

Stymie patterns: The case of French-language learning in Indonesian universities

Merry Andriani¹, Wening Udasmoro^{1*}, Roberta Salsano², Tri Indri Hardini³

¹*French Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Jl. Nusantara no. 1 Bulaksumur, Yogyakarta 55281, Indonesia*

²*Linguistic department, Universitas 'Ca Foscari, Venice, Italia*

³*French Study Program, Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Isola, Sukasari, Bandung, West Java 40154, Indonesia*

ABSTRACT

Learning languages is inevitably related to one's learning culture and patterns. Despite the existence of different language learning strategies in Indonesia, students' achievements, in general, show unsatisfying facts. Several learning patterns have the potential to stymie foreign-language learning at particular educational levels. Those learning patterns are the accumulation of long traditions and practices in teaching and learning foreign languages. This study examined the practices of teaching and learning French as a foreign language at two universities in Indonesia. These institutions were selected based on their approaches to teaching and learning the language; one employs a pedagogic approach, while the other applies a generalist approach. Data were collected through in-depth interviews with nine students and six lecturers, as well as observation of four classes between March 2016 and October 2017. The data were subsequently selected and analyzed with a didactic of foreign language methodology. The methodology was based on a post-structural paradigm with an emphasis on intertextuality and interdiscursivity. This method implied the approach to discourse analyses referred to as the French perspective. Results from the analysis showed that the universities tended to teach French with a repetitive and uniform approach. The most prominent didactic technique was rote memorization through mnemonics, which permeated almost all aspects of learning the foreign language. The failure to combine this technique with other learning strategies stymied students' efforts to learn the language.

Keywords: Critical sociolinguistics; didactic; French as a foreign language; learning patterns.

First Received:

6 September 2021

Revised:

25 April 2022

Accepted:

20 May 2022

Final Proof Received:

27 May 2022

Published:

31 May 2022

How to cite (in APA style):

Andriani, M., Udasmoro, W., Salsano, R., & Hardini, T. I. (2022). Stymie patterns: The case of French-language learning in Indonesian universities. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 180-189. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46548>

INTRODUCTION

Every year more than 150,000 Indonesians enrol in French-language programs through high schools, universities, or institutions, including the Alliances Française and the Institut Français (Andriani et al., 2019). This number is still far lower compared to other foreign language learners in Indonesia, such as 872,441 learners of Japanese and 1.046.490 of Mandarin Chinese (Darmawangsa et al., 2020). In addition to the significantly lower number of

learners, Indonesians' command of the French language remains suboptimal. According to the National Center for Certification known as *Centre National des Certifications* (CNC), most Indonesians only achieve a B1 (moderate) level on their proficiency tests (CNC, 2014). They ranked far below the global average, as Table 1 shows.

Nonetheless, these data indicate that French-language learners have significant potential.

* Corresponding Author
Email: udasmoro@ugm.ac.id

Table 1
Indonesians' French Language Proficiency in 2012

DELF-DALF LEVEL (CECR)	INDONESIA	GLOBAL
A1	97.55%	94.75%
A2	94.77%	94.21%
B1	64.59%	87.30%
B2	24.77%	76.07%
C1	17.24%	71.64%
C2	63.64%	75.67%

As seen in the above table, Indonesians met or exceeded the global average for the A1 and A2 levels. As seen in the table below, Indonesians met or exceeded the global average for the A1 and A2 levels. Only at the B1 level do Indonesians' results drop significantly below the global average, bottoming out at the C1 level (17.24%) according to the statistic data from CNC, Centre National des Certifications of French Embassy in Indonesia in 2012 (CNC, 2014). This number is floating at the same rate up until 2018.

This begs the question: What is the reason for the significant decline in testing scores at the moderate level? This article examines the techniques for and the approaches to teaching French at the university level. Two higher education institutions were selected based on their international certification and their students' achievement of B1 rankings. It is also worth noting that senior high school curricula are limited to the A1 and A2 levels.

The present study employs a didactic perspective to understand language learning. It borrows profoundly from Chiss to distinguish pedagogy from didactics (Chiss, 2013; Coste, 2007). According to Chiss (2013), pedagogy refers to the theories and methods of instruction, including a two-way interaction between teachers and students; it cares little for the materials used during instruction.

Conversely, didactics offers a conceptual triangle, consisting of the knowledge/material being taught, the people learning this knowledge/material, and the people transferring this knowledge/material. The language learning strategy within pedagogical approaches and methodology in Indonesia has been widely discussed and perfectly compiled in "*Strategi pembelajaran bahasa*" [Language learning strategy] by Iskandarwassid and Sunendar (2013). The term 'strategy' refers to a tactic or pattern used by teachers or lecturers in the language learning process in order to facilitate students to think and develop their cognitive capacity through the correct language use (Iskandarwassid & Sunendar, 2013, p. 3).

