

aefl

by Siti Aisyah

Submission date: 10-Sep-2021 01:53PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1645124961

File name: aefl.pdf (301.18K)

Word count: 5349

Character count: 30353

Title

2
Implementation of CLT and Its Minimum Results

Author

Siti Aisyah

Bio-Profile:

Siti Aisyah is an English lecturer at IAI Syarifuddin Lumajang, Indonesia. Her research interest is teaching and learning strategies including challenges, perspectives, attitudes, and motivation. She got her Master of English Education and Literature at the State University of Surabaya. Now, she is taking her doctoral program of English Education and Literature at the same university. She can be reached at siti_aisyah_yes@yahoo.com.

2 Abstract

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is still claimed as the best approach in English Language Teaching (ELT). That is why CLT has been implemented in Indonesia since the early 1980s. It means that the CLT has been proposed and used in various Indonesia curriculums, namely Curriculum 1984, Curriculum 1994, Competency Based Curriculum (KBK) in 2004, School Based Curriculum (KTSP) in 2006, and Curriculum 2013. Unfortunately, after applying the CLT at secondary education for almost 30 years, the English proficiencies of Indonesian people remain low.

Based on the latest report of English Proficiency Index (EPI), the English proficiency of Indonesian people is in the 32nd with the level of medium ability from 70 countries. This result is really unsatisfactory since English has become the significant means of communication around the world. Indeed, English competence is becoming crucial to enhance the global competition in ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) which includes competition in various sectors. Such condition implies that most of Indonesian students remain difficult to be engaged in real life communication. They cannot actively use English after learning English for 6 years at junior and senior high schools. Thus, it can be said that the implementation of CLT in Indonesia has not been

successful with such minimum results. That is why this research will investigate the implementation of CLT at secondary level of education in Indonesia to find out the real factors producing the gap between long implementation of CLT and low output of CLT.

Key Words: *Communicative Language Teaching*

Introduction

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is assumed as the best approach in teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) / English as a Second Language (ESL). It is because this approach in language teaching emphasizing on the meaning and communication with its goal of developing the students' communicative competence (Littlewood, 1981; Canale, 1983; Nattinger, 1984; Brown, 1987; Nunan, 1987; Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Widdowson, 1990). Indeed, the communicative competence is basically as the knowledge that the students as the language users have internalized to enable them to understand and produce messages in the language (Ellis, 1994:696). For EFL countries, CLT is an approach to English language teaching (ELT) that emphasizes on the interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of English learning so that the English learning comes through having to communicate real meaning in real communication with natural strategies for English acquisition.

Communicative Language Teaching

Basically, the term of CLT covers a variety of approaches that all focus on helping the students to communicate meaningfully in a target language. Communicative language teaching is being developed nowadays. CLT is now being applied in many non-English countries where English is treated as a foreign language because the worldwide increasing demand for good communication in English. It is in line with what Professor Jack C. Richards states in his book *Communicative Language Teaching Today* that "...the ever growing need for good communication skills in English has created a huge demand for English teaching around the world, as millions of people today want to improve their command of English or ensure that their children achieve a good command of English... The worldwide demand for English has created an enormous demand for

quality language teaching and language teaching materials and resources” (Richards, 2006:5).

The huge demand of having good communication skill of English increases significantly the responsibility of the EFL teacher. Indeed, having good communication skills in English is a burning desire for most people that places communicative competence of English is more demanded. This condition drives the aim of language teaching to take the communicative competence as the language learning goal involving listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills. However, the theories and practices of CLT have faced various challenges in EFL contexts (Anderson, 1993; Ellis, 1996; Li, 1998; Liao, 2000; Takanashi, 2004; Yu, 2001). The implementation of CLT remains facing problems and resistance in the English as a foreign language context when it is intended to meet the demand of modern media age placing the EFL students as the users of media. This demand pushes the EFL students to choose to be literate in media so that they will be avoided as the passive users of media or even as the victims of media. There should be movement in CLT to fulfil this need indeed.

In addition, CLT becomes the desired approach in language teaching since it facilitates the best language teaching. It is because the syllabus consisting of a skill-based syllabus and a functional syllabus, according to Richards & Rodgers (1986), also sets a communicative design for the instruction, materials, and classroom techniques to meet the goal of language learning that is to develop students’ communicative competence. As a result, both EFL teachers and students play their communicative roles during the communicative classroom activities.

