Teachers' Belief and Practices regarding Communicative Language Testing In Malaysian Secondary School

Punitha Gopal, Prof. Dr Mohamed Amin bin Embi
Education Faculty of National University of Malaysia
punithag1009@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The principles of Communicative language teaching mainly concentrate in encouraging students to communicative effectively in second language. Apparently, many ESL teachers are adapting Communicative Language Teaching in line with Secondary school English language syllabus to cater to their students' real life needs in enhancing their communicative skills rather than emphasizing the linguistic structures. However, few studies have been conducted on how the students were assessed based on the Communicative language teaching in schools which ultimately aims to enhance students speaking ability. This study investigates the teacher's beliefs and practices of conducting communicative language testing in the classroom. The key objective is to answer the question how well the communicative language tests are administered communicatively in order to examine the students' competence (knowledge of the language) and performance (the use of the language in appropriate context). Quantitative research methodology was utilized in this study. The survey questionnaires were distributed to 30 secondary language teachers from two urban schools in Shah Alam to gather data pertaining the teachers beliefs and practices of Communicative language tests in the classroom. Viewed statistically, the data resulted from Communicative Language Testing beliefs and practices questionnaire was analyzed through frequencies and percentages. The study found that, language teachers from two urban schools portrays positive beliefs and practices of communicative language testing and aware of the principles that involves in communicative language testing. However, the constraints encountered by teachers in conducting Communicative tests seem to be a stumbling block in implementing Communicative language tests in the classroom. The findings of this research are expected to help teachers reflect on their current communicative language testing practices as well as offer some suggestions for designing and implementing a fair successful method of communicative testing which genuinely test the students communicative ability.

Keywords: Communicative Language testing, principles, communicative skills, beliefs, practices.

----

1. Introduction/Background

Little research has been carried out in the area of communicative language testing and assessment. Although some researchers have paid attention to the implementation of communication language approach in teaching English as a second language in enhancing communicative skills (Ahmad & Rao, 2013; Reza Raissi et al., 2013), little is known about how communicative language tests are actually designed and administered in measuring students real communicative competence (Bernardo, 2011; Nguye & Le, 2003 ; Ireland,2000). Furthermore, a large body of literature says that Communicative language approach emphasis the importance of using a language rather than only learning the rules. Hymes (1972) views that, both knowledge and ability to use language reflects a person who acquires communicative competence. Candlin (1976) and Winddowson (1978) recognized the need to address the functional and communicative potential of language rather that the mastery of grammatical structures. Language courses should focus on the 'use' whereby learner shows his ability to apply his knowledge of linguistic rules for effective communication compared to the 'usage' where users demonstrate his knowledge of linguistic

rules (Widdowson, 1978). Richard and Rodgers (2001) as cited in Bernardo (2011) claimed that, by applying Communicative approach language teachers can enhance learners communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) and communicative language ability (Bachman, 1990) as the language users have the ability to use their knowledge of language to execute and perform that knowledge in appropriate and contextualized communicative language situations.

Communicative language approach is widely adopted by teachers and educators in developing their students ability in communicative skills because it has diverse set of principles that covers language learning in communicative way (Bachman, 1990) as well as learners are engaged in wide variety of classroom procedures to master the needed skills and to be a successful language users in various meaningful communication situations. The present language instruction which embrace the Communicative Approach showed a mismatch between how learners are taught or trained in 'communicative way' and how their performance are evaluated in 'communicative way'. If the ultimate aim of language teaching is to develop communicative competence of the learners, then the effectiveness of classroom instruction must be established by implementing an appropriate communicative language testing instruction (Bernardo, 2011; Ireland, 2000). Past research on the Communicative language teaching has concentrated only on two broad issues which are the teachers' beliefs and practices of communicative language approach as a classroom instruction and about the perceived problems in using Communicative Language Teaching (Reza Raissi et al., 2013; Chang, 2011). Consequently, an incomplete picture of the way Communicative Language testing is applied in assessing students communicative competence and performance has been given less emphasize and abandoned by many teachers when comes to evaluating them.