In this study, the primary data were collected using the critical sociolinguistic perspective and investigated within a didactic framework. As such, a theoretical understanding of French language

didactics is necessary. According to Fought (2004), the concept of critical sociolinguistics emerged in response to classical sociolinguistics' tendency toward variationism, particularly its tendency to investigate the influence of class, gender, age, along with others on the language used by individuals. Such variationism has been unfruitful, as it has been incapable of understanding the ideologies, attitudes, and identities that underpin language and the increasingly global nature of modern society (Austin, 1962; Chaubet, 2015; Fishman, 1991; Wright, 2016).

The rise of service, transportation, and communication sectors—with their accelerated growth since the dawn of the new millennium—has stimulated the emergence of new concepts of space and time. Societies today must deal with such phenomena as transnationalism, neoneationalism, common values, and neocolonialism. Communication and information technologies have become increasingly diverse, and, at the same time, new linguistic phenomena have emerged (Barker, 2001).

Recognizing such developments, Fishman (1991) proposed that sociolinguistic theory must be enriched with reference to the other social sciences. As a result, sociolinguists began embracing new critical approaches that relied on actual social and cultural theories. Likewise, they sought to incorporate a pluridisciplinary approach into a singular critical paradigm. Such a paradigm will be used to investigate the production, distribution, and consumption of the French language by its users in Indonesia.

Within the context of production, distribution, and consumption, as introduced by Bourdieu (1982), the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (*Cadre Européen Commun de Références pour les Langues*; CECR) represents a product used in French-language education. This manual has been circulated by the French and Indonesian governments, with Indonesian students as its consumers. According to Fairclough (1992, p. 71), production and consumption are fundamentally socio-cognitive processes, wherein the cognitive abilities of individuals are used to produce and interpret texts in accordance with internalized social structures and conventions. Through such a socio-cognitive approach, collective understandings of linguistic and social practices are achieved.

CECR recommends the teaching of French as a foreign language through an *actionnelle* perspective, i.e., one that emphasizes action and attitude as a means of creating social actors through foreign-language learning. Language learning, thus, is intended to create social reality, belying an assumption that language usage and social reality are inevitably interrelated (Cuq & Gruca, 2006; Lefranc, 2014; Pennycook, 2001). As argued by Wijzen (2013, pp. 54-55), there are three dominant

perspectives regarding the link between language and reality.

The first perspective views language does not simply reflect reality, but rather contributing to its construction. In other words, language is not merely informative, but also performative (Fabian, 2001, p. 29 as cited in Wijsen, 2013, p. 55). This perspective is significantly influenced by Austin's three types of speech act—*locutoire* (locutionary), *illocutoire* (illocutionary), and *perlocutoire* (perlocutionary)—as well as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis that the structure of a language determines the modes of thought and behavioral characteristics of the culture in which it is spoken (Wijsen, 2013, p. 58). The second perspective—widely embraced amongst sociolinguists—holds that social reality influences the usage of language within a community. The third perspective, advocated by social constructivists such as Berger and Luckmann (in Wijsen, 2013, p. 58), attempts to take a middle road: it holds that language and social reality are related dialectically, with identities and relations simultaneously shaping and being shaped by language use.

Language usage (discourse) is strongly influenced by sociocultural reality, and vice versa. Understanding the dialogue between language usage and social reality is thus paramount for understanding the incorporation of the CECR in French-language teaching in Indonesia. The social reality of France, and of Europe in general, differs significantly from that of Indonesia; as such, their language usage must necessarily differ. This implies that, even as the CECR is employed in French-language teaching in Indonesia, and even as Indonesian students are expected to utilize the French language in an appropriate manner, it inevitably clashes with Indonesian students' understanding of their own particular social reality and their everyday activities.

Critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1989, 1992) explains that our perception of reality, as well as our conceptual construction of our observed reality, is expressed through linguistic media. Discourse, thus, refers to all forms of language usage, including linguistic interactions at the parole level. According to Wijsen (2013, p. 58), as with other social sciences, sociolinguistic discourse analysis revolves around participants' perspectives. However, unlike other approaches, it attempts to express how individuals' perspectives are influenced by their social position and their efforts to maintain and/or transform the social structure (Fairclough, 1992, p. 65).

This circumstance leads to the following questions: which French language didactic practices and cultures are dominant in Indonesia? How do these didactic practices and cultures stymie the learning of foreign languages, in this case, French language learning? These questions will be

answered herein with reference to several findings in the field.

METHOD

Data Collection

The qualitative data were collected in five different phases following the discourse circuit of French language learning in Indonesia. First, the research began with an in-depth analysis of the CECR text, with a particular focus on Chapter 5 which deals with foreign-language learning and the creation of 'social actors' through such learning.

