration among the teachers themselves. The researcher noticed during his visits to the schools that there were no English language departments or liaison offices to coordinate between teachers and the administration. On the contrary, and as explained in the following script, the administration sometimes asked teachers to do things out of their principle duties, which is teaching. Overloading teachers with extra jobs affects teaching performance. In the interview, Teacher E expressed his concern about the relationship the administration and the principal had with the teachers. His comments on the absence of support from the administration were as follows:

Other problems that I encountered are related to the administration. The principal usually asks us to do extra jobs other than teaching and without any rewarding. For example, I was asked to be the course coordinator, class coordinator, deal with all students’ problems in addition to preparing the results in all courses. I personally believe that teachers’ performance and teaching will be negatively influenced by wasting their time and effort in things out of their teaching. (Teacher E interview)
Therefore, administrators, inspectors, and teachers have to realize that support for actual players of curriculum implementation is crucial for the curriculum implementation success. Chueng and Wong (2011) indicated in their study that creating team spirit and collaboration among teachers is crucial in assisting teachers to implement the reform effectively. Creating a community and team culture also seems to be very important when teachers implement new innovations.

Memorization and the culture of traditional teaching were also perceived as a barrier to the implementation of the new communicative curriculum. Participants indicated that students’ belief and reliance on traditional teaching methods embodied in memorization and repetition made it difficult for teachers to implement communicative activities and lessons effectively. The survey results indicate that more than 60% of the respondents perceived students’ reliance on memorization and repetition as a major concern when teachers implement the new innovation. This finding was supported by the interviewees’ data as well. However, unlike other studies conducted in the area of English as a second language curriculum implementation, memorization and repetition did not appear to be on the top list of the inhibitive factors (Al-Darwish, 2006; Cheung & Wong, 2011; Hung 2009; Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Waters & Vilches, 2008).

The new innovation presupposes a special environment and learning culture. CLT curriculum requires learners to give up memorization and repetition and instead be active participants and play the role of communicators. Such roles are difficult to achieve when students are used to a culture of learning dependent on memorization and where the teacher is the center of knowledge. In the case of Libyan high schools, the relationship
between the learners and the teachers is one of authority and respect. Thus, students do not question or communicate freely as the new innovation aims. As a result, most of the teachers adopt and follow traditional teaching methods.

It seems clear that culture plays a major role in creating difficulties for teachers trying to implement CLT activities. Students are not used to role-playing or interactive settings, which are the core of CLT curriculum. Most of the interviewees expressed their need for more help and support with teaching methodologies. In the interview, Teacher B told the researcher that it was very difficult to get his students to adapt to the new learning environment. His comments were as follows:

Every time I try to get them participate and be active learners, they hesitate and the students used to tell me that it is the teacher ‘s job to explain and teach every piece and our job as students is to memorize that so we can pass the exam.

Another interviewee described a number of problems she encountered as she was implementing the new curriculum. One of these obstacles is related to students. She expressed her concern that unless teachers and other stakeholders in curriculum change help students adapt to the new environment, it would still be very hard to achieve the goals of the new innovation and change would be at a lower level. The following is the interviewee’s comments regarding this problem:

With regard to the problems associated with students, students are used to memorization and repetition type of learning. Students also have one belief that they should study only to pass exams and graduate. Students
also think that it is the teacher’s job to explain everything and students do not have to make any efforts because the teacher is the only knower and the only knowledge transmitter. (Teacher D interview)

Students’ reliance on memorization and the absence of active roles make them think that all knowledge has to come from the teacher and their job is to memorize what they learn from the lesson. According to Teacher A, this is a big challenge when changing teaching practices, as the new curriculum requires:

Students think that they have to receive knowledge rather than share and participate in gaining knowledge. This belief makes it hard to the teacher to implement CLT which requires students’ participation and active involvement in the classroom.

The mismatch between the realities of the classroom, student resistance, and the principles and goals of the new curriculum created a significant challenge for teachers. O’Sullivan (2004) reported the same concern in his study. O’Sullivan noted that in the settings of CLT curriculum, the focus on student-centered approaches with little teacher guidance may be inappropriate, particularly when students’ background understanding and the methods to which they have been subjected in their schools do not provide a firm basis for self-learning and discovery.

Other problems that participants indicated in this study are related to students’ reluctance to participate in class and their lack of motivation to learn. Although these concerns were ranked at the bottom of the difficulties, as presented in Table 9, teachers
still struggle with these problems in their classroom practice. The new curriculum requires students’ participation and teachers’ role is only guiding and facilitating. The data showed that these problems impacted the curriculum implementation negatively. More than half of the respondents in this study perceived students’ lack of motivation and resistance to participation as a major challenge for implementing communicative activities in the classroom. Student resistance to participation in class can be attributed to two main reasons. The first one is related to the students’ low proficiency in English. When students feel that their proficiency is low and they are unable to produce correct sentences, they feel shy and fear embarrassment if they say something wrong in front of their classmates. The second reason is that Libyan students believe that knowledge has to be transferred to them from their teachers.

Nonetheless, building up a supportive environment is highly recommended as a way to help students avoid anxiety. In this way, they will be less fearful and more willing to participate in class. Giving opportunities for learners to make erroneous statements and giving them positive feedback have proven helpful for encouraging class participation (Hung, 2009). The authoritarian relationship between teachers and students also affected student participation in the classroom. In the case of Libya, students believe that the teacher is the center of the learning process, and everything has to be done through the teacher. Namely, students wait until the teacher explains all the details of the lesson or the activity. Students do not share knowledge or exchange information in the classroom; rather, they receive and memorize what they are being told to use in exams. This belief or
culture contradicts the principles of CLT and that is why teachers find it difficult to execute the change effectively.

Interestingly, though, and contrary to the literature with regard to student-related difficulties, interviewees in this study revealed the factors that make students unwilling to participate and learn. The first factor is cheating, and the second one is students’ socioeconomic status. As Teacher B stated in the interview, students’ beliefs that they will pass the exam by cheating and that they do not have to make a lot of effort to go to the next level make them reluctant to participate in classroom activities. His response was as follows:

One of the problems that I have to address here is students’ reliance on cheating and the spread of this phenomenon among students. Honestly, I have noticed that many students started to depend on cheating in exams rather than preparing themselves for the exam. For example, in one occasion, I asked my students to follow up with classes and come prepared, so they can learn something and develop their knowledge; their response was the following: “we will pass the exam, so why we bother ourselves with studying.” Actually, they passed the exam with high grades. This belief in students’ mind about cheating and how they can pass exams affect hard-working and diligent students thinking and beliefs. Hard-working students started complaining to teachers about cheating and how their classmates pass exams without making any hard efforts.