Therefore, the purpose of this research is to answer the research question "How communicative are the language tests used in assessing students competence (knowledge of the language) and performance (actual use of the language in real life situations)? More specifically, this research has two objectives which is to investigate the secondary language teachers' perception and practices of communicative language tests in classroom and to examine the communicative qualities of the language test in assessing students competence and performance in using the language. Thus, this research attempts to explore how the teachers actually aware of the important qualities that involved in a communicative language testing which advocates the principles of communicative approach when testing their students' performance in communicative skills and the constrains faced by teachers in conducting Communicative Language Tests. Essentially, this research responds to the call for an effective ways or techniques in which communicative competence may best be tested and evaluated by the teachers. There are little attention given in the way of standardize testing and evaluation as many teachers have their own completely independent method of evaluating their students (Ireland 2000). Furthermore, many teachers are simply not testing their students in a communicative manner and thus neglecting both the aims and principles of the course (Ireland, 2000; Bernardo, 2011). In addition, this research is delimited to review the secondary language teachers' practices in urban schools in term of designing, implementing and assessing their students' when testing them in communicative courses. The findings of this research are expected to help teachers reflect on their current communicative language testing practices as well as offer some suggestions for designing and implementing a fair successful method of communicative testing which genuinely test the students communicative ability.

1.2   Theoretical Framework

Developing a language tests that examine learners communicative ability requires several components that takes consideration of learners' language ability. The model of language use in language tests as proposed by Bachman & Palmer (1996) describes the test takers characteristics which include topical knowledge, affective schemata, personal characteristics and language ability interact with three main components of language competence, strategic competence and physiological mechanisms which reflect how a language user's modify their both knowledge or competence and the capacity for implementing, or executing that competence in appropriate, contextualized communicative language use. Therefore this model is selected for this study as it sets as a guideline for the teachers to reflect on their Communicative assessment which is intended to test their learners' communicative ability.

2   Literature Review
2.1   Communicative Language Testing

Communicative language testing focuses both on learners' knowledge of a language and how to use it (competence) and also to what extend learners apply their knowledge to meaningful communicative situations (performance). It is intended to achieve the goal of assessing language learners' ability to take part in acts of communication or to apply the language in real life situations (Phan, 2008), which eventually provide the tester with information about testee's ability to perform in the target language in certain context-specific tasks (Boddy& Langham,2000; Razmjoo, 2011). Communicative language testing viewed no longer follows the traditional way of written examination which essentially tests students' ability to manipulate grammatical structure of a language. Currently, it is seen as an ongoing activity which attempts to determine what students are capable of achieving in real situations. Shimada (1997) pointed out that, teaching and testing is used to measure the learning and if there is mismatch between what is learned and what is measures, then the students will feel discontented with the unfairness of testing which results in having poor motivation in language learning.

 A study by Razmjoo (2011),exploring the language proficiency model based on which the communicative test are designed and constructed in Iranian high school revealed that the elements of Communicative language testing is not represented and practiced in the tests constructed by Italian testers as it fail to develop the quality of tester's language performance. Another case study by Bernando (2011) to examine how communicative is language tests used in assessing students competence and performance , uncovered that the test items used in English language tests focus on language accuracy alone and abandoned the use of language in actual real life contexts. The use of discreet- point, paper and pencil test, decontextualised test items reduce the communicative qualities of sample tests which shows total mismatch between the instructional approach of the teachers and their assessment practices. Both researchers view that there are certain aspects neglected when designing communicative language tests and unsuccessful to meet   the real potentials of learners ability to use the language for their real life communication purposes. Their views support the notion that communicative language testing, an authentic performance based assessment is required to assess the students' language skills in an act of communication. The learners are engaged in real world tasks in realistic contexts and are expected to response and simulate in appropriate context or situations (Mcmara, 2000).

2.2   The Essentials in Communicative Language Testing

Currently, significant consideration on designing communicative language testing tasks plays an important part in language testing field. Probably this is because, Nunan (2009) points out that, the fundamental principle in curriculum design reflect the connection between assessment and teaching. In other words students should be tested based on what is taught, in this case, language should be taught and tested for communication. Nunan (2009) also further argues that communicative language teaching requires communicative language testing. Students are expected to perform activities that stimulates communicative of language outside the testing situations. Similarly, Weir (1990), noted that, tests of communicative language ability should be direct as possible, and attempt to reflect the 'real life' situation as well as the tasks should involve realistic discourse processing. In other words, the very goal of communicative language testing is to engage learners to utilize their language knowledge correctly when they are exposed to variety of social context which eventually creates a 'real-life' communication situation. Thus, the students are expected to naturally apply the target language to communicate and this promotes actual realistic interactions. Phan (2008) highlighted that the learners are explicitly informed what they are supposed to perform in the target language in given context and this statement of objectives helps in formulating assessment criteria for teachers.