The French-language manuals used by the selected Indonesian universities were subsequently examined in the second phase, with a specific focus on the interactional and discursive elements for students at the B1 level. Reference was made to the *Echo* packet used by both universities, which consists of textbooks as well as an audio-visual material in CD and DVD formats. Analysis of this packet focused on the linguistic practices evident in the communication, the discursive situations presented through the packet's sixteen B1-level videos, and the students' reaction to this material.

The data were collected primarily from the manuals used by the French-language departments at the two universities. The manuals used by IFI Yogyakarta (a formal partner of the French Embassy) were used for comparison as a standard of the European Framework since they strictly follow the CECR strategies by the *actionnelle* approach. The two universities were chosen for this study because of their specific characteristics. The first university has employed a general approach to learning, while the second has employed a pedagogic approach. The general approach to learning refers to the common perspective on learning the French language in order to master the language for general purposes. The pedagogical approach has some specific purposes to guide the French language learners to become educational professionals. Both universities are located in Yogyakarta, a major center of learning that has long been recognized as an example of pluralism; it may thus be surmised that their programs include students from throughout the Indonesian archipelago. Finally, both universities teach the language up to the B1 level using CECR-based manuals.

Classroom observation in three different classes was employed in the third phase to understand the application of manuals and guidelines in the learning process (Arsyad, 2014). During this stage, researchers were able to use dialogic methods of observation. The observation enabled the researchers not only to investigate previously identified data but also to ascertain the curricular elements that could not readily be understood by students.

Interviews were subsequently conducted in the fourth phase with the lecturers and students who used these methods and materials in their classrooms. Students interviewed were those who had been enrolled for at least three semesters, and who were currently studying French using *Echo-2*.

The majority of the students' test results achieved A2 level, and they were preparing for their B1 test. Approximately twenty student respondents, who were between 18 and 23 years of age, were selected from the two Indonesian universities and IFI. Seven lecturers ranging from thirty to fifty years of age were also interviewed. These lecturers used *Echo-2* as their teaching reference and material.

During the final stage of this study, interviews were conducted with those involved in the decision to incorporate CECR into the university curricula. They included the department chairs, the Director of IFI Yogyakarta, and the employees of the Linguistic Division of the French Embassy in Indonesia. To facilitate comparison, the chairperson of the Indonesian Association of French-Language Lecturers was also interviewed. Interviews were also conducted with French nationals who were familiar with CECR and who were involved in the teaching of French as a Foreign Language, including one of the individuals involved in preparing the *Echo* manuals. These interviews required significant time and patience as well as collaboration and support from lecturers, students, and other informants.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the selected manuals, i.e., the linguistic practices within particular communicative and discursive interactions, were analyzed linguistically with an encoding/decoding model to identify their lexical, grammatical, and semantic elements. Meanwhile, the data from interviews with the students (the subjects of the French-language teaching and learning process) and interviews with the individuals involved in the research sites were recorded and transcribed. These data were subsequently analyzed and discussed using a three-stage model of critical discourse analysis of Fairclough, involving description (linguistic analysis), interpretation, and explanation. All of these data were subsequently organized and analyzed using an intertextual and interdiscursive method.

Fairclough (1989, 1992) offers a typology of critical discourse analysis, which can be implemented within the context of this study, as follows: 1. Three dimensions of discourse exist at the micro-level (the interpersonal level, i.e. CECR-related discourses between students), the meso-level (the institutional level, i.e. CECR-related discourses within the institutions that teach French in Indonesia), and the macro-level (the societal level, i.e. CECR-related discourses at the national level,

particularly those involving the didactics of French-language education and related policies).

Fairclough (1992, pp. 64-65) also identifies discourse as having three effects: positioning the subject by creating a social identity; shaping social relations; and creating mental maps (cognition, belief, knowledge). He also notes three assumptions that underpin discourses (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 68-86): (1) that discourses are social practices, and share many similarities with other social practices, but are distinguished by their *linguistic form* (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 71-72); (2) that discourse and reality interact and operate through discursive practices, and these discursive practices contribute strongly to the linking of realities, texts, and contexts (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 71-86; Firmonasari et al., 2020); (3) and that the link between linguistic and social practices is dialectic, not deterministic (Fairclough, 1992, p. 68; Ulinnuha et al., 2013).

Finally, Fairclough (1992, p. 199) identifies discourse as having three stages. In the first stage, description, efforts are made to analyze the linguistic features of the text (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 73-78). Fairclough recognizes language as consisting of multiple elements, including grammar, vocabulary, cohesion, and textual structure. Linguistics has offered a means of socio-cognitively analyzing discourses through their vocabularies and metaphors, as seen in Wijzen's study of religious discourses (2013). Such analysis focuses on the practices of over-wording (also known as overlexicalization), re-wording (also known as relexicalization), and alternative wording within oral interactions and linguistic practices (Fairclough, 1992, p. 194; Halliday, 1973). Over-wording refers to the use of synonyms and near-synonyms to express the same ideas. As an example, Fairclough refers to the words used in the Kingman Report regarding English-language proficiency amongst British schoolchildren: 'competence', 'effectiveness', 'mastery', 'facility', 'expertise', and 'skill' (Fairclough, 1992, p. 193). Re-wording, meanwhile, refers to the creation of new words as alternatives for, or antonyms to, existing ones (Cholsy et al., 2015). Alternative wording refers to the various ways of using words to deliver the same semantic field, by using different choices of linguistic features (Andriani, 2019; Fairclough, 1992).

