eed
collegiate forum
Universitas Kristen Indonesia

PROCEEDING

EFL Theory & Practice: Voice of EED UKI

English Education Department (EED) Collegiate Forum 2015-2018

Editor
Parlindungan Pardede

Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
FKIP UKI
2019

PROCEEDING

English Education Department Collegiate Forum (EED CF) 2015-2018

"EFL Theory and Practice: Voice of EED UKI"

Editor:
Parlindungan Pardede

Reviewers:
Parlindungan Pardede
Hendrikus Male
L. Angelianawati
Asri Purnamasari
Horas Hutabarat
Lamhot Naibaho

Cover designer:
Situjuh Nazara

PREFACE

English Education Department Collegiate Forum (EED CF) is an academic forum organized by the English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Kristen Indonesia (EED FKIP UKI). Initiated in 2008 by Mr. Parlin Pardede Dean of FKIP UKI, the event was held bi-monthly in every even moth. It aims at providing a friendly and open opportunity for the faculty, students, alumni, and English teachers to share ideas, research findings, and experiences in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) field. It is expected that the forum can cater the interested parties an innovative and exciting opportunity to share, care, and collaborate for developing their professionalism in EFL learning and teaching.

Following related parties' recommendation, staring from 2015 the papers presented in the forum will be compiled and published in a proceeding in every four years. This proceeding, therefore, includes the 24 articles presented in the forum from 2015 to 2018. Since the presentation in this forum is voluntary, every resource person is free to decide the EFL topic he or she presents. Consequently, the articles in this volume cover a broad theme. Despite the broad theme, the topics covered in the articles do represent current hot issues in EFL, such as learning and teaching methodology and strategies; language skills, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar development; curriculum, evaluation and assessment matters; language research methodology, and the implementation of technology in EFL.

On behalf of EED FKIP UKI, I would like to offer my appreciation all faculties, students, alumni, and fellow English teachers who had contributed in EED CF along 2015-2018. My special thanks should go to Parlindungan Pardede whose hard work in editing the articles in this proceeding has made this publication possible.

Finally, I hope each article in this proceeding can inspire every reader as it had inspired the audiences when it was presented in EED CF.

Jakarta, July 26, 2019
English Education Department Chairperson,

Hendrikus Male

CONTENTS

The Effect of Graphic Organizers on EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension[1]

Horas Hutabarat
anggiat.mananda@yahoo.co.id
Damayanty Hotmauli
dhotmauli@gmail.com
Universitas Kristen Indonesia Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This study employed the experimental design. It aimed at investigating whether or not graphic organizers (GOs) use affects students' reading comprehension. The participants were 60 eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 102 Jakarta. These students were divided into two groups: the experimental and the control group. Each group consisted of 30 students. Both groups were taught reading comprehension in eight sessions using the same learning materials. However, the control group was taught in the way they were used to be taught, and the experimental group was taught using GOs technique. The same pretest and posttest were administered to both groups to collect the data. The obtained data were analyzed by using SPSS 21. The results showed that the post-test mean score of the experimental class is 84.66, and the post-test mean score of the control class is 56.33. The hypothesis test showed there is a significant effect of GOs use. The value of Sig. of equality variances (0. 043) was lower than Sig.   (0.05). Therefore, it was concluded that there is a significant effect of using GOs in advancing the eleventh-grade EFL students' reading comprehension in SMA Negeri 102 Jakarta. This study pointed out that GOs can be an effective technique to improve EFL students' reading comprehension.

Keywords: graphic organizers, reading comprehension, EFL

INTRODUCTION

Reading English texts is very essential for EFL learners because reading is not only a subject but also a service skill. It is also the key channel and the main source for a second or foreign language input When students have learned reading effectively, they will be able to learn the other language skills (listening, speaking, and writing) and

---

components (grammar, discourse structure, and vocabulary) effectively by reading. Krashen and Brown (2007) emphasized that reading is the most important skill among the four language skills as it can improve overall language proficiency.

