



## TEACHER'S STRATEGIES IN TEACHING CONTEXTUAL ENGLISH

Abdulloh<sup>1</sup>, Condro Nur Alim<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto

---

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Published : 15/09/2024

---

#### Keywords:

*Contextual Teaching and Learning  
Merdeka Curriculum  
English Language Teaching  
Vocational High School  
Discovery Learning  
Problem-Based Learning.*

---

### ABSTRACT

This study explores the implementation of contextual teaching strategies within the Merdeka Curriculum, focusing on English instruction in Indonesian vocational high schools (SMK). With English positioned as a vocational subject, effective and context-relevant teaching methods are essential to equip students with communicative competencies aligned with their professional fields. The study highlights the use of two main strategies: Discovery Learning and Problem-Based Learning (PBL). Discovery Learning fosters student autonomy and critical thinking through guided exploration, while PBL encourages collaboration and problem-solving based on real-world scenarios. Both strategies were integrated into modular teaching plans that reflect the values of the Pancasila Student Profile and the principles of the Merdeka Curriculum. Assessments were designed to measure cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains through diagnostic, formative, and summative approaches. The findings suggest that contextual strategies enhance student engagement, understanding, and skill development, making them effective tools for English language instruction in vocational education settings.

---

### Corresponding Author:

Abdulloh,  
Program Studi Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris,  
Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto,  
Jl. KH. Ahmad Dahlan, Po. Box. 202 Purwokerto, Banyumas, Indonesia.  
E-mail: [abdullohkbm@gmail.com](mailto:abdullohkbm@gmail.com)

---

### How to Cite:

Abdulloh., & Alim, C. N. (2024). *Teacher's Strategies In Teaching Contextual English*. Khazanah Pendidikan-Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan (JIK), 18 (2), 481-496.

---



## 1. INTRODUCTION

English has been taught as a subject in Indonesian schools since elementary school, until senior high school, and vocational high school. Even at the university level, English is taught as the primary language (Lee, Anita, 2017). A vocational high school is the same as a diploma or even a university, it majors in a specific program. Engineering, fashion design, and fishing are just a few of the disciplines available in the advanced degree. The curriculum in each stratum will direct the learner to specialize in certain competencies. By speaking or writing the language of communication, students will be able to prepare for and succeed in a variety of activities and vocations. Speaking a foreign language has become crucial for success in many social activities and occupations, according to Dudley-Evans & St. John (1998) and Widodo (2016). It entails the use of a learning methodology as well as approaches for teaching English as a foreign language. Learning approaches and methods for teaching EFL must be effective in the context of the student (Moreno et al., 2021). They also stated that recent ELT (English Language Teaching) research has shown that ESP is extensively employed in college English courses to get closer to the student's context and fulfill their professional demands. According to Lamri (2016), the role of ESP is to assist language learners in developing their needs and talents in order to use the language.

English for special purposes has already been used in the university, and English has recently collaborated with university topic teachers in the development of English for specific purposes. They each play a unique role. Lamri (2016) backs this up. ESP entails taking on a collaborative role in which the language instructor collaborates with the other teachers. An English teacher's job description includes being a lesson planner, teacher, learning organizer, and activity creator. The job of the subject teacher was defined as consultant or informant, supporter, monitor, and facilitator. The benefits included increased confidence, less anxiety in teaching ESP courses, and receiving immediate feedback from the subject teacher. The benefits included increased confidence, less anxiety in teaching ESP courses, and receiving immediate feedback from the subject teacher. The disadvantages were that it was difficult to balance the different schedules of both professors and that lesson planning took time. Students were enthusiastic about this instructional style. They enjoyed studying due to the interesting and informative activities as well as the teacher's assurance (Chaovanapricha, Khacheenuj; Chaturongakul, Panna, 2020).

Even after the emergency curriculum was implemented, the Indonesian government still allowed schools to choose their own curriculum. Curriculum 2013 was amended in 2006, and a new curriculum, later known as Curriculum Merdeka, was unveiled. The Merdeka curriculum differs from the preceding one in some ways. In 2019, the government launched *Sekolah Pengerak* for senior high schools and SMK Center of Excellence for vocational schools, ushering in the rise of ESP in vocational schools. *Merdeka* Curriculum, like other Indonesian curricula, is drawn from the standard method, which was broken down from Pancasila student profiles for national educational goals at the SMK Center of Excellence. The curriculum frameworks, or curriculum structures, are established by the central government. It becomes a development guideline for schools in implementing the new curriculum.

English is designated as the vocational content curriculum in the Merdeka curriculum. English, along with math and informatics, will use vocational content as its teaching material. As a result, it is envisaged that the teaching and learning process would be more contextual in terms of content in relation to the specific aims. The contents must be in accordance with the government's regulation of chief decision on standardization, curriculum, and assessment from the ministry of education, culture, research, and technology No. 008/H/KR/22 regarding the learning achievement of young education, elementary education, and middle high education in merdeka curricula (BSKP, 2022).

Teaching English in the Merdeka curriculum prepares students to be lifelong learners with Pancasila's student profiles such as obedience to God, splendid character, independence, and critical thinking. Being creative, helping others, and having a global outlook are all important. Because teaching English is universal and the pace of the teaching is dynamic and fluid, those profiles can be established during the teaching and learning process. Teaching English has the potential to improve Pancasila's students' proofreading skills through written, visual, and spoken texts, as well as activities generated during the teaching and learning process.

English teachers have major obstacles when it comes to putting English in the curriculum for specific purposes. English teachers in the old curriculum just imparted content to pupils, but in the Merdeka curriculum, teachers must be conversant with the productive topics. English teachers confront issues with delivering content using the appropriate approaches or procedures to make it contextual. As a result, such problems must be met by the correct teacher's selection of the topic as well as the approaches for presenting the lesson. The teacher can use the contextual teaching learning as the strategy to overcome the problem.

## **2. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### **Strategies used by the teachers in teaching contextual English**

Based on the observation document and direct observation, there are four findings of strategies which were applied by the participants. They were discovery learning, problem based learning, CTL by implementing REACT strategy and Contextual material or ESP. Those findings will be explained more detailed in the following sections.