The second stage is interpretation (Wijzen, 2013, pp. 61-62). In a socio-cognitive analysis, linguistic and social practices are linked through discourse (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 71-86). Discursive practices (such as interpersonal interactions) are important, as they shape the dialectics between the linguistic and social practices that constitute them (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 72-80). When participants produce (*communicate*) or consume (*interpret*) oral and written texts, they utilize the "mental maps" (Fairclough, 1992, p. 82) or "cognitive apparatuses" available to them (Fairclough, 2001, p. 133), or the

"mental models" (van Dijk, 2008, p. 75) that are stored textually in their long-term memories. Such resources are simultaneously cognitive, existing within the minds of their users, and social, having been constructed by society (Fairclough, 2001, pp. 19-20). In the context of this research, students can only understand texts by linking them with the resources and models available to them.

The final stage is the explanation (Wijsen, 2013, pp. 62-63). The socio-cognitive analysis assumes that a dialectic relationship exists between language usage and social reality. In this research, students' statements and utterances simultaneously shape and are shaped by their social structure, which they can reproduce or transform through their language (Fairclough, 1992, p. 72; Udasmoro, 2017).

Linguistic analysis cannot be separated from the social practices and contexts that inform language usage. As Halliday (1973, p. 65 in Fairclough 1992, p. 26) explained:

Language is as it is because of its function in the social structure, and the organization of behavioural meanings should give some insight into its social foundations.

Just as texts cannot be separated from their contexts, they cannot be separated from other texts. The link between texts, also known as intertextuality, was conceptually explored by Foucault (1969). The concept of intertextuality is significant in this study, as the CECR discourses that emerge within Indonesian society must be linked with the micro-, meso-, and macro-levels of CECR discourses that circulate in Indonesia, France, and other countries that reference CECR in their French-language education. Such interactions produce interdiscursivity.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

French language learning pattern in Indonesia

French is an Indo-European language, within the Gallo-Roman family. Grammatically, it relies heavily on the conjugation of verbs in accordance with their subject, tense, and mode. The language differs significantly from Indonesian, which is an Austronesian language that has no verbal conjugation. In Indonesian, verbs are not conjugated in accordance with their subject, tense, and mode. French words, on the other hand, are found in Indonesian through loan words originated from Dutch and Portuguese. French teachers could identify the transparent words which are easily recognised by Indonesian learners (Hardini & Grangé, 2016).

This study was designed in reference to a post-structuralism paradigm to understand language from its users' perspectives. As stated by Bourdieu (1982, p. 103), post-structuralism seeks to avoid any division between internal and external linguistics. It aims to avoid separating language and linguistic

elements from its human users (a common transgression of the structuralism paradigm). By employing a post-structuralism approach, this study attempted to understand French-language learning through the perspective of its practitioners and its actors in Indonesia. Most of the narratives from the lecturers and student respondents mentioned the morphosyntactic aspects as the first challenge in learning and teaching French.

Related to the morphosyntactic difference between French and Indonesian, we investigated the obstacle found among French language learners in Indonesia. According to Arrivé et al. (1986, p. 393), morphosyntactic is the study of the formal variations experienced by morphemes as a result of syntactic processes. The morphosyntactic analysis deals with grammar, sentence structure, and other linguistic elements that are commonly studied as part of the syntax. Interviews with informants indicated that several morphosyntactic elements had commonly hindered Indonesians' efforts to study French from progressing. Several elements, selected based on the frequency with which they were mentioned (reworded) by informants, are discussed below.

As stated previously, conjugation is a major difference between French and Indonesian. Most informants, both learners and teachers, indicated that conjugation is the difficult part of the language acquisition process (Grevisse & Goosse, 2008). It was evident that conjugation errors were the most commonly found in the oral and written French-language texts produced by students. According to the *Trésor de la Langue Française*, the foremost dictionary of the French compiled by the National Center for Scientific Research (*Centre National des Recherches Scientifiques* [CNRS]) and available online (CNRS, n.d.), *conjugation* is defined as follows:

Conjugaison: GRAMM: Pouvoir être énoncé dans un ordre déterminé, selon un paradigme avec toutes les variantes morphologiques qui expriment les notions de temps, de mode, de voix, de personne et d'aspect.

Translation:

Conjugation: GRAMMAR: May be enounced in a determined order, in accordance with a specific paradigm, with particular morphologies that express notions of tense, mode, voice, and personage.