To be detailed features of CLT, Brown (2007) analyzes four characteristics of CLT which are considered as the core assumptions of creating communicative atmosphere in language teaching. They are (1) classroom goals are focused on all of the components of communicative competence and not restricted to grammatical or linguistic competence, (2) language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes so that organizational language forms are not the central focus, but rather, aspects of language that enable the learner to accomplish those purposes, (3) fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative techniques in which at times fluency may have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners

meaningfully engaged in language use, and (4) in the communicative classroom, students ultimately have to use the language productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts (Brown, 2007:241). Thus, EFL teachers have been encouraged to implement CLT to develop students' English abilities appropriately in context due to the awareness of English being the most widely spoken language in the world and used in various areas such as technology, science, and business.

Indeed, CLT has been introduced in EFL settings to improve students' abilities to use English in real contexts (Littlewood, 2007) and to advocate teaching practices which develop communicative competence in authentic contexts (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). It is clear that CLT in its characteristics does not downplay the importance of grammar nor advocate the abandonment of any focus form, but acknowledge the students about the relationship between grammatical form and communicative meaning through practices. Later, they view the characteristics of CLT as ten crucial matters which differ CLT from other language teaching approaches. They claim that (1) CLT focuses on the whole learner, (2) in CLT teacher is a guide, counselor, organizer, and facilitator, (3) CLT provides students with opportunities to share and explore their attitudes, feelings, and opinions, (4) CLT uses authentic, from-life materials, (5) create a genuine and realistic learning situations, (6) CLT creates a secure or non-threatening learning atmosphere, (7) CLT uses a variety of materials, topics, activities and ways of interacting, (8) CLT emphasizes on acquisition of cultural knowledge, (9) CLT gives a tolerance of errors, and (10) the target of CLT is fluency.

In reality, the application or implementation of CLT varies according to the methodologies which the language teachers used. The communication activities in CLT is basically intended as a preparation for survival in the real world. This underlines what Clarke and Silberstein (1977) viewed that "classroom activities should parallel the 'real world' as closely as possible. Since language is a tool of communication, methods and materials should concentrate on the message and not the medium. The purposes of reading should be the same in class as they are in real life." It is clear that the teachers should be able to provide the exposure to real language, appropriate methods and materials when they are applying the communicative language teaching. That is why the teaching of certain English skills should be based on the purpose of each skill and directed to the use of English in everyday life. The main reason of reading, for example,

is to obtain the information being needed from the text and that information should be beneficial to the students' real life.

There are a number of CLT literatures have been written by scholars such as such as Brumfit and Johnson (1979), Littlewood (1981), and Johnson (1982) offering the discussion of elements underlying the teaching and learning theories for the CLT practices, namely the communicative dimension in language learning, authentic task, and the principle of meaningfulness. The communicative dimension deals with activities involving the real communication to promote language learning. The authentic task relates to the activities using the target language to indorse the meaningful learning. The third element is the principle of meaningfulness in which the target language is meaningful for students to support the learning process. Indeed, learning activities are consequently selected according to how well they engage the students in meaningful and authentic use of language which are not just mechanical practices of language patterns. These principles can be inferred from the practices of CLT which overcome the crucial conditions to promote EFL learning rather than the process of EFL acquisition.

In accordance with the basic principle of language teaching promoted by CLT, teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) should make the students have experiences of using English in real life situations so that they are able to employ their linguistic skills in normal communication events. As the best language teaching approach, CLT makes use of real-life situations that necessitate communication (Galloway, 1993) to grasp a normal meaningful communication event which generally requires the use of many linguistic skills. When the students are engaged in conversational exchanges, for example, they are involved in practicing both listening and speaking in some contexts. In fact, a communicative event requires all linguistic skills in a single event. By giving the nature of communicative acts to the students, they are triggered to apply more than one skill at the same time in real-life communicative activities.