In order to achieve a real life communication skills, four important components of communicative competence include grammatical, socio linguistics, discourse and strategic competence is a useful framework of designing communicative language tests because all these components are interdependent with each other to form knowledge of a language and ability to use it (Canale &Swain, 1980). Grammatical competence deals with knowledge of lexical items, rules of morphology, syntax, sentence grammar, semantics and phonology. The sociolinguistic competence made up of sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse. Discourse competence concerns mastery of cohesion and coherence in different genres and finally strategic competence is the ability to use verbal and non- verbal communication strategies in order to make up for the weakness in communication because of the limitations of the language mastery (Canale& Swain,1980) .Canale and Swain influential model of communicative competence set as a guideline for designing communicative language test (Weir, 1990). However, Harsono (2009) in his study found that there is no adequate, clear understanding and sample of Communicative Language tests that measure Communicative competence used in Senior High Schools (SMU) in Indonesia. Besides, the test is lack of content validity and showed insignificant correlation between the student's scores of communicative language tests and report marks because the test only cover reading, structure and vocabulary . Basically the test fail to include all the language skills as required in the communicative language tests. If the learners are weak in integrating language skills, then it is difficult to measure their ability of combining language skills as in the case in real life communication situations. According to Ramzjoo (2011), Communicative Language testing should have high content validity, includes fair reflection of tasks the learners are required to perform as a part of the course itself. Similarly, Phan (2008) asserted that, concentration on the content is essential and factors like learners' age, proficiency level, interest, goals and needs have to take into account in designing a communicative language tests. The tests are basically constructed based on the learner's genuine needs as they will be guidance and assist them to communicate in a real life situation as well as useful in their future workplace. Browns (2005) and Ireland (2000) also support the principle that communicative language tests need to be based on communication that is meaningful and enables the learners to use the language in real life and therefore communicative tests should be based on evaluating

these communicative skills. Scoring Criteria for communicative language test is also another vital component which enables to elicit students' ability in accomplishing communicative task. A well defined set of scoring criteria which measures the learners 'performance" to their level best is expected to bring about positive washback (Phan, 1980).

There are few challenges and constraints in communicative testing that hinder the implementation of communicative language tests and teachers show unfavorable attitudes in practicing them in the classroom. According to Phan (2008), the issue of validity whereby whether learners performing well in a test in classroom are also able do well outside the classroom in real life situation is questionable. Besides, Sook (2003), in his study revealed few constraints in conducting speaking tests in the Korean EFL classroom context which includes, large classes, excessive workload for teachers, difficulties in eliciting students responses, teachers' and students' low proficiency that reflects teachers decision making in conducting communicative language tests in the classroom. Implementing Communicative language testing promises positive effects as it helps teachers to measure learners' language ability more accurately. Although the presence of communicative language Teaching in Malaysia schools which is already in place for many years still it seems difficult to apply this method due to some lacks in the Malaysian secondary school system (Reza Raissi & Fazirah Mohd Nor, 2013). This indirectly, convey that what is taught need to be tested as it is reasonable and necessary to implement communicative tests in harmony with the communicative teaching method to access learners' ability to communicate. However, how far the students were tested communicatively based on the teaching methods and theories applied in the classroom are still questionable. Nevertheless, the traditional way of language testing in many schools remain practical and fail to integrate communication skills which are important in evaluating students' real use of the language knowledge.

3.   Methodology, Findings, Analysis and Discussion
3.1   Methodology
This is a descriptive study that examined the teachers' beliefs and practices in implementing Communicative Language tests in the classroom. It involved the use of questionnaires consisted of both close and open- ended questions that were used to obtain data both in qualitative and quantitative forms. Descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentages were used to describe the demographic information of the participants and also the responses regarding the teacher's beliefs, practices, and principles they hold in conducting Communicative language tests. The target population of this study was thirty English language teachers from two urban governmental schools in Selangor state in Malaysia. The participants of the study have been selected based on purposive sampling by following three criterions in which all the respondents are from governmental school which follows the assigned curriculum/syllabus of Pentaksiran Berasakan Sekolah. The second criterion is the location of school situated in Shah Alam, Selangor as they are using same curriculum and the last criterion is the participants were selected only for those who are teaching English language and have academic qualification of English Language.

