The Effects of Communicative Language Teaching of Student-Centered Approach on Students' Speaking Ability at XI Grade of SMAN 1 Lubuk Sikaping

Irwansyah
Student of Magister Program,
Yogyakarta State University

Endang Nurhayati
Lecturer of Linguistics Magister Program
Yogyakarta state University

Abstract
This study aimed to find out the effects of communicative language teaching on students' speaking skill using video. The participants of this study involved 60 students class XI of SMAN I Lubuk Sikaping in the academic year of 2017/2018. The participants of this study were divided into two classes (experimental and control class): class XI IPA 2 as the control group and class XI IPA 1 as the experimental group. This study used quantitative method and the data analyzed by using statistical analysis. The data obtained from the result of pre-test and post-test that was given to the participants during the process of the research. The result of this study was found that the mean of control pre-test class was 63.68 and post-test of control class was 80.0, while the mean of experimental pre-test was 64.28 and post-test of experimental class was 85.69. However, the mean value on the speaking skill test of the experimental group is higher than that of the control group. The increase of the scores in experimental class showed that the communicative language teaching was effective to use in teaching speaking in class XI of SMAN Lubuk Sikaping. Moreover, the result of the t-test was $0.011< 0.05$, it indicated that there is a significant differences between students' speaking ability who are taught using communicative language teaching and students' speaking ability who are taught without using communicative language teaching.

Keywords: Communicative Language Teaching, student-centered approach, Speaking Skill, Teaching Speaking, Anxiety.

Introduction
Speaking skills is an important skill in everyday life as an effective oral communication media. Speaking is the ability to pronounce the word sounds, to express and convey feelings, ideas, and also the submission of intent to others in the form of thoughts, ideas, and heart's content.

The effectiveness of language teaching approach in the higher education community still much debate within educators, scholars, and policy makers. Effective teaching must be able to create good situation and appropriate with students' need. Teaching speaking in senior high school

based on the curriculum that was made by the policy maker. The students in SMAN 1 Lubuk Sikaping faced some problems due to their speaking ability. Based on the writer observation in SMAN 1 Lubuk Sikaping the students have enough vocabulary but the feel default to express their idea during teaching learning processes, its impede students' speaking ability.

Moreover, there are several factors due to difficulty of students' speaking while teaching learning speaking process. First, lack of practices in speaking class, the teacher give exercise more than speaking practice. Second, the use inappropriate method in teaching speaking that make student bored and lack of interest to follow the course. The last, lack of mastering the aspect of speaking such as, grammar, pronunciation, and syntax.

The writer believe that the use appropriate method is one of the crucial aspect in improving students' speaking ability. The writer believes communicative language teaching of student centered leaning can solve students' difficulty in speaking while teaching learning process. Communicative language teaching is kind of student centered approach. Communicative language teaching (CLT) emphasize students' creativity and activity in teaching learning. CLT also create situation of the students in real communication that make student feel naturally in teaching learning process.

This study tries to propose a solution as a way to increase the learners' speaking skill. The teaching of speaking skill must be innovative and attractive in order to get effective learning outcomes. Reflecting on the students' problems related to speaking skill, the use of communicative language teaching of student-centered approach should be attempted to minimize those constraints on their learning process.

Literature Review
Learning and teaching
Learning and teaching is like two sides of coin, teaching cannot be defined apart from learning. Brown (2001: 10) states that teaching and learning process as facilitating and guiding the learners, supporting learners to learn, and conditioning learning situation. B. F. skinner views process of learning as an operant conditioning through a wisely paced program of reinforcement. Furthermore, Saljo (1979) states that learning has five conceptions; learning as the growth of understanding, as the acquirement of truths or processes, as memorizing, as the construction of meaning, as an informative development to reach the goal of understanding of reality.

Behavioral believes that learning process of stimuli and response during learning process. In another hand, constructivism defined that teaching learning process as social interaction. Social constructivism stresses the role of social interaction and learning to contrast the cognitive and emotional images of truth (brown, 2001:12).

Deciding teaching style, methods, approach, and techniques must be appropriate with the learners' style and learners' needs in learning. The successful of teaching learning process was due to the using appropriate methods, approach, and techniques in teaching process.