Several examples of the conjugation of verbs are provided below. Take the root verb *regarder* (to see, to watch). Although this root verb is the one listed in dictionaries, in everyday speech and writing it must be conjugated in accordance with its tense, subject, mode, and voice. In the present tense, with the active voice and indicative mode, it would be conjugated as follows:

- *je regarde* (I see)
- *tu regardes* (you see)
- *il regarde* (he sees)
- *elle regarde* (she sees)
- *on regarde* (we see)

- *nous regardons* (we see)
- *vous regardez* (you see)
- *ils regardent* (they see)
- *elles regardent* (they see).

This verb is a regular one and as such the root *regarder* experiences no changes during conjugation. Its Indonesian-language equivalents *melihat* and *menonton* experience no conjugation when used in different tenses and with different subjects. Their prefixes differ only when they are used in the passive voice. Some participants in this research omitted the conjugation in their production of French, whether in writing or speaking. They frequently used the root verb in sentences, making the sentences difficult to understand. Some others wrote the conjugation but made mistakes in accordance with the subject. While other participants pronounced incorrectly the conjugation for a certain subject. Most participants missed the pronunciation for the third subject in the plural (*ils/elles*).

Irregular verbs, however, are more difficult for students, as conjugation involves changing not only the suffix but also the root. Take, for example, the word *aller* (go), which is conjugated as follows:

- *je vais* (I go)
- *tu vas* (you go)
- *il va* (he goes)
- *elle va* (she goes)
- *on va* (we go)
- *nous allons* (we go)
- *vous allez* (you go)
- *ils vont* (they go)
- *elles vont* (they go)

When conjugating irregular verbs, students must consider not only the subject, tense, mode, and voice, but also the complex morphological processes involved (Grevisse & Goosse, 2008). However, most French-language grammar do not include specific entries on 'conjugation' *per se*. Instead, different elements of conjugation are included in these textbooks with discussion on verb categories, tenses, and modes. The morphological processes experienced by root words during conjugation are listed in handbooks. They were analyzed in this research, but no syntactic contexts or examples were provided. It was found that in those handbooks, conjugation was also presented within a table list in an appendix in the book, repeatedly without examples in sentences. Further analysis of the student handbooks showed that there were two different approaches applied in the didactic of the French language for foreigners. The handbook used in the two universities applied the communicative approach while the handbook used in IFI (for comparison) referred to the *actionnelle* approach or task-based approach. Both are labeled according to the CECR or CEF (Common European Framework)

guideline for foreign languages teaching and learning.

Observation of the didactic practices of French-language education in those two universities indicated that students were expected to memorize conjugations without being provided an understanding of the pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects of their application within everyday language (as expected by the CECR). In other words, Indonesian students' lessons were limited to morphological (Widharyanto & Binawan, 2020). As a result, few understood mode, which is used to communicate how an action (i.e., verb) is realized. Several modes, however, were recognized: *indicatif* (indicative), *conditionnel* (conditional), *impératif* (imperative), *subjonctif* (subjunctive), *infinitif* (infinitive), and *participe* (participle).

One of the informants with experience preparing materials for the students, Informant D-1, explained conjugation as follows:

Data 1:

Interview with Informant D-1 regarding Conjugation 1

Although some in the class may have a basic command of French, but they don't really... what, they know the present-tense **conjugation**, but the others, they don't know....

.... We don't have a choice. Conjugations **must be memorized**, and **articles** have to be **memorized**. Even if we open a dictionary, we still need to **memorize** them. There's no choice.

The rewording of the word "conjugation" in this interview indicates its importance that is perceived by the actors involved in French-language learning in Indonesia. The same holds true for the word *memorize*. In another interview, the same informant again reworded the word "conjugation" and used *alternative wording* to emphasize the use of memorization as a didactic process.

Data 2

Interview with D-1 Regarding Conjugation 2

... we teach **conjugation**, right... for the **conjugation** of *est*, *être*, we can search for them in the dictionary until we're tired, and never find it. So what? We must **memorize** them, like it or not. And usually, during the second meeting, one by one I tell them to **memorize** *avoir* and *être*, to have a command of them. But it takes half an hour just for that.

The use of the word "memorize" and its variations (or, in the original interview, the word *hafal* and its variations *dihafal*, *ngapalin*, and *diapalin*) in the excerpt above is intended to emphasize the importance of memorization for Indonesians who are learning French. Such a method has long been used for language learning, at least since the global and audio-visual structure (*structure global et audio visual*, SGAV) approach

was advanced in the 1960s and 1970s. This approach emphasized the mechanical repetition of the grammatical structure as a means of facilitating memorization.