3.2   Findings and Analysis
3.2.1   Respondents' Demographic Variables
A total of 30 respondents from the two schools were involved in this study.The sample was dominated by female respondents (100%) and the majority of the respondents fell in the 31-45 age group. Regarding the level of education earned by the participants, two of them hold a Master degree. The rest of the twenty-eight teachers are holder of degree. Majority of the

twenty-seven teachers are major in TESL (90%) and three in Linguistics Studies. Overall, the participants' academic fields are related to teaching English Language. As with the teaching experience of the participants, it varies from six years to 25 years. Among the participants seven teachers have 6-10 years of teaching experiences, fourteen teachers have 11-15 years, six teachers have 16-20 year and the remaining three teachers have been teaching for 21-25 years.

3.2.2   Teachers Communicative Language Practices and Beliefs

The first research question on beliefs and practices teachers hold about the implementation of language communicative testing in classroom shows that there are (90%) of teachers familiar with the principles of Communicative language testing and the theories that underpin Communicative approach which shows the teachers have background knowledge acquired during their teaching courses regarding the nature of Communicative language approach. However, the data reveal that although the teachers are familiar about the Communicative Approach, they reflect uncertainty concerning the principles of communicative testing as 20% is totally unfamiliar and 80% are quite familiar about Communicative language testing. A total of 20% of the respondents claimed that they implement Communicative Approach in teaching English to their own students. A total of 60% of the respondents believed the tests they assessed are communicative tests and 40% deem that their own tests designed possess communicative qualities. The data also shows, more than half (57%) of the department school teachers attached to support the notion of using communicative approach in language teaching. In addition, minority of 10% admitted, they often/always practice communicative tests in assessing their students language performance whereas a substantial number of respondents (53%) sometimes and (37%) rarely apply communicative tests in evaluating their students language performance communicatively. The findings also revealed that, considerable number of 34% of the respondents always and (38%) sometimes experience difficulties in designing communicative language tests.

The most common oral communicative tests employed in classroom were oral interviews (70%) and information gap (57%). Meanwhile, tests item like show and tell (23%), giving direction (27%) and other communicative tests items are unfavorable among teacher in designing and administrating communicative tests in the classroom. Majority of the respondents (90%) stated that they evaluate their students by conducting speaking tests and 73% claimed that they test their students speaking ability by having paper and pencil tests. Half of the respondents (50%) evaluate by classroom observation and 40% use speaking scoring criteria when evaluating their students speaking ability. A closer look at the tests format revealed that the most popular test format utilized in sample examination were Multiple choice questions (83%), reading comprehension (93%), WH-Questions (87%) and fill in the blanks (80%). Question items like True and false (60%), matching (53%) and Gap filling (40%) were fairly used in the language communicative tests. Completing statements (13%) and Essay (12%) question items were least utilized in designing communicative language tasks. Basically the preferred test formats like Multiple choice, Wh-Questions, reading comprehension, fill in the blanks, true and false are still prevalent in language test which follows the "conventional way" of testing. This shows that teachers often use objective written examinations which ease teachers work in grading and marking them. Thus, these language tests question items reflect limited of authentic use of communication skills in real life contexts and it is questionable whether this design of language sample examination can really stand as solid bases for assessing the students' communicative performance. According to Boddy & Langham (2000), in order to obtain overall achievement of students' language

ability, the tests should include as many tasks as possible. In other words, the tests items developed need to cover all the macro skills without dominating only few language skills that seen in this case, as teachers are still rely on and limit themselves to traditional way of language testing that require learners to give short answers and choose correct answers which may not entirely evaluate the students' success in communicative competence.