#### **Discovery Learning**

Discovery Learning was the first strategy used by T1. Based on the documentation study, T1 planned and stated the strategy in the module. T1 was going to implement the strategy in the classroom. T1 used discovery learning because T1 needed the students to know information about report text by their own experiences. T1 believed that by using discovery learning report will gain the objective of the learning process. Because students practice for independent learning, develop their creativity, and gain knowledge of learning, the discovery learning model is appropriate for learning to identify observation result report text (Harris & De Bruin, 2018; Bovill, 2020). That opinion was also supported by Mufida (2019), the term "discovery learning" describes learning by oneself. Discovery learning entails giving the instructor instructions on how to plan student activities including searching, processing, searching, and investigating. Students gain new expertise in their topic of study as well as broader problem-solving abilities including developing rules, testing ideas, and obtaining data.

The experience process could be seen from the observation in the process of data processing or verification. In this stage, T1 gave 5 questions about report text. By giving the questions the students could made their experience to find out the answers by them self. By the activity this strategy developed the student's motivation. The students got motivation to search many sources to find the answer from the question given.

In relation with learning preparation, There were some items would be prepared by T1 such as creating the module teaching based on learning objective plan in *Merdeka curriculum*, preparing student's worksheet or it was called LKPD or student's worksheet and making student assessment in preparing teaching module, T1 created module of report text. T1 designed the module teaching by stating some components to be informed. They were general information, main component, and appendixes.

There were some general information to be informed. They were school identity, teacher's name, the years of making, the name of the lesson, level of school, Phase or semester, main material, and time allotment. From those information this research could find some findings. The school identity of T1 was SMK N 1 Wadaslintang, The name of the Was RW, the year of making

module teaching was 2023. This module was for English lesson for vocational High school at Phase E in even semester. T1O1 designed this module to teach report text and the time allotment was 1 meeting or 2 x 45 minutes.

The next part in general information was the early competency. It was about the understanding questions based on the topic given which was report text. The next part was Pancasila student's profiles. T1 stated some profiles should be gained by the students through the learning process. Those were the obedience to Allah SWT as the God, Global mindset, and collaborative. T1 also prepared some tools to be used in the fourth part. Those were learning media such as white board, marker, laptop, LCD, note and stationery. The next was student's target. This part mandated that the students were able to understand and respond the question in relation with report text. The fifth part was leaning model. This showed that this module would apply discovery learning.

The second component was main component. There were 7 main components. They were learning objective, meaningful comprehension, trigger questions, learning preparation, learning activity for the first meeting, assessment, and reflection.

There were 5 learning objective would be achieved in the module. There were the students could be able to read and get the information related to the report text, the students could be able to search and evaluate the detailed specific and the main core of report text, the students could be able to understand the main idea about the issues or the developing of the plot in report text, the students could identify the purpose of the report text and the last learning objective was the student could be able to developing the skill to make simple inference in understanding implicit information related to report text.

In relation to meaningful comprehension, T1 stated about the students could understand the questions and respond in relation with the report text. And the next part was trigger question like; 1). Do you like to read or listen a text about a place or something? 2) Is it fiction or non-fiction? Why? 3). Elephant, fish, blue whale are some title of a text. Is it report text? 4). Based on your opinion, what is a report text?

The second preparation was students worksheet making. T1 designed student's worksheet by making group to do the task. T1 gave jumbled paragraph to be arranged in a good order. There were 6 jumbled paragraphs to be analyzed and set in order. To make the students arranged in good report text composition, T1 gave some clues related to the sequence of report text. The clues was portrayed the description each paragraph. And then T2 created 10 questions. Those questions would be the measurements of the learning process and to know how far the students understand of the right composition of the report text. The students did the student worksheet and gave the skill assessment by giving two rated aspects. They were the skill of information process 1-4 score and the skill of completing accuracy time was scored 1-4.

The last part of preparation in implementing the strategy was determining the assessment. There were three assessments applied namely; diagnostic, formative and summative assessments. In diagnostic cognitive, there were 2 types. The types were diagnostic non-cognitive and diagnostic cognitive assessments. In the non-cognitive assessment, T1 asked the student to choose the emoticon which represented their emotions. It could be happy, sad or confused. There were some questions in the assessment. It were about the student emotion, the influence of environment to the study and about the report text.

In the cognitive diagnostic assessment, the created some questions and also equipped with rubric. The rubric was started from identification of the material would be tested, prepared the question, the possibility answers, scores and follow up action. The material would be tested was report text. The first question was "what is the report text", and then there were three possibility answers. The students might answer "it is a text that include into factual text or non-fiction text". If the students could answer the question well, it was categorized intact comprehension and

followed by follow up plan. The plan was continued to the next material. The second possibility of the student's answers was "it is an example of a text. The students' answers are categorized in partial comprehension and follow up plan was giving remedial teaching and the third possibility's answer was "it was a game". The answer reflected the students did not understand at all about the learning process. T1 continued follow up plan by giving teaching and learning process. Those were cycles of determining the follow up plan based on cognitive diagnostic assessment. The next question of cognitive diagnostic assessment was 'what is the purpose of a report text'. The third question was "how many generic structure of report text. The fourth was "what is the general classification of the report text", and the last was "what is the description of the report text". Those diagnostic assessment were in essay form by scoring criteria. If the answer was complete, it was scored 20, if the answer was less complete, it was scored 10 and if the answer was not complete, the score was 5. And the score maximum was 100.

The third kind of the assessment was summative. There were two texts consisted of 5 questions each. The questions were in multiple choice. There were two guidelines in summative assessment. They were knowledge assessment instrument and knowledge question item instrument. There were four components in the knowledge assessment instrument. They were learning objective, main material, question indicator and the question number. There were 5 learning objective would be achieved in the module. They were reading and getting the information related to the report text, searching and evaluating the detailed specific and the main core of report text, understanding the main idea about the issues or the developing of the plot in report text, identifying the purpose of the report text and the last learning objective was developing the skill to make simple inference in understanding implicit information related to report text. In addition to the main material, all the material were in report text.