However, this didactic method differs significantly from the one recommended by the CECR with the *actionnelle* approach, which urges the use of lexical blocks in diverse pragmatic situations and for communicative purposes. According to CECR guidelines, conjugation should be introduced inductively, over time, rather than all at once. There is no structured or continuous effort to systematize language learning. CECR requires language learners to be capable of identifying grammatical patterns through oral and written activities. Language lessons—including those used to teach conjugation—must be contextual, rather than separated from their pragmatic context (Conseil De L'Europe, 2005).

Stymie learning patterns in studying French language

According to Bourdieu (1970), educational institutions are highly conservative in their maintenance of values and traditions, even more so than churches. He attributes this to these institutions' function to maintain deep-rooted cultural and social values. Conventional didactic patterns are intended to reproduce practices and culture, thereby enabling institutions to function as extensions of the dominant social class and its efforts to maintain its comfortable and privileged position (Bourdieu, 1970: 237; Wodak & Boukala, 2015). These patterns were apparent when observing learning activities in university classrooms: lecturers rely on conventional techniques and didactic cultures when teaching French.

The conventional techniques are evident primarily in the expectation that students 'memorized' conjugations. Such rote memorization, as facilitated through mnemonics, has traditionally been used in education systems around the world (Wright, 2016; Yule, 2012). Second, lecturers maintained a monopoly over the distribution of knowledge and the allocation of speech opportunities within the classroom. It created a didactic hierarchy through which lecturers exert full control over classroom activities (Pennycook, 2001; Ulinnuha et al., 2013; Widharyanto & Binawan, 2020). Third, learning activities were dominated by reading, listening, understanding, and translating. Lecturers sat in front of the classroom and instructed the students to open their textbooks. Students took turns reading the contents of the textbooks aloud, as their peers listened and observed. Afterward, the lecturers asked the students to explain the meaning of the text or to translate it into Indonesian. On other occasions, they asked students to reformulate (rewrite) existing texts. Fourth, and finally, learning activities remained oriented towards *grammaire*

(grammar), predominantly involving contextual morphosyntactic exercises that focused on the French language's structure and grammatical system.

Such didactic practices differ significantly from those recommended by CECR, which emphasizes the sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of foreign-language learning. Morphology, syntax, and phonetics should be adapted for pragmatic and sociolinguistic purposes, rather than be designated as the central component of foreign-language learning (Beacco, 2013; Little & Erickson, 2015). Similarly, CECR has a tolerance for grammatical and structural errors, seeing them as an inevitable part of language learning.

Meanwhile, at the meso-level, CECR recommends that lecturers and educators employ a positive system for evaluating the results of foreign-language learning. The positive model recommends that evaluation focus on the texts produced and appreciate these texts in accordance with learners' achievements. It thus differs significantly from the conventional approach, which concentrates on identifying the linguistic shortcomings and mistakes made by users during the language learning process. Such emphasis on users' linguistic shortcomings is demonstrated in Data 3 below:

Data 3

Writing Produced by M-1

A mon avis, pour trouver un équilibre entre
 Bagi saya pendapat, untuk menemukan art keseimbangan antara
 In my opinion, to find balance between

le travail et la vie privée, on doit pouvoir faire
 art pekerjaan dan art hidup pribadi, kita harus dapat melakukan
 work and private life, we must do

attention avec des émotions, parce que des émotions très important.
 perhatian dengan art emosi, karena art emosi sangat penting.
 attention to emotion, because emotion very important

Correction:

A mon avis, pour avoir un équilibre entre le travail et la vie privée, on devrait être capable de contrôler les émotions, comme ceci est un élément très important.

The above sentence is taken from a 180-word text produced by Informant M-1 as part of the B1-level evaluation, which requires learners to independently produce French-language texts. In accordance with the CECR framework, at each level learners must produce texts of a minimal length: 40 words at the A1 level, 120 words at the A2 level,

160 words at the B1 level, and 200 words at the B2 level, while at the C1 level, learners' text may only be 220 words in length. If learners' texts are longer than the maximum or shorter than the minimum, they lose one point for every 10% difference. Texts produced by learners must be evaluated in accordance with the framework and descriptors outlined in the CECR.

In order to ensure objectivity, evaluation sheets must be anonymous, and texts must be scored in accordance with the principles of positive evaluation. The correction provided in Data 3 above is quite significant, grammatically, as the minor clause lacks a verb (and thus, a predicate):

**parce que des émotions très important.*
 Conj. Subject Adjective

In French, sentences are expected to include at least a subject and a predicate and often use the structure "Subject + Predicate + Complement". Structures that are presented as sentences, but lack a predicate, are not considered sentences. Similarly, all predicates in French must be conjugated in accordance with the subject and tense of the sentence. In a conventional evaluation, the above-cited text would receive poor marks, as it lacks a predicate in its minor clause.

However, in a positive evaluation, the above-discussed grammatical error should not have serious consequences. In positive evaluation, the main criteria are the learner's understanding of the communication situation presented to them, the learners' ability to convey pertinent facts, events, and experiences, and the learners' ability to maintain sentence and paragraph coherence. In such an evaluation, sentence structure constitutes only 20% of the total score. Such evaluations have been deemed revolutionary in the field of language teaching, where it has challenged the dominance of the grammar-centric model (Andriani et al., 2019; Little & Erickson, 2015).

