



ISSN 2830-3385 (Print)
ISSN 2830-3202 (Online)

BATARA DIDI: English Language Journal

Vol. 3 No. 1, 2024 (Page: 1-12)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56209/badi.v3i1.97>

Students' Speaking Skills through Communicative Language Teaching

Achmad Basir¹

¹Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia

Article History



Abstract

This study was designed to increase the English speaking of students by implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in the second grade of Department of Dental Nurse Politeknik Kementerian Kesehatan Makassar. The subject taught was the English for Dental Nurse and the sample used in this study was class A as a control group and class B as an experimental group. This study implemented quasi experimental design with nonequivalent control group design. The result of this study showed significant greater improvement in students' English speaking by implementing Communicative Language Teaching approach for experimental class than implementing Grammar Translation Method for control group. The study's findings demonstrated that Grammar Translation Method was not as successful at increasing students' speaking as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

Keywords

Communicative Language Teaching Approach Speaking

Introduction

English is a subject that all students have to learn it in Poltekmas Makassar, especially in dental department, the students have more opportunities to practice English because each meeting students have to follow two parts such as theory and practice. Theory is 90 minutes and practice time is also 90 minutes a week. But their progress in English skill is still unsatisfactory.

The purposes of learning English in dental nurse department Poltekmas Makassar is to make the students can speak English in oral form. Doing communicate is the way to convey the ideas as orally. In making students enable to speak up, the teacher and students have to use the language to communicate their idea. Finnegan (2014) Communication is the basis of human life and language is the main thing in communicating between humans.

To achieve the target language teaching, the approach should make students more interested in learning and do communicate well. Many English teachers still implemented the traditional approach, which is one-way or passive instruction and does not involve class participation. As a result, the students are inexperienced in oral English communication. This has also occurred

¹Corresponding Author: Achmad Basir, Address: Sultan Alauddin No.259, Gn. Sari, Kec. Rappocini, Kota Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan 90221

in Dental Nurse Department Poltekmas Makassar, teaching method still uses conventional method.

Referring to the cases above, the researcher considers making the students more initiative in making interacting and having communication in the class. To get this aim the lecturers have to look for suitable approach. Approach must be employed in the classroom since supporting the teaching and learning process is crucial to achieving the instructional objectives (Efrizal 2012). Taking the appropriate approach makes the students more enjoying in the class. In having successfully in the class, the researcher has to suggest in using CLT because it is one of approach which makes the student happy to follow the teaching process. Saputra (2015) found that CLT had a good supporting to increase students' speaking skill in making interact with other. Additionally, Vongxay (2013) came to the conclusion that CLT is the best teaching strategy for students studying English as a second language since it gives them more opportunity to communicate in class and develop their communicative abilities.

CLT is a learning strategy that needs to be used in class because it is excellent for students learning English as a second language since it gives them more chances to actively participate in class discussion and develop their interpersonal communication skills.

Literature Review

The Concept of Communicative Language Teaching

Savignon (2002) concluded that CLT must be a solution in dealing with educational problems. For example, teachers should use CLT in achieving learning objectives because in this approach students become facilitators in class. The target language is the goal of communication in the classroom, emphasizing that in language applications, students are expected to be able to express their ideas and opinions and teachers assess students.

CLT is very useful as Losi & Nasution (2022) pointed out CLT also can make the students interested in learning English. Some researchers found that CLT is very useful in teaching English Foreign Language like Mangaleswaran & Aziz (2019) found that using CLT in the communicative group activity can increase learners' speaking skills. It can also be concluded that the learners can speak well, increase their vocabulary, grammatical structure pretty good

The learners become having fun to learn English by applying CLT as approach like Vongxay (2013) found that using CLT is very good for students in helping to study because it gives chance for learners in having communicate and interacting each other and teacher in the class. This teaching approach makes students to self-regulate in their learning and become active learners so they felt more confident to express their idea.

According to Savignon (2002), "CLT should be based on the process and objectives of classroom learning" and "as the concept of theoretical in CLT must be in communicative competence". The basic objective of CLT is to strengthen second language learners' ability to communicate. Four components of communicative competence were first recognized by Alat (2012). One of the main tenets of CLT, according to Brown & Abeywickrama (2004), is focusing on all aspects of communicative competence while setting classroom goals. Therefore, it is crucial for CLT to establish methods and procedures for teaching language skill and to make communicative competence the end objective of language teaching.