Furthermore there were five question indicators functioned as a guidance for teachers in determining their pupils' level of proficiency. As a guideline for judging the quality of questions, beginning with the distribution of cognitive levels and progressing to the level of difficulty. As a starting point for constructing HOTS queries. There were the students could be able to read and get the information related to the report text, the students could be able to search and evaluate the detailed specific and the main core of report text, the students could be able to understand the main idea about the issues or the developing of the plot in report text, the students could identify the purpose of the report text and the last learning objective was the student could be able to developing the skill to make simple inference in understanding implicit information related to report text. in addition to the main material, all the material were in report text. The end of the instrument was question number. The numbers were used to how many numbers of question indicators.

Besides the knowledge assessment instrument, there were knowledge question item instrument. They were 5 questions related to report questions and also the key answers with 20 score each questions. The last part of the instrument were the total acquisition score of the question. There was also the maximum score and the mark. The counting was getting from the total acquisition score divided by maximum score multiply 100.

The last part in the main component was enrichment and remedial task. In the enrichment task the students supposed to look for the report text and tried to know about the text based on the learning objectives mentioned before in the learning objective. While the remedial T1 repeated the lesson in the classroom. The end of the module was appendixes. They were about assessment, materials, glossaries and reference.

After explaining about assessment technique, there were Remedial and enrichment. T2 planned to give remedial in the condition of the students had been accomplished minimum learning criteria. The criteria should be 75. The enrichment was given who passed minimum learning criteria or KKM. The material for learning was written and spoken text discussion in the form of short and simple test.

In contrast to more conventional methods of learning, where knowledge is said to be merely transferred to the learner, discovery learning is seen as a promising way of learning for a number of reasons, the main one being that the learner would develop a better structured base of knowledge due to their active involvement with the domain (Aldalur, 2023)

### **Problem Based Learning**

Problem based learning was the second strategy used by T2 and T3 in the first observation. T2 and T3 applied the educational strategy called problem-based learning (PBL) because T2 and T3 wanted the students to learn through active learning and the students got the chance to work together to find solutions to issues collaboratively. In the general understanding about PBL it can be said that PBL is a learning strategy that should be established in accordance with the requirements of the Curriculum 2013 is problem-based learning (PBL). This is in line with PBL's constructivist orientation, student-centered learning, ability to foster the development of the soul, collaboration, metacognitive thinking, high-level thinking skills, increased understanding of meaning, increased independence, facilitated problem-solving, and teamwork. It is supported by Allen (2011) in problem-based learning, students learn by solving challenging, practical issues in cooperative groups while being guided by professors. In this chapter, we look at the evidence that the approach is successful in generating deep topic understandings and talk about how process skills like research, negotiation and teamwork, writing, and verbal communication may be developed.

From the document study T2, and T3 planned it and stated the strategy in the module they were going to implement the strategy in the classroom. The first observation for T2 and T3 were relatively close in the observation, so they planed the same strategy to teach the same material.

In relation with learning preparation, there were some items would be prepared by T2 and T3. T2 and T3 prepared about module, media, learning tool, learning sources and student's worksheet. T2 and T3 would use PowerPoint and also Canva, while the learning tool was laptop and projector, whereas the learning sources was from English book class X and also preparing student's worksheet.

In preparing the module T2 and T3 worked together in making the learning module, it can be seen from the printed module. They collaborated to apply the strategy. The module designed by stating the general information such as the name of the school, the lesson, class and semester, material, main material, time allotment, and also the year of making module.

T2 and T3 determine the learning outcome from Learning Objective flow.

*"Capaian Pembelajaran: Pada akhir Fase E, peserta didik membaca dan merespon berbagai macam teks seperti narasi, deskripsi, prosedur, eksposisi, recount, dan report. Mereka membaca untuk mempelajari sesuatu atau untuk mendapatkan informasi. Mereka mencari dan mengevaluasi detil spesifik dan inti dari berbagai macam jenis teks. Teks ini dapat berbentuk cetak atau digital, termasuk di antaranya teks visual, multimodal atau interaktif"*

In the learning objective T2 and T3 planed in teaching activity based on Problem based learning activity, the students could be able to read and respond in relation to recount text, to read and get in formation, search and evaluate detail specific and main of the text, to arrange simple recount text. T2 and T3 also stated the learning material about spoken and written recount text. The materials consist of definition, social function, generic structure and language feature.

T2 and T3 planned to use Problem Based learning and in the learning T2 and T3 would like to use assessment. The next component was assessment technique. There were three aspects would be assessed. They were aptitude, knowledge and skill aspects to be assessed. The technique in attitude assessment was non-test. The assessment form was self-assessment, the form of the knowledge assessment was essay while the instrument in assessment technique was based on the assessment knowledge and skill. There were some criteria in attitude assessment guidelines. The student's attitude would be scored based on the attitude observed. Score 1 was

for the attitude which never came up in the assessment, score 2 was for the attitude which sometimes came up in assessment, score 3 was for the attitude which often came up in the assessment and the last guideline was score 4 was for the attitude which always came up in the attitude assessment.

In the knowledge assessment, the test technique was used to assess it. The form of assessment was essay. The aspect of knowledge assessment instrument was answering the questions based on the text. And the assessment guidelines of the knowledge assessment based on the criteria. The correct score was 4 and the false answer was 0. The score could be gained from the calculation below; the gained score divided by maximum score multiply 100.

In addition to the skill assessment, T2 and T3 used test technique in the form of performance test. The instrument were; a) identify and analyze the generic structure of a simple discussion text; b) presented the result of the student work on the form of the classroom. As guidelines for written skill assessment in generic structure was for generic structure. Score 1 was for very low performance, score 2 was for enough performance, score 3 was for acceptable and score 4 was for very acceptable. For spoken skill assessment there were 3 categories in assessment such as pronunciation, intonation and gesture. In the pronunciation item there were 4 scores for assessing it, score 1 was poor, score 2 was for acceptable, score 3 was for good and 4 was for very good. In the intonation items there were 4 scores in assessed pronunciation. Score 1 was for poor, score 2 was for acceptable, score 3 was for good and 4 was for very good. In the item of gesture, score 1 was poor, score 2 was for acceptable, score 3 was for good and 4 was for very good. The score was gained from gained score divided by maximum score multiply 100.