In the *actionnelle* perspective promoted by CECR, written and spoken texts must be produced and reproduced with recognition of actual sociocultural contexts. Mere simulations, which ignore the realities of French society, must be avoided.

Such elements of language use are also understood at the micro-level, as reflected in the following interview excerpts:

Data 4

Interview with Informant M-4 regarding Grammar

- T: Now, for the question of *grammaire*. In your opinion, what most helped you with the B1 test?
 M-4: Me, when it came to conjugation, it didn't concern me too much. When we speak, it's mostly the *présent* (present), the *future* (future), or the *passé* (past). Nobody uses the *futur antérieur* (anterior future), the ... and then.
 T: They don't? Why not?

- M-4: It feels like such a hassle. So I prefer voicing opinions, but using *phrase générale* (general phrases) in the *présent* (present), with the necessary conjugations.
 T: Okay. French is different from Indonesian, in the tenses, the conjugation of the *présent*, *passé*, and *futur*. How do you apply these concepts of time?
 M-4: It depends what I'm talking about. If it's my opinion, now, usually I use the *présent* (present) or the *subjonctif* (subjunctive). But if I'm talking about the past, of course I use the *passé*. But I've never really used *futur antérieur*, no.

An understanding at the micro-level was also reflected in the text produced by Informant M-4 in the B1 evaluation. The informant received a good score, one of the highest in their cohort. This score, however, would not be given if the text were evaluated using a classical perspective, as it contained multiple morphosyntactic and lexical errors:

Data 5

Writing by M-4

- a. *Il faut qu' on étudie, travaille pour compléter nos nécessités*
 Harus bahwa kita belajar, bekerja untuk melengkapi kita kepentingan
 We must learn, work to fulfil our needs
importants..
 penting
 important

Correction:

Il faut que l'on étudie et l'on travaille pour fournir les besoins principaux.

- b. *On oublie souvent qu' il y a d'autre raison pour joyer*
 Kita lupa sering bahwa ada lain alasan untuk (?)
 we often forget that there are other reasons for (?)

la vie en étant sociable, générosité et s'accepter
 art hidup dengan bersifat sosial, murah hati dan menerima
 life means being sociable, generous, and accepting

ce qu' on a maintenant.
 apa yang kita punya sekarang
 that which we have now

Correction:

On oublie souvent qu'il y a d'autres raisons pour profiter de la vie, tout en étant sociable, généreux et accepte ce qu'on est devenu.

The text produced by Informant M-4 predominantly used the present tense, and even the subjunctive mode (in Data 5.a). In Data 5.b, similarly, the informant used the *gérondif* mode in the present tense. Both modes are often deemed

difficult by Indonesian students of French, and indeed are not found in the texts produced by other informants.

Interestingly, Sentence 5.b used the word *joyer* as an infinitive verb. This word is not found in the French lexicon, but it was likely formed by adding the suffix *-er* (a marker of regular verbs) to the English-language root word *joy*. Nonetheless, the intent of the sentence was understood by the Indonesian lecturer evaluating the text.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above discussion, it can be concluded that the teaching of French as a foreign language in Indonesia has been dominated by the conventional paradigm, one that was built upon the foundation of rote memorization and mnemonics. The implementation of this method did not refer to the *actionnelle* perspective that is recommended by the CECR. Similarly, the majority of the educators have reproduced the didactic culture through which they first learned French as a foreign language. It was evident in their continued reliance on the reading, listening, understanding, and translating approach, as well as their continued dominance within classroom discourses.