(Teacher B interview)
As revealed in the above script from the interview, students’ resistance and low motivation to develop their communicative competence posed a big challenge to the teachers. It will take a lot of effort from teachers, educators, and policy makers to eradicate such a phenomenon. Students’ perceptions about learning and exams in the way presented in the teacher’s response above affects even hard-working students, as it makes them less enthusiastic to participate and learn. The second factor that emerged as a major theme in the teachers’ responses to the interview question regarding the inhibitive factors was the socioeconomic status of the students. It is related to students’ lack of motivation, which was perceived as a major problem for the respondents. Previous research did not reveal such a finding. When teachers were asked about what factors facilitated or inhibited their implementation of the new curriculum, the interviewees mentioned this factor as a challenge to the teachers:

The socioeconomic status is another problem that affects students’ learning and therefore, influences my curriculum implementation. Some families cannot afford school supplies to their students and government does not help with that. Also, there are some students who come from low income families and live far from schools and they cannot make it to school every day or they come late to school. Therefore, they miss classes. Some of them can’t even afford taking a taxi especially in the absence of public transportation. Students with low income or working class family usually feel frustrated and discouraged to study and learn. (Teacher C interview)
Thus, students’ resistance to class participation may be caused by several reasons, including low motivation and unfamiliarity with the approaches and methods of teaching used in CLT curriculum. Teacher C believes that “although students recognize the importance of class participation, most of the students seemed reluctant to participate either of being low motivated or because they were used to be spoon-fed.” In other words, students are used to teacher–centered approaches where their main job as learners is to memorize what the teacher tells them in the classroom. The unwillingness of students’ participation could also be explained with what was said earlier regarding cheating. Students think that they do not have to make any efforts since they will be able to cheat and pass to the other level. Educators, teachers, and principles need to work hard with the Ministry of Education to eradicate this phenomenon; otherwise, there is no point behind the new reform.

Another possible explanation for students’ resistance to class participation may be attributed to classroom environment. Most of the schools the researcher visited in this study do not have the facilities that would help implementing the curriculum effectively. As a result, teachers had no choice but to use lecture-style approach instead of creating interactive settings. There was little interaction as teachers revealed in the interviews.

However, when teachers were asked about changing to more interactive settings, participants mentioned funding issues, class size issues, and other factors mentioned above, which deterred teachers from building up more interactive classroom settings. All in all, the presence of the inhibitive factors in those learning environments that the study
targeted results in student resistance and unwillingness to participate actively in the classroom, thus creating big challenges for teachers.

**Research question three**

What are teachers’ perceptions of the planned curriculum and the relationship between the operationalized curriculum and the planned curriculum in their classrooms?

This part addresses the third research question which investigates the teachers’ perceptions of the new curriculum and the relationship, if any, between what teachers actually do in the classroom and the prescribed curriculum embodied in the assigned textbooks. This section presents and analyzes the participants’ opinion regarding the new English language curriculum in Libyan high schools. Qualitative data were used to answer this research question. Teachers’ responses from the first interview question formed the data used in this part.

The first major theme that emerged from the respondents’ answers was communicative ability development. All of the interviewees indicated that one of the benefits of the new curriculum is its focus on developing the communicative abilities of learners. This curriculum goal was manifested in one of the participant’s answers. Teacher D described the new curriculum as follows:

The new curriculum does not focus only on just one skill. But it has all skills combined, students have to read and learn stuff in their major field in English. I strongly believe that if this curriculum practiced and taught effectively; it will help students to increase practical communication
ability and develop abilities to express basic knowledge in their major field in English. (Teacher D interview)

Moreover, the data showed the importance of this curriculum as a means to assist students in enriching both their major field knowledge and their basic communication skills. Developing the communicative competence of the learner is an important aspect of this curriculum. However, achieving this goal does not seem to be feasible within the existing learning and teaching conditions of Libyan high schools. Classroom realities and school structure do not help to implement the reform effectively. As explained earlier, teachers encounter many problems when they want to practice the new curriculum principles.

One of the participants criticized schools, districts, and the Ministry of Education for what he called “official hypocrisy” in a reference to the contradictory policies regarding curriculum and teaching: “They wanted us to teach the task-based curriculum and at the same time they ask us to teach students the skills of the unified national test [in Libyan education system, senior high school students have to take a national test that is unified across the country]” (Teacher A interview). Another teacher talked about the same issue and how the focus on testing can make the development of communicative abilities difficult to achieve:

Unfortunately most of the students are studying because they have to, not because they want to. They study for the tests and not to learn and develop their language skills. So, I think that learning a language is about real-world communication, not just test scores. And I guess that is why we
have English classes. I believe the most important goal is for students to
overcome their inherent fears, and just speak, without fear of making
mistakes. (Teacher E interview)

The new curriculum was also perceived as an opportunity for the learners to know
about other cultures. As Teacher C commented, “The students’ textbooks have many
topics that talk about different cultures especially for history and social sciences major
students.” Exposing students to cultures other than their own will help them increase their
knowledge and improve their learning abilities.

Overall, the interviewees indicated that developing commutative abilities is one of
the best goals of the CTL curriculum. However, the mismatch between school realities
and the goals of the curriculum pose difficulties for the major players of curriculum
implementation.

 Teachers also revealed the value of the new curriculum in terms of skills
integration. The new innovation combines the four language skills required to develop
the learners’ knowledge in a foreign language. All the interviewees strongly agree that if
the curriculum were practiced fully and effectively, learners’ four language skills—
listening, speaking, reading, and writing—can be improved and developed.

Nonetheless, all the respondents expressed their complaints about the contextual
contexts and school realities in addition to other inhibitive factors mentioned earlier in
our comments on the second research question and how these stand as obstacles to
achieving the goals of the CLT curriculum successfully. The new curriculum adopts the
learner-centered approach that does not fit into the Libyan educational context, unless
something is done to overcome the difficulties mentioned in research question two. This finding supports the results of Mi Nam (2005): “[B]ecause of several constraints such as tight schedules, large classes, and students’ different levels of proficiency, the teachers seemed to have a hard time considering each individual student’s progress or specific needs in a class” (p. 117).

The second part of the third research question is an attempt to check the relationship between the prescribed assigned curriculum embodied in the textbooks and “the operational curriculum”—what actually being taught in classrooms (Uhrmacher, 1997). Teachers were asked in the interview to explain and give examples of their classroom practices of the new curriculum. It seems obvious that regardless of the teachers’ efforts to implement the curriculum as intended, with the focus on communicative abilities and adopting new teaching strategies that consider the learner-centeredness approach, what is being done in classrooms is not a real reflection of the new curriculum. As one of the respondents stated in her interview, although she tried hard to practice the new curriculum as intended, she encountered several barriers that affected her implementation negatively:

As a teacher of specialists and non-specialists, I noticed that using English in class for non-specialist students makes students struggle more in understanding and learning. Students’ low proficiency in English and their belief that the teacher is only transmitter of knowledge makes them depend heavily on teachers and do not often involve in discussion or participation. The non-specialist students also have a belief that they study
English course only to pass exams to go to the other level and not to understand and learn English for communicative purposes and use in their personal life.