This study was carried out to ascertain the effects of implementing CLT in English education to improve students' English competence. And the goal of this study was to understand how CLT was used to improve students' English.

The Characteristics of Communicative Language Teaching

Littlewood in Richards & Rodgers (2014) pointed out, "one of the goals of communicative-based language teaching is an emphasis on systematic attention, functional aspects and language aspects. This means that the emphasis of this procedure is that students must work in pairs or form groups by utilizing the language resources available in class assignments for problem solving.

Brown & Abeywickrama (2004) stated that there are six characteristics that are described as descriptions of CLT. (a) language components such as grammar, discourse, functional, sociolinguistics, and strategies must be goals in communicative competence; (b) Language techniques must be made well and must involve students in the use of pragmatic, authentic, and functional language; (c) the complementary principles underlying communicative techniques are fluency and accuracy. Sometimes fluency may have to be more important than accuracy for students to engage with the language; (d) Students must use English, productively and receptively, in contexts that have not been previously practiced outside the classroom; (e) Paying attention to the student learning process must be prioritized through an understanding of their own learning style; (f) The teacher becomes a facilitator and guide.

Referring to the characteristics above CLT has purpose in learning to gain all components of language by asking the students to study hard not only fluently but also accurately. Therefore, the lecturer needs to balance the activities which focus on both fluency and accuracy. The characteristics of CLT that must be used in the classroom include the curriculum, classroom activities, subject and assignments, and the roles of the instructor and students.

Syllabus

The syllabus becomes a reference in the plans to be achieved in a teaching process. The CLT approach is included in the Syllabus to give language teachers room to create lesson plans about the target language and task activities. Listening, reading, writing, and oral communication in English are integrated in syllabus and in syllabus also showed teaching grammar through integrating the text.

Classroom Activities

Activities used in the application of CLT include role plays, simulations, language games, and group discussions. First, discussion can be conducted in groups, pairs, or as a class. Second, to encourage them to use the target language in class, students are provided a simulation of speaking with real-life situations. Language games are the third. According to Larsen & Freeman (2000), CLT should routinely employ items like these. This game needs to be well-designed and give pupils communication practice in order for them to enjoy the learning process. The only distinction between role play and simulation is that role play allows for the employment of acquired identities and pretending to be someone else. According to Larsen-Freeman (2000), this role play is crucial.

Material and Tasks

The purpose of the research-developed teaching materials is to help students' speaking abilities. In terms of selecting and preparing teaching materials, there are several factors that must be

considered. First, learning that includes authentic tasks. Second, the theme and content of the material must meet needs, interests and background.

Roles of teachers and students

The concept of implementing CLT must be student-centered, and the teacher hopes to become a facilitator who can make students use the target language in a communicative learning atmosphere. teaching plans that have been made communicatively and can be implemented in class activities which ultimately make all students interact communicatively.

Levitt (2002) stated that teachers must have three main roles. The facilitator is the main thing, the independent participant is the second thing, and the next activity is to be an observer. Since they are the ones who communicate the language-learning process, the students' participation in CLT is of utmost significance. As communicators, they are responsible for negotiating the meaning of their communication while attempting to comprehend and assimilate the meaning of others' messages utilizing their proficiency in the target language (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

Thus, students must always play the role of being communicators, negotiators in the communication process so that communication interactions between students and teachers occur. Students are expected to be active recipients, not passive recipients. The student's contributions are independent learning among the students. So that they have an important role to support each other and make the class lives.

Communicative Competence

According to Savignon (2002), "functional language proficiency" refers to the ability to convey, interpret, and negotiate meaning in interactions between two or more members of the same (or separate) speech community. Savignon (2002) further distinguished between the following components of communicative competence: 1) communicative competence is a dynamic, not static concept; 2) communicative competence consist of speaking and writing, as well as to many other symbolic systems; and 3) communicative competence is context specific. Communication occurs in a plethora of different contexts, and one's ability to succeed in a certain function depends on their understanding of that context; 4) Theoretically, competence and performance are related; 5) communicative competence is relative rather than absolute and depends on everyone's collaboration.

Referring to the statement above, the researcher makes oral production the main thing which is called speaking skills. Melser (2009) revealed that through verbal communication you can provide ideas and information to other students as directly. Therefore, English teaching must focus on how to enable students to communicate with their friends and express their ideas in English. Speaking does not only express something orally, but several aspects really need to be mastered by students so they can be skilled at speaking. Namely accuracy, pronunciation, fluency and vocabulary.