Such a didactic culture does not provide foreign-language learners with the space they need to grow and advance their abilities. Likewise, it does not reflect the CECR framework's guidelines for French-language learning, particularly its recommendation to use the *actionnelle* approach. Under this new perspective, emphasis is no longer given to foreign-language learners' ability to memorize and apply grammatical rules, but rather to learners' ability to incorporate their learned language in their actions and in their interactions with others. This paradigm shift has also demanded a new approach to evaluation, one in which the texts are produced by learners is appreciated rather than dissected to identify grammatical errors. To supplement this important finding, this study recommends that future researchers investigate the didactic practices used in teaching other foreign languages in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Andriani, M. (2019). *Adaptasi kerangka Eropa dalam politik linguistik didaktik Bahasa Prancis di Indonesia* [Unpublished Dissertation]. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Andriani, M., Udasmoro, W., & Suhandano, S. (2019). Ideological struggles and identity construction within the politics of French linguistics in Indonesia. *Humaniora*, 31(1), 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.34626>
- Arrivé, M., Gadet, F., & Galmiche, M. (1986). *La grammaire d'aujourd'hui* [Today's grammar]. Flammarion.
- Arsyad, A. (2014). *Media pembelajaran* [Today's Grammar]. Rajawali Pers.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Barker, C. (2001). Cultural studies and discourse analysis: A dialogue on language and identity. SAGE.
- Beacco, J.-C. (2013). *Éthique et politique en didactique des langues: Autour de la notion de responsabilité* [Ethics and politics in language didactics: On the concept of responsibility]. Didier.
- Bourdieu, P. (1970). *La reproduction* [The Reproduction]. Editions de Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982). *Ce que parler veut dire* [Language and Symbolic Power]. Fayard.
- Chaubet, F. (2015). *Globalisasi budaya* [Cultural Globalisation] (F. I. Mokoginta, Trans.). Jala Sutra.
- Chiss, J. L. (2013). La didactique du français et des langues à l'épreuve de la pluralité linguistique et culturelle [French-language didactics in linguistic and cultural plurality]. In J. C. Beacco (Ed.), *Ethique et politique en didactique des langues autour de la notion de responsabilité* [Ethics and politics in language teaching around the notion of responsibility] (pp. 99–112). Didier.
- Cholsy, H., Wijana, I. D. P., Nadar, F. X., & Udasmoro, W. (2015). The status of French loanwords in the Indonesian language. *Humaniora*, 26(3), 303–314. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.6189>
- CNC. (2014). *Rapport statistique 2014—Centre National des Certifications Indonésie*. Unpublished.
- CNRS. (n.d.). *Dictionnaire trésor de la langue Française*. Cnrtl. <https://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/conjugaison>
- Conseil De L'Europe. (2005). *Cadre Européen commun de références pour les langues (CECR)* [Common European framework of reference for languages]. Didier.
- Coste, D. (2007). *Contextualiser les utilisations du cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues (CECR)* [Contextualizing the use of the common European framework of reference for languages]. Forum on Language Politics Strasbourg.
- Cuq, J.-P., & Gruca, I. (2006). *Cours de didactique du français langue étrangère et seconde: Buch responsabilité* [Course of Didactic of French as Foreign and Second Language]. Press Universitaire de Grenoble.
- Darmawangsa, D., Sukmayadi, V., & Yahya, A. H. (2020). First-year students' communication apprehension in learning French as foreign language. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10 (2), 340–348. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i2.28599>

- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Firmonasari, A., Udasmoro, W., & Mastoyo, Y. T. (2020). Understanding secularism and national identity in French political discourses. *Humaniora*, 32(2), 135–150. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.55450>
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). Putting the 'socio' back into the sociolinguistic enterprise. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 1991(92), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1991.92.127>
- Foucault, M. (1969). *L'archéologie du savoir* [The archaeology of knowledge]. Gallimard.
- Fought, C. (Ed.). (2004). *Sociolinguistic variation: Critical reflections (Illustrated edition)*. Oxford University Press.
- Grevisse, M., & Goosse, A. (2008). *Le bon usage: Grammaire française* [The correct usage of French grammar]. De Boeck & Larcier.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. Edward Arnold.
- Hardini, T. I., & Grangé, P. (2016). An overview of Indonesian loanwords from French. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 155. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i1.2749>
- Iskandarwassid, & Sunendar, D. (2013). *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa* [Language learning strategy] (4th ed.). Sekolah Pascasarjana UPI - Rosdakarya.
- Lefranc, Y. (2014). *Le management enchanteur: Gouvernement, technologie et double langage du CECRL* [Amazing management: government, technology, and language duality in CECRL]. Groupe d'études sur le Plurilinguisme Européen; Nom de votre éditeur. <http://www.cahiersdugepe.fr/index.php?id=2694>
- Little, D., & Erickson, G. (2015). Learner identity, learner agency, and the assessment of language proficiency: Some reflections prompted by the common European framework of reference for languages. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 120–139. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000300>
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Udasmoro, W. (2017). The language construction of Muslims as the others in French contemporary discourses. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, 7(1), 77–99. <https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v7i1.77-99>
- Ulinuha, R., Udasmoro, W., & Wijaya, Y. (2013). Critical discourse analysis: Theory and method in a social and literary framework. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v2i2.170>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Widharyanto, B., & Binawan, H. (2020). Learning style and language learning strategies of students from various ethnics in Indonesia. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 39(2), 480–492. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v39i2.28173>
- Wijzen, F. (2013). *Religious discourse, social cohesion and conflict: Studying Muslim–Christian relations* (New ed.). Peter Lang.
- Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). (Supra)National identity and language: Rethinking national and European migration policies and the linguistic integration of migrants. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 253–273. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000294>
- Wright, S. (2016). *Language policy and language Planning: From nationalism to globalisation* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yule, V. (2012). Experiment in education, psychology and linguistics to solve a social problem. *ISAA Review*, 11(1), 16. <http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=608747413210404;res=IELHSS>