Most of the teachers complained about the poor teaching conditions, lack of professional development, and other factors and how that hampered the successful implementation of the curriculum. One of the teachers explained how under-qualified teachers struggle when they teach the new curriculum:

And I know there has been no professional development or any training for the teachers to teach the new curriculum. So, a lot of us struggle in teaching it and usually teachers avoid difficult parts and assign them as homework to the students or skip them all at once. I think it is very important that teachers get training courses and support from the administrators and the inspectors. (Teacher B interview)

Another teacher’s comments confirmed the researcher’s inference about the mismatch between what is being taught in the classroom—the operational curriculum—and the planned curriculum represented in the assigned textbooks:

However, when it comes to participation and class discussion, I usually try to give opportunities to students to participate and answer the book questions. For example, when I ask a question to a student and I do not get the answer from first time, I wait and ask the question again in simpler language, so the student gets the chance to participate and understand. But
because of the time constraints, I always find me self enforced to end up the discussion and go back to more traditional methods of teaching by asking the students to memorize and learn what has been explained. I know this is not what I am supposed to do according to the new curriculum goals. But as I explained there are many obstacles and time is one of them. (Teacher C interview)

Regardless of the teachers’ efforts to implement the curriculum as it should be to achieve its goals, it is noticeable that what is happening inside classrooms is not a true reflection of the new curriculum. Namely, teachers’ practices inside the classroom may not include activities that are real features of the CLT curriculum, such as group work, communicative tasks, and an interactive classroom environment: “I would describe my way of teaching the new curriculum in my class by giving the students the new vocabulary of each new topic to add to their vocabulary stock and ask them to learn them by heart.” (Teacher B interview)

The idea of focusing on both meaning and form and developing communicative competence should be practiced consistently and coherently throughout formal English education. This cannot be achieved without the support and encouragement from policy makers, educators, principals, and inspectors to the real players of the implementation process. Even though the objective of English education in Libyan high schools is to develop communicative competence, this objective is influenced by several inhibitive factors related to professional development, class time, class size, and funding, among others as mentioned earlier in this study. Unless policy makers, curriculum developers,
school principals, and inspectors work together to facilitate those obstacles, achieving the goals of the new change is unfeasible.

The findings indicate that complete adaptation of the new curriculum in Libyan high school English language classrooms does not appear to be what was expected from the change. Due to the restrictions mentioned earlier, teachers had to adapt and make some adjustments to their teaching practices. In the following section, the implications of the relationship between teachers’ real practices in the classroom and the new curriculum are presented.

**Research question four**

This section addresses the last research question, which focuses on the implications that the relationship between the operational and the planned curriculum has for the English language curriculum in Libya. The researcher depended on the conclusions drawn for the first three research questions to answer the fourth research question, in addition to the fourth interview question. Respondents’ comments in the interview and in the open-ended questions were also used as supporting data.

The findings of this study showed some of the teachers’ concerns and complaints about the CLT curriculum in their classrooms. The data indicate that there is a gap between what is expected in the new curriculum and what is actually being done in classrooms. The discrepancies between the goals of the new curriculum and teachers’ practices can best be explained by the conflict between the demands of the curriculum and the realities of English language teaching in Libyan high schools.
Based on the data drawn for the first three research questions, the researcher inferred that there are some realities that need to be recognized by educators, policy makers, inspectors, and principals of schools in Libya. Among these and most important are: time factors, funding, class size, professional development, teacher workload, and student motivation and resistance to practice. These factors impacted teachers’ actual performance of the curriculum and created the gap between the curriculum goals and what is being taught to students. English language teachers cannot do anything about these hindrances unless policy makers realize the realities of the implementation process of the curriculum.

As the data revealed, all the inhibitive factors are beyond the teachers’ control. Thus, their practice is negatively impacted and the discrepancy between the curriculum and its application is apparent. One of the respondents’ comments on what can be done to facilitate the implementation process was as follows:

First, I think having the intention and the desire to teach and be a teacher is very important factor in curriculum implementation in general and in English language in particular. Also, as a teacher I have to get rid of the belief that I am the only knowledgeable and knower in the class. Adopting the interactive classroom environment is also helpful in facilitating the curriculum. Another important factor is class size, small classes make it more feasible to implement the curriculum effectively as teachers can go around the class and check with every single student as opposed to large classes where it is difficult to do so. It is also important that teachers
should not be overloaded and be given enough time. For example, I teach about 450 students from all departments. Because the school does not have enough teachers I have to teach all those students. Motivation and rewards for teachers also can help successful implementation of the curriculum. Not to forget the equipment such as language labs, CD players and all audio and visual aids that are needed to implement the curriculum. All these I believe will help in achieving successful implementation of the curriculum. (Teacher D interview)

Another interviewee mentioned the following in her response to what can be done to facilitate teaching the new curriculum. The teacher’s comments support the researcher’s inference about the mismatch between curriculum goals and classroom realities:

Once again, I confirm that if the problems associated with class size, school administration, inspectors, and parents are solved or worked on. Then classroom practices will change to better. In-service teacher’s training also is important in helping teachers implement the curriculum successfully. Teachers also should be motivated. (Teacher A interview)

Furthermore, the data indicate that regardless of the efforts made by the teachers to implement the curriculum effectively, achieving the goals of the new curriculum seem to be unfeasible with the current teaching conditions in Libyan high schools. This failure can be attributed to: (1) the incompatibility of the curriculum design with the teaching
conditions, (2) the lack of professional support and lack of resources, and (3) student’s low proficiency. These factors are found in other contexts in the area of curriculum implementation. Once again, these findings support the researcher’s inference about the mismatch between the planned and operational curriculum.

The body of literature presented in this study with the findings mentioned above suggests the reasons for the non-effective implementation of the curriculum. Failure to take the teaching and classroom-level realities into consideration when decisions are made to make curricula reform is the explanation. The communicative-based English language curriculum for Libyan high schools seemed to ignore the local realities of the teachers and schools. Top-down models are no longer considered the most appropriate models. They are rigid and focus mainly on inputs and outputs. They ignore the actual process of change, most notably the complexities of implementation (O’Sullivan, 2004 p. 599).

Thus policy makers need to realize these facts and realities about curriculum change to avoid or at least reduce the drawbacks of any further change they might decide to do. The findings of this study suggest some implications for policy makers, educators, inspectors, principals, and teachers with regard to the following factors. Prior to decision making about curriculum reform, people in charge have to look at the realities of the teaching situation where the change is going to happen and take those realities into account. The data revealed that there are four major areas need to be dealt with. These include external factors, school factors, teacher factors, and student factors.
Issues related to external factors: Policy makers need to recognize that funding and sustainable support for change is a must for successful implementation. Although the Libyan governments spent a large amount of money on the process of curriculum change, the inadequate allocation of those funds caused many problems for curriculum implementation players. For example, both sets of data showed that class size is still a major problem hindering effective implementation. It is clear that the Libyan government neglected or failed to find a radical solution for such a problem. Most of the participants complained about their class size and expressed their concern about teaching the new curriculum in such an environment. Policy makers need to recognize that adequate investment can help in achieving the goals of change. Investing adequately would help recruit teachers and as a result the issue of classroom size can be solved and can help reduce the teachers’ load. The results suggest that more funding and adequate spending should be taken into consideration. It would be more manageable for teachers to run interactive classrooms.

People involved in the process of curriculum change need to realize that there are realities and factors related to schools, teachers, and students that can impact the process of change negatively or positively. For example, having the student participate actively and communicatively in class is a major principle of the new curriculum. However, students’ low proficiency and reluctance to participate caused a major hindrance to teachers. As indicated in the findings, students’ low proficiencies and reluctance to participate appeared among the top inhibitive factors to the process of change. The data indicated that due to student’s low proficiency, their participation is restricted; and
therefore, students do not get involved actively and fully in class activities. Most of the teachers indicated that building a supportive environment and assigning achievable tasks are good strategies to help students become more involved in the classroom.