Those components were completed by appendix about material teaching. The material teaching about the display material of recount text with the title My holiday in Bali in the link below <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-6Huw8gOJ-g> and material Canva presentation at [https://www.canva.com/design/DAFcYqN1aBs/126cg3eGtmYNikeM7O5LpA/edit?analyticsC\\_orrelationId=74190543-d930-43a0-8dc1-c259129e7096](https://www.canva.com/design/DAFcYqN1aBs/126cg3eGtmYNikeM7O5LpA/edit?analyticsC_orrelationId=74190543-d930-43a0-8dc1-c259129e7096).

T2 and T3 completed the module by student worksheet. There were two student worksheets. The first student worksheet was used to know the good arrangement of the text, the generic structure of the text for group and students' worksheet for individual task.

Based on the TO1 and 2, T1 applied PBL as the strategy in teaching Report text. The objective of report text are students could read for getting information related to report text, students could search and evaluate detail specific and the main report text, students could understand the main issues and the developing plot in report text, students could identify the purpose the writer writes the text and the last was students could develop the skill to do simple inferences in understanding report text implicitly. While in the observation T2 and T3 also used PBL to teach recount text. The objective of the T2 and T3 lesson was the students are able to read and respond in relation with recount text, read and get information in relation with recount text, search and evaluate the detailed specific in relation with recount text and arrange simple recount text. From modules in the stage of implementation in the introduction the modules stated that relate the students' knowledge in the last meeting. In the first step was orientation. Organizing the students to learn, guiding the students to investigate both individually or in group, developing and presenting the student's work and the last was the analyzing and evaluating process. From the step in module it was clear that those are the step in implementing the PBL such as; exploring the issue, state what is known by the student, defining the issue, researching the knowledge, investigating solution, presenting and supporting the chosen solution and the last is reviewing the student's performance.

In summary PBL is a student-centered, inquiry-based teaching approach. The students work on a real-world, poorly structured issue that calls for deeper research. (Jonassen & Hung, 2008, Rafiq, 2023). It is also supported by (Hamalik, 2008) PBL is a type of learning that can encourage students to seek out and respond to information they have independently discovered,

as well as to develop their own knowledge to address issues. Students are encouraged to actively participate in the teaching and learning process by following the processes in PBL, which can direct them to find their knowledge through consistent scientific method methods. It also supported by Huda (2015) students can be motivated to solve problems successfully and actively participate in learning process activities by being presented with problems to solve.

### **Contextual Teaching Learning**

In creating the module, there were some preparation done by T2. They were designing module, preparing learning material, determining the learning model, providing the media and also learning resources from the book also from the internet, designing the step in implementing REACT strategy, preparing assessment, providing remedial and enrichment activity also providing the material from internet and the last one was providing student's worksheet.

Based on the module of RPP made by T2, there were some items in the general information such as the school identity, the lesson, class and semester, material, main material, time allotment and the academic year. From the module this research could say the RPP was going to be implemented in Wadaslintang vocational high school and the lesson was English. The class would be taught was class XI semester 4. The material would be taught was discussion text, while the allotment time was 2 hours or 2 x 45 minutes in the 2022/2023 academic year. After the general information of the module there were 6 components in the module. They were learning outcomes, learning objective, teaching material, learning method, media or tool, material and the sources, learning activity, assessment technique, enrichment and remedial program, assessment technique, enrichment and remedial task, assessment and guidelines assessment.

In the general information the module would be implemented in vocational high school 1 Wadaslintang. It would teach English lesson at eleventh grade semester 4. The main materials was discussion text. This module consumed 2 hours meeting with each meeting was 45 minutes. There were 70 minutes in implementing this module of discussion text.

In the learning outcome component, in the end of phase F, the students read and respond a lot of kind of text such as; narration, description, procedures, argumentation, and discussion individually. They read to learn something and read for pleasure. They look for, synthesize and evaluate detail specific and core from a lot of text type. The text can be in printed or digital, involving visual text, multimodal or interactive. They show their comprehension toward main idea, the issues or plot development in many texts. They identify the purpose of the text and do inference to understand implicit information in the text.

Based on the module, there were 7 learning objectives of the student would gain based on REACT strategy, the students could be able to read and respond, read and look for discussion text, read for pleasure, search detailed specific and core of discussion text, synthesize detailed specific of discussion text and identify the purpose of discussion text.

In the third component was learning material. There were two types of materials. They were spoken and written discussion text. In the text material, there were 4 detail information about the text. They were the definition of discussion text. The definition was a discussion text. It is a text that present both sides of issue or argumentation. The title of the text often outlines the issue to be discussed in the form of a question. The purpose of the text was to present two point of view about issue or problem, to present arguments for differing points of view about issue or problem and to present arguments from differing points of view about issue or problem. Another information was the generic structure of the text. There were 4 generic structures of the text. They were issue, argument pro, argument cons and conclusion or recommendation. Issue was the first structure state the issue which is to discussed. Argument pro was to present the point in supporting the presented issue. In argument cons was presenting other points which disagree to the supporting point. And the last structure was conclusion or recommendation. It was stating the writer's recommendation of the discourse.



In the fourth component was language features. They were thinking verb likes *feel, hope, believe*, etc. In the second language features was using contrastive conjunction like *however, on the other hand, but, in other side, although*, etc. The third language feature of discussion text was modality. It was like *must, should, could, may*, etc. And the last language feature was adverbial of manner like *deliberately, hopefully* etc. The language feature was completed by the example of the text. It was about television. In the learning model, this module was stated REACT strategy. This module completed with media or tool, material and sources. The media was power point, the equipment was computer and projector. The source of learning were English book class eleven. The other source was [http://sangpemimpinkehidupan.blogspot.com/2015?03?discussion-text-definition\\_generic.html](http://sangpemimpinkehidupan.blogspot.com/2015?03?discussion-text-definition_generic.html).