Although reading English texts is very essential, most EFL students find it very difficult to master. Deporter and Hernacki (1999) stated students find reading very difficult so that they are anxious to read. Despite their realization of the high importance of reading, Indonesian students, according to Kweldju (1996), are not interested to read textbooks due to their inadequate prior knowledge, inability to comprehend the reading texts and complex structure of the textbooks. Fitrawati (2009) also found that many learners face difficulty in understanding textbooks in English. For many Indonesian students in tertiary education level, reading classes were considered boring and stressful because of over long reading text/s, unfamiliar vocabulary, lack of pre-reading activities activating the students' background knowledge, and repetitive teaching (Firmanto, 2005). Since reading comprehension is very crucial to master, it is very important to find strategies to help their reading comprehension beneficial. This study is an attempt to meet that challenge by investigating whether or not graphic organizers (GOs) use has a positive effect on students' reading comprehension. GOs was selected to investigate because some previous studies (Fisher, 2002; Parker, 2007; McKnight, 2010; Roa, 2011; Jiang, 2012; Rumiris, 2012; Biria and Sharifi (2013) have claimed its effectiveness to help learners understand the structure of the different texts they read.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Reading Comprehension
Reading comprehension is, in essence, the process of understanding and interpreting texts in order to get some specific or detail information. Klingner and Geisler (2008: 65) stated that reading comprehension is a process of constructing meaning from a text which involves the complex coordination of several processes, including decoding, word reading, and fluency along with the integration of background knowledge and previous experiences. This is confirmed by Grabe and Stoller (2002) who defined reading as the ability to draw meaning from the written text and interpret it appropriately. They argued that the process of reading involves a number skills, such as word recognition and syntactic processing, and those skills enable the reader to anticipate text information, select key information, mentally organize it, summarize it, monitor comprehension, repair comprehension breakdowns, and match comprehension output to readers' goals. Thus, reading is an active, not a passive process.

These definitions indicate that while reading, a person should not only receive the message or meaning embedded by the author but also "constructs" meaning based on the information provided in the text. Smith, as cited in Pardede (2010) posited reading is not just extracting meaning from a text but a process of connecting information in the text with the knowledge the reader brings to the act of reading. This is supported by Maria (1990) who suggested that reading comprehension is a " …holistic process of constructing meaning from written text through the interaction of (1) the knowledge the reader brings to the text, i.e. word recognition ability, word knowledge, and knowledge

of linguistic conventions; (2) the reader's interpretation of the language that the writer used in constructing the text; and (3) the situation in which the text is read. (p. 14-15).

To efficiently get the meaning of the text, readers are required to fulfill three things: (1) identify and understand the words in the text or words recognition, (2) construct and understand the words, and (3) coordinate the words and interpret them so that there is an accurate understanding (Leipzig (2001). Nation (2001: 339) and Richard and Bamford (as cited in Harmer (2001: 210) supported this by describing that a text can be understood by the reader when it is written using specialized vocabulary and grammar that exist at the level of the readers' ability. Thus, to make sure that students can read effectively, Brown (2004, p. 206) recommended the teacher to include their understanding of the basic ideas, expressions, idioms, phrases in context, grammar, supporting ideas, and vocabulary in the evaluation of reading skills.

As suggested by Heilman et.al (1981), reading comprehension can be classified into four levels: literal, interpretative, critical, and creative. Literal reading comprehension refers to acquiring directly stated information in a text. Thus, in literal reading, one aims only to understand the explicitly stated information, and the reader's understanding could be checked by examining his ability to recognize and recall facts; identify the main idea and supporting details; categorize, outline, and summarize the information. Interpretive reading deals with what the author means by what is said. It, therefore, necessitates the ability to read between the lines and make inferences about things implicitly stated. Interpretative reading could also include the skills to interpret figurative language, draw conclusions, predict outcomes, determine the mood, and judge the author's point of view. Critical reading, defined as "an active and purposeful process of comprehending, questioning and evaluating printed material and in order to react intelligently to the writer's ideas (Pardede, 2007), deals with why the author says what he or she says. In critical reading, the reader should use some external criteria from his/her own experience in order to evaluate and judge the quality of the information, the values of the writer's use of language, and the writer's reasoning, simplifications, and generalizations. In other words, the reader should react emotionally and intellectually to the texts. Creative comprehension involves the formulation and rethinking of ideas. It necessitates the reader's involvement with the information presented as he uses it to formulate or rethink ideas of his own, his skills to understand implied and inferred meanings and to evaluate and appreciate reactions.