Participants also expressed their need for more professional support to help them make a smoother transition from traditional teaching environments and beliefs to a more constructive and communicative teaching environment. Therefore, prior to the decision for curricular change, policy makers and administrators should consider providing professional support to teachers that will help them implement the curriculum effectively. Principals and inspectors also should realize that overloading teachers with extra activities and demanding them to focus on quantity will hinder the implementation process. As indicated in this study, most of the participants revealed their frustration about two major factors that affect their teaching of the new curriculum. Cheung and Wong (2012) state that “strengthening professional development programs and building teachers’ capacity is the first and foremost things that … should be considered to ensure that the curriculum reform is a success” (p. 52). Building a collaborative environment and continuous professional programs are key factors for curriculum reform success. The results suggest that efforts have to be made in this respect to assure that teachers are provided with adequate professional programs and the needed support. Taking into account these issues will undoubtedly assist teachers to perform the curricular changes successfully.

Another inhibiting factor is the school. There was a consensus among the participants that miscommunication between the principals and teachers and the absence
of collaborative work, in addition to the overwhelming demands, were hampering teachers from successful implementation of the curriculum. For example, both sets of data showed that participants were concerned about the time allocated for English classes. Teachers complained that many of the curriculum contents created a great challenge because such lessons and tasks require longer instruction time than what is allocated for in English classes. Teacher B claimed that some of the reading lessons are very long and contained complex vocabulary. As a result, one lesson might take up to three classes time to cover.

The data provided evidence about the imbalance between the time available for teachers and the content of the curriculum to be taught. Interviewees also indicated that in many occasions, lessons are skipped to save time and meet the demands from the principals and the inspectors to cover the whole curriculum. Therefore, considering the balance between curriculum content to be taught in class and time allocation is important. Moreover, educators need to know that there is a difference between the actual time of teaching and the official 45 minutes assigned because some of this time is lost in settling down the class, taking absence and warming up the students for the new lesson.

All in all, curriculum makers, educators, policy makers, inspectors, principals, and teachers should realize that the process of curriculum change is complex and dynamic. Curriculum reform involves so many interrelated factors that can either facilitate or impede the process of change.
**Chapter Six: Summary, Conclusion, Limitations, and Recommendations**

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of English language teachers regarding the new communicative-based curriculum in Libyan high schools. The study’s aims were to: a) evaluate and critique the high school English curriculum; b) explore and describe teachers’ perceptions regarding English instruction in high school settings; and c) identify the strengths and weaknesses of the high school English curriculum and how it resonates with teachers’ beliefs about English language teaching and learning. English language instruction and proficiency is crucial for Libyan high school teachers since some of them will go back to universities and pursue graduate studies in TESL; thus, their perceptions may have an impact not only on their current classroom practices but also on future curricula reforms and changes.

The research applied a mixed methods research approach to collect data. Sequential procedures for data collection were followed where quantitative data was collected first, followed by the qualitative data. A total of 104 surveys were distributed to English language teachers in Libyan high schools. Sixty seven surveys were returned with a response rate of 64.42%. Then, five teachers with different teaching experiences were chosen to interview for the qualitative data. The teachers’ experiences extended from 2 years to more than 10 years.
Additionally, the study examined the factors influencing the teachers’ implementation of CLT. Specifically, the study sought to answer the four main research questions below. The first and second research questions were used for the quantitative data, while the third and fourth questions were used for the qualitative data. Results for each research question are presented and summarized.

- How have English teachers in Libyan high schools implemented the new curriculum?
- What factors facilitate or inhibit the implementation of the new curriculum? What effect do these factors have on the implementation of this curriculum?
- What are teachers’ perceptions of the planned curriculum and the relationship between the operationalized curriculum and the planned curriculum in their classrooms?
- What implications does the relationship between the operational and the planned curriculum have for the English language curriculum in Libya?

Conclusions

The first research question asked the participants about their practices of CLT principles. The overall results showed that high percentages of the participants practiced the CLT principles. However, later in the study it was determined that the practice of CLT principles was hampered by several factors, as presented in the results from the
second and third research questions. Each principle that received 3 or higher on the scale was considered practiced.

The quantitative data showed that not all the participants practiced CLT in their classrooms. Fifty-six out of the 67 respondents indicated that they have practiced CLT. Eleven of the participants reported that they never practiced CLT, although the curriculum they used was based on CLT principles. However, differences between the degrees of practice among these principles were noticeable. For example, the results showed that developing communicative competence and creating communicative roles for learners were perceived positively, as these two principles received higher means. The percentage of CLT principles practice was 75.4% with an average mean score of 3.77.

Although teachers expressed the importance and necessity of applying the principles of CLT to have better results and to improve their learners’ performance, they did not hide their fears and concerns about the conditions of their schools and classrooms, which do not meet the minimal requirements needed to implement the curriculum successfully.

The second research question focused on the difficulties and obstacles that teachers encounter when they practice curricula reform, specifically communicative-based English curricula. To answer this research question and to identify the obstacles that teachers encounter and how the inhibitive factors affect the implementation process, the study used quantitative and qualitative data. Item 11 in the survey asked the participants to rate the items as a major problem, a potential problem, or not a problem.
Moreover, question three of the interview focuses on the difficulties and obstacles that teachers encounter when implementing CLT.

Results showed a number of factors that are considered major concerns by the participants. Eleven of these factors were identified in the quantitative data, including teacher’s limited time for teaching CLT materials, insufficient funding, students’ low English proficiency, teachers’ lack of training in CLT, teachers’ lack of opportunities for in-service training in CLT, large classes, lack of support from colleagues and administrators, focusing on rote memorization in teaching and learning, students’ resistance because teachers are considered the knowledge transmitter, students’ lack of motivation for developing communicative competence, and students’ resistance to class participation. In addition, qualitative data supported the quantitative findings by considering these factors as major concerns for the teachers. Both sets of data indicate that the CLT implementation process was negatively influenced by these factors, as they were rated as major or potential problems by the participants.

The findings of the qualitative data support the quantitative data. Most of the interviewees expressed their concern about the difficulties of practicing communicative activities in large classes. Their concerns were based on the fact that it was unfeasible to have all the learners participate in such activities. Moreover, it is difficult to monitor and manage large classes when teaching communicative lessons and activities, which are time consuming and labor intensive.

The third research question investigated the teachers’ perceptions of the new curriculum and the relationship, if any, between what teachers actually do in the classroom and the prescribed curriculum represented in the assigned textbooks.
Qualitative data were used to answer this research question. Teachers’ responses from the first interview question formed the data used in this part. The first major theme to emerge from the respondents’ answers was communicative ability development. All of the interviewees indicated that one of the big benefits of the new curriculum is its focus on developing the communicative abilities of learners.

Moreover, the data showed the importance of this curriculum as a means to assist students enrich both their major field knowledge and their basic communication skills. Developing the communicative competence of the learner is an important aspect of this curriculum. However, achieving this goal does not seem to be feasible within the existing learning and teaching conditions of Libyan high schools. Classroom realities and school structure do not help to implement the innovation effectively.

Teachers also revealed the value of the new curriculum in terms of skills integration. The new innovation combines the four language skills required to develop the learner’s knowledge in a foreign language. All the interviewees strongly reported that if the curriculum was practiced fully and effectively, learners’ four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—could be improved and developed.