Regarding with the implementation of CLT in ASIA, this language teaching approach has been applied in several ASIA countries earlier than in Indonesia, namely China, India, Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand. There are many studies analyzing this CLT approach from these countries in which some of them are done by Nishino (2008), Lixin (2011), Mustaphaa and Yahaya (2012), and Kumar, Philip, and Kalaiselvi (2013). The findings of these studies implied that the CLT was successfully

implemented as an English teaching approach in different contexts of these countries. These studies describe that English teaching and learning using the CLT approach lead the students to communicate real meaning in real communication so that they use their natural strategies for English acquisition. In other word, those studies proof that the English teaching using CLT makes the students learn to use English in natural and real contexts with satisfactory results.

CLT in Indonesia

In Indonesia, the CLT has been implemented as an English teaching approach since 1984. This means that the CLT approach has been used continuously for almost 30 years in various forms of curriculum changes starting from the 1984 Curriculum up to the 2013 new curriculum. The Indonesian curriculums that have taken the CLT as the ELT approach are the Curriculum 1984, Curriculum 1994, Competency Based Curriculum (KBK) in 2004, School Based Curriculum (KTSP) in 2006, and Curriculum 2013.

Unfortunately, after long implementation of CLT in Indonesia EFL classes, the English proficiencies of Indonesian students remain low as what has been informed by English Proficiency Index (EPI) in its latest report in 2015. EPI is a test to measure the average level of English ability of adults in a country by merging the data from EFSET (EF Standard English Test), which is the first free English test with world standards. EPI declared that the English proficiencies of Indonesian people was in the 32nd level of 70 EFL countries. From 70 countries with 910,000 adults aged 18-30 years, the English proficiency level of Indonesian adults is in a position of 32nd. While Singapore is at the 12th level, Malaysia at the 14th position, India at the 20th place, Vietnam at the 29th ranking, Japan at the 30th grade, and Taiwan at the 31st level. Thus, the CLT implementation for 32 years, its result is really unsatisfactory since the English competence is becoming crucial to enhance the global competition in ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) which includes competition in various sectors, especially in global communication.

Today, Indonesian secondary school students get English as a compulsory subject twice times a week within 60 minutes per lesson. The secondary students are assumed to have sufficient number of hours devoted to English as a foreign language.

Formally, the instructional objective of English subject at secondary school is that the students are expected to experience the English skills of reading, listening, speaking, and writing in certain thematic contexts using appropriate structures with the level of 2,500 words. To get this target, the new English curriculum of 2013 requires the English teachers to apply the Scientific Approach which basically the notion of this approach still bases on the CLT approach by taking the principles of CLT approach, namely (1) language is an instrument to express meaning, (2) meaning is determined by both linguistic and situational contexts, (3) learning a language is learning to use the language in communicative activities in the target language, (4) mastery of the language components is needed to support the mastery of communicative competence, and (5) the teaching of the language components can be done whenever necessary. The new curriculum of 2013 implements more flexible system avoiding a great deal of classroom activities for encouraging the creativities of the EFL teachers and students during the lesson. This is why the new curriculum provides only detailed general guidelines in terms of the learning objectives, teaching methods and techniques, and the scope and general order of the learning materials.

Methodology

The condition of Indonesian students that are difficult to be engaged in real life communication and unable to use English actively after learning English for 3 years at junior high school and 3 years at senior high school indicates that the implementation of CLT in Indonesia has not been successful hitherto. That is why the investigation of this paper focuses on finding out the real factors of producing the gap between the long implementation of CLT and the low students' English proficiencies at Indonesian senior high school contexts. Thus, this study is going to search the issues of any challenges faced by the senior high school teachers and students causing the minimum results of CLT approach after being applied for many years in Indonesia. Through a descriptive qualitative research with the methodologies of focus group discussion (FGD), questionnaires, and field observation, this research is going to get valid and objective findings relating to how the CLT approach has been exactly applied in EFL classes at Indonesian secondary schools.

In investigating the real implementation of CLT approach in EFL secondary classes, the writer held a mini research involving four English teachers of public senior high schools with twelve students and three English teachers of public junior high school with six students. They filled out the questionnaires and joined the focus group discussion in Indonesian language after classes. The observations are also done by the writer during English classes.