According to Adler (as cited in Rumiris, 2012, pp. 49-54) there are seven strategies having a firm scientific basis for improving text comprehension: (1) monitoring comprehension, (2) metacognition, (3) graphic and semantic organizer, (4) answering questions, (5) generating questions, (6) recognizing story structure, and (7) summarizing. Monitoring comprehension could be done by students when instructions are explained clearly. Clear instruction guides them to be aware and understand when they have to "fix" the problem in their understanding. Metacognition could be defined as thinking about thinking. A good reader uses metacognition strategies to think about and has control over their reading. In line with this Block, Grambell, and Presley (2002) stated that metacognition is an awareness of and knowledge about strategies for planning, monitoring, controlling one's own learning. Graphic and semantic organizers illustrate a

concept and relationship between concepts in a text using a diagram. Regardless of the table, GOs can help readers focus on the concept and how they are related to other concepts. GOs can help students in text structure "between fiction and non-fiction" as they read, provide them with tools they can use to examine and show relationships of text and help them write well-organized summaries of text.

The fourth strategy, answering questions, can be effective because they give students a purpose for reading. Focusing on what the students are going to learn, helps them think actively as they read, encourage them to monitor their comprehension, and help them review the contents and relate what they have learned to what they already know. The fifth strategy, generating questions, makes students aware of whether they can answer the question. If they understand what they are reading, students learn to ask themselves questions that require them to combine information from different segments of text. Recognizing story structure enables students to learn to identify the categories of contents: covering characters, setting, events, problem, and resolution. The seventh, summarizing, requires students to determine what is important in what they are reading and to put it into their own words.

Graphic Organizers

GOs are "Visual devices that depict information in a variety of ways. Most commonly, they employ lines, circles, and boxes, to form images which depict four common ways information is typically organized: hierarchic, cause/effect, compare/contrast, and cyclic or linear sequences. These images serve as visual cues designed to facilitate communication and/or understanding of information by showing how essential information about a topic is organized" (Ellis & Howard, 2005, p.1). This is in line with Parker (2007) and McKnight (2013) who defined GOs as visual representations that help to gather and sort information.

In the context of learning, GOs are a visual frame employed to represent knowledge and understanding of a subject matter by organizing important aspects of a concept or topic into a logical pattern using labels. GOs have many patterns, i.e. maps, graphs, charts, diagrams, or clusters. McKnight (2010) claimed there are 100 reproducible GOs that can be used in reading, writing, and the content area. Despite their various form, each their purpose is similar, i.e. to depict the relationships between facts and figures or key concepts and ideas within a learning task. In reading comprehension context, GOs can be effectively used in all lessons for students of all educational levels to check not only their understanding but also to motivate and enhance their thinking skills. According to Krasnic (2011, p.24), by organizing and linking key concepts connected to what students are reading, they will be able to clear their thoughts and refine their thinking.

Various studies have been conducted on the use of GOs as a reading strategy to improve EFL learners' reading comprehension. Fisher (2002) carried out extensive research on the effect of GOs on student reading comprehension. Based on his findings, he concluded GOs are the most helpful strategy employed by students belonged to the experiment group. Roa (2011) investigated GOs impact in the reading comprehension of eighth-grade students in a private all-girls bilingual school. In the study, many positive

results regarding the use of GOs as a reading strategy were presented. It indicated that GOs enhanced reading comprehension in students almost any level and any age, promoted the development of strategic reading by processing information skills, advanced students' metalinguistic awareness, and provided opportunities to practice memory strategies.