Nonetheless, all the respondents expressed their complaints about the instructional contexts and school realities, in addition to other inhibitive factors mentioned earlier in our comments on the second research question and the obstacles to achieving goals and change successfully. The new curriculum adopts the learner-centered approach that does not fit into the Libyan context unless something is done to overcome the difficulties mentioned in research question two.
The second part of the third research question is an attempt to check the relationship between the prescribed assigned curriculum embodied in the textbooks and “the operational curriculum” (Uhrmacher, 1997). Teachers were asked in the interview to explain and give examples of their classroom practices of the new innovation. It seems obvious that regardless of the teachers’ efforts to implement the curriculum as intended with a focus on communicative abilities and adopting new teaching strategies that consider the learner-centeredness, what is being done in classrooms is not a real reflection of the new curriculum.

Regardless of teachers’ efforts to implement the curriculum as it should be to achieve its goals, it is noticeable that what is happening inside classrooms is not a true reflection of the new curriculum. Namely, teachers’ practices inside the classroom may not include activities that are real features of the CLT curriculum, such as group work and communicative tasks, and even the classroom environment is not interactive as one teacher explained: “I would describe my way of teaching the new curriculum in my class by giving the students the new vocabulary of each new topic to add to their vocabulary stock and ask them to learn them by heart” (Teacher B interview).

The findings indicate that complete adaptation of the new curriculum in Libyan high school English language classrooms does not appear to be what was expected from the change. Due to the restrictions mentioned earlier, teachers had to adapt and make some adjustments to their teaching practices. In the following part, the implication of the relationship between teachers’ real practices in the classroom and the new curriculum is presented.
The fourth research question for this study investigated the relationship between teachers’ practices and the prescribed curriculum to see if what was being practiced in classrooms was a true reflection of the prescribed curriculum. The question also looks into the implications the study may suggest.

The respondents revealed some of their concerns and complaints about the CLT curriculum practice in the classrooms. The data revealed also that there is a gap between what is expected from the new curriculum and teachers in the classrooms. The differences between the goals of the new curriculum and teachers’ practices can best be explained by the conflict between the demands of the curriculum and the realities of English language teaching in Libyan high schools.

The study revealed that time, funding, class size, professional development, teacher workload, and student motivation and resistance to practice impacted teachers’ actual performance of the curriculum and created the gap between the curriculum goals and what is being taught to the students. English language teachers cannot do anything about these hindrances unless policy makers realize the realities of the implementation process of the curriculum. All the inhibitive factors are beyond the teachers’ abilities. Thus their practice is negatively impacted, and the discrepancy between the curriculum and its application is apparent.

Furthermore, the body of literature presented in this study and the findings mentioned above suggest the reasons for the non-effective implementation of the curriculum. Failure to take the teaching and classroom-level realities into consideration when decisions are made to make a change is the explanation. The communicative-based
English language curriculum for Libyan high schools seemed to ignore the local realities of the teachers and schools. Top-down models are no longer considered the most appropriate models.

I inferred some of the implications from this research question data. The results showed that there are different influential factors that should be considered when curriculum change is to be implemented. First, policy makers need to recognize that funding and sustainable support for change programs is a must for successful implementation. People involved in the process of curriculum change should realize that there are realities and factors related to schools, teachers, and students that can impact the process of change negatively or positively, such as students’ low proficiency, professional support, class size, and time. Principals and inspectors also should realize that overloading teachers with extra activities and demanding them to focus on the quantity of the curriculum will hinder the implementation process rather helping the teachers.

There was a consensus among the participants that miscommunication between the principals and teachers, the absence of collaborative work, and the overwhelming demands were hampering teachers from successful implementation of the curriculum. The data provided evidence about the imbalance between the time available for teachers and the content of curriculum to be taught.

All in all, curriculum makers, educators, policy makers, inspectors, principals, and teachers should realize that the process of curriculum change is complex and dynamic.
The curriculum reform involves so many interrelated factors that can either facilitate or impede the process of change as explained earlier in this study.

**Limitations**

This study has several limitations. First, the participants of this study are limited in number. The total number of participants was limited to 67, compared to the total English language teachers’ population in Libyan high schools. Thus, to get a more detailed picture of the current implementation of CLT in Libyan high schools, a larger scale study could be done. And, the quantitative portion of the study was limited by items selected for the survey. If items were different, responses may be different.

Second, document collection also can be used in addition to classroom observation to gain broader and more generalizable results about the process of CLT implementation.

Third, the findings drawn in this study were based upon teachers’ points of view. Students’ perceptions could be included to compare and contrast with those of the teachers. The study also focused on public schools, so further studies can be done to include private schools and thus comparison can be conducted between the two school types.

**Recommendations**

This study reported results about Libyan high school English language teachers’ perceptions about the new curriculum. The study also explored the obstacles that teachers encounter when they practice the new curriculum inside classrooms. As with most
educational research, this study recommends possible directions for future studies in the field of curriculum change.

First, the participants of this study were from public schools only; thus further research can include private school teachers and other regions in the country to get a broader picture about the process of curriculum change in Libya.

Second, the perception of school principals, inspectors, and students about the new curriculum is limited in this study; therefore, it is recommended for future studies to investigate principals, inspectors, and students’ perceptions of CLT implementation with greater depth. Also, the results of this study were based on teachers’ self reports. So, further studies can use classroom observations as a technique for data collection to explore teachers’ CLT practice in more detail and to examine closely the factors that promote or hinder the curriculum implementation process.

In conclusion, the interviews in this study were restricted by time factor, thus a long-term qualitative study is recommended to explore the teachers’ perceptions and the factors that influence the implementation process.
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Appendix A: Questionnaire for Libyan EFL teachers in public high schools

Cover Letter

Dear teacher,

You are invited to participate in my research study. The goal of this study is to collect information about your experiences with teaching English and your views about the barriers that teachers encounter in implementing the English curriculum. You are asked to participate in this study because you are a teacher of English in Libyan high schools. If you agree to participate in the study, you will respond to a questionnaire that will ask you questions about your background information such as your age, English teaching experience, as well as statements that will investigate your views and opinions toward the English language curriculum in high schools. It may take you up to 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. In addition, in a few weeks, after I receive the completed questionnaire, I would like to interview some of you to gain more in-depth insight into your teaching experiences of the new English curriculum. You will not be asked about your name and there is no need for you to write it on the questionnaire. The results of this research study will be given only in summary form. If you choose to participate in this study, all information obtained will be maintained in strict confidence by me and no information about your identity will be disclosed. Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the full right to decide not to participate in the study at all, or to withdraw at any time without penalty. Participation or non-participation will not affect your status at the institute. By completing the survey you indicate that you agree to participate in this research study. If you have any concerns or questions about this study, please contact me:

Salem Altaieb, University of Denver, Colorado, United States
E-mail: samaltaieb@gmail.com

Supervisor: Dr. Kimberly Hartnett-Edwards, University of Denver, Colorado, United States.