3.2.3 Principles teachers practice in conducting Communicative Language Testing.

The results derived from research question on what are the principles of Communicative Language testing teachers practice in conducting communicative tests showed the majority (87%) of the participants claimed that they provide chances to their students to take part in acts of communication in accomplishing their communicative tasks and tests, which achieve the main goal of Communicative language tests and reflects the teachers concern in preparing students to speak confidently when they are exposed to real life situations. Phan (2008) noted that, learners engaged in act of communication portray their ability to use language in real life contexts. Twenty- five participants (83%) stated they evaluate their students' communicative ability by taking consideration of their knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and sentence formation. Besides, twenty-four respondents (80%) claimed that they engage their students in appropriate social contexts during their completion of communicative task. However, almost half of the respondents (47%) are uncertain and disagree that the tasks employed in measuring the student's communicative ability reflect "real life" situations. Twenty- three respondents (76%) gave emphasis on student's ability to use the target language during speaking tests. Fourteen respondents (47%) showed their uncertainty and disagreement in integrating the four macro skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in testing their student's communicative competence. Furthermore, seventeen of the respondents (57%) claimed that they state the objectives of communicative tasks expected to be performed by their students whereas 13 respondents (43%) uncertain and disagree in stating the objectives to their students. A total of 20 teachers believed that considerable importance is needed when selecting contents for communicative tests include students' age proficiency level, interests and goals. A total of nineteen respondents (64%) ensure that communicative tests are designed meaningfully to meet students' personal needs. Majority of nineteen respondents claimed that they use clear scoring criteria when testing student's communicative ability. Meanwhile, 11 respondents (37%) expressed their uncertainty and disagreement concerning their scoring criteria. Seventeen respondents (56%) stated that the speaking test task conducted in the classroom match the course objectives and syllabus design whereas thirteen respondents (43%) are uncertain and disagree about the reliability of their test as they unsure of their speaking test match the course objective and syllabus design.

3.2.4 Constraints in Conducting Communicative tests

Data findings relating research question three which is on the practical constraints that influence the teachers in conducting Communicative tests indicate that 25 respondents (83%) believe big class size restrain teachers from utilizing communicative language tests in the classroom. Besides, 24 respondents (80%) claimed that, excessive work in addition to classroom teaching inhibits their practice of Communicative language tests. Almost all the respondents 28 (93%) claimed, lack of effective assessment instruments impede their practice in conducting speaking assessment. Furthermore, twenty-seven respondents (81%) reported they have difficulties in eliciting student's responds and half of them (53%) have difficulty in ensuring the reliability of their testing assessments. Minority of eight respondents (27%) viewed that teachers low proficiency in English proficiency affects their confidence in conducting speaking assessment where as twenty-two respondents (72%) pointed that

students low English proficiency impede the process of conducting language communicative assessment in classrooms. Finally, twenty one respondents (60%) stated that, they were given few opportunities for retraining as they have limited knowledge regarding the implementation of Communicative language testing in the classroom. Teachers need to be exposed and aware of the shift in education programme because they equip teachers with great knowledge on how to implement and achieve their student's educational needs. Teacher's knowledge of the feasibility of a communicative assessment innovation is crucial in determining the ultimate success or failure of that innovation (Li, 1998).

3.3   Discussion
The practice of communicative approach in language teaching by evaluating the testing procedure used to assess students' communicative ability determines the success of learners' ability to apply their language skills to communicate effectively. Therefore, communicative language tests are not solely hinge on traditional written exam which ultimately concern in testing students ability to manipulate grammatical structure of a language (Cunliff, 2002). The very aim of communicative approach has for communicative language testing is to develop the learners 'communicative competence'(Hyme,1972) and 'communicative language ability' (Bachman, 1990) whereby learners acquire the both knowledge , competence in target language and to execute that knowledge in appropriate and meaningful real varied context and situations (Canale & Swain,1980), Hence, a valid and clear evaluation of what language learners can achieve in communication skills in real life situation need a constant testing in classroom.