Findings

Since the focus of this research is investigating on the CLT practices to find out the real factors underlying the minimum result of long CLT implementation, the mini research has been done at Indonesian senior and junior high schools for a couple of months. Based on the mini research, it is found that the EFL teachers and students in Indonesia secondary schools become bigger factors contributing to the unsuccessful implementation of the CLT approach in EFL classes than other academic factors. It means that the gap between long CLT implementation and minimum results is generally caused more by the doers' factors than by other factors.

As of the analysis on the teachers' questionnaires, it is shown that (1) one teachers feel that they have known CLT well so they have the ability and confidence in running communicative classroom activities, (2) most teachers feel that they do not know well the CLT and how to run their teachings using CLT approach, and (3) two teachers feel confident and five of them do not feel confident that their students understand their explanation in English when teaching. Moreover five teachers felt unsure that their students will not find difficulty in understanding explanations in English. In terms of fluency of their English words, two teacher said that they were not sure if they were able to recite the words of English well, one teacher were convinced that their English instructions could make students become reluctant, three teachers were not sure if they were able to speak English very well, and four teachers also were not sure if using English instructions can make the effective teaching and learning process. Most of the teachers say that they use several strategies to overcome their weaknesses in running English activities using the CLT approach by (1) switching into Indonesian language directly when they do not know how to explain something in English, (2) speaking slowly so the students will be easy to understand, (3) searching for the word in the

dictionary when getting stuck. Although they were not sure of their English proficiencies, few of them does not feel hesitant in using English in the classroom to encourage their students to develop their English.

From the students' responses to the questionnaires, it is found that (1) in terms of the teacher's explanations in English, eight students said that the teacher's explanation is less obvious and ten of them said it was unclear, (2) in response to the question asking about the difficulties students understand the teacher's explanation, and twelve students said that sometimes they feel difficult to understand the teacher's explanation using English. It is clear that most of the students were not always able to understand the teachers' explanations easily. This affects the quality of students the task at hand. Furthermore a total of eleven students assume that they found difficulties in understanding the tasks given by their teacher. The ten student answers indicates that the use of English instruction and explanations gives positive effect on their English language proficiency.

Furthermore, English for Indonesian students is considered as a foreign language, not a second language. This means that Indonesian students will typically use English only at schools and in other particular settings. Consequently the students, especially the remote students, do not have many practical opportunities to use English outside the classroom compared to those who live in big cities. This condition makes English teaching challenging. Having little contact with other English speakers, Indonesian students are not motivated to master spoken or written English. Moreover the EFL students do not experience four linguistic skills in balance, namely reading, speaking, listening, and writing skills in real contexts.

Moreover, due to the fact that the national examination becomes the most target of secondary schools, they focus their teaching and learning much on achieving the target. The students are trained to engage in learning English using written multiple choice forms which neglects other linguistics skills, namely speaking and writing. As a result the Indonesian students are not accustomed to express their ideas in English. They have just focused on how to pass the national examination of English subject based on Indonesian Competency Standard Graduates (*SKL = Standar Kompetensi Lulusan*) which do not include speaking and writing materials. This leads the English teachers more concentrate their teaching on materials included in the *SKL*, namely reading and

listening in which these two materials should be integrated into speaking activities. Both teachers and students come into belief that English speaking and writing are less crucial matters for the students to achieve excellently than reading and listening.

Other factor is there are very limited references for the English teachers which can inspire them to teach English communicatively, meaningfully and creatively. Consequently the teachers often use conventional methods in teaching English which is often done in a silent atmosphere focusing on doing written textbook exercises. No doubt, the students often feel bored and stressed during English classroom activities which they rarely feel engaged. The vast majority of students are unable to produce satisfactory spoken and written English in terms of generating ideas. This is why both teachers and students cyclically neglect English writing and speaking year after year during English classroom activities.

In fact, expressing ideas in English are crucial for students. Good communication in written and spoken English is essential to think and express opinions and feelings clearly. Even at the university level students' writing and speaking abilities are much emphasized during lecturing. That is another reason to develop students' speaking and writing skills at high schools before studying at universities. To achieve this successfully, the English teachers of secondary schools, especially those at remote areas with limited support facilities for teaching, must have good strategies for their English classroom activities. One such strategy is using authentic speaking and writing materials which bring real practical language into the classroom. This is how the EFL teachers should apply the CLT approach in English classes. In fact, spoken or written learning materials that are created with some real-life goal for native speakers are called as authentic materials (Polio, 2014:1-8). Thus, these materials are obviously not designed for language learning purposes such as magazine advertisements, movie review, television shows, conversations between native speakers, train schedules, nutrition labels, postcards, etc.