Speaking
Speaking as effective means of communication for people in daily interaction. Without speaking, people will fill difficult to deliver his idea to other people. For most people, basic skills in acquiring second language is the people can transfer his massage to the receiver. It's

because of speaking is the importance tools for communication. Speaking needs great deal of respiratory system, not only mouth but also all system in producing speech needed. In addition, as mentioned above, speaking is not just making sound (Combleet and Carter, 2001).

Louma (2004:2) states communication as a cooperative of producing meaning concerning with delivering and receiving information. The meaning itself must be appropriate with the context/situation in which it occurs, environments, and the purposes for speaking. Tarigan (1981:15) says that speaking is the ability to convey the word or sound of expression to deliver or sending information, felling, and ideas.

Furthermore, Thornbury (in Harmer 2002:343) differ two kind dimension of speaking, transactional and interpersonal functions. The function of transactional is to carry out the information and to facilitate the good conversation, while interpersonal function is to keep good relation between people. Kayfetz (1992:22) states that the main concern in speaking is the ability to produce an oral language and it is called as human verbal communications.

The Aim of Teaching Speaking
Murcia (1991:126) believe that the aim of teaching and learning speaking is to encourage learners to acquire communication skills and foster learners to apply the language in the real life communication in and out of the classroom. Moreover, Pourhosein Gilakjanin (2016) stated that human interactions in multifarious processes. Speakers communicate when they are going to tell something to the listeners. They also use the language for multi purposes.

Scrivener (2005:146) states that the important goal of speaking skill are confidence and fluency. Latha (2012) state that the learners should understand how to sound the word and how to stress the sentences in specific way. The students must acquire the knowledge of language aspect.

Factors affecting student's speaking ability
Mahripah (2014) stated that the ability of speaking second language learners affected by some component of linguistics such as vocabulary, grammar, morphology, and phonology. In addition, their ability also affected by psychological aspects such as motivation, behavior, and personality. Furthermore, Woodrow (2006) states that anxiety also has negative effect on students speaking ability, learners will very cautious to make mistake and errors during speaking activity. They believes that making mistakes and errors during speaking can delay and impede them to speak in front of audiences or classmates. Bahsir, Dogar, and Azam (2011) state that the distress of speaking English is connected to personality paradigms of someone such as anxiety, shyness, and risk taking. Occasionally, dangerous anxiety may lead learners' displeasure.

Richard and Reynanda (2002:205) state that there are four aspects of affecting students' speaking ability; aural medium, age, affective factors, and socio-cultural factor

1. Age or Maturational Constraints
Krashen and Scarcella state that learning a second or third language in early childhood through ordinary experiences has higher ability than those who starting learning in adult.   Many adult learners troubled to acquire a language like native speaker. This fact indicate that the age of learners itself may disturb learners to achieve a second or third language and to speak the target language like native speaker.

2. Aural Medium
Doff (1998) state that speaking ability cannot be improve without improvement of listening skills. The successful of dialogue is according to the learners comprehend what is spoken to

them. The listener cannot replay the conversation unless she/he understands the massage. It means listening plays important role to develop learners' speaking ability.

3. Socio-cultural Factors

The socio-culture affect foreign language learning because language cannot apart from social and culture. The learner will use the language in their real life among society, the have to understand the context of language in their social life

5. Affective Factors

The affective factors are related with anxiety, self-esteem, emotion, and attitude of second language learners. The successful of learners to acquire the language influenced by their emotion in their process of learning a language.

Furthermore, Woodrow (2017) views that the language teacher plays an important role in motivating students' engagement and students' participation in speaking activities. The students more motivated when the teacher know students' psychology during language learning processes. Involving students' more in teaching practices will increase students' confidents to acquire the knowledge as good as they work. Revee (2016) says, students more motivated when the teacher gives informative feedback, sets-up an anxiety-free atmosphere, offers choices etc.

Students-Centered Learning

Thornburg (1995) stated students-centered learning as a discipline that take account of the communication among students that produce creative and effective learning to be applied in the actual world. Thornburg also illustrate the essential of the students like important team member in the game, without team member the game would not be success. He believes that teacher is only a part of students-centered activity and teacher not the main actor and player. The students-centered approach focuses on the activity of the students and the teacher only become controller among students. Students-centered learning as a model that places the learner in the center of learning activity. The learners learn using their own strategy and own pace, they will be more intrinsically than extrinsically.

Meanwhile, Hormon and Hirumi (1996) describes students-centered instruction is the contrary of teacher-centered instruction. Students-centered instruction as the goal of the school system that should be meet with the goal of learners.

Students feel more enjoyable to express their idea or making oral communication when the teacher can engaging a good condition and adopting a students-centered approach, with those condition he also can trigger inner drives within their students in class (vibolpul : 2016).

The Purpose of CLT

Freeman (2000:128) states that the communicative language teaching involve student to speak in the target language. To communicate in target language the learner need to muster the knowledge of language aspects, the meaning, function and forms. Hymes (in Ricard 2002:159) believes that the purpose of (CLT) is to increase students' communication competence.

The Characteristics of CLT

Freeman (2000:129) views the most characteristic of communicative language teaching is the intensive of communication in the process of learning. Students apply the language through communicative activities such as role play, debate, picture strip, and language games.

Littlewood (in Richard 2002: 155) believes that the most important characteristic of communicative language teaching is to use a language as systematics and structural aspects of language.

Richard and Rodges (2002:161) define four characteristic of communicative language teaching:
1. Language is the expression of making meaning systems:
2. Communication and interaction;
3. The structures of language replicates its functional incommunicative competence;
4. The primary units of language is not only the structural and grammatical features, but using a language in discourse field;

Methodology

This study used quantitative method that belongs to experimental research. According to Johnson and Christensen (2008: 33), quantitative method is emphasizing on the collection of quantitative source. Moreover Johnson and Christensen (2008: 41) says that experimental research the researcher manipulates the independent variable to show the cause and effect from the data.

This study has two variables, independent variable and dependent variable. The independent variable is communicative language teaching of students-centered approach using video and the dependent variable is speaking skill of the students at the second grade of SMAN I Lubuk Sikaping. To obtain the data the writer used pre-test and post-test in the control and experimental class. The experimental class taught using communicative language teaching by using video as a treatment while control class used conventional method and media.

Finding and Discussion
The Description Pre-Test Scores of the control and Experimental Class

The minimum score in control class after pre-test given is 50 and the maximum score is 76. Moreover, the mean value of pre-test in control class is 63.68, the modus is 56, the median is 64.0 and the standard deviation is 7.467. The results of the data analysis are presented in the table of descriptive analysis as shown below.

Table 1 Descriptive analysis of the pre-test score on Students' Speaking Skill

N	Sum	Mean	Modus	Median	SD	Max	Min
31	1974	63.68	56	64.0	7.467	76	50

The data obtained from the pre-test given to experimental class shows that the minimum score is 54 and the maximum score is 80. Moreover, the mean value is 64.28, the mode is 60, the median is 62.0 and the standard deviation is 7.440. The results of the score analysis are presented in the table of descriptive analysis as shown below.

Table 2: Analysis of descriptive Pre-Test Score of the experimental Class

N	Sum	Mean	Modus	Median	SD	Max	Min
29	1864	64.28	60	62	7.440	80	54

Table 3: Analysis of descriptive speaking Pre-test of experimental and Control Class

Group	N	Sum	Mean	Modus	Median	SD	Max	Min
Control	31	1974	63.68	56	64.0	7.467	76	50
Experimental	29	1864	64.28	60	62	7.440	80	54

Table 3 shows that the mean value on the experimental class is 64.28 while that in the control class is 63.68. It proved that the mean value of the control class is lower than the value of the experimental class; however the mean value difference is not quite significant.

In this study, the writer applied t-test before the treatment given to the participants the see the differences between pretest scores in experimental and control class. To analyze hypothesis and data the researcher used SPSS 21 computer program. Hypothetically, in this hypothesis testing H1 is accepted if the value of $p < 0.05$ or t-bserved > t table. So H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted.

The Description Speaking Post-Test Scores of Control and Experimental Class
The minimum and maximum scores gained after post-test given are 60 and 92. Moreover, the mean value is 80.0, the mode is 80, the median is 80.0 and the standard deviation is 8.0. The result of the scores analysis are drawn in the table of descriptive analysis as shown below.

Table 4: Analysis of Descriptive Post-Test Score on Speaking Skill of the Control Class

N	Sum	Mean	Modus	Median	SD	Max	Min
31	2480	80.0	80	80.0	8.0	92	60

The data obtained from the post-test given to control class showed that the maximum score is 92 and minimum score is 60. Moreover, the mean value of this test is 85.69, the modus is 88.0, the median is 85.69, and the standard deviation is 8.792. The result of the scores analysis are listed in the table of descriptive analysis as shown below.

Table 5: Analysis of Descriptive of The pre-test Score of the Experimental Class

N	Sum	Mean	Modus	Median	SD	Max	Min
29	2485	85.69	88	85.69	8.792	96	60

Table 6: Analysis of Descriptive post-test Scores of the Experiment and Control Class

Group	N	Sum	Mean	Modus	Median	SD	Max	Min
Control	31	2480	80.0	80	80.0	8.0	92	60
Experimental	29	2485	85.69	88	85.69	8.792	96	60

Table 6 shows that there was an increase (21.42) of the mean value on the experimental class (85.69) and there was an increase (16.32) of the mean value on the control class (80.0). It means

that the increase of the mean value on the experimental class is higher than that of the control class.

Inferential Analysis
Normality Test
The researcher apply normality test to see the normal distribution of the data. The researcher used One-sample Kolmogorov – Smirnov. Theoretically, in pre-testing analysis, if the value of p or Asymp. Sig.2-tailed is greater than α (0.05), the data has a normal distribution (Imam Ghozali, 2009:151). However, if the value lower than 0.005 the data is not categorize to normal distribution. The table below presented the value of normality test of students' speaking skill.

Table 7: The value of Normality test of students' speaking skills

Variables	p	A	Interpretation
Pre-test of experimental class	0.330	0.05	Normal
Post-test of experimental class	0.131	0.05	Normal
Pre-test of control class	0.196	0.05	Normal
Post-test of the control class	0.139	0.05	Normal

Test of Homogeneity

Homogeneity test applied to examine whether the variance of sample was homogenous or not. In this study, both classes, experimental and control class, tested using F test to analyze the homogeneity of pre-test and post-test scores. The scores homogenous if Fobserved ≤ Ftable or the score of p is higher than 0.5. The table below presented the homogeneity test of pre and post-test in both classes.

Table 8: the value of pre and post-test of control and experimental class

Sources	Groups	N	F	F tabel	df		p	Level significance	interpretation
Pre-test	control	31		4.007	1	58	0.847		
	experimental	29	0.037					0.05	Homogeneous
Post-test	control	31		4.007	1	58	0.612		
	experimental	29	0.260					0.05	Homogeneous

Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing is aimed at revealing whether there is a significant difference on the Speaking Ability between the students who are using of communicative language Teaching of Student-Centered Approach Using Video and those who are taught without using of Communicative Language Teaching of Student-Centered Approach Using Video. Hypothesis null (H0) must be applied in this study to analyze it was rejected or accepted. Absolutely, the null hypothesis is "there is no significant differences on students' speaking ability between speaking skill between the students who are taught using of Communicative Language Teaching of Student-Centered Approach Using Video and those who are taught without using of Communicative Language Teaching of Student-Centered Approach Using Video".

To analyze hypothesis and data the researcher used SPSS 21 computer program. T-test applied to see the difference mean score of post-test and pre-test in both classes. Hypothetically, in this hypothesis testing H1 is accepted if the value of $p < 0.05$ or t-bserved > t table. So H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted.

Table 9: The Value of T-Test of Post-Test Score on Students' Speaking Ability BetweenThe Students Who are Taught Using Communicative Language Teaching of Student-Centered Approach Using Video and Those Who Are Taught Without Using of Communicative Language Teaching Of Student-Centered Approach Using Video

Data	T-observed	T-tabel	Df	P	α	Interpretation
Post-test	-2.625	2.001	58	0.011	0.05	Significant

From the table above, it can be seen that –tobserved < –ttable, i.e. -2.625 < - 2.001 with, also $p < α$, i.e. 0.011 < 0.05. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected properly. It means that the use of Communicative Language Teaching of Student-Centered Approach Using Video shows a significant difference on the students' Speaking Ability It seen from the results of the post-test after controlling students' pre-test scores.

In addition, it can be said that the use of Communicative Language Teaching of Student-Centered Approach Using Video has a significant influence on the students' Speaking Ability.

Conclusion

Based on data above, the writer suggests some conclusions as follows:
1. The mean value of experimental class after given treatment is 85.69 and mean value of control class is 80.0. It is indicated that students who are taught using communicative language teaching of student centered learning using videos have good speaking skill.
2. The hypothesis in this study "there is significant difference in students' speaking ability who are taught using communicative language teaching of student centered learning using videos and students taught without using communicative language teaching of student centered learning using videos" is accepted. It is proved by the value of t-test of the post-test scores between experimental class and control class. The value t-observed < t-table, i.e -2,625 < -2.001 with $p < α$, i.e 0.011 < 0.05

References

Bashir, M., Azeem, M., & Dogar, A. H. (2011). Factor Effecting Students' English Speaking Skills. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 34-50.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd edition).* New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne, Ed. (1991), *Teaching English as Second or Foreign Language Second Edition*, Massachusetts; Heinle &Heinle Publisher

Cornbeet, s, carter, R. (2001) *The language of speech and writing.* London. Routledge

Doff, A. (1998). Teach English: *A Training Course for Teacher.* Cambridge University Press.

Ghozali, Imam. (2009). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program SPSS.* Semarang: Bp UNDIP.

Harmer, J. (2002). *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3rd Edition).*London: Longman.

Harmon, S. W. & Hirumi, A. (1996). A systematic approach to the integrating of interactive distance learning into education and training. *Journal of Education for Business* 71(5), pp. 267-271. May

Johnson, Burke and Larry Christensen. (2008). *Educational Research*: Third Edition. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kayfetz, J.L (1992)., *Speaking Effectively*, Boston: Heinle Publisher.

Latha, B. M. (2012). Teaching English as a Second Language: Factors Affecting Learning Speaking Skills. *International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology* (IJERT), 1(7), 1-6.

Luoma, S. (*2004*). *Assessing Speaking*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane, (2000)*Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching,* UK; Oxford University Press,.

Mahripah, S. (2014). *Exploring Factors Affecting EFL Learners' Speaking Performance*: from Theories into Practices. Proceedings of the 3rd UAD TEFL International Conference 2014 "Materials Development in Asia and Beyond: Directions, Issues, and Challenges." English Education Department, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Nasiri, A., & Pourhossein Gilakjani, A. (2016). A Review of EFL Learners' Speaking Skill and the Strategies for Improvement. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods (MJLTM), 6*(9), 53-59

Henry G, Tarigan, (1981) *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*, Angkasa, Bandung.

Revee, J. (2016) Autonomy-supportive teaching: What it is, how to do it. In W. C. Liu, J.C. K. Wang, & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Building Autonomous learners perspectives from research and practice using self-determination theory* (pp. 129-152) New York: Springer.

Richards, J.C and Renandya W.A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching (An Anthology of Current Practice).* Cambridge: Cambridge University

Scrivener, Jim,(2005) *Learning Teaching a Guidebook for English Language Teachers Second Edition,* Oxford: Macmillan Publisher.

Säljö, R. (1979). "*Learning in the Learner's Perspective: 1: some commonplace misconceptions*" Reports from the Institute of Education, University of Gothenburg.

David D. Thornburg, (1995) "*Welcome to the communication age*", Internet Research, Vol. 5 Issue: 1, pp.64-70, https://doi.org/10.1108/10662249510084471

Vibulphol, J. (2016). Students' motivation and learning and teachers' motivational strategies in English classrooms in Thailand. *English Language Teaching*, 9(4),64-75. Doi: 10.2239/elt.v9n4p64

Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and Speaking English as a Second Language. *RELC Journal, 37*(3), 308-328.

Woodrow, L. (2017) Motivation in language learning. In R. Breeze & C. Sancho Guinda (Eds.*), Essential competencies for English-medium University teaching* (pp. 235-248). The Netherlands: Springer International Publishing.