An analysis of data based on survey questionnaires was done to investigate the teachers' belief, practices and principles they hold in implementing communicative language testing and also the constraints in conducting these tests in the classroom. This study has shown that, the teachers are well aware of the practicality of Communicative language approach and quite familiar of the underlie principle of communicative language testing, yet they neglect to fully utilize this teaching approach in classroom teaching and indirectly diminish the practice of communicative tests which seen essential in assessing students' language performance. Half of the respondents who practice Communicative approach found to have difficulties in developing communicative test which lack in elements or features that make a language tests genuinely communicative. Besides, the use of discreet point, paper and pencil test items proved to reduce the communicative qualities of the tests. Nunan (2009) asserted that, presently traditional paper and pencil test of grammatical knowledge are still popular among teachers. Thus, teachers need to aware that students need to expose to more situational assessment format to effect natural use of the target language. Current study have shown that multiple choice and short answer test are not communicative since the ability to select one word from an array of choices is entirely different from the ability to use them in meaningful utterances that not only convey a purpose but also appropriate to a specific context (Ireland, 2000). Similarly, McKay (2006) noted that, these types of tests have little authenticity to the learners' world. Commonly, passing the test meant obtaining a certain number of correct responses. However, Morrow (1981), asserts that answers to tests should be more than simply right or wrong whereby learners are evaluated on the basis to what extend the students have reached to native speaker's system as well as unearth the quality of learner's language performance.

Apparently, the language testing administered in classroom uncover that the teachers are still using the traditional modes of assessment they mainly focused on reading, writing and

vocabulary skills. Phan (2008) claimed that communicative tests should offer students the opportunity to encounter and use the language receptively and productively in authentic situations to show how strong their language ability is. Put in other words, students' assessment evaluation based on language tests should integrate all the language skills as it will elicit the students' use of combined language skills in real life communication.

The Communicative testing principles teachers practice show that the teachers focused on students' language accuracy as the students were expected to apply their knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and sentence formation. However, they fail to engage the learners in a meaningful and realistic interaction by adapting 'real life' situation tasks during the assessment. Cunliff (2002), pointed out, communicative tests developed should not only focus on accuracy as a language alone but demand interactive ,pragmatic test items which demonstrates real, meaningful and natural use of language as possible during testing procedure. Thus a valid content of communicative language tests need to be designed to tests the students overall performance include accuracy and fluency in using target language outside the classroom. Ireland (2000), asserted that, there are four level of grading areas need to be include in communicative course like fluency of speech, naturalness of discourse, accuracy of language used and successful completion of task. All these criterion are expected to test students' about to what extent they can carry out the conversation naturally with realistic intonation and rhythm without delays besides to examine how accurate students utilize the language learned in completing the communicative task assigned successfully. Moreover, fair number of teachers expressed their uncertainty regarding the validity of the tests content whether the speaking tests designed match the course objectives and syllabus design. Bachman (1990) highlighted that construct validity is most fundamental for speaking tests because it examines if the tests matches a theoretical construct. The content of tests, therefore, should be carefully designed based on Communicative Language testing principles to elicit learners' communicative ability comprehensively about how an individual can function in a normal situation outside the test. This means, the tasks learners perform have to be a representative of the language and skills needed to work in the real life context.

The practical constraints teachers face in conducting communicative language tests however influence the teachers' practices to use the traditional mode of assessment. The findings reflect the teachers point of view to whether implement the communicative tests in the classroom as majority of them reported large class, excessive workload, lack of effective assessment instruments and difficult in eliciting students responses impact their decision making in employing communicative language tests (Sreehari, 2012; Sook, 2003) . As a matter of fact, implementing communicative language testing is a challenge for teachers because their role in designing and adopting the principles of communicative language teaching and testing determine the communicativeness of the tests and how well the communicative language tests designed to measure the learners language ability accurately is questionable and need to be explored in future research. There is an urgent need for both research and more experiments at the classroom level, as to how communicative courses can be most effectively and fairly tested and evaluated, hence testing programmes must be designed and employed reflecting the concept of the approach (Ireland 2000). Thus educators' role in making decision to strive students' success relies on planning, gathering and analyzing information from various sources to arrive at results that prove significant to teaching and learning. (Gottlieb 2006, as cited in Bernardo 2011). Therefore assessment tools, in this case communicative language tests need to be carefully planned and designed to ensure they do match with the language principles and instruction taught. In other words, the students tested the way they are taught. The selection of assessment tasks and procedures

should be given importance as incorrect decision in designing them could put the learners at a disadvantage (McKay, 2006).