In the learning activity, there were three learning activities. They were opening, main and closing activities. In the opening activity, T2 greeted the student and asked them to party together. T2 checked the student's attendance and asked their condition. T1 planned to motivate the students by implementing ice-breaking "penguin dance" from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TwgriuP0ic>. T1 explained leaning outcome and learning objectives would be delivered and explained the relation between the materials would be done and had already done or the previous material. T1 expressed the trigger questions after giving the picture of group discussion to know the readiness of the students such as; 1) what is the picture about? 2) Have you ever done this activity; 3) when did you do it; 4) what is it about; 5) do you get the same or different opinion? 6) How can you cover the difference?

In the main activity there were relating to the students background knowledge and experience, experiencing, applying, cooperating and transferring. In relating strategy T2 asked the students to observe the video from you tube channel <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tofk2V03mI4> and related the concept or event in daily life with the concept would be learned. In the experiencing step, T2 planned to divide the students into some groups. Then T2 gave LKPD or students worksheet about discussion text to the students. The next activity was guiding the students to observe discussion text by giving explanation about the discussion text about generic structure and language features. T2 advised the students to make some notes of discussion text in the discourse to be discussed in the group discussion. In the next step, T2 gave the opportunity to question about what, how, why, about discussion text which would be learnt in group. T2 leaded and guided the students to analyze discussion text based on the student's worksheet. In the applying step, T2 connected the result of student's worksheet to understand to the student's discussion text. T2 leaded the student's comprehension which had already understood about discussion text. T2 leaded the students to use the student's comprehension they had to analyze other discussion text. In cooperating step, T2 leaded the students to discuss with friends in the group to discuss the result of their analysis. The next step T2 appealed each group to arrange the result of student's discussion. T2 guided the students to conclude the result of the analysis which had been done. The last step was transferring. T2 directed the students to communicate the student's comprehension by using point presentation. T2 guided the students for transferring or applying the comprehension which they had owned in the group by presenting students worksheet.

The closing activity was the last learning activity. In this part, T2 planned to repeat the questions. Then T2 gave a chance the students to ask about the material. Then T2 summarized the learning process about discussion text. In the last activity in the learning activity was T2 closed the learning process by praying and greeting the student.

The next component was assessment technique. There were three aspects would be assessed. They were aptitude, knowledge and skill aspects to be assessed. The technique in attitude assessment was non-test. The assessment form was self-assessment, the form of the knowledge assessment was essay while the instrument in assessment technique was based on the assessment knowledge and skill. There were some criteria in attitude assessment guidelines. The

student's attitude would be scored based on the attitude observed. Score 1 was for the attitude which never came up in the assessment, score 2 was for the attitude which sometimes came up in assessment, score 3 was for the attitude which often came up in the assessment and the last guidelines was score 4 was for the attitude which always came up in the aptitude assessment.

In the knowledge assessment, the test technique was used to assess it. The form of assessment was essay. The aspect of knowledge assessment instrument was answering the questions based on the text. And the assessment guidelines of the knowledge assessment based on the criteria. The correct score was 4 and the false answer was 0. The score could be gained from the calculation bellows; the gained score divided by maximum score multiply 100.

In addition to the skill assessment, T2 used test technique in the form of performance test. The instrument were; a) identify and analyze the generic structure of a simple discussion text; b) presented the result of the student work on the form of the classroom. As guidelines for written skill assessment in generic structure was for generic structure. Score 1 was for very low performance, score 2 was for enough performance, score 3 was for acceptable and score 4 was for very acceptable. For spoken skill assessment there were 3 categories in assessment such as pronunciation, intonation and gesture. In the pronunciation item there were 4 scores for assessing it, score 1 was poor, score 2 was for acceptable, score 3 was for good and 4 was for very good. In the intonation items there were 4 scores in assessed pronunciation. Score 1 was for poor, score 2 was for acceptable, score 3 was for good and 4 was for very good. In the item of gesture, score 1 was poor, score 2 was for acceptable, score 3 was for good and 4 was for very good. The score was gained from gained score divided by maximum score multiply 100.

Those component were completed by appendix about material teaching. The material teaching about the display material of discussion text of *Bahasa Inggris Peminatan SMA* in the video link <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tofk2V03mI4> and presentation material of [https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1-XIU\\_4BXXxH9hwhGdw8c-aun-AqGrZnw/usp=share\\_link&ouid=10695959499576173642396&rtpof+true&sd+true](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1-XIU_4BXXxH9hwhGdw8c-aun-AqGrZnw/usp=share_link&ouid=10695959499576173642396&rtpof+true&sd+true). This module also was completed by student worksheet. There were two student worksheets. The first student worksheet was used to know the language features based on the generic structure of the text. There were 4 paragraph with the title "Do Teenagers Really Need a Mobile Phone? "And the second LKPD was a text with the title "advertisement" from [https://roboguru.ruangguru.com/question/advertisements-there-are-many-reasons-forboth-side-of-the-quetion-should\\_QU-ROBOGURU-1732](https://roboguru.ruangguru.com/question/advertisements-there-are-many-reasons-forboth-side-of-the-quetion-should_QU-ROBOGURU-1732). There were 5 questions in multiple choice to do and those student worksheet were done in group.

In summary CTL as mentioned by above explanation was supported by Buhunggo (2023) contextual learning is made up of seven main elements, including constructivism, which aims to help students develop their understanding through new experiences and their underlying knowledge and beliefs, asking (questioning), which uses questions to get students to think, finding (inquiry), which starts with observation, learning communities, which are made up of a variety of students, and apprehension.

### 3. CONCLUSION

The strategies which were used by three English teachers of SMKN 1 Wadaslintang in implementing teaching contextual English varied from discovery learning, Problem Based Learning, CTL by applying REACT strategy, and contextual English or ESP.

The implementation of those strategies in the classroom shows that the syntax of each strategy had been applied by the participants. Those indicates that the participants tried to apply maximally in the teaching learning process from the preparation, implementation and evaluation. The contribution of strategies in toward the student's participation in the classroom could be seen from the behavioral, cognitive and social dimension. In the behavioral facet the strategy can be active in learning process, the student could collaborate with the other students. In cognitive

aspect of students, the strategies can made the students focus on their attention on completing a task or meeting learning objectives. And in the social dimension, the strategy could lead the students to use the community to interact with interlocutor and social interaction. One of the participants has applied the ESP as the materials to be taught in the teaching learning process by using the material from the vocational content in fishery department while the other participants haven't apply the contextual English in their materials presented in teaching learning process yet. Two of them still use the general English materials to teach in the learning process. But they have the awareness about the English position as vocational lesson group. It can be seen from the questionnaires and also from the interview done. They realized that English should be taught contextually in specific material in the special major.