Accuracy

Accuracy in speaking is the main thing in every pronunciation that can be accepted by the interlocutor, grammar also needs to be considered properly and the choice of words according to their designation. Accuracy has three elements that are interrelated with the others, such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. However, in this study, researchers focused on vocabulary and pronunciation.

Vocabulary

According to Schmitt & Schmitt (2020), vocabulary is described as the total quantity of words in a language, the words that a person is familiar with, and a list of words with their definitions, sometimes found in the back of a book meant to teach a foreign language. The study's vocabulary included the terms that students chose and employed in a variety of contexts. In essence, the researcher came to the conclusion that a student's vocabulary is the total quantity of words with meaning in a given language that they must use when speaking.

Vocabulary is the main element in understanding a language before putting I speaking. Memorizing all the vocabulary that has been studied is still difficult for students because they are hampered by practicing and using it. Therefore, they need to receive more training to remember it. Heremy (2003) states that there are three types of vocabulary, namely: (1) Active vocabulary, or words that are constantly utilized while speaking in daily life; (2) Reserve words are those that are comprehended but infrequently utilized in conversation because they are typically employed in writing; (3) Words used in passive vocabulary are ones that the writer is just faintly aware of the meaning of.

Pronunciation

The manner a specific sound or sounds are produced during speaking is known as pronunciation. One approach for speakers to communicate clearly with others is by doing this. Levis (2006) pronunciation is the result of pronouncing a language or certain words. The results of teaching pronunciation are always related to the introduction or understanding of the results of learning speech and the production of words. Pronunciation teaching needs to be taught so that students can produce English utterances that can be understood and understood by the person they are talking to. Due to the potentially lethal consequences of word meaning variations, pronunciation is especially crucial when speaking, and intonation and stress can have an impact on meaning errors.

Fluency

Goldstein et al. (2005) defines passivity as the ability to produce speech as naturally as that of native speakers. Speaking skills are influenced by the accuracy of syllables, mastery of the language system, and fluency in speaking so that there is no doubt in communication. Ascione (1993) pointed out that fluency is fluency in language, having adequate vocabulary to make it easier to speak and write.

Fluency means the ability of students to communicate in English well so that they are able to overcome the mistakes that they usually make it, for example in grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. Fluency is also something very complex, for example in terms of continuous fluency in discourse, including the use of sentence patterns based on word order, grammar and other aspects in terms of fluency

Hypothesis

The theoretical basis of CLT is communicative, such as in terms of speaking, the assumptions of researchers regarding the application of CLT are very capable of improving students' abilities in speaking English. Vocabulary, pronunciation and fluency in English can be tested empirically by differentiating significant pretest and post-test average scores.

Research Methods

Using a quasi-experimental design with a non-equivalent control group design, this study was conducted (Ball, 2021). Pre-test, treatment, and post-test procedures were carried out in two or more treatment groups in a non-equivalent control group. Pretest and post-test by using recordings were carried out on the experimental and control groups. Students' prior knowledge was obtained from the pre-test that had been carried out as well as to understand the improvement in teaching English, a post-test was carried out which focused on the results of oral speech, accuracy (vocabulary, pronunciation) and fluency. Treatment and test in speaking are two main things in this research process. In each meeting the CLT and GTM approaches were applied and carried out 6 times in class meetings. To understand English competence, students were given a test using a questionnaire model

Treatment for Experiment group using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

The subjects of this study were conducted at Poltekmas Makassar second graders who had received care from the researcher. the method utilized to make studying English fun for the students.

Experimental group

The treatment was conducted for 6 times meetings and the time in the class spent for one and a half hours. Applying CLT was in the experiment group; (1) The researcher takes on the role of a facilitator and guide in the classroom; (2) The focus of the opportunities shifted to the educational process; (3) Allowed more time to speak and use the language each time used discussion; (4) Practice in speaking by dialogue; (3) Question and answer were used in describing object; (4) After doing Reading the text, must be given time to give comment; (5) Improving vocabulary by games; (6) If the student absent, they must copy the module; (7) Given homework assignment; (8) Given Evaluation as oral

Treatment for Control group using Grammar Translation Method

Reading and translate the passage, Result translation must be in writing and or speaking, Answer the question after reading the text. Students learned the spelling, Translated the native language to the mother tongue, Answer the question by filling the blank, Vocabulary must be memorized, Grammar must be memorized, Trying used the new vocabulary into good writing.