This project has been approved by the University of Denver Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
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Survey for Libyan English language teachers

Title: Teachers’ perception of English language curriculum in Libyan public schools: An investigation and assessment of the implementation process of English Curriculum in Libyan public high schools
Q-1 Age: -------
Q-2 Gender:
○ Male
○ Female

Q-3 Years of experiences teaching after obtaining your degree: --------------

Q-4 Level of education:
○ Higher diploma
○ Bachelor’s degree
○ Master's degree
○ PhD

Q-5 Which group of students are you teaching?
○ English major
○ English non-major
○ Both

Q-6 What subjects are you teaching currently? -------------------------------

Q-7 Did you learn about CLT in your teacher education program?
○ ----- Yes
○ ----- No

Q-8 Have you tried CLT?
○ ----- Yes, and I am still using it now
○ ----- Yes, but I am not using it now
○ ----- No, Never (skip to item 10 if you answered " No" )

Q-9 On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is rarely practice and 5 is practice fully, how would you rate your current implementation of each principle of CLT? (Rarely practice 1 2 3 4 5 practice fully)
  The objective is to develop student’s communicative competence
○ 1
○ 2
○ 3
○ 4
○ 5

  The role of the student is a communicator.
○ 1
○ 2
○ 3
○ 4
○ 5
Four skills “listening, speaking, reading, and writing are integrated in the classroom practice.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Instructional materials may include thematic development materials, task-based materials, and authentic, real life materials.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Students are evaluated both on fluency and accuracy by being asked to perform a real communicative function. (I.e. To assess students' writing skill, they are asked to write a letter to a friend.)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Q-10. The following are some difficulties that some EFL teachers have had in adopting CLT. Did you encounter these difficulties or do you think they might be difficulties if you adopt CLT in Libyan high schools? Please rate the following items on a scale of 1= not a problem, 2= potential problem, 3= not a problem, circle the option that you think best reflects your opinion.

Teacher's limited proficiency in spoken English.

- 1
- 2
- 3

Teachers' limited sociolinguistics/ cultural competence.

- 1
- 2
- 3
Teachers’ lack of training in CLT.
1
2
3

Teachers have few opportunities for in-service training in CLT.
1
2
3

Teachers have little time for teaching materials for CLT class.
1
2
3

Lack of authentic teaching materials.
1
2
3

Large classes.
1
2
3

Insufficient funding, school facilities (few language labs, technology equipment).
1
2
3

Lack of support from colleagues and administrators.
1
2
3

Grammar-based examination.
1
2
3

Lack of assessment instruments.
1
2
3

Students' low English proficiency.
1
2
3

Students' resistance to class participation.
1
2
3

Students' resistance because teacher is central and knowledge transmitter.
1
2
3

Students' resistance because of the concept that learning should be serious, not playing games.
1
2
3

Using the prescribed book in teaching.
1
2
3

Using English language to teach CLT curriculum.
1
2
3

Emphasizing the process or the product.
1
2
3

The conflict of doing grammar explanation and error correction.
1
2
3
Focusing on rote memorization and repetition.

1
2
3

Open-ended question.
Q-1. Could you please describe how you implement the CLT curriculum in your class? Could you give some examples of how you teach?

Q-2. What problems have you encountered in teaching English? How do they influence your curriculum? How do you address the problems? Which problem do you find most difficult to address? Are there any other factors that influence your teaching practice?

Q-3. What problems have you encountered in teaching English? How do they influence your curriculum? How do you address the problems? Which problem do you find most difficult to address? Are there any other factors that influence your teaching practice?

4. What can be done to facilitate the teaching and learning of the CLT curriculum?
If you need more space please use an extra white sheet and attach it to this survey.

Please provide us with contact information such as phone number or email if you like to participate in the interview. Phone: -----------------, Email: -------------

Thank you for cooperation and participation.
الاخوة الأساتذة المحترمون،

انتم مدعوون للمشاركة في دراسة عنا مناهج اللغة الإنجليزية بالمرحلة الثانوية وكيفية تطبيقها. يهدف الاستبيان المرفق إلى جمع معلومات عن كيفية اداؤك لهذا المناهج، وكيفية نظرك حول العراقيل و الصعوبات التي تواجهك في تطبيق المناهج كما نتص اهدافه. وقد تم اختيارك للمشاركة في هذه الدراسة كونك استاذاً للغة الإنجليزية بالمرحلة الثانوية.

في حال قبولك المشاركة في هذه الدراسة، سيطلب منك الإجابة على الأسئلة الموجودة بهذا الاستبيان والمتعلقة بالمعلومات العامة حول الاستاذ و وجهات النظر حول تطبيق المناهج والصعوبات وال العراقيل التي تواجه الأساتذة في تدريس مناهج اللغة الإنجليزية بالمرحلة الثانوية.

قد تستغرق الإجابة على الأسئلة حوالي 20 دقيقة و لن يطلب منك كتابة اسمك على الاستبيان. و في حال موافقتك المشاركة في الدراسة فاعلم بأن إجابتك ستحظى بالسرية التامة و لن يتم الكشف عنها للعامة. ان اجهزة الاستاذة والابحاث تعرف بأن المشاركة في هذه الدراسة اختيارية و ليست إجبارية. و لك حرية اتخاذ القرار بعدم المشاركة في الدراسة في أي وقت دون أن تكون باعث. و اعلم أيضًا أنه يمكنك التوقف عن المشاركة في أي وقت حتى وأن قد بدأت في تعبئة الاستبيان.

أخيرا، ان إجابتك على هذا الاستبيان تعتبر موافقة منك على المشاركة بهذه الدراسة. إذا كان لديك أي استفسار أو استفسام يمكن التواصل معنا، وشكرًا لك / لكي مقدماً.

الباحث: سالم رمضان التائب

كلية التربية، جامعة دنفر، كولورادو، الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية

البريد الإلكتروني: samaltaieb@gmail.com

المشرف: د. كيمري هارتنت إدواردز

جامعة دنفر، كولورادو، الولايات المتحدة

تمت الموافقة على إجراء هذه الدراسة من قبل مجلس متابعة الابحاث لحماية المشاركين في الدراسات الإنسانية التابعة لجامعة
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>السؤال</th>
<th>الإجابة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>العمر</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الجنس</td>
<td>ذكر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سنوات الخبرة في تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية بعد حصولك على المؤهل</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المستوى التعليمي</td>
<td>دبلوم عالي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>دكتورة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أي المجموعات تدرس؟ المتخصصون غير المتخصصون كلاهما</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الماهي المواد التي تدرسها حالياً؟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ثانيًا: التدريس التواصلى للغة (سى ال تى) يضع تدريس اللغة التواصلى قيمة عالية للاستخدام الفعلي للغة الشفهية والمكتوبة لغرض التواصل الحقيقي وكوسيلة لطلاب للتعلم. إن هذا المنهج كان محط اهتمام البرنامج الغربي لتدریس اللغة الأجنبية لسنوات عدة و الآن أيضاً هو محل اهتمام العديد من البلدان العربية كليبيا. الرجاء الإشارة الى الخبرات التى تملكها فى تعلم او استخدام جوانب هذا المنهج في تدريس لغة الإنجليزية</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هل تعلم أي شيء عن هذا المنهج في دراستك؟</td>
<td>نعم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هل استخدم هذا المنهج؟</td>
<td>نعم و ما زلت استخدمه الآن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>على مقياس من 1 إلى 5 حيث واحد يشير إلى الاستخدام النادر و 5 إلى الاستخدام الكلي. كيف تقيم أداءك الحالي لكل مبادئ من مبادئي منهج التدريس التواصلى؟</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الهدف هو تطور القدرة التواصلية للطالب</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دور الطالب هو التواصلى</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
المهارة الاربعة " الاستماع , التكلم , القراءة , و الكتابة كنها مدمجة في التدريس 1 2 3 4 5

المواد التدريسية تشمل مواد تطوير الموضوع , مواد مبنية على مهام , مواد حقيقية من الحياة اليومية 1 2 3 4 5

يقم الطلاب على الطلاقة و الدقة و ذلك بمطالبهم بداء و وظيفة تواصلية حقيقية ( بمعنى اخر ان تقيم المهارة الكتابية للطالب , يطلب منهم مثل كتابة رسالة لصديق ) 1 2 3 4 5

11- هذه بعض الصعوبات التي واجهت بعض مدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة اجنبي عند استخدامهم اسلوب التدريس التواصلى للغة , هل واجهت هذه الصعوبات او هل تعتقد بأنه يمكن ان تكون صعوبات في حالة استخدامك لأسلوب التدريس التواصلى للغة في الثانويات الليبية ؟ الرجاء تقييم العناصر الآتية على مقياس من 1 الى 3 حيث 1= مشكلة , 2= مشكلة ممكنة , 3= ليست مشكلة... الرجاء وضع دائرة على افضل خيار يعكس وجهة نظرك.