#### 4. REFERENCES

- Al Hakim, M. F., Sariyatun, S., & Sudiyanto, S. (2018). Constructing student's critical thinking skill through discovery learning model and contextual teaching and learning model as solution of problems in learning history. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multi religious Understanding*, 5(4), 175-183.
- Alonso, F., López, G., Manrique, D., & Viñes, J. M. (2008). Learning objects, learning objectives and learning design. *Innovations in education and teaching international*, 45(4), 389-400.
- Alangui, W.V. (2017) Ethno mathematics and culturally relevant mathematics education in the Philippines. In M. Rosa.
- Aldalur, I., & Perez, A. (2023). Gamification and discovery learning: Motivating and involving students in the learning process. *Heliyon*, 9(1).
- Alham, A. Alghamdi, (2021), Exploring early childhood teacher's belief about STEM education in Saudi Arabia, *Early childhood Education Journal* <https://doi.org/210.1007/s10643-021-01303-0>
- Alvi, M. (2016). A manual for selecting sampling techniques in research.
- Allen, D. E., Donham, R. S., & Bernhardt, S. A. (2011). Problem-based learning. *New directions for teaching and learning*, 2011(128), 21-29.
- Annisa, S. (2015). Teaching Speaking in English Using contextual Teaching and Learning. *English Education Journal*, 6(4), 497-510.
- Anggrawan, A. (2019, October). Percentage of Effect of Blended Learning Model on Learning Outcome. In 2019 Fourth International Conference on Informatics and Computing (ICIC)(pp. 1-4). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIC47613.2019.8985741>
- Apriyanto, B., Nurdin, E. A., Ikhsan, F. A., & Kurnianto, F. A. (2017). Application of Discovery Learning to Increase Activity and Student Learning Results in Understanding the Life Environment in SMP Negeri 2 Sukodono. *Geosfera Indonesia*, 1(1), 29-34.
- Aritonang, F., Al Aziz, I. S. A., & Suwandi, S. (2023). Utilization of Assessment Features in Platform Merdeka Mengajar (PMM) in the Assessment of Indonesian Language Learning. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, 8(2), 134-141.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. dkk. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning
- Astuti, S., Slameto, S., & Dwikurnaningsih, Y. (2017). Peningkatan kemampuan guru sekolah dasar dalam penyusunan instrumen ranah sikap melalui in house training. *Kelola: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 4(1), 37-47.
- Ayende, E., & Bleza, E. (2023). Discovery learning in English Language Teaching. *Educia Journal*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Azis & Dewi (2019). The implementation of Contextual Teaching and learning on English Grammar Competence. <https://e-Journal.ikhac.ac.id/index.php/alsuna>.

- Baker, E.D., Hope, L., & Karandjeff, K. (2009) Contextual Teaching & learning: A promising Approach for basic skills Instruction. Research and Planning group for California Community Colleges (RP Group). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED521932>.
- Bakara, T., & Hutahayan, R. (2021). Penerapan Belajar Kelompok Pada Pelajaran IPA Terpadu Untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Siswa SMP. *Jurnal Dedikasi Pendidikan*, 5(2), 615-622.
- BOUREKKACHE, S. (2022). English for specific purposes: writing scientific research papers. Case study: PhD students in the computer science department.
- Bygate, M., & Samuda, V. (2009). Creating pressure in task pedagogy: The joint roles of field, purpose, and engagement within the interaction approaches. In Mackey, A., & C. Polio (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction: Second language research in honor of Susan M. Gass* (pp. 90–116). Abingdon: Routledge.
- BSKAP, Kemendikbudristek, and Kemendikbudristek BSKAP. (2022) "Peraturan Kepala Badan Standar, Kurikulum dan Asesmen Pendidikan Kementerian Pendidikan Kebudayaan, Riset dan Teknologi Nomor 030/P/2022."
- Cambridge dictionary online [Электронный ресурс].- Режим доступа: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org>
- Calixton, S. O., & Mascuñana, C. G. (2019). Strand Specificity and Perceived Effectiveness of Language Activities in the Senior High School English Instruction. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 2(1), 23-36.
- Chaovanapricha, K., & Chaturongakul, P. (2020) Interdisciplinary Teacher Collaboration in English for Specific Purposes Subject in a Thai University, *English Language Teaching*, 13(5) pp 139-148.
- Choon-Eng Gwee, M. (2008). Globalization of problem-based learning (PBL): cross-cultural implications. *The Kaohsiung journal of medical sciences*, 24, S14-S22.
- Chi-Jen Lin, Gwo-Jen Hwang, Qing-Ke Fu, Ya-Han Cao, Facilitating EFL students' English grammar learning performance and behaviors: A contextual gaming approach, *Computers & Education*, Volume 152, 2020, 103876, ISSN 0360-1315, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103876>.
- Clarke, D. (2002). *Perspective on practice and meaning in mathematics and science classroom*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Crawford, L. M. (2001). Teaching contextually: Research, rationale, and techniques for improving student motivation and achievement. Texas: CCI Publishing, Inc.
- Derewianka, B. (2003). *Trends and issues in genre-based approaches*. RELC journal, 34(2), 133-154.
- Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A. N., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing EFL learner's speaking ability, accuracy and fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 6(2), 177-186.
- Duff, P. A. (2011). How to carry out case study research. *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide*, 95-116.
- Douglas, D. (2000). Assessing language for specific purposes. Cambridge University Press.
- Suryawati, E., & Osman, K. (2017). Contextual learning: Innovative approach towards the development of students' scientific attitude and natural science performance. *Eurasia Journal of mathematics, science and technology education*, 14(1), 61-76.
- Emilia, E. (2005). *A critical genre-based approach to teaching academic writing in a tertiary EFL context in Indonesia*. University of Melbourne, Department of Language, Literacy and Arts Education, Faculty of Education.
- ETS. 2007. Digital Transformation – A Framework for ICT Literacy: A Report of the International ICT Literacy Panel. Princeton, NJ, Educational Testing Service.