The data collected through the steps in experimental and control group as follows: Treatment material after giving speaking test by using recording to know the students' prior knowledge of communicative competence were given to experimental and control group. After doing pretest, it must be given treatment to the experimental by CLT and control group by GTM. Six meetings used in this treatment and every meeting used one and a half hour. Post-tests were carried out in two classes after doing the treatment that was carried out to find out the results. The patient is interviewed before, during, and after treatment as part of the test, which is conducted in the form of a question-and-answer session between the nurse and the patient. giving both groups a test

Technique of Data Analysis

The results of communicative competence in English were analyzed by conducting English proficiency tests after students were taught through the CLT and GTM methods. SPSS version 24.0 is used to analyze data obtained from English language test instruments, statistical data in the form of frequency, mean and standard deviation.

Results and Discussion

The major goal of this study was to determine the effect of incorporating communicative language instruction into the English language curriculum at the Dental Nurse Department of Poltekmas Makassar in order to increase the students' speaking.

For the test result, descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage were calculated. Heaton (1988) score classification was employed in this study's analysis to determine students' communicative competency achievement (accuracy, fluency, and vocabulary).

Students' Speaking Achievement

The frequency and percentage of pretest and Post-test score for Experimental Group (E) and Control Group (C)

The research results, both pre-test and post-test, are tabulated as in the following table

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of Pretest Score for Classes in terms of Pronunciation

Classification	Score	E		C	
		Pretest		Pretest	
		F	P (%)	F	P (%)
Excellent	9.6-10	0	0	0	0
Very Good	8.6-9.5	0	0	0	0
Good	7.6-8.5	0	0	1	2.6
Fairly Good	6.6-7.5	2	5.4	8	21.1
Fairly	5.6-6.5	0	0	0	0
Poor	4.6-5.5	5	13.5	15	39.5
Very Poor	0-4.5	30	81.1	14	36.8
Total		37	100	38	100

2 students (5.4%) in the Experimental (E) group had "fairly good" scores on the pretest, 5 students (13.5%) had "poor" scores, and 30 students (81.1%) had "very poor" scores. Most students in the E group received "very poor" marks on the pretest. One student (2.6%) from the Control (C) group received a "good" score, eight (21.1%) received a "fairly good" score, fifteen (39.5%) received a "poor" score, and fourteen (36.2%) received a "very poor" score. Most students in the C group received "fairly good" scores on the pretest.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage of Pretest Score for Both Classes in terms of Vocabulary

Classification	Score	E		C	
		Pretest		Pretest	
		F	P (%)	F	P (%)
Excellent	9.6-10	0	0	0	0
Very Good	8.6-9.5	0	0	0	0
Good	7.6-8.5	0	0	1	2.6
Fairly Good	6.6-7.5	2	5.4	8	21.1
Fairly	5.6-6.5	0	0	0	0
Poor	4.6-5.5	17	45.9	20	52.6
Very Poor	0-4.5	18	48.6	9	23.7
Total		37	100	38	100

Two students (5.4%) in the Experimental (E) group received a "fairly good" score on the pretest, 17 students (45.9%) had a "poor" score, and 18 students (48.6%) received a "very poor"

score. Most students in the E group received "very poor" marks on the pretest. One student (2.6%) from the Control (C) group received a "good" score, eight (21.1%) received a "fairly good" score, twenty (52.6%) received a "poor" score, and nine (23.7%) received a "very poor" score. Most students in the C group "got fairly" good pretest scores.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage of Pretest Score for Both Classes in terms of Fluency

Classification	Score	E		C	
		Pretest		Pretest	
		F	P (%)	F	P (%)
Excellent	9.6-10	0	0	0	0
Very Good	8.6-9.5	0	0	0	0
Good	7.6-8.5	1	2.7	3	7.9
Fairly Good	6.6-7.5	1	2.7	8	21.1
Fairly	5.6-6.5	0	0	0	0
Poor	4.6-5.5	5	13.5	17	44.7
Very Poor	0-4.5	30	81.1	10	26.3
Total		37	100	38	100

The pretest results for the Experimental (E) group revealed that 1 student (2.7%) received a "good" score, 1 student (2.7%) received a "fairly good" score, 5 students (13.5%) received a "poor" score, and 30 students (81.1%) received a "very poor" score. Most students in the E group received "very poor" marks on the pretest. Three students (7.9%) from the Control (C) group received "good" scores, one student (21.1%) received "fairly good" scores, 17 students (44.7%) received "poor" scores, and 10 students (26.3%) received "very poor" scores. Most students in the C group received "poor" scores on the pretest.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of Post-test Score for Classes in terms of Pronunciation