- القدرة المحدودة للاستاذ في اللغة الكلامية 1 2 3
- القدرة الثقافية و اللغوية الاجتماعية المحدودة للاستاذ 1 2 3
- نقص التدريب للاستاذ في مجال التعلم اللغوي التواصلى 1 2 3
- المدرسين بالخدمة الفعلية لديهم فرص قليلة للتدريب على استدلال التعلم التواصلى 1 2 3
- لدى المدرسين وقت قليل لتدريس المواد الخاصة باسلوب التدريس التواصلى 1 2 3
- العجز في مواد التدريس الحقيقية 1 2 3
- النقص الكبيرة من ناحية العدد 1 2 3
- الدعم المالي الغير كافى , امكانيات المدارس من حيث ( معامل اللغة , التجهيزات التقنية ) 1 2 3

3
- غياب الدعم من الزملاء و المدراء 1 2 3
- الامتحانات منهجية على القواعد 1 2 3
- غياب اليات التقييم 1 2 3
- طلاقة الطلاب الضعيفة في اللغة الإنجليزية 1 2 3

150
غياب الحافز لدى الطلاب لتطوير القدرة التواصلية

رفض الطلاب المشاركة في الفصل

رفض الطلاب للاستاذ مركز المعلومة وهو الناقل الوحيد لها

رفض الطلاب نتيجة للفهم بأن التعلم يجب أن يكون جدى وليس عن طريق التمثيل والألعاب

استخدام الكتاب المعد في التدريس

استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية لتدريب المنهج

التأكيد على الطريقة لا المحصلة أو المنتج

الاختلاف على توضيح القواعد وتصحيح الأخطاء

اسئلة مفتوحة

1- هل بالتمكن وصف الطريقة التي تدرس بها المنهج التواصلى في فصلك؟ هل بالتمكن اعطاء الأمثلة على طريقة تدريسك؟

2- ما هي المشاكل التي واجتها في تدريسك اللغة الإنجليزية؟ كيف تؤثر هذه المشاكل على المنهج؟ كيف تصف هذه المشاكل؟ أي المشاكل تعتبر الأصعب؟ هل هناك أي عوامل أخرى تؤثر على أدائك التدريسي؟
ما الذي يجعل المنهج ناجحا في فصل الدراسى؟ وما هي العناصر التي تعتبرها أساسية في تدريس المنهج؟ ولماذا؟

ما الذي يمكن عمله لتسهيل تدريس وتعلم المنهج؟

إذا احتجت مساحة إضافية الرجاء استخدام أوراق بيضاء وحاحفها بهذا الاستبيان. الرجاء تزويدنا برقم هاتف أو إيميل في حالة رغبتك في المشاركة في المقابلات الشخصية لهذه الدراسة. رقم الهاتف_________________________ إيميل_________________________

شكرا جزيلًا لمساهمتك في هذه الدراسة.
Appendix C: Interview Protocol

1. What is your opinion about the new curriculum? And could you please describe how you practice CLT in your class with some examples?

2. When you first practiced CLT, was it different from the way you are practicing now? Do you make any adjustments when you implement CLT in your classroom? If so, how do you adapt CLT in your classroom? Why do you make this adaptation?

3. What problems have you encountered? How do they influence your practice of CLT? How do you address the problems? Which problem do you find most difficult to address? Are there any other factors that influence your practice of CLT?

4. What can be done to make CLT curriculum implementation successful in your classroom?

5. What makes CLT successful in your classrooms? What components do you consider essential in your CLT classrooms? Why is that?
Appendix D: Informed consent form for the survey

Title: Teachers’ perception of English language curriculum in Libyan public schools: An investigation and assessment of the implementation process of English Curriculum in Libyan public high schools

You are invited to participate in a study that will investigate and assess the implementation process of the English language curriculum in Libyan high schools. In addition, this study is being conducted to fulfill the requirements of doctoral degree in Curriculum and Instruction. The study is conducted by Salem Altaieb. Results will be used to identify any barriers or difficulties that Libyan teachers of English encounter in teaching the curriculum. The researcher can be reached at (phone: 091-322-9820/e-mail: samaltaieb@gmail.com). This project is supervised by Dr. Kimberly Hartnett-Edwards, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, (phone: 303.871.2720, e-mail: Kimberly.Hartnett-Edwards@du.edu).

Participation in this study should take about 15 minutes of your time. Participation will involve responding to the survey questions about your practice and teaching of the English curriculum. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. The risks associated with this project are minimal. If, however, you experience discomfort you may discontinue at any time. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Your responses will be identified by code number only and will be kept separate from information that could identify you. This is done to protect the confidentiality of your responses. Only the researcher will have access to your individual data and any reports generated as a result of this study will use only group averages and paraphrased wording.

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the interview, please contact Paul Olk, Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-871-4531, or you may email du-irb@du.edu, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs or call 303-871-4050 or write to either at the University of Denver, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-2121.

You may keep this page for your records. Please sign the next page if you understand and agree to the above. If you do not understand any part of the above statement, please ask the researcher any questions you have.

I have read and understood the foregoing descriptions of the study called (Teachers’ perception of English language curriculum in Libyan public schools). I have asked for and received a satisfactory explanation of any language that I did not fully understand. I
agree to participate in this study, and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any
time. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature ____________  Date ______________

___ I would like a summary of the results of this study to be mailed to me at the
following postal or e-mail address:
طلب الموافقة على المشاركة في الاستبان

عنوان الدراسة: إدراك المعلمين لمناهج اللغة الإنجليزية في المدارس الليبية العامة: تحقيق وتقديم عملية تدريس منهج اللغة الإنجليزية في المدارس الثانوية العامة بلبيبة

انتم مدعوون للمشاركة في هذه الدراسة، والتي ستتحقق وتقديم عملية تنفيذ مناهج اللغة الإنجليزية في المدارس الثانوية الليبية. إن هذه الدراسة تجري تلبية لمتطلبات درجة الدكتوراه في المناهج والتدريب. ستجرى الدراسة من قبل الباحث سالم التائب، وسوف تستخدم النتائج للتعريف على أي عوائق أو صعوبات تواجه مدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية في تدريس المناهج الدراسية. ويمكن الوصول إلى البحث عن طريق (هاتف: 9820-322-901) أو البريد الإلكتروني: samaltaieb@gmail.com.