4.   Conclusion and Suggestions

This paper has explored the teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the implementation on Communicative Language testing in the classroom. The findings indicated that language tests neglect the aspects of speaking skills when comes to evaluating the learners real life communication skills and also measuring learners' communicative competence in the target language. Language testing considered as an essential access to education, employment, and making decision of students' placement in particular courses (McNamara, 2000). Therefore teachers should take into consideration the communicative language principles in the process of developing and testing so that the tests measures learners' real quality of language competence and performance which make the tests more reliable. Harsono (2005) suggested that, teachers should consider the characteristics of CL tests like validity, reliability and practicality when using or developing tests, conduct CL tests at any time necessary, for example, at the end of every topic of discussion and assess the students' during the teaching and learning process and the test formats should be chosen by considering the characteristics of communicative competence which assessing the dynamic negotiation of meaning, including measures of both written and spoken language, being context specific, and assessing performance that is observable rather than competence.

References

Ahmad, S. & Rao, C. (2013). Applying Communicative Approach in Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A case study of Pakistan. *Porta Linguarum, Vol. 20,* 187-203

Bachman, L., F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* New York: Oxford University Press

Bachman, L., F., & Palmer, A., S. (1996). *Language testing in practice.* New York: Oxford University Press

Boddy, N. & Langham, C. (2000). Communicative language Testing: an attainable goal? http://faculty.ksu.edu.sa/aljarf/research%20library/testing%20references/5.langham.pdf [accessed on December 18th 2013]

Bernardo, A., S. (2011). The Empirical Dimension of Communicative Language Tests: The Case of Selected Philippine Universities. I-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching Vol. 1, 30- 49

Brown, J,. D. (2005) Testing in Languaeg Programme. New York: McGraw-Hill

Canale, M,. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoritical basis of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. Applied Lingustic Vol. 2, 1-47

Cunliffe, B. (2002). A Communicative Approach to Second Language Testing and Evaluation. Studies in Culture Vol. 22, 61-82

Chang, M. (2011). Factors Affecting the Implementation of CLT in Taiwanese College English Classes.

English language Teaching Vol. 4, 3 – 12.

Harsono, Y., M.   (2009). Developing Communicative Language Tests for senior High School. TEFLIN Journal Vol. 21, 237-255

Ireland, G. (2000). Are communicative language classes being tested communicatively?. Bunkyo Institute University Foreign Language Section Vol. 1, 31-48

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 Vol. 4,* 677-703.

McKay, P. (2006). Assessing young language learners. Cambridge University Press

Nunan, D. (2009). Introduction to task based teaching. Singapore. Cengage Learning

Nguyen, C., & Le, D. (2013). Communicative Langugae Testing: Do School Tests measure Students' Communicative Competence? FLLT Conference Proceedings. http://www.fllt2013.org/private_folder/Proceeding/856.pdf [accessed on December 18th 2013]

Phan, S. (2008). Communicative Language Testing. TESL Working Paper Series Vol. 2, 1-10

Razmjoo, S., A. (2011). Language proficiency tests in the Iranian Context: Do they represent Communicative Language Testing Model?. Journal of Pan- Pacific Association of Applied Lingustics Vol. 2, 85-96

Reza Raissi & Fazirah Nor.(2013). Teachers' Perceptions and Challenges regarding the implementation of Communicative language Teaching (CLT) in Malaysian Secondary Schools. Proceeding of the Global Summit on Education. http://worldconferences.net/proceedings/gse2013/papers_gse2013/236%20Reza%20Raissi%20&%20Fazirah%20bt%20Mohd%20Nor.pdf [accessed on December 18th 2013]

Reza Raissi, Faizah Mohamad Nor, Marzillah A Aziz, Zaidah Zainal & Zanariah Md Saleh. (2013). A Comparison between Students' and Teachers' Ideas Regarding Communicative Language Teaching Implementation in Malaysian Secondary School; Qualitative Survey. Journal of Basic And Applied Scientific Research Vol. 4, 608-614

Shimada, K. (1997). Communicative Language Testing: Principles and Problems English Review Vol. 12, 3-24

Sook, K.H. (2003). The types of speaking assessment tasks used by Korean Juniour Secondary School English teachers. Asian EFL Journal http//www.asian-efl-journal.com/dec_03_gl.pd [accessed on December 18th 2013]

Sreehari, P. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching: Possibilities and Problems. English Language Teaching Vol. 5, 87-93

Weir, C., J. (1990). Communicative Language Testing. New York: Prentice Hall

Widdowson, H., G. (1978). Teaching Language as communication. London: Oxfrod University Press