Classification	Score	E		C	
		Post-test		Post-test	
		F	P (%)	F	P (%)
Excellent	9.6-10	2	5.4	0	0
Very Good	8.6-9.5	0	0	0	0
Good	7.6-8.5	6	16.2	3	7.9
Fairly Good	6.6-7.5	15	40.5	6	15.8
Fairly	5.6-6.5	0	0	0	0
Poor	4.6-5.5	13	35.1	20	52.6
Very Poor	0-4.5	1	2.7	9	23.7
Total		37	100	38	100

The post-test results for the Experimental (E) group revealed that two students (5.4%) received "excellent" scores, six (16.2%) received "good" scores, fifteen (40.5%) received "fairly good" scores, thirteen (35.1%) received "poor" scores, and one (2.7%) received extremely "poor" scores. The majority of students in the E group received "fairly good" post-test scores. In contrast, in the Control (C) group, 3 students (7.9%) received "good" marks, 6 students (15.8%) received "fairly good" marks, 20 students (52.6%) received "poor" marks, and 9 students (23.7%) received "very poor" marks. Most students in the C group received "poor" scores on the post-test.

Table 5. Frequency and Percentage of Post-test Score for Classes in terms of Vocabulary

Classification	Score	E		C	
		Post-test		Post-test	
		F	P (%)	F	P (%)
Excellent	9.6-10	3	8.1	0	0
Very Good	8.6-9.5	0	0	0	0
Good	7.6-8.5	8	21.6	3	7.9
Fairly Good	6.6-7.5	12	32.4	6	15.8
Fairly	5.6-6.5	0	0	0	0
Poor	4.6-5.5	13	35.1	25	65.8
Very Poor	0-4.5	1	2.7	4	10.5
Total		37	100	38	100

Based on the above table, it was determined that the majority of students scored in the excellent, good, fairly good, poor, and very poor categories on their Post-test. Three students (8.1%) in the Experimental (E) group received "excellent" scores on the Post-test, eight (21.6%) received "good" scores, twelve (32.4%) received "fairly good" scores, thirteen (35.1%) received "poor" scores, and one (2.7%) received "very poor" scores. The majority of students in class E received "poor" Post-test results. 3 students (7.9%) from the Control (C) group received "good" scores, 6 students (15.8%) received "fairly good" scores, 25 students (65.8%) received "poor" scores, and 4 students (10.5%) received "very poor" scores. Most students in the C group received "poor" scores on the Post-test.

Table 6. Frequency and Percentage of Post-test Score for Both Classes in terms of Fluency

Classification	Score	E		C	
		Post-test		Post-test	
		F	P (%)	F	P (%)
Excellent	9.6-10	3	8.1	0	0
Very Good	8.6-9.5	0	0	0	0
Good	7.6-8.5	7	18.9	5	13.2
Fairly Good	6.6-7.5	14	37.8	11	28.9
Fairly	5.6-6.5	0	0	0	0
Poor	4.6-5.5	12	32.4	16	42.1
Very Poor	0-4.5	1	2.7	6	15.8
Total		37	100	38	100

According to the table above, 3 students (8.1%) in the Experimental (E) group received exceptional scores, 7 students (18.9%) received "good" scores, 14 students (37.8%) received "fairly good" scores, 12 students (32.4%) received "poor" scores, and 1 student (2.7%) received "very poor" scores on the Post-test. The majority of students in class E received "fairly good" Post-test scores. Five students (13.2%) in the Control (C) class had "good" grades, eleven (28.1%) received "fairly good" grades, sixteen (42.1%) received "poor" grades, and six (15.8%) received "very poor" grades. Most students in the C class had "poor" scores on the Post-test.

The classification of the students' communicative competence after the treatment by using CLT for the Experimental group and GTM for the Control group was made based on the description of the communicative competence in the pretest and Post-test results as shown in the Table above.

The impact of students' English speaking by using CLT and GTM

Total students are 37 tested, 30 received very low scores, and no one in the experimental group received high marks for pronunciation. These circumstances were modified grammatically by the mother tongue. The score for pronunciation in the experimental group was lower than in the control group because only 14 of the 38 students in the control class received very poor scores, and one student received an excellent score.

A very poor 18 out of 37 students, the higher score in the experimental group, just 2 of 37 scored fairly good in vocabulary. Less vocabulary was the cause of it. It can be stated that the vocabulary score in the experimental group was lower than in the control group since 9 of the 38 students in the control group received very poor scores, and only one of the 38 students received a decent score.