Rumiris (2012) conducted an action research to improve the students' reading comprehension using GOs technique in a private university in Jakarta, Indonesia. The finding indicated that GOs was successful in improving students' reading comprehension. Jiang (2012) studied the effects of a 16-week reading instruction program with GOs on the development of college-level EFL students' English reading comprehension. The results revealed that GOs instruction significantly improved reading comprehension and the learned information was retained seven weeks after the instructional treatment. Additionally, Biria and Sharifi (2013) studied the impact of GOs on reading comprehension ability. The results revealed that compared to other post-reading strategies, GOs were statistically more significant and effective for the low-skilled readers.

The main objective of this study is to investigate the effect of GOs on eleventh grade EFL students' reading comprehension in SMAN 102 Jakarta. Based on this objective, the question of this study is stated as follow: "Is there a significant effect of GOs on the eleventh graders' reading comprehension at SMAN 102 Jakarta?" Based on this research question, the hypotheses to be tested in this study were formulated as follow:

H_o: There is no significant effect of graphic organizers on the eleventh graders' reading comprehension at SMAN 102 Jakarta.

H_a: There is a significant effect of graphic organizers on the eleventh graders' reading comprehension at SMAN 102 Jakarta.

METHOD

This study is quasi-experimental research design investigating the effect of GOs on EFL students' reading comprehension. The variables of this study were the use of GOs as the independent variable and reading comprehension achievement as the dependent variable. Conducted in SMAN 102 Jakarta in March to April 2015, the participants were 60 eleventh-graders who were selected via convenience sampling. Due to administrative restrictions, the participants could not be selected randomly. They were also grouped by treating XI Social 1 the control group, and XI Social 2, the experimental group and. Each group consisted of 30 students.

Both groups were taught reading comprehension in six sessions using the same learning materials. However, the control group was taught in the way they were used to be taught, and the experimental group was taught using GOs technique. To suit the students' educational level and the types of text they read, 12 types of GOs employed in the experiment, i.e., ABC Brainstorm, Venn diagrams, Spider, Cornell Notes, Three-Column Notes, Analysis Notes, Summary Organizer, Story Board Notes, Outline Notes, Cycle of Food Chain, Chain of events, and Beginning-Middle-End.

Data were collected using a pre-test and a post-test. The pretest was intended to see the initial condition of the two groups, while the post-test was used to measure the students' achievement by comparing it with the pretest results. Both tests were designed in 20 multiple choice questions. To measure the validity and reliability of the instrument in this study, the researcher conducted a deep consultation with the experts. After getting the approval that the test was valid and reliable, the researcher distributed the test to the students. The SPSS 22.0 was employed to analyze the data. Independent t-test analysis was used to determine whether there were any differences between the critical reading skills of participants in the experimental group and that of the control group.

FINDING
Participants' Initial Competences in Reading Comprehension

Table 1
Participants' Pretest Results

Group	f	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Control	30	56.50	25.00	80.00
Experimental	30	49.83	25.00	80.00

Viewing from the pretest results, which was administered to see the students' initial reading comprehension competence, the competence of the control and experimental group was relatively similar. The mean score of the control group was a bit higher than that of the experimental. However, the difference is not significant (see Table 1).

Table 2
The Control Group's Pretest vs. Posttest Results

Group	Scores	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Control	Pretest	56.50	25.00	80.00
	Posttest	56.33	25.00	85.00

Participants' Development in Reading Comprehension
As shown by Table 2, despite the increase of the maximum score (from 80.00 in the pretest to 85.00 in the posttest, the mean score declined 0.17 point. This indicated the conventional way of learning reading employed in the control group did not enhance the students' reading comprehension competence.

Table 3
The Experimental Group's Pretest vs. Posttest Results

Group	Scores	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Experimental	Pretest	49.83	25.00	80.00
	Posttest	84.66	65.00	100.00

Table 3 reveals the significant improvement of reading comprehension competence in the experimental group. Seeing from the mean scores change, the experimental group

got 32.83 increase. This indicated the use of GOs significantly enhanced the students' reading comprehension competence.

Hypothesis Test Results

To test the hypotheses proposed to answer the research question, the independent sample t-test was administered. The results were presented in Table 4.

Table 4.