- [www.ets.org/Media/Tests/Information\\_and\\_Communication\\_Technology\\_Literacy/ictreport.pdf](http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/Information_and_Communication_Technology_Literacy/ictreport.pdf)
- Fatmawati, F., Gani, S. A., & Samad, I. A. (2018). Techniques for ESP Students in Teaching English. *English Education Journal*, 9(4), 513-526.
- Haerazi, H., Prayati, Z., & Vikasari, R. M. (2019). PRACTICING CONTEXTUAL TEACHING AND LEARNING (CTL) APPROACH TO IMPROVE STUDENTS'READING COMPREHENSION IN RELATION TO MOTIVATION. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 8(1), 139-146.
- Hiver, P., Al-Hoorie, A. H., Vitta, J. P., & Wu, J. (2021). Engagement in language learning: A systematic review of 20 years of research methods and definitions. *Language teaching research*, 13621688211001289.
- John, A.M., & Dudley\_evens, T. (1991) English For specific Purposes: International in Scope, Specific purpose. *TESOL Quarterl*, 25, pp297-314
- Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar*. Cammeray, NSW: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.
- Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for?. *American political science review*, 98(2), 341-354.
- Gosling D. and Moon J. (2001) "How to Use Learning Outcomes and Assessment Criteria", SEEC Office, London.
- Hull, D., & Greveelk, J. H. (1998). Technical preparation: The Next Generation. Waco Texas: Center Occupational Research and Development.
- Hung, W., Jonassen, D. H., & Liu, R. (2008). Problem-based learning. *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology*, 3(1), 485-506.
- Johns, A. M. (2012). The history of English for specific purposes research. *The handbook of English for specific purposes*, 5-30.
- Johnson, E. B. (2002). Contextual Teaching and Learning: What it is and why it's here to stay. California: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Jovanovic, J., Gasevic, D., Dawson, S., Pardo, A., & Mirriahi, N. (2017). Learning analytics to unveil learning strategies in a flipped classroom. *Internet and Higher Education*, 33, 74-85.
- Kartika, A., Kismartini, K., & Rahman, A. Z. (2021). Implementasi Kebijakan Kuliah Daring di Universitas Diponegoro. *Journal Of Public Policy And Management Review*, 10(4), 79-98.
- Kartika, T. P. D. (2016). Penerapan Pembelajaran Kontekstual Dengan Model Problem Based Learning. *Journal of Accounting and Business Education*, 1(1).
- Khalil ET all (2020) Appropriate Teaching Methods for General English and English for Specific Purposes from Teachers' Perspectives. *Arab World English Journal*. 10602 Davlee Lane, Richmond, Texas, 77407. e-mail: editor@awej.org; e-mail: info@ASELS.org; Web site: <https://awej.org/>
- Khamidovna, P. O. (2020). The mechanism of developing a culture of communication in students in the educational process. *JCR*, 7(12), 3096-3103.
- Kasnowo, K., & Hidayat, M. S. (2022). Penguatan Kompetensi SDM Guru melalui Kurikulum Merdeka di SDN Jatirejoyoso. *Jurnal Pengabdian Pada Masyarakat Indonesia*, 1(3), 33-38.
- Kepmendikbud RI. (2020). Learning Outcomes in Early Childhood Education, Basic Education, and Middle Educationah as a reference for curriculum development Number 958/P/2020; Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Keputusan Kepala Badan standar Kurikulum dan Assesment Pendidikan. (2022) Dimensi Elemen dan Sub eleme Profil Pelajar Pancasila.
- Kinsella-Meier, M. A., & Gala, N. M. (2016). Collaboration: Definitions and Explorations of an Essential Partnership. *Odyssey: New Directions in Deaf Education*, 17, 4-9.



- Kurikulum 2013, Kurikulum Darurat(2020-2021), dan Kurikulum atau Kurikulum Merdeka Mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris. 2022) Satu Kajian Bandingan e-ISSN 2961-9920. Vol pp373-382.
- Lamri, ham and Eddine. (2016) An introduction to English Specific Purposes, Online lectures for third year"licence"level. Abou Bekr Belkaid University-tlemecen Faculty and Language Department of English.
- Lastari, S., & Budiastuti, R. E. (2018, November). Implementasi Discovery Learning terhadap Keaktifan Siswa pada Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Materi "Song" di SMA N Guntur Demak. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Mahasiswa Unimus* (Vol. 1).
- Lee, A.( 2017) English and Identity in Multicultural context. Issues, Challenges, Oportunities. Vol 28, pp 1, Teflin Journal.
- Lotulung, cristian Florence et al, (2018) effectiveness of Learning Method contextual Teaching Learning (CTL) for Increasing Learning Outcomes of Entrepreneurships Education. TOJET, vol 17. Issue3, The Turkish Online Journal of education Technology.
- Luna Scott, C. (2015). The futures of learning 2: What kind of learning for the 21st century?
- Nugroho, T&Narawaty D. (2022). Proceeding Seminar Nasional Bahasa, Seni dan Sastra: bahasa, Seni, sastra dan Pengajarannya di era digital.
- Marsh, C.J. (2009) Key Concept for Understanding Curriculum Teacher's.
- Martin, R., Sexton, C., & Gerlovich, J. (2002). Teaching Science for All Children: Methods for constructing understanding. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mashrabovna, U. M. (2022). Important Characteristics to Become Autonomous Learner. *International Journal on Orange Technologies*, 4(12), 23-26.
- Mulengan, I.M. (2018) Innocent Mutale Mulenga, Conceptulization and definition of a curriculum, Online ISSN 2664-0899. Print ISSN 2517-9306., pp1-23 Journal Of Lexicography and Terminology.
- Moon, K., Brewer, T. D., Januchowski-Hartley, S. R., Adams, V. M., & Blackman, D. A. (2016). A guideline to improve qualitative social science publishing in ecology and conservation journals. *Ecology and society*, 21(3).
- Mufida, H. N., Linuwih, S., & Sugianto, S. (2019). Descriptive Analysis of Student's Self Efficacy in The Discovery Learning Processes. *Physics Communication*, 3(1), 41-46. <https://doi.org/10.15294/physcomm.v3i1.14990>
- Nawas, A. (2018). Contextual teaching and learning (CTL) approach through react strategies on improving the students' critical thinking in writing.
- Nurasiah, I., Marini, A., Nafiah, M., & Rachmawati, N. (2022). Nilai Kearifan Lokal: Proyek Paradigma Baru Program Sekolah Penggerak untuk Mewujudkan Profil Pelajar Pancasila. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(3), 3639-3648.
- ÖZBAY, A., & KAYAOĞLU, M. (2015). The use of REACT strategy for the incorporation of the context of physics into the teaching English to the physics English prep students. *TARİH KÜLTÜR VE SANAT ARASTIRMALARI DERGİSİ-JOURNAL OF HISTORY CULTURE AND ART RESEARCH*, 4(3).
- Parnell, D. (2001). Contextual Teaching Works. Waco Texas: Center for Occupational Research and Development
- Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2008). When the gate opens: The interaction between social and linguistic goals in child second language development. In Philp, J., liver, R., & Mackey, A. (Eds.), *Second language acquisition and the younger learner: Child's play?* (pp. 83–104). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ponto, J. (2015). Understanding and evaluating survey research. *Journal of the advanced practitioner in oncology*, 6(2), 168.