In the experimental group, 30 of the 37 students received very poor fluency scores and one had good score. It was brought on by verbal limitations, hesitation, and difficulty expressing oneself. And in the control group, 10 of the 38 students received very poor scores, while three received good scores, indicating that the experimental group's fluency was lower than the control group.

CLT used in teaching process during 6 meetings in experimental group and GTM in control group. Based on the data that had been collected in both groups; CLT in experimental group increased the pronunciation, vocabulary and fluency suited what Larsen-Freeman (2000) CLT goal made the students enable to communicate in English fluently and accurately. Richards (2005) pointed out one of CLT goals developed fluency. It also showed in the mean score of pretest and post-test.

The result findings above, CLT approached had important rules to increase students' score than GTM. Some factors that influencing are making group discussion, doing simulation, using games and role-play. Larsen-Freeman (2000) pointed out that these factors are very popular in CLT, it caused giving many opportunities in making communicating practice, so the students fell enjoy. Higgs & Clifford in Brown & Abeywickrama (2004) said CLT focused to make the students be master in English language in verbal or writing.

Conclusion

The t-value's conclusion result indicated that it was higher than the t-table. When compared to the control group, the t value was 16.261 and the t table was 1.666. It showed that there was significant difference between teaching English through CLT and GTM is accepted. However, the experimental group's t-value is higher than the control groups. Therefore, it can be said that the CLT approach, which the researcher employed in his research, was better than the grammar translation method.

According to the researcher's findings, CLT is a strategy that can boost students' speaking at Poltekmas Makassar. CLT can also address several issues with teaching English. The students' inability to actively communicate, interaction, difficulty starting a discussion, lack of vocabulary, and fluency are the final issues. As a teaching strategy, CLT helps the lecturer improve or enjoy the condition when using the language.

References

- Alat, D. K. K. S. S. (2012). Using Communicative Language Teaching (Clt) Approach Through Small Group Discussion as a Device to Stimulate the Students to Speak in English.
- Ascione, M. E. (1993). *Fluency development in second language teaching* (Doctoral dissertation, Lethbridge, Alta.: University of Lethbridge, Faculty of Education, 1993).
- Ball, M. N. (2021). Mental Health Delivery Method Outcomes for the Postsecondary Student: A Quantitative Quasi-Experimental, Non-Equivalent Control Group Pretest-Post-test Study.
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2004). Language assessment. *Principles and Classroom Practices*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, 20.
- Efrizal, D. (2012). Improving students' speaking through communicative language teaching method at Mts Ja-alhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic boarding school of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and social science*, 2(20), 127-134.
- Finnegan, R. (2014). *Communicating: The multiple modes of human communication*. Routledge.
- Goldstein, B. A., Fabiano, L., & Washington, P. S. (2005). Phonological skills in predominantly English-speaking, predominantly Spanish-speaking, and Spanish-English bilingual children.
- Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Writing English language tests*. Longman.
- Heremy, J. (2003). How to teach English: An introduction to the practice of English language teaching. *England: Pearson Education Limited*.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. oxford University.
- Levis, J. M. (2006). Pronunciation and the assessment of spoken language. In *Spoken English, TESOL and applied linguistics: Challenges for theory and practice* (pp. 245-270). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230584587_11
- Levitt, K. E. (2002). An analysis of elementary teachers' beliefs regarding the teaching and learning of science. *Science education*, 86(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.1042>
- Losi, R. V., & Nasution, M. M. (2022). Students' attitudes toward communicative language teaching (CLT) in English speaking intensive program. *International Journal of English and Applied Linguistics (IJEAL)*, 2(1), 95-102. <https://doi.org/10.47709/ijeal.v2i1.1428>
- Mangaleswaran, S., & Aziz, A. A. (2019). The impact of the implementation of CLT on students' speaking skills. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP)*, 9(4), p8814.
- Melser, D. (2009). Verbal communication: from pedagogy to make-believe. *Language Sciences*, 31(5), 555-571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2008.06.001>
- Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.

- Saputra, J. B. (2015). Communicative Language Teaching: Changing Students' Speaking Skill. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 4(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.24127/pj.v4i1.277>
- Savignon, S. J. (2002). Communicative language teaching: Linguistic theory and classroom practice. *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education*, 1-27.
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (2020). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Vongxay, H. (2013). *The implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) in an English department in a Lao higher educational institution: a case study* (Master's thesis).