Conclusion

The ELT in Indonesia secondary schools today is still too stiff focusing on tenses, vocab, and pronunciation. The CLT approach implemented by EFL teachers in classroom practices is very far from the curriculum expectations. Indonesian students

remain being taught to be able to read and write only. The students become clumsy when speaking English. Regrettably, when the students are trying to use English for conversation with their fellows, they are dubbed or stamped by others as doing ostentatious acts of foreigners. As a result, the students feel fear of expressing their feeling and ideas in English effecting their anxiety of speaking, dread of being wrong in using English, and worry about doing incorrect grammar or tenses.

Unfortunately, teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) for students at secondary school is assumed to be difficult for it is done not in a practical use. It is because English is regarded as an academic subject in the school system and is not widely used outside of the classroom (Peace Corps, 1989:7). Both EFL teacher and students have no opportunity to use English outside the classroom so that English for them is as the compulsory subject only. This also makes the teaching-learning activities of EFL becomes time-intensive which can often be boring and unwilling to be involved actively for the students. As a result, the EFL students show little knowledge about how to communicate a contextually appropriate idea and how to express it. Common challenges that the EFL students face in communicating or expressing their mind include word choice, grammar, organization, and generation of ideas, and creativity. It means that EFL can also prove difficult to learn due to all of complicated problems involved, that are linguistic, psychological, and cognitive issues faced by the students.

Finally, the pressures of English tests in multiple choice formats for midterm tests, final semester tests, and national examination force the EFL teachers to focus their attention on grammatical rules, linguistic accuracy and students' final piece of work instead of communication skill. This makes the EFL teachers may often depend their teaching merely on the text books or students worksheets which leads the EFL students graduate within adequate training in English use. Due to having limited knowledge and experiences of using English, the EFL students often feel stuck, bored, and even stressed in English classroom activities. Thus, since the students' proficiency and motivation are low, according to Goss (1999), the teaching EFL remains a challenge. That is why there are some approaches in language teaching developed by the experts like communicative language teaching approach to overcome this kind of problem.

References

- Adi, S. S. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching: Is it appropriate for Indonesian context?. *Instructional Technology*, 51.
- Allen, J., & Widdowson, H. G. (1979). Teaching the communicative use of English. In C. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.). *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp. 147-157). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ansarey, D. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching in EFL Contexts: Teachers Attitude and Perception in Bangladesh. *ASA University Review*, 6 (1), 61-78.
- Banciu, V., & Jireghie, A. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching. *The Public Administration and Social Policies Review*, IV (1), 94-98.
- Belchamber, Rebecca. (2007). The Advantages of Communicative Language Teaching. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. XIII, No. 2, February 2007. <http://iteslj.org/>.
- Brandl, K. (2007). *Communicative language teaching in action: Putting principles to work*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language teaching and learning*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Canale, M. and M. Swain. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1/1:1-47.
- Canale, M. (1983). From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. In J. C Richards & R. W Schmidt. *Language and Communication*. New York: Longman. 2-27.
- Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (Eds.) (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667206>
- Chang, M. (2011). EFL Teachers' Attitudes toward Communicative Language Teaching in Taiwanese College. *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*, 53, 17-34.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching?. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 141-152.

- Chang, M., & Goswami, J. S. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college English classes. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), p3.
- Competence-Based Curriculum. (2004) Competence Standard of English Lessons for Junior High Schools. The Indonesian Department of National Education.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dailey, A. (2010). Difficulties Implementing CLT in South Korea: Mismatch between the language policy and what is taking place in the classroom. 1-23. Retrieved from <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/sociolinguistics/ADaileyDifficultiesImplementingCLTinSouthKorea2.pdf>
- Ellis, Rod. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford, U.K: Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2007). *How to teach English*. Pearson: Longman.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. J. B. Pride and J. Holmes, (eds.) *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Education, 269-93.
- Iftahar, Shampa. (2014). Rethinking English Teaching through CLT in Government Primary Schools of Bangladesh. *DIU Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Volume 2 July 2014, 193-214.
- Kaisheng, H. (2007). Reconsideration on CLT in College English: Theory and Practice. *Canadian Social Science*, 3(1), p.87-90.
- Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT journal*, 50(3), 187-198.
- Kienbaum, B., Russell, A., & Welty, S.(1986). *Communicative competence in foreign language learning with authentic materials*. Final Project Report. Purdue University, Calumet, Indiana. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275200).
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Liao, Xiao Q. (2000) How Communicative Language Teaching Became Acceptable in Secondary Schools in China. *The TESL Journal*, Vol. 6, No: 10.

- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in East Asian Classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(03), 243-249.
- Littlewood, W. (2008). Foreign language teaching methods: From past prescriptions to present principles. *Foreign Language Teaching in Schools*, 31(4), 1-13.
- Littlewood, W. (2011). Communicative Language Teaching. In T. S. Rodgers, *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (pp. 153-177). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Llurda, Enric. (2000). On Competence, Proficiency, and Communicative Language Ability. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 85-96.
- Marcellino, M. (2009). English Language Teaching in Indonesia: A Continuous Challenge in Education and Cultural Diversity. *TEFLIN Journal: A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 19(1).
- Miller, Lindsay. (2000) Student Teachers' Perceptions about Communicative Language Teaching Methods *RELC Journal*, Vol. 31, No:1 (1-22)
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative Language Teaching in Practice*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Musthafa, B. (2001). Communicative language teaching in Indonesia: Issues of theoretical assumptions and challenges in classroom practice. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 2(2).
- Ngoc, K. M., & Iwashita, N. (2012). A Comparison of Learners' and Teachers' Attitudes Toward Communicative Language Teaching at Two Universities in Vietnam. *University of Sidney Papers in TESOL*, 25-49.
- Nishino, T. (2008). Japanese secondary school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding communicative language teaching: An exploratory survey. *JALT Journal*, 30(1), 27.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: Making it work. *ELT Journal*, 41(2), 136-145.

- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2000). An introduction to task-based teaching. *ELT Advantage, Cengage Learning*.
- Nunan, D. (2003). The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37/4, 589-613.
- Ozsevik, Z. (2010). *The Use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL Teachers' Perceived Difficulties in Implementing CLT in Turkey* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).
- Rao, Z. H. (2002). Chinese students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom. *System*, 30(1), 85-105.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Jack C. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667190>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogers, C. V., & Medley, F. M. (1988). Language with a Purpose: Using Authentic Materials in the Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 21, 467-478. Retrieved from <http://www.dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1988.tb01098.x>
- Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative Language Teaching: State of The Art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 261-278.
- Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching - Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*. United States of America: Yale University.
- Savignon, S. J., & Wang, C. (2003). Communicative Language Teaching in EFL contexts: Learner attitudes and perceptions. *IRAL*, 41(3), 223-250.

- Sultana, F. & Alim, A. (2013). Efficacy of Communicative Language Teaching Primary A School-Bangladesh Context. *International Journal of English Language Education*. 2(1): 113-119.
- Sun, Guangyong., & Cheng, Liying. (2002). From Context to Curriculum: A Case Study of Communicative Language Teaching in China. *TESL Canada Journal*, Volume 19, Issue 2, Spring 2002, 67-86.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willis, Jane. (1996). *A Framework of Task-Based Learning*. New York: Longman.
- Wong, C. C., & Barrea-Marlys, M. (2012). The Role of Grammar in Communicative Language Teaching: An Exploration of Second Language Teachers' Perceptions and Classroom Practices. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 9, 61-75.
- Wu, W. (2008). Misunderstandings of Communicative Language Teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 1, 50-53.
- Wu, Y. (2009). The Application of CLT in College English Vocabulary. *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 4, 128-131.
- Yoon, K.E. (2004) CLT Theories and Practices in EFL Curricula: A Case Study of Korea. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6/3, 1-16.

aefl

ORIGINALITY REPORT

18%

SIMILARITY INDEX

20%

INTERNET SOURCES

6%

PUBLICATIONS

6%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

eprints.uns.ac.id

Internet Source

8%

2

www.tesol.id

Internet Source

7%

3

researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz

Internet Source

3%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 3%

Exclude bibliography On