The Results of the Independent Sample T-Test

| | | Levine's Test for Equality Variance | | t-test for equality of Means | | | | | 95% Confidence interval of the difference | |
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. Error difference		
Scores	Equal Variance assumed	.785	.379	-3.252	62	0.002	-7.16656	2.20391	-11.57212	-2.76101
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.252	59.93	0.002	-7.16656	2.2039	-11.57513	-2.75779

As shown by Table 4, the results obtained from the independent sample t-test showed there was a significant difference in the scores for the use of the use of GOs technique (M=84.66) and the use of conventional technique (M=56.33) on conditions t (58)= -10.840, p = 0.000, and t (-0.840) was lower than Sig.   (0.05). This suggested that the H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted. Thus, it was concluded that there is a significant effect of graphic organizers on the eleventh graders' reading comprehension at SMAN 102 Jakarta. Specifically, the results suggest that when GOs technique is used in teaching reading, the students reading comprehension will develop higher than when conventional technique is used.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the effects of using GOs on teaching reading comprehension to Indonesian secondary school EFL learners. The data analysis showed the significant instructional effect of GOs on EFL learners' reading comprehension. Thus, the study showed that the instructional effect of GOs instruction on reading comprehension is more significant than the conventional techniques. This study provides empirical evidence, in line with the findings of Fisher (2002), Roa (2011), Rumiris (2012) and Biria and Sharifi (2013) concerning the positive effects of using GOs on students' reading comprehension.

As shown by Table 2, despite the increase of the maximum score (from 80.00 in the pretest to 85.00 in the posttest, the mean score declined 0.17 point. This score decline might be due to the waning of the students' reading interest. Based on the results of several studies, Miranda et al. (2011) noted that reading interest and engagement are the key factors that determine reading success. This also verified Crosby's (2013) findings indicating that readers with more positive attitudes toward reading also had better comprehension scores.

The findings designated that this study supports the use of GOs in facilitating reading comprehension since it can the retention of unfamiliar but meaningful material by the prior introduction of relevant concepts so that provision of GOs technique to learning materials improve the students understanding the material. Most readers must have experienced that questions assist readers to activate his prior knowledge and to make an association between the new information and existing knowledge. Thus, when EFL learners are provided with GOs prior to reading comprehension activities, they would read more effectively, and when they read effectively, higher comprehension will be achieved. Therefore, this study supports the use of graphic organizers to promote students' reading comprehension and learning from texts.

CONCLUSION AND SUGESSTION

Based on the findings and discussion presented in previous sections, it can be concluded that the GOs technique can be used as an alternative instructional strategy to improve students' reading comprehension. In relation to this, EFL teachers are recommended to employ GOs technique in their classrooms. Despite that, due to administrative and time restrictions, this study has some limitations. First, the participants of this study were limited to the students of the same grade of the school. To get more valid results, further study is needed to investigate the effect of using GOs to develop reading comprehension at different levels of language proficiency, comparing gender, comparing children and adults, and comparing learners with different learning styles. In addition, investigating the students and teachers' views of using GOs is also recommended.

REFERENCESS

Biria, R., & Sharifi, M. M. (2013). Graphic organizers and reading comprehension ability: Evidence from Iranian EFL university students. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 10(5), 358-365.

Block, C., Gambrell, L,. & Pressley, M. (2002). *Improving comprehension instruction rethinking research, theory, and classroom practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Crosby, R. (2013). Reading attitudes as a predictor of Latino adolescents' reading comprehension (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of California, Riverside, CA.

Deporter, B., & Hernacki, M. (1992). *Quantum learning: membiasakan belajar nyaman dan menyenangkan.* Translated by Alwiyah Abdurrahman. Bandung: Kaifa PT Mizan Pustaka.

Ellis, E., & Howard, P. (2005). Graphic organizers: Power tools for teaching students with learning disabilities. *Graphic Organizers and Learning Disabilities* 1, 1-5.

Firmanto, S. O. (2005). Student's behavior of reading comprehension: Expectations and follow up. Paper presented at the *LIA International Conference*, Jakarta.