كلمة كاملة تحت إشراف الدكتورة: كيمبرلي هارتنت أيدوردز، قسم المناهج والتدريس بجامعة دنفر، دنفر، ولاية كولورادو، الرمز البريدي 80208، هاتف: 303-2720-871، أو بريد إلكتروني: Kimberly.Hartnett@du.edu

إن المشاركة في هذه الدراسة قد تستغرق (15) دقيقة من وقتكم. وسوف تشمل المشاركة الإجابة على استبان الاستبان المتعلقة بتدريس منهج اللغة الإنجليزية. المشاركة في هذه الدراسة ضرورية تماماً، وان المشاركة المرتبطة بهذه الدراسة ضرورية جداً. ولكن إذا شعرتم بعدم اعتناء يمكنكم التوقف على الإجابة في أي وقت. نحترم حكمكم في عدم الرد على الاستبان التي قد تشعركم بعدم الارتياح. ورفضكم للمشاركة أو الانسحاب منها لا يترتب عليه أي عقوبة أو خسارة.

وسيتم التعرف على أجابتكم من خلال السري والاحترام في البحوث فقط، وستبقى الإجابات مرتبطة بالبيانات الخاصة بك، والتي تتعلق بالبيانات وحلفاء المعلومات. سوف يكون مدقراً بالبحث فقط الوصول إلى البيانات الفردية وان أي تقارير أو نتائج تستنتج من هذه الدراسة سوف يتم التعبير عليها بعبارات الباحث وتخليص على أساس المجموعات وليس الأفراد.

إذا كان لديك أي مخاوف أو شكاوى أثناء الدراسة، الوجه الإتصال بالباحث: بي بول الك، رئيس لجنة مراجعة البحوث، مركز حماية البشر المساهمين في البحوث، هاتف: 313-495-7183-303 أو بريد إلكتروني: IRB@DU.EDU، Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at the University of Denver, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208

يمكنك الاحتفاظ بنسخة من هذه الموافقة لسجلاتك الخاصة.

لقد قرأت وفهمت الاستبان المذكورين أعلاه واعترفت ووافقتم على ما ذكر أنفسكم. إذا لم تفهم أي فقرة، فإن الاتصال بالباحث لوضوح ذلك.

لقد قرأت وفهمت الاستبان المذكورين أعلاه وأنتسبت وامتت القدرات العامة للبحث عن أي لغة ملائمة. وعليكم أمانى موافقتكم للمشاركة بهذه الدراسة وانتم انتسبت من حق الإنساح في أو وقت. لقد استلمت نسخة من هذه الموافقة.

التقديم: -----------------------------

التاريخ: -----------------------------

التوقيع: -----------------------------

------ ارغب في الحصول على تقرير النتائج هذه الدراسة
Appendix F: Informed Consent Form For The Interview

Title: Teachers’ perception of English language curriculum in Libyan public schools: An investigation and assessment of the implementation process of English Curriculum in Libyan public high schools.

You are invited to participate in a study that will investigate and assess the implementation process of the English language curriculum in Libyan high schools. In addition, this study is being conducted to fulfill the requirements of doctoral degree in Curriculum and Instruction. The study is conducted by Salem Altaieb. Results will be used to identify any barriers or difficulties that Libyan teachers of English encounter in teaching the curriculum. The researcher can be reached at (phone: 091-322-9820/e-mail: samaltaieb@gmail.com). This project is supervised by Dr. Kimberly Hartnett-Edwards, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, (phone: 303.871.2720, e-mail: Kimberly.Hartnett-Edwards@du.edu).

Participation in this study should take about 30 to 45 minutes of your time. Participation will involve responding to at least (5) questions about your practice and teaching of the English curriculum. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. The risks associated with this project are minimal. If, however, you experience discomfort you may discontinue the interview at any time. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Your responses will be identified by code number only and will be kept separate from information that could identify you. This is done to protect the confidentiality of your responses. Only the researcher will have access to your individual data and any reports generated as a result of this study will use only group averages and paraphrased wording.

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the interview, please contact Paul Olk, Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-871-4531, or you may email du-irb@du.edu, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs or call 303-871-4050 or write to either at the University of Denver, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-2121.

You may keep this page for your records. Please sign the next page if you understand and agree to the above. If you do not understand any part of the above statement, please ask the researcher any questions you have.

I have read and understood the foregoing descriptions of the study called (Teachers’ perception of English language curriculum in Libyan public schools). I have asked for
and received a satisfactory explanation of any language that I did not fully understand. I agree to participate in this study, and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature ___________________ Date ________________

___ I agree to be audiotaped. ___ I agree to be photographed

___ I do not agree to be audiotaped. ___ I do not agree to be photographed

Signature ___________________ Date ________________

___________ I would like a summary of the results of this study to be mailed to me at the following postal or e-mail address:
طلب الموافقة على المقابلة الشخصية للدراسة.

عنوان الدراسة: إدراك المعلمين لمناهج اللغة الإنجليزية في المدارس الليبية العامة: تحقيق وتقسيم عملية تدريس مناهج اللغة الإنجليزية في المدارس الثانوية العامة الليبية

أنتم مدعوون للمشاركة في هذه الدراسة وانها ستستفيد مناهج اللغة الإنجليزية في المدارس الليبية. إن هذه الدراسة تعني تلبية متطلبات درجة الدكتوراه في المناهج والتدريب. ستجرى الدراسة من قبل الباحث سالم التائب. سوف تستخدم النتائج في أي عوائق أو صعوبات تواجه مدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية في تدريس المناهج الدراسية. ويمكن الوصول إلى البحث عن طريق (هاتف 9820-322-901) أو samaltaieb@gmail.com.

هذه الدراسة تحت إشراف الدكتورة: كمبريلى هارتنت إيدوردز، قسم المناهج والتدریس بجامعة دنفر، دنفر، ولاية كولورادو، الرمز البريدي 80208، هاتف: -871-300-291 أو برید اکترونی: Kimberly.Hartnett-Edwards@du.edu

إن المشاركة في هذه الدراسة قد تستغرق من 30-45 دقيقة من وقتك. سوف يشمل المشاركون الإجابة على أسئلة المقابلة الشخصية المتعلقة بإنجازهم في إدراك المناهج. سوف يكون يقدر الباحث اشتراكهم في هذه الدراسة سوف يتم تقديمه لها في وقت لاحق. يمكنهم في عدم الرد على الأسئلة التي قد تكون باردة أو متطلبة، وعندما يشعرمان بعدم الرضا يمكنهم الانسحاب من الدراسة.

لا يوجد ارتباطات تتعلق بنتائج الدراسة. ستتمكن المشاركون من متابعة مشاركتهم في الدراسة أو الانسحاب من خلال الاتصال بالباحث. يمكن استخدام الرموز لحماية البيانات الخاصة بمشاركتهم في الدراسة.

إذا كان لديكم أي مخاوف أو شكاوى أثناء الدراسة، الرجاء الاتصال بالسيد: بول الك، رئيس لجنة مراجعة DU: IRB@DU.EDU أو تشغيل مركز البحوث على العنوان التالي: Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at the University of Denver, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208

أوافق على تسجيل المقابلة
أوافق على التصوير
لا أوافق على تسجيل المقابلة
لا أوافق على التصوير
لا أريد الحصول على تقرير بنتائج هذه الدراسة

تاريخ:

التوقيع:
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