- Purnawanto, A. T. (2022). Perencanaan Pembelajaran Bermakna Dan Asesmen Kurikulum Merdeka. *JURNAL PEDAGOGY*, 15(1), 75-94.
- Rahimah, R. (2022). Peningkatan Kemampuan Guru SMP Negeri 10 Kota Tebingtinggi Dalam Menyusun Modul Ajar Kurikulum Merdeka Melalui Kegiatan Pendampingan Tahun Ajaran 2021/2022. *ANSIRU PAI: Pengembangan Profesi Guru Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 6(1), 92-106.
- Sabroni, Doni. (2017) "Pengaruh model pembelajaran Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) terhadap kemampuan komunikasi matematis siswa." *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Matematika dan Pendidikan Matematika*. Vol. 1. No. 1.
- Sari, D. P. (2020). Implementation of REACT Strategy to Develop Mathematical Representation, Reasoning, and Disposition Ability. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, 11(1), 145-156.
- Santrock, J. W. (2017). Educational Psychology. In BMC Public Health (Vol. 15). McGraw-Hill. <https://ejournal.poltektegal.ac.id/index.php/siklus/article/view/298%0Ahttp://repositorio.unan.edu.ni/2986/1/5624.pdf%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jana.2015.10.005%0Ahttp://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/12/58%0Ahttp://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&P>
- Rafiq, A. A., Triyono, M. B., & Djatmiko, I. W. (2023). The Integration of Inquiry and Problem-Based Learning and Its Impact on Increasing the Vocational Student Involvement. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16(1).
- Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149–172). New York: Springer.
- Roopa, S., & Rani, M. S. (2012). Questionnaire designing for a survey. *Journal of Indian Orthodontic Society*, 46(4\_suppl1), 273-277.
- Richards, Jack C. (2008) "Second language teacher education today." *RELC journal* 39.2. 158-177.
- Risan, R., Hasriani, H., & Muhayyang, M. (2021). The Implementation of CTL Method in teaching English to the students of MAN 1 Enrekang. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 16(1), 125-136.
- Rusman. (2013). Model-model pembelajaran: Mengembangkan profesionalisme Guru (2nd ed.). Jakarta: Rajawali pers.
- Sianipar, F. L. (2018). The Effect of Using Contextual Teaching and Learning to Eighth Graders' Reading Comprehension at SMP 3 PSKD Jakarta. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 4(1), 54. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v4i1.788>
- Sari, R. M. (2019). Analisis Kebijakan Merdeka Belajar Sebagai Strategi Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan, *Produ: Prokurasi Edukasi-Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 1(1)
- Supriyono, S. (2022). Religion and Scientific Culture in Learning Curriculum 2013. *Bulletin of Pedagogical Research*, 2(1), 26–46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.51278/bpr.v2i1.252>
- SAPUTRA, A. H. (2008). HUBUNGAN INTENSIFIKASI RETRIBUSI PASAR DENGAN PENINGKATAN PENDAPATAN ASLI DAERAH KOTA YOGYAKARTA TAHUN ANGGARAN 2006-2007 (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta)
- Syakur, A., Zainuddin, H. M., & Hasan, M. A. (2020). Needs analysis English for specific purposes (esp) for vocational pharmacy students. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, 3(2), 724-733.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument; how to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. *How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research (August 10, 2016)*.
- Trujeque-Moreno, E. E., Romero-Fernandes, A., Esparragoza-Barragan, A., & Villa-Jaimes, C. J. (2021) Need Analysis in the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Approach: the case of the benemerita Univeridad Autonoma De Puebela. *MexTESOL Jurnal*, 45 (2)n2

- TUNAZ, M., & Bengü, A. K. S. U. (2023). Preparatory School Students' Perceptions of Learning English for Specific Purposes (ESP) for International Relations. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 12(3), 594-602.
- Van den Bossche, P., Gijselaers, W. H., Segers, M., & Kirschner, P. A. (2006). Social and cognitive factors driving teamwork in collaborative learning environments: Team learning beliefs and behaviors. *Small group research*, 37(5), 490-521.
- Verstegen, D. M., de Jong, N., van Berlo, J., Camp, A., Könings, K. D., van Merriënboer, J. J., & Donkers, J. (2016). How e-learning can support PBL groups: A literature review. *Educational technologies in medical and health sciences education*, 9-33.
- Widodo, H.P. (2016) Teaching English Specific Purposes (ESP). English for vocational purposes (EVP), W.A. Renandya, H.P. Widodo (Eds.), English language teaching today: Linking Theory and practice. Vol 5 pp277-291, Springer.[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2_19).
- Wolters C.A., Hussain M. Investigating grit and its relations with college students' self-regulated learning and academic achievement. *Metacognition and Learning*. 2015;10(3):293–311. doi: 10.1007/s11409-014-9128-9.