Fisher, A. L. (2001). Implementing graphic organizer notebooks: The art and science of teaching content. *Reading Teacher*, 55(2), 116-120.

Fitrawati. (2009). Improving Senior High School Students' Reading Comprehension through Reading Strategies Derived from Genre-Based Approach. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Seni* 10(2), p. 89-99.

Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. London: Pearson Education, Inc.

Hamm, M. & Adams, D. (1992). *The collaborative dimensions of learning*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching.* Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Heilman, A, et.al. (1988). *The principles and the practices of teaching reading*. Ohio: Charles E. Merill Publishing Co.

Jiang, X. (2012). Effects of discourse structure graphic organizers on EFL reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 24 (1), 84-105.

Klingner, J. K., & Geisler, D. (2008). Helping classroom reading teachers distinguish between language acquisition and learning disabilities. In Klingner, J. K., Hoover, J. J. & Baca, L. M. (Eds.). *Why do English language learners struggle with reading? Distinguishing language acquisition from learning disabilities* (pp. 57-74). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Krashen, S. & Brown, C.L. (2007). What is academic language proficiency? *STETS Language and Communication Review*, 6(1), 1-4.

Krasnic, T. 2011. *How to study with mind maps: The concise learning method*. Concise Books Publishing.

Kweldju, S. (1996). English department students' interest and strategies in reading their content area textbooks. *TEFLIN Journal*, 8(1), 104-117.

Leipzig, H.D. (2001). What Is Reading?.www.readingrockets.orgarticle/352

Maria, K. (1990). *Reading comprehension instruction, issues and strategies*. Parkton, MD: York Press.

McKnight, K. (2010). *The teacher's big book of graphic organizers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Miranda, T., Williams-Ross, D., Johnson, K., & McKenzie, N. (2011). Reluctant readers in middle school: Successful engagement with text using the e-reader. *International Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 1(6), 81-91. Retrieved November 2013 fromhttp://www.ijastnet.com/journals/Vol_1_No_6_November_2011/9.pdf

Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pardede (2010). A review & on reading theories and its implication to the teaching of reading. Retrieved June 2014 fromhttps://parlindunganpardede.com/articles/language-teaching/

Pardede, P. (2007). Developing critical reading in the EFL classroom. Retrieved September 2013 from http://parlindunganpardede.wordpress.com/articles/language-teaching/developing-critical-reading-in-the-efl-classroom/

Parker, C. (2007). *30 Graphic organizers for reading*. USA: Shell Education

Rahvard, Z.J. (2010). Cooperative Learning Strategies and Reading Comprehension. *California Linguistic Notes*, 35(2). Retrieved October 2013 from http://hss.fullerton.edu/linguistics/cln/SP10PDF/Rahvard-Coop-ED.pdf.

Resmi, E. C., Wijaya, B., & Suhartono, L. (2012). Improving Students' Reading Comprehension of Recount Text through Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) Technique. Tanjungpura: University Pontianak

Roa, M.A. (2011). Making connections: impact of graphic organizers in reading comprehension and summarization (Master's thesis). Universidad de la Sabana, Chía, Colombia.

Rumiris, J. (2014). Improving university students' reading comprehension using graphic organizers: An action research. *Jurnal Dinamika Pendidikan*, 7(3), pp. 157-164

Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R. E. (1994). Student teams achievement divisions: STAD. *Using Student Team Learning*, 2(1), 14–18, 20–21, 23–26, 43–47.

Tiantong, M., & Teemuangsai, S. (2013). Student team achievement divisions (STAD) technique through the moodle to enhance learning achievement. *International Education Studies*, 6(4), 85–92. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n4p85

Wichadee, S. 2006. The Effects of Cooperative Learning on English Reading Skills and Attitudes of the First-Year Students at Bangkok University. Retrieved September 2013 from http://www.kj.fme.vutbr.cz/lsp/soubory/lsp2006.pdf

PROCEEDING
English Education Department Collegiate Forum (EED CF) 2015-2018

(A bimonthly academic forum organized by the English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan) Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta)

"EFL Theory and Practice: Voice of EED UKI"

Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
FKIP UKI Jakarta
2019