

**THE EFFECT OF USING COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE  
TEACHING (CLT) TOWARD WRITING ABILITY OF  
THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS AT STATE  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (SMAN) 1  
KAMPAR TIMUR DISTRICT  
KAMPAR REGENCY**

Thesis

Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of Requirements  
for Getting Bachelor Degree of Education  
(S.Pd.)



By

**DENI PEBRIZAL**

**NIM. 10614003443**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM  
RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1433 H/2012 M**

**THE EFFECT OF USING COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE  
TEACHING (CLT) TOWARD WRITING ABILITY OF  
THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS AT STATE  
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (SMAN) 1  
KAMPAR TIMUR DISTRICT  
KAMPAR REGENCY**

Thesis

Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

for Getting Bachelor Degree of Education

(S.Pd.)



**By**

**DENI PEBRIZAL**

**NIM. 10614003443**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1433 H/2012 M**

## ABSTRAK

**Deni Pebrizal (2012): “Pengaruh Penggunaan Pengajaran Bahasa yang Komunikatif terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Siswa Kelas Dua pada Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri 1 Kecamatan Kamar Timur Kabupaten Kamar”.**

Berdasarkan studi pendahuluan penulis, ditemukan bahwa, siswa tidak bias mencapai Standar Ketuntasan Minimal keterampilan menulis. Siswa mempunyai masalah dalam kemampuan menulis mereka. Hal ini disebabkan beberapa factor. Misalnya, sebagian siswa cenderung membuat kalimat yang tidak menurut tata bahasa dalam mengungkapkan ide-ide mereka; sebagian siswa mempunyai keterbatasan kosa kata dalam mengatur ide-ide mereka. jadi, penulis tertarik melakukan penelitian tentang hal ini.

Penelitian ini mempunyai tiga rumusan masalah yaitu bagaimana kemampuan menulis siswa yang diajar dengan pengajaran bahasa yang komunikatif, bagaimana kemampuan menulis siswa yang diajar tanpa pengajaran bahasa yang komunikatif, dan apakah ada pengaruh yang signifikan dari penggunaan pengajaran bahasa yang komunikatif terhadap kemampuan menulis siswa.

Penelitian ini diadakan di Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri 1 Kecamatan Kamar Timur Kabupaten Kamar. Subjek dari penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas dua Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri 1 Kecamatan Kamar Timur Kabupaten Kamar dan objek penelitian ini adalah pengaruh penggunaan pengajaran bahasa yang komunikatif terhadap kemampuan siswa dalam menulis. Dua variable yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah pengaruh penggunaan pengajaran bahasa yang komunikatif sebagai variable X dan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis sebagai variable Y. Adapun jenis penelitian ini adalah penelitian quasi eksperimen.

Populasi dari penelitian ini adalah seluruh siswa tahun kedua dan penulis mengambil 2 kelas sebagai sampel; XI 2 yang terdiri dari 36 siswa sebagai kelas eksperimen dan XI 1 yang terdiri dari 35 siswa sebagai kelas control. Ada dua alat ukur yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Alat ukur pertama adalah observasi dan yang kedua adalah tes. Observasi dilakukan untuk mengidentifikasi implementasi dari penggunaan pengajaran bahasa yang komunikatif terhadap kemampuan siswa dalam menulis, dan tes digunakan untuk mengidentifikasi kemampuan siswa dalam menulis. Untuk menganalisa data, peneliti menggunakan rumus T test secara manual.

Berdasarkan hasil analisa data, penulis menemukan bahwa ada pengaruh yang signifikan dari penggunaan pengajaran bahasa yang komunikatif terhadap kemampuan menulis siswa kelas dua pada Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri 1 Kamar Timur, dimana T menunjukkan 7.30 pada level signifikan 5% adalah 2.00, sedangkan pada level signifikan 1% adalah 2.65. Hal ini dapat dibaca 2.00 lebih kecil dari 7.30 lebih besar dari 2.65. Hal ini berarti  $H_0$  ditolak, sedangkan  $H_a$  diterima.

## THE LIST OF CONTENTS

<b>SUPERVISOR APPROVAL</b> .....	i
<b>EXAMINER APPROVAL</b> .....	ii
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENT</b> .....	iii
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	vi
<b>THE LIST OF CONTENTS</b> .....	ix
<b>THE LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	xii
<b>THE LIST OF APPENDICES</b> .....	xiii
<b>CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
A. The Background.....	1
B. The Definition of the Terms.....	5
C. The Problem.....	5
1. The Identification of the Problem .....	5
2. The Limitation of the Problem.....	6
3. The Formulation of the Problem .....	6
D. The Objective and Significance of the Research .....	6
1. The Objective of the Research .....	6
2. The Significance of the Research.....	7
<b>CHAPTER II : REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>	
A. Theoretical Framework.....	8
1. The Nature of Writing.....	8
2. Writing Ability .....	10
3. The Nature of Paragraph .....	13
4. Communicative Language Teaching.....	15
a. The Nature of Communicative Language Teaching.....	15
b. The Procedure of Communicative Language teaching.....	22
B. The Relevant Research.....	23
C. The Operational Concept .....	24

	D. The Assumption and Hypothesis .....	27
	1. The Assumption .....	27
	2. The Hypothesis .....	27
<b>CHAPTER III</b>	<b>: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>28</b>
	A. The Design of the Research .....	28
	B. The Location and Time of the Research .....	29
	C. The Subject and Object of the Research .....	29
	D. The Population and the Sample of the Research.....	29
	E. The Technique of Data Collection .....	31
	F. The Technique of Data Analysis.....	34
<b>CHAPTER IV</b>	<b>: PRESENTATION OF DATA ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>35</b>
	A. Data Presentation .....	35
	1. The Students' Writing Ability on Pre-Test.....	38
	a. Experimental Class .....	38
	b. Control Class.....	40
	1. The Difference of Students' Writing Ability on Pre-Test .....	41
	2. The Students' Writing Ability on Post-Test .....	43
	a. Experimental Class.....	43
	b. Control Class.....	45
	3. The Difference of Students' Writing Ability on Post-Test.....	46
	B. Data Analysis .....	48
	1. The Students' Score before Giving New Treatment (Communicative Language Teaching) for Experimental Group.....	49
	a. Experimental Group.....	49
	b. Control Group.....	50
	2. The Students' Score after Giving New Treatment (Communicative Language Teaching) for Experimental Group .....	51

	a. Experimental Group.....	51
	b. Control group.....	53
	3. The Effect of Using Communicative Language Teaching Toward Students' Writing Ability. ....	54
	C. Testing Hypothesis.....	59
<b>CHAPTER V</b>	<b>: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION</b> .....	61
	A. Conclusion .....	61
	B. Suggestion.....	62
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....		63
<b>APPENDICES</b>		
<b>CURRICULUM VITAE</b>		

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Quasi Experimental Design.....	28
Table 2	The Population and Sample of the Research.....	30
Table 3	The Classification of Students' Score .....	31
Table 4	The Recapitulation of the Data Observation.....	36
Table 5	The Students' Writing Ability on Pre-Test in Experimental Class .....	38
Table 6	The Students' Writing Ability on Pre-Test in Control Class .....	40
Table 7	The Difference of Experimental and Control Group in Writing Ability on Pre-Test.....	42
Table 8	The Students' Score on Post-Test in Experimental Class.....	43
Table 9	The Students' Score on Post-Test in control Class .....	45
Table 10	The Difference of Experimental and Control Group in Writing Ability on Post-Test .....	47
Table 11	The Simple Description of Experimental Group's Score on Pre- Test.....	49
Table 12	The Simple Description of Control Group's Score on Pre-Test .	50
Table 13	The Description of Experimental Group's Score on Post-Test..	51
Table 14	The Description of Control Group's Score on Post-Test.....	53
Table 15	Mean and Standard Deviation of the Score.....	55

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### A. Background of the Problem

Writing is one of four language competences in English. Writing is not easy. It needs study hard and much practice to develop it into the behavior activity. According to Miller, writing is an activity to make sense of the information that present ideas and it enables student to communicate effectively.<sup>1</sup> Then, Nunan states that writing is a skill that needs practice every day because it is a long and often painful process.<sup>2</sup> Writing is one of essential productive English skills that students should master. It plays an important role in ESL/EFL learning. Lois T. Milie stated “A student who is not writing cannot improve”<sup>3</sup>. As the essential skill, writing should be taught intensively at school. The process of learning writing has widely spread from junior level of education through university levels. Especially in Senior High Schools, writing has been a compulsory subject and part of overall evaluation of English learning.

State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur (SMAN 1 Kampar Timur) is one of senior high schools in Kampar Regency. English is served as a compulsory subject in this school. At the second grade of State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur, based on school based curriculum (KTSP), writing monologue text in the form of reports, narratives, and analytical exposition is the indicator of students’ success in writing. Writing is a skill that students should acquire in a language classroom. Writing can improve the students’ language and stimulate students’ cognitive that is useful for students who learn a language. In writing, the

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert Keith Miller. *Motives for Writing*. 5<sup>th</sup> Edition. (New York: McGraw Hill. Inc. 2005)p. 1

<sup>2</sup>David Nunan, *Language Testing Methodology*. (London: Prentice hall International, 1991) p. 8

<sup>3</sup>Hughey, et. Al. *Teaching ESLComposition: Priciples and Technique*. (Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, inc. 1983) p. 50

students are trained to be a good writer. But, for some students, writing is more difficult than other skills.

Based on the writer's observation in State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur (SMAN 1 Kampar Timur), students have problems in writing. They have difficulty in forming the idea they have in mind into the form of written text. Many students do not know about the grammar and suitable vocabularies that will be used in writing. As the effect, the students' ability in writing is lower than the standard minimum criteria of achievement (KKM) of English subject at State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur (SMAN 1 Kampar Timur). The minimum criteria of achievement (KKM) English subject at State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur (SMAN 1 Kampar Timur) is 78. The problems of the students in SMAN 1 Kampar are mentioned in the following phenomena as follows:

1. The students tend to construct ungrammatical sentences in expressing their ideas.
2. The students have limited vocabulary in organizing their idea.
3. The students have lack of making written English.
4. The students find difficulties in organizing form of paragraph.
5. The students have limited knowledge of grammar.

Based on the phenomena above, the teacher should have an appropriate method in teaching writing in order that the students can solve their problems in writing skill. Furthermore, to help students in solving their problem in writing skill, the researcher applied new method that is Communicative Language Teaching. Communicative Language Teaching is different from other methods because it focuses on student's interaction with the teacher and other students as a means of creating language skills in a new language. Communicative language teaching has an aim to make communicative competence as the

goal of language teaching and develop procedure for teaching of the four language skills. Littlewood in Jack C Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers states that one of the most characteristic of the most features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language.<sup>4</sup>

In communicative language teaching, the implication for the learner is that they should contribute as much as they gain, and thereby learn in an interdependent way. The teachers have a role to facilitate the communication process between all participants in the classroom and to act as independent participant within the learning-teaching group.<sup>5</sup>

Richards and Rogers in Kalayo Hasibuan and Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari state that there are some principles of Communicative language Teaching.<sup>6</sup> They are:

- a. Language should be a means to an end and the focus should be on meaning, not on the form
- b. The learner has to formulate and produce ideas, information, opinions and so on
- c. Teacher intervention to correct mistakes should be minimal as this distracts from communication

In addition, by using communicative language teaching students are expected to interact with other people, either in the flesh, through pair and group work, or in their writing.<sup>7</sup>

Based on the explanation and the problem above, the writer is interested in conducting a research entitled **The Effect of Using Communicative Language**

---

<sup>4</sup>Richards, Jack C and Rodgers, Theodore S, *Approach and Methods in Language Teaching*. (New York: Cambridge University press, 1986 )p. 66

<sup>5</sup>Ibid; p. 77

<sup>6</sup>Hasibuan, Kalayo and Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari, *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. (Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press, 2007) p. 60

<sup>7</sup>Ibid; p. 68

## **Teaching (CLT) toward Writing Ability of the Second Year Students at State Senior High School (SMAN) 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency.**

### **B. Definiton of the Term**

1. Writing is words that have been written or printed on something.<sup>8</sup> In this research, writing means as the act.
2. Ability is a level of skill or intelligent.<sup>9</sup>
3. According to Richard & Rodgers, Communicative Language Teaching is an approach that aim to make communicative competence the goal of language teaching and develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication.<sup>10</sup>

### **C. Problem**

#### **1. Identication of the Problem**

From the background above, the problems can be identified as follows:

- a. Why do the students tend to construct ungramatical sentences in expressing their ideas?
- b. Why do the students have limited vocabulary in organizing their idea in writing form?
- c. Why do the students have lack of making written English?

---

<sup>8</sup>Hornby, AS. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Six Edition)*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2000) p. 996

<sup>9</sup>Ibid. p 2

<sup>10</sup>Richards, Jack C and Rodgers, Theodore S. Op. Cit.p. 66

- d. Why do the students found difficulties in organizing form of paragraph?
- e. Why do the students have limited knowledge of grammar?

## **2. Limitation of the Problem**

In this research, it is necessary to limit the problem. So, the writer limites problems of the research only to find out the effect of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) toward writing ability of the second year students at State Senior High School (SMAN) 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency.

## **3. The Formulation of the Problem**

The problem of this research will be formulated in the following questions:

- a. How is the students' writing ability taught by using Communicative Language Teaching?
- b. How is the students' writing ability not taught by using Communicative Language Teaching?
- c. Is there any significant effect of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) toward writing ability of the second year students at state senior high school (SMAN) 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency?

## **D. The Objective and Significance of the Research**

### **1. The Objective of the Research**

- a. To find out the students' writing ability at the second year of SMAN 1 Kampar Timur who taught by Communicative Language Teaching.
- b. To find out the students' writing ability at the second year of SMAN 1 Kampar Timur who not taught by Communicative Language Teaching.

- c. To know Is there any significant effect of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) toward writing ability of the second year students at state senior high school (SMAN) 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency?

## 2. **The Significance of the Research**

By doing the research, the researcher hopes that it can:

- a. Enlarge researchers' knowledge about the real teaching process.
- b. Fulfil one of the requirements of S.1 degree of English Education Department of Education and Teachers Training Faculty of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau Pekanbaru.
- c. Give information to the teacher about the use of Communicative Language teaching to improve writing ability at the second year students of SMAN 1 Kampar Timur.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### A. Theoretical Framework

##### 1. The Nature of Writing

Writing is a tool for communication. Writing is a form of communication between the writer and the reader which the writer can express the ideas, the feelings, the opinion, and the thoughts. Nunan states that writing means of transmission of a message from one place to another.<sup>1</sup> It means writing is a tool of communication through written form to give information to somebody else that cannot be done directly through oral communication because of limitation of time, distance, and chance to communication face to face. In writing, we have to consider many aspects in order to send our ideas in a correct form so that our writing is readable and understood. Writing involves some aspects namely structure, vocabulary, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation as well. The complex process in writing makes it so difficult to do. Heaton states that writing skills are complex cognitive activities and sometimes difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only on grammatical and rhetorical device but also on conceptual and judgement element.<sup>2</sup>

John Langan, in his 'book English Skills', emphasizes that competent writing is a skill that anyone can learn with practice. It is a process consisting of a number of principles and techniques that can be studied and mastered.<sup>3</sup>

Based on Syafi'i et.al, there are eleven rules for writing:<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>David Nunan. Op. Cit. p. 8

<sup>2</sup>Heaton, J. B. *Writing English Language Test*. (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1975) p.135.

<sup>3</sup> John Langan. *English Skills (7th ed)*. (New York: McGraw-Hill. 2001) p. 3

<sup>4</sup> M. Syafi'i, S. *The Effective Paragraph Development; The Process of Writing for Classroom Setting*. (Pekanbaru: LBSI. 2007)p 90-91.

- a. To join to independent clauses, use a comma followed by a conjunction, a semicolon alone, or a semicolon followed by sentence modifier.
- b. Use commas to bracket nonrestrictive phrase, which are not essential to sentence's meaning.
- c. Do not use commas to bracket phrase that are essential to a sentence's meaning.
- d. When beginning a sentence with an introductory phrase or an introductory (dependent) clause, include a comma.
- e. To indicate possession, end a singular noun with an apostrophe followed by an "s". Otherwise, the noun's form seems plural.
- f. Use proper punctuation to integrate a quotation into a sentence. If the introductory material is an independent clause, add the quotation after a colon. If introductory material ends in "thinks," "saying," or some other verb indicating expression, use a comma.
- g. Make the subject and verb agree with each other, not with a word that comes between them.
- h. Be sure that a pronoun, a participial phrase, or an appositive refers clearly to the proper subject.
- i. Use parallel construction to make a strong point and create a smooth flow.
- j. Use the active voice unless you specifically need to use the passive.
- k. Omit unnecessary words.

## **2. Writing ability**

Writing ability is the ability of a person to express his/her ideas, feelings, or something in his/her minds to others by using written language. In addition to writing ability, Graves, et al say that we use writing as a vehicle to learn about something or understand it.<sup>5</sup>

Discussing about writing, there are several types of writing, say for example Brown divides the classroom writing performance into five genres, they are:<sup>6</sup>

a. Imitative or writing Down

This type of writing performance is for the novice writers, the students will simply write down English letters, words, and possibly sentences in order to learn the conversation of the orthographic code.

b. Intensive or Controlled

This type writing focussed on grammatical concepts. This type would not allow much, if any, creativity on the part of writer.

c. Self Writing

A significant proportion of classroom writing may be devoted to self writing, or writing with only the self in mind as an audience.

d. Display Writing

It is already noted earlier that writing within the school curricular context is a way of life. For all, language students, short answer exercises, essay examinations, and even research reports will involve an element of display.

e. Real Writing

---

<sup>5</sup> Graves, F. Michael, et al. *Teaching Reading in 21st Century (Second edition)*. (Singapore: Allyn & Bacon, A Pearson Education Company. 2001) p 420

<sup>6</sup> Brown, H. Douglas. *Teaching by Principles*. (San Francisco: State University. 1994) p 327-330

Real writing is a product of written text in any types of writing products, under which the messages written can be easily communicated by both writer and reader with communicative language.

Generally, in writing ability we have to know the components of writing. Jacobs L. Holly et. al state that there are five components of writing, they are:<sup>7</sup>

#### 1. Content

It means that the ability to think creatively and develop thought, excluding all irrelevant information.

#### 2. Organization

Fluent expression, ideas clearly states, well organized, and logically sequenced a cohesive. An essay is coherent if its paragraphs are woven together of flow into each other. An essay, which lack of unity or orderly movement will not be coherent, the readers cannot move easily from one paragraph which is no relation to the first.

#### 3. Vocabulary

In writing, there should be sophisticated range, effective word idiom, word choice and its usage.

#### 4. Language Use

Grammar or a language is description of speaking and writing habits of people who use it. In composition paragraphs or texts, the knowledge of is very important. Without them, the writers will not be able to use it. So, the readers may not catch the points of writer's message.

---

<sup>7</sup>Jacobs L. Holly. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. (Massachusetts: Newbury House Publisher inc. 1981)p 30.

## 5. Mechanics

Essay writing is mechanically good if its writer demonstrates mastery of conventions, good spelling, punctuation, capitalization and paragraphing and also hand writing. The ability to give ideas in writing form is not easy, especially for students. They should have a good feeling in everything which is interesting in a paragraph. Therefore, it is necessary for them to guide, and no control their ideas, which can be applied in teaching writing.

It is also supported by Hughey et al states that there are five components of writing. They are content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.<sup>8</sup>

### 3. Nature of Paragraph

The term of paragraph can be defined in many ways. As syafi'i et al. said, "Paragraph is a unit of information in writing that unified by a central idea". From the statement above, we conclude that paragraph is a part of writing that explains the central idea/ main idea, and each paragraph has sentence. Every sentence in the paragraph must help to develop the topic sentence and support each other in order to make the writing become a good composition.

From the statement above, it can be seen that there is a very close relationship between sentences and paragraph. That is why paragraph must be constructed by at least one sentence. A paragraph expresses an idea built by a group of related sentences. In order to make a paragraph easy to be understood, the sentences should be arrange systematically. Therefore, to make a good writing in a paragraph, it is very important for the writers to use

---

<sup>8</sup>Hughey B. Jane et al. *Teaching ESL Composition: Principles and Techniques.*( Massachusetts: Newbury House Publisher inc. 1983)p 140

the parts of a paragraph correctly. As syafi'i et al state, there are some part of paragraph, they are:<sup>9</sup>

a. Topic Sentence

The topic sentence is the most general statement of the paragraph. It determines the content, flow and style you want communicate. It does not only name the topic of the paragraph, but also limits the topic to one or two areas that can be discussed completely in the space of a single paragraph.

b. Supporting Sentence

Supporting sentence develops the topic sentence. The function of supporting sentence is to provide the reader with evidence that the idea expressed in the topic sentence is true.

c. Concluding Sentence

A concluding sentence signals the end of the a paragraph and leaves the reader with the important points to remember. This sentence tells the reader that the paragraph is finished, and it completes the picture or story about the subject of the paragraph.

After knowing the parts of paragraph, we should know the process of writing, they are:

a. Prewriting

Prewriting is viewed as thinking before writing. A writer will strive hard to perform the product of this writing in a good performance either in the aspect of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, or mechanics. There are some steps in prewriting, such as choosing and narrowing a topic, brainstorming (listing, free writing, and clustering).

---

<sup>9</sup>M. Syafi'I, S. Op.cit p 2

#### b. Planning (Outlining)

In the planning stage, we need to organize the ideas generated by brainstorming. The steps of planning are brainstorming by listing, grouping, writing the topic sentence, and simple outlining.

#### c. Writing and Revising Draft

After doing brainstorming and outlining as the first and the second process of writing, we can start to write and revise several drafts “frequently” until we have produce a final copy (writing product) to hand it.

### **4. Communicative Language Teaching.**

#### **a. The Nature of communicative Language Teaching.**

An approach is a set of correlative assumption dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning. An approach is axiomatic. It describes the nature of the subject matter to be taught.<sup>10</sup>

Method is an overall plan for the orderly presentation of language material, no part of which contradicts, and all of which is based upon, the selected approach. An approach is axiomatic, a method is procedural.<sup>11</sup>

A technique is implementational- that which actually takes places in class room. It is particular trick, stratagem, or contrivance used to accomplish an immediate objective.<sup>12</sup>

Strategy is a plan of action designed to achieve an overall aim. Strategy usually requires some sort of planning. You'd probably use strategy when faced with a new situation. While, Model is a comprehensive and systematic approach to assessment,

---

<sup>10</sup> Richards, Jack C and Rodgers, Theodore S. Op. Cit. p. 15

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. 15

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. 15

treatment, and evaluation which includes theoretical principles, clinical indications, contraindications, goals, methodological guidelines and specifications, and the characteristic use of certain procedural sequences and techniques.<sup>13</sup>

According to Richard & Rodgers, Communicative Language Teaching is approach that aims to make communicative competence as the goal of language teaching and to develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication.<sup>14</sup>

CLT have the purpose to form and develop communicative competence and develop procedures for teaching four language skills. According to Richard in Communicative Language Teaching Today, communicative competence includes the following aspects of language knowledge:

1. Knowing how to use language for a variety of different purposes and functions.
2. Knowing how to use of many language according to the setting and the participants (e.g. knowing when to use formal and informal speech or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication).
3. Knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts (e.g. narratives, reports, interviews, conversations).
4. Knowing how to keep communication besides there are limitations in one's language knowledge (e.g. through using different kinds of communication strategies).

Richards and Rogers in Kalayo Hasibuan and Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari state that there are some principles of Communicative language Teaching.<sup>15</sup> They are:

---

<sup>13</sup><http://ulyarosyita.blogspot.com/2011/03/what-is-difference-between-strategy.html>. Retrieved 21-06-2012.

<sup>14</sup>Richards, Jack C and Rodgers, Theodore S. Op. Cit p. 66

<sup>15</sup>Hasibuan, Kalayo and Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari, Op.cit. p. 60

1. Language should be a means to an end and the focus should be on meaning, not on the form.
2. The learner has to formulate and produce ideas, information, opinions, and so on.
2. Teacher intervention to correct mistakes should be minimal as this distracts from communication.

In addition, Communicative Language Teaching is viewed as approach to teaching. It sees fluency and the ability to communicate in a variety of settings and in a variety of ways (verbal and non verbal, written) at the core of teaching and learning.<sup>16</sup>

Communicative Language Teaching usually is characterized as a broad approach to teaching, rather than as a teaching method with a clearly defined set of classroom practices. As such, it is most often defined as a list of general principles or features. One of the most recognized of these list is David Nunan's five features of CLT:<sup>17</sup>

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
2. The introduction of authentic text into learning situation.
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the learning management process.
4. An enhancement of learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements of classroom learning.
5. An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom.

These five features are claimed by practitioners of CLT to show that they are interested in the need and desire of their learners as well as the connection between the language as it

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. p. 39

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/knowledge-wiki/communicative-approach/>. Retrieved 12 April 2011.

is taught in their class and as it used outside the classroom. Any teaching practice that helps students communicative competence in an authentic context is deemed an acceptable and beneficial form of instruction. Thus, in the classroom CLT often takes the form of pair and group work requiring negotiation and cooperation between learners, fluency-based activities that encourage learners to develop their confidence, role-play in which students practice and develop language function.

In addition, by using communicative language teaching students are expected to interact with other people, either in the flesh, through pair and group work, or in their writing.<sup>18</sup>

Communicative language teaching advocates subscribed a broad set of principles such as these (Rodgers):<sup>19</sup>

1. Learners learn a language through using it to communicate.
2. Authentic and meaningful communication should be the goal of classroom activities.
3. Fluency is an important dimension of communication.
3. Communication involves the integration of different language skills.
4. Learning is a process of creative construction and involves trial and error.

Brown states four characteristics as definition of CLT, they are:<sup>20</sup>

1. Classroom goals are focused on all of the components of communicative competence and not restricted to grammatical or linguistic competence.
2. Language techniques are designed to engage learner in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes. Organizational language forms are

---

<sup>18</sup> Richard, Jack C and Rodgers, Theodore S, Op.Cit; p. 68

<sup>19</sup> Hasibuan, Kalayo and Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari. Op. Cit. p. 59

<sup>20</sup> Brown, H. Douglas, *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (San Francisco: State University. 2000) p 266-267

not the central focus but rather aspects of language that enable the learner to accomplish those purpose.

3. Fluency and accuracy are seen complementary principles underlying communicative techniques. At times fluency may have to take on more important than accuracy in order to keep learner meaningfully engaged in language use.
4. In the communicative classroom, students ultimately have to use language productively (spoken and written) and receptively (read and listened).

Moreover, Howatt in Locchana and Language in Kalayo distinguishes between the weak and the strong version of Communicative Language Teaching. The weak version stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use English for communicative purposes and therefore attempts to integrate communicative activities into the program of language teaching. This is the version followed in most learning contexts, especially in Asian countries. As different from this, the stronger version of communicative language teaching claims that language can be acquired only through communication. This would mean that teaching involves not just “activating an existing knowledge of the language”, but “stimulating the development of the language system itself”. However, whether it is weak or the strong version, the proponents of Communicative Language Teaching have always viewed learning a second/foreign language as acquiring the linguistic means to perform different functions.<sup>21</sup>

In learning and teaching process, the role of learners as negotiator between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which

---

<sup>21</sup> Hasibuan, Kalayo and Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari. Op. Cit. p. 60

the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an interdependent way.

Breen & Candlin in Rodgers & Theodors state that the teacher has two main roles: the first is to facilitate the communication process between all participants in the classroom, and between these participants and the various activities and texts. And the second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group. The latter role is closely related to the objectives of the first role and arises from it. These roles imply a set of secondary roles for the teacher; first, as an organizer of resources and as a resource himself, second as a guide within the classroom procedures and activities. Other roles assumed for the teacher are need analyst, counselor, and group process manager.<sup>22</sup>

#### **b. The Procedure of Communicative language Teaching**

According to Diane Larson Freeman states that there are several procedures of Communicative language Teaching that have:<sup>23</sup>

1. Teacher greets the class and distributes a hand out.
2. Teacher tells the students to underline the writer told about.
3. Teacher gives the students the direction for the activity in target language.
4. The students try to state the writer told about in different words.
5. The students unscramble the sentences of the newspaper article.
6. The students play a language game.

---

<sup>22</sup> Richards, Jack C and Rodgers, Theodore S. Op. Cit. p. 77

<sup>23</sup> Diane Larson Freeman. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. (New York: Oxford University Press).p.125-128

7. The students are asked what they know about the article.
8. A student makes an error. The teacher and other students ignore it.
9. Teacher gives each group of students a strip story and a task to perform.
10. The students work with a partner to predict what the next pictures in the strip story will look like.
11. The students are to do a role play. They are to imagine that they are all employee of the same company.
12. The teacher reminds the students that one of them is playing the role of the boss and that they should remember this when speaking to her.
13. Teacher moves from group to group offering advice and answering question.
14. The students suggest alternative forms they would use to state a prediction to a colleague.
15. After the role play is finished, the students elicit relevant vocabulary.
16. For their home work, the students are to listen to a debate on the radio or watch it on television. They are then to write in English what they have listened or watched.

**b. Relevant Research**

In order to avoid plagiarism, the writer states two researchers dealing Communicative Language Teaching. They are:

1. Cai Wenjie (2009) did his online published research entitled “Using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) to Improve Speaking Ability of Chinese Non-English Major Students”. The study was conducted with the cooperation of Chinese Non-English Major Students at University of Wisconsin-Platteville which the problem presented in this paper was to identify how Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) improved the speaking ability of Chinese non-English major students. The main purpose of learning language

was to communicate with native speakers. But the commonest teaching method in the university in China was the Grammar Teaching. This kind of teaching method emphasized the reading and writing skills. Also, it was a teacher-centered situation, students just need to listen. Students have no time to practice their speaking skill. Therefore, the researcher researched it as problem of the research. The population of the research was the Chinese non-English major students that consisted of 46-55 students.

2. Herlina (2008) did her research entitled “The Effectiveness of Using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Developing Students’ Activeness in Completing Pair and Group Task at The Second Year of MAN 2 MODEL Pekanbaru”. The object of her study was to find out the effectiveness of CLT in developing students’ activeness in completing pair and group task. This research was conducted by experiment study toward two groups. The subject of the study was the students at the second year of MAN 2 MODEL. The population of her study was 64 students. She or the researcher applied the pre-test and post-test of speaking ability into two groups. After testing, the students who used the CLT have better increasing in completing pair and group task than the students who did not used the CLT.

### **c. Operational Concept**

To clarify the theory used in this research, the operational concept is used to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation. It is an important element in scientific study because the concepts are still operated in an abstract from the research planning which must be interpreted into particular words in order to be easily measured empirically. In analyzing the use of Communicative Language Teaching to improve Students’ writing ability, the

writer uses several indicators as guidance to conduct this research. There are two variable in this research. They are X, namely; communicative language teaching, and Y, namely; students' writing ability. X is independent variable and Y is dependent variable. The indicators are as follows:

1. Variable X (teaching Procedures by using Communicative Language Teaching(CLT))

- a. Teacher greets the class and distributes a hand out
- b. Teacher tells the students to underline the writer told about.
- c. Teacher gives the students the direction for the activity in target language.
- d. The students try to state the writer told about in different word.
- e. The students unscramble the sentences of the newspaper article.
- f. The students play a language game.
- g. The students are asked what they know about the article.
- h. A student makes an error. The teacher and other students ignore it.
- i. Teacher gives each group of students a strip story and a task to perform.
- j. The students work with a partner to predict what the next pictures in the strip story will look like.
- k. The students are to do a role play. They are to imagine that they are all employee of the same company.
- l. The teacher reminds the students that one of them is playing the role of the boss and that they should remember this when speaking to her.
- m. Teacher moves from group to group offering advice and answering question.
- n. The students suggest alternative forms they would use to state a prediction to a colleague.

- o. After the role play is finished, the students elicit relevant vocabulary.
- p. For their home work, the students are to listen to a debate on the radio or watch it on television. They are then to write in English what they have listened or watched.

2. Variable Y (students' writing ability)

- a. The students are able to think creatively and develop thought, excluding all irrelevant information.
- b. The students are able to organize their ideas clearly.
- c. The students are able to use appropriate vocabulary to express the ideas into written form.
- d. The students are able to write grammatical sentence in order to make the reader may catch the point of writer's message.
- e. The students are able demonstrate the mastery of conventions, good spelling, punctuation, capitalization and paragraphing and also hand writing

**d. The Assumptions and the Hypothesis**

**1. The Assumptions**

Before constructing the hypothesis, the researcher would like to offer some assumptions:

- a. The students' writing ability is varied.
- b. The difference methods in teaching writing might make the different in the students' writing ability.

## **2. The Hypothesis**

Based on the assumptions above the researcher formulates two hypotheses as follows:

Ho: There is no significant difference of students' writing ability who taught by Communicative Language Teaching and who taught by audio-lingual method at the second year of SMAN 1 Kampar Timur.

Ha: There is significant difference of students' writing ability who taught by Communicative Language Teaching and who are not taught by Communicative Language Teaching at the second year of SMAN 1 Kampar Timur.

**CHAPTER III**  
**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**A. The Research Design**

This research is an experimental research. According to Creswell, “in an experiment, you test an idea (or practice or procedure) to determine whether it influences an outcome or dependent variable.”<sup>1</sup> This experimental research uses Quasi Experimental design. In this design, the researcher can use pre- and posttest design. Furthermore Creswell says that the researcher can use intact group the experimental and control treatments, give a pre-test to both groups, hold experimental treatment activities with the experimental group only, after that give a post-test to assess the differences between the two groups<sup>2</sup>.

**Table III.1**  
**Quasi Experimental Design**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Pre-Test</b>	<b>Treatment</b>	<b>Post-Test</b>
B	T1		T2
C	T1	X	T2

Explanation:

B : Experimental group

C : Control Group

T1 : Pre-test for experimental group and control group

: Receiving particular treatment

X : without particular treatment

T2 : Post-test for experimental group and control group<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> John W. Creswell. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research (3rd Edition)*. (New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc. 2008). p. 299.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 313-314.

<sup>3</sup> Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2008), p. 25

## **B. Location and Time of the Research**

The research was conducted at State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency. This research was conducted from October until November 2011.

## **C. Subject and Object of the Research**

The subject of this research was the second year students of State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency, while the object of this research was students' writing ability through Communicative Language Teaching.

## **D. Population and Sample**

The population of this research was the second year students of State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency. The students were divided into 8 classes consisting of 5 classes of science and 3 classes of social studies. The number of second year students of State Islamic Senior High School was 286 students.

**Table III.2**  
**The Total Population Of Second Year Students Of State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency**

No	Class	Students
1.	XI Science 1	35
2.	XI Science 2	36
3.	XI Science 3	35
4.	XI Science 4	37
5.	XI Science 5	35
6.	XI Social 1	37
7.	XI Social 2	35
8.	XI Social 3	36
Total		286

The population of 286 students was large enough to be taken as samples. Because all samples had the same characteristic, Gay and Airasian suggest that the writer can use Cluster sampling. So the writer selected two groups of students to be taken as samples<sup>4</sup>.

All of the samples had the same opportunity to be taken as the representatives of all samples. Furthermore because they were homogenous, the writer randomly chose class XI Science 2 as an experimental group and class XI Science 3 as a control group. The experimental group consisted of 36 students, while the control group consisted of 35 Students. So, 71 students were representative enough to be sample of the research.

## **E. Data Collection Technique**

In this research, the writer collected the data by using:

### 1. Observation

Observation was the way to organize and control student's behavior, movement and interaction by the teacher or writer. In this research, the writer applied participant observation. The writer directly observed the process of teaching and learning in the classroom.

### 2. Test

Test was used to measure the ability of objects being researched<sup>5</sup>. The Test, in this technique was divided into two ways; pretest was given before the treatment and posttest

---

<sup>4</sup> L. R. Gay and Peter Airasian. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (6th ed.)*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2000).p. 129

<sup>5</sup> Suharsimi Arikunto. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik (6th ed.)*. (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2006)p. 223.

was given after doing the treatment. To measure the ability of analytical exposition writing ability, the writer used ESL Composition Profile taken from Syafii<sup>6</sup> and Jacobs<sup>7</sup>:

**Table III. 3**  
**The Scoring Guide of the English Composition Test for Teachers**

Aspects	Range	Criteria
<b>Content</b>	30-27	<i>Excellent to Very Good:</i> Knowledgeable, substantive, through development of thesis, relevant to assigned topic.
	26-22	<i>Good to Average:</i> Some knowledgeable of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to topic, but lacks details
	21-17	<i>Fair to Poor:</i> limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic
	16-13	<i>Very Poor:</i> does not show the knowledge of subject, non substantive, not pertinent, not enough to evaluate.
<b>Organization</b>	20-18	<i>Excellent to Very Good:</i> Fluent expression, ideas clearly stated or supported, well organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.
	17-14	<i>Very Good to Average:</i> somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing
	13-10	<i>Fair to Poor:</i> non fluent, ideas confused or disconnect, lacks logical sequencing and development
	9-7	<i>Very Poor:</i> does not communicate, no organization, not enough to evaluate
<b>Vocabulary</b>	20-18	<i>Excellent to Very Good:</i> sophisticated range, effective word or idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register
	17-14	<i>Good to Average:</i> adequate range, occasional errors of word or

<sup>6</sup> M. Syafii, *et al. Op Cit.*p. 139-150

<sup>7</sup> Holly L. Jacobs, *et al. Op Cit.*p. 90

		idiom form, usage but meaning not obscured
	13-10	<i>Fair to Poor:</i> limited range, frequent errors of word or idiom form, choice, usage, meaning confused or obscured
	9-7	<i>Very Poor:</i> essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form, or not enough to evaluate
<b>Language Use</b>	20-18	<i>Excellent to Very Good:</i> Effective complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order or functions, articles, pronouns, prepositions.
	17-14	<i>Very Good to Average:</i> Effective but simple constructions, minor problems in complex constructions, several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order of functions, articles, pronouns, preposition but meaning never obscured.
	13-10	<i>Fair to Poor:</i> major problems in simple or complex constructions, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order or functions, articles, pronouns, prepositions and or fragments, deletions, meaning confused or obscured
	9-7	<i>Very Poor:</i> virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors, does not communicate, not enough to evaluate
<b>Mechanics</b>	10	<i>Excellent to Very Good:</i> demonstrates mastery of conventions, few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
	7	<i>Very Good to Average:</i> occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, but meaning not obscured
	4	<i>Fair to Poor:</i> frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, poor handwriting, meaning confused or obscured
	2	<i>Very Poor:</i> no mastery of conventions, dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegible, or not enough

		to evaluate.
Total Score:		Comment:

## F. Data Analysis Technique

In this research, the data were analyzed by using statistical method. The writer used score of posttest of the test of the experiment group and control group. The writer analyzed the data by using t-test to know whether the result of the research was statistically significant. The data were analyzed by using formula below<sup>8</sup>:

$$T: \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Explanation:

To = Table Observation

$M_x$  = Mean score of Experimental Class

$M_y$  = Mean Score of Control class

$SD_x$  = Standard Deviation of Experiment class

$SD_y$  = Standard Deviation of Control class

N = Number of students/Sample

---

<sup>8</sup> Hartono. *Op Cit.*p.193

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION OF THE DATA ANALYSIS

#### A. Data Presentation

The data of the research were taken from the students' scores of writing ability of the second year students at State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency on pre-test and post-test of both classes: experimental and control class. The experimental class had been taught by Communicative Language Teaching Method while control class had been taught by conventional strategy. Furthermore, to analyze the data, the writer analyzed post-test result because it influenced larger the research finding rather than pre-test. Post-test was given to the students in both classes after treatment was complete during eight meetings and the results of test were evaluated by two raters.

In the teaching process, the writer also observed the use of Communicative Language Teaching Method toward writing ability of the second year students at State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency. The purpose of observation was only to describe the condition of classroom participant itself and how the teacher treated the debate method in the class room. The observation was conducted by the English teacher. The writer treated experimental class for eight meetings by Communicative Language Teaching Method and all of meetings had been observed by the English teacher in every meeting. The data observation can be seen as follows:

**Table IV.1**

#### **The Recapitulation of the Data Observation**

No	Item Observed	Observation Times								Total			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Yes	%	No	%
1	Teacher distributes a hand out									8	100%	0	0%
2	Teacher tells the students to underline writer told about									8	100%	0	0%
3	Teacher gives the students the direction for the activity in target language									8	100%	0	0%
4	The students try to state the writer told about in different word									8	100%	0	0%
5	The students unscramble the sentences of the newspaper article									7	87.5%	1	12.5%
6	The students play a language game									7	87.5%	1	12.5%
7	The students are asked what they know about the article									8	100%	0	0%
8	A student makes an error. The teacher and other students ignore it									6	75%	2	25%
9	Teacher gives each group of students a strip story and a task to perform									8	100%	0	0%
10	The students work with a partner to predict what the next pictures in the strip story will look like									8	100%	0	0%
11	The students are to do a role play. They are imagine that they are all employee of the same company									8	100%	0	0%
12	The teacher reminds the students that one of them is playing the role of the boss and that they should remember this when speaking to her									8	100%	0	0%
13	Teacher moves from group to group offering advice and answering question									6	75%	2	25%
14	The students suggest alternative forms they would use to state the writer told about to a colleague									6	75%	0	25%
15	After the role play is finished, the students elicit relevant vocabulary									8	100%	0	0%

16	For their home work, the students are to listen to a debate on the radio or watch it on television. They are then to write in English what they have listened or watched.									8	100%	0	0%	
<b>Total</b>											<b>118</b>	<b>93.7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6.2</b>

Based on the table observation above, the writer implemented 16 steps communicative language teaching on 8 meetings. In the first, second, third, fourth, seventh, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, fifteenth, and sixteenth steps, the writer did 8 times or 100%. It means that the writer applied the items well. In the fifth and the sixth steps, the writer did it 7 times or 12.5%. It indicated that the writer practiced this item very well. In the thirteenth and fourteenth steps, the writer did it 6 times or 75%. It means that the writer also implemented items number 13 and 14 well. Based on the recapitulation of the data observation above, it can be seen that the implementation of communicative language teaching got total 93.7%. It means that it is categorized very good.

The most important in this research is not only the implementation result of observation of communicative language teaching in the experimental class, but also the result of testes after taught the students by communicative language teaching in experimental class and conventional strategy in control class. The detailed collective data can be seen in the following explanation.

## **1. The Students' Writing Ability on Pre-test**

### **a. Experimental class**

The students' Writing Ability before the writer gave new treatment (Communicative Language Teaching Method) for experimental class can be seen in the following table:

**Table IV.2**  
**Students' Writing Ability in Experimental Class**

<b>Students' Code</b>	<b>Rater I</b>	<b>Rater II</b>	<b>Final Score</b>
S-1	55	61	58
S-2	65	63	64
S-3	40	72	56
S-4	65	75	70
S-5	75	53	64
S-6	80	76	78
S-7	50	56	53
S-8	60	49	54.5
S-9	70	79	74.5
S-10	65	63	64
S-11	65	52	58.5
S-12	45	55	50
S-13	70	55	62.5
S-14	50	63	56.5
S-15	75	63	69
S-16	53	42	47.5
S-17	80	70	75
S-18	80	66	73
S-19	77	68	72.5
S-20	60	68	64
S-21	60	57	58.5
S-22	60	61	60.5
S-23	65	61	63
S-24	60	67	63.5
S-25	65	70	67.5
S-26	76	67	71.5
S-27	50	49	49.5
S-28	50	59	54.5
S-29	70	68	69
S-30	46	65	55.5
S-31	60	65	62.5
S-32	70	42	56
S-33	70	58	64
S-34	60	69	64.5
S-35	50	54	52
S-36	65	63	64

<b>Total</b>	<b>2257</b>	<b>2225</b>	<b>2240.5</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>62.69</b>	<b>61.80</b>	<b>62.23</b>

By looking the detailed data on the table above, the writer found that the total score which was evaluated by rater 1 was 2257, and the mean score was 62.69. In addition, the total score which was inspected by rater 2 was 2225 and mean score was 61.80. It was evaluated from the same test. Then, by summing up the score from rater 1 and rater 2 and then divided 2, the writer found its total score. The total score gotten by experimental class on pre-test was 2240.5 and the mean score was 62.23.

#### **b. Control Class**

Writing Ability of the students in conventional group can be seen in the following table:

**Table IV.3**  
**Writing Ability in Control Class**

<b>Students' Code</b>	<b>Rater I</b>	<b>Rater II</b>	<b>Final Score</b>
S-1	73	78	75.5
S-2	73	79	76
S-3	51	55	53
S-4	40	55	47.5
S-5	55	55	55
S-6	60	52	56
S-7	80	54	67
S-8	70	65	67.5
S-9	73	70	71.5
S-10	70	83	76.5
S-11	60	58	59
S-12	65	56	60.5
S-13	64	69	66.5
S-14	45	52	48.5
S-15	50	69	59.5

S-16	51	59	55
S-17	45	49	47
S-18	45	61	53
S-19	66	85	75.5
S-20	45	61	53
S-21	70	63	66.5
S-22	46	71	58.5
S-23	60	61	60.5
S-24	66	55	60.5
S-25	51	59	55
S-26	45	54	49.5
S-27	70	67	68.5
S-28	70	49	59.5
S-29	70	63	66.5
S-30	50	73	61.5
S-31	50	56	53
S-32	40	45	42.5
S-33	45	61	53
S-34	50	59	54.5
S-35	60	63	61.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>2164</b>	<b>2094</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>57.82</b>	<b>61.82</b>	<b>59.82</b>

Based on the data on the table above, the writer found that the total score which was evaluated by rater 1 was 2024, and the mean score was 57.82. In addition, the total score inspected by rater 2 was 2164 and mean score was 61.82. It was gotten from the same test. In the same time, by summing up the score from rater 1 and rater 2 and then divided 2, the writer found its total score. The total score which was gotten by control class on pre-test was 2094 and the mean score was 59.82.

### c. The Difference of Students' Writing Ability on Pre-test

To clear the data; the writer compared the students' writing ability score of both classes (experimental and control class) in the table VII below:

**Table IV.4**  
**The Difference of Experimental and Control Group**  
**in Writing Ability on Pre-Test**

<b>Experimental Class</b>		<b>Control Class</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
47.5	1	42.5	1
49.5	1	47	1
50	1	47.5	1
52	1	48.5	1
53	1	49.5	1
54.5	2	53	5
55.5	1	54.5	1
56	2	55	3
56.5	1	56	1
58	1	58.5	1
58.5	2	59	1
60.5	1	59.5	2
62.5	2	60.5	3
63	1	61.5	2
63.5	1	66.5	3
64	6	67	1
64.5	1	67.5	1
67.5	1	68.5	1
69	2	71.5	1
70	1	75.5	2
71.5	1	76	1
72.5	1	76.5	1
73	1		
74.5	1		
75	1		
78	1		
	<b>N=36</b>		<b>N=35</b>

Based on the table above, the writer found that the maximum score gotten by experimental class on pre-test was 78, the minimal score was 47.5, and the modus of its score was 6. It meant that the highest frequency was 6 or most of students got score 64. Besides, the maximum score gotten by control class on pre-test was 76.5, the minimal score

was 42.5, and the modus of its score is 5. It meant that the highest frequency is 5 or most of students in control class got score 53.

## 2. The Students' Writing Ability on Post-test

### a. Students' Writing ability in Experimental Class

Students' writing ability in experimental group can be seen in the table below, this data were analysed to answer the formulation of the research and prove the assumption of this research.

**Table IV.5**  
**Students' Writing Ability in Experimental Class**

<b>Students' Code</b>	<b>Rater I</b>	<b>Rater II</b>	<b>Final Score</b>
S-1	70	89	79.5
S-2	70	65	67.5
S-3	70	85	77.5
S-4	80	89	84.5
S-5	65	70	67.5
S-6	93	73	83
S-7	60	65	62.5
S-8	70	69	69.5
S-9	91	91	91
S-10	80	91	85.5
S-11	75	52	63.5
S-12	80	75	77.5
S-13	70	59	64.5
S-14	75	75	75
S-15	91	87	89
S-16	80	89	84.5
S-17	82	81	81.5
S-18	80	79	79.5
S-19	80	85	82.5
S-20	60	83	71.5
S-21	80	87	83.5
S-22	91	90	90.5
S-23	75	77	76
S-24	73	75	74

S-25	73	83	78
S-26	91	91	91
S-27	90	90	90
S-28	75	78	76.5
S-29	70	87	78.5
S-30	70	83	76.5
S-31	80	81	80.5
S-32	75	87	81
S-33	80	89	84.5
S-34	80	78	79
S-35	70	65	67.5
S-36	75	78	76.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>2770</b>	<b>2871</b>	<b>2820.5</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>76.94</b>	<b>79.75</b>	<b>78.35</b>

The result of post-test on the table above explained that the total score evaluated by rater 1 was 2770, and the mean score was 76.94. In addition the total score evaluated by rater 2 was 2871, and mean score was 79.75. Its scores was evaluated from the same test. Next, by summing up the score from rater 1 and rater 2 and divided into 2, the writer found its total score. The total score gotten by experimental class on post-test was 2820.5 and the mean score was 78.35.

**b. Students' Writing Ability in Control Class**

The students' writing ability of control class is appeared one by one in the following table:

**Table IV.6  
Students' Writing Ability**

<b>Students' Code</b>	<b>Rater I</b>	<b>Rater II</b>	<b>Final Score</b>
S-1	79	81	80
S-2	78	82	80

S-3	53	58	55.5
S-4	45	60	52.5
S-5	65	63	64
S-6	77	79	78
S-7	79	79	79
S-8	76	80	78
S-9	80	76	78
S-10	80	82	81
S-11	50	55	52.5
S-12	70	50	60
S-13	73	43	58
S-14	50	48	49
S-15	45	70	57.5
S-16	50	43	46.5
S-17	60	45	52.5
S-18	45	54	49.5
S-19	67	60	63.5
S-20	50	44	47
S-21	60	60	60
S-22	78	79	78.5
S-23	70	60	65
S-24	60	60	60
S-25	50	64	57
S-26	55	34	44.5
S-27	78	79	78.5
S-28	70	50	60
S-29	60	70	65
S-30	45	65	55
S-31	45	43	44
S-32	50	50	50
S-33	40	60	50
S-34	60	55	57.5
S-35	45	55	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>2138</b>	<b>2136</b>	<b>2137</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>61.08</b>	<b>61.02</b>	<b>61.05</b>

The calculation data on the table above explained that the total score evaluated by rater 1 was 2138, and the mean score was 61.08. Then, the total score evaluated by rater 2 was 2136, and mean score was 61.02. Its scores were also gotten from the same test. Then, by summing up the score from rater 1 and rater 2 and the result was divided into 2, the writer

found its total score; The total score gotten by control class on post-test was 2137 and the mean score was 61.05.

**d. The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students Both Classes**

To detail the data easier, the writer collected the scores of students' writing ability of both classes (experimental class and Control class) on post-test as follows:

**Table IV.7**  
**The Difference on Writing Ability of the Students Both Classes**  
**on Post-Test**

<b>Experimental Class</b>		<b>Control Class</b>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
62.5	1	44	1
63.5	1	44.5	1
64.5	1	46.5	1
67.5	3	47	1
69.5	1	49	1
71.5	1	49.5	1
74	1	50	2
75	1	52.5	3
76	1	55	1
76.5	3	55.5	1
77.5	2	56	1
78	1	57	1
78.5	1	57.5	2
79	1	58	1
79.5	2	60	4

81	1	63.5	1
81.5	1	64	1
82.5	1	65	2
83	1	78	3
83.5	1	78.5	2
84.5	3	79	1
85.5	1	80	2
86.5	1	81	1
89	1		
90	1		
90.5	1		
91	2		
	<b>N=36</b>		<b>N=35</b>

The table above indicated that the writer found the maximum score gotten by experimental class on post-test was 91, and the minimal score was 62.5, and the modus of its score was 3. It meant that the highest frequency was 3 or most of students got score 67.5, 76.5, and 84.5. Besides, the maximum score gotten by control class on post-test was 81, and the minimal score was 44. While the modus of its score was 4, it means that the highest frequency was 4 or most of students in control class got score 60.

## **B. Data Analysis**

To answer the formulation of the problem consisted of three formulations, in this case, the researcher serves them completely, they are as follows:

1. How is the students' writing ability taught by using Communicative Language Teaching?
2. How is the students' writing ability not taught by using Communicative Language Teaching?
3. Is there any significant effect of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) toward writing ability of the second year students at state senior high school (SMAN) 1 Kampar Timur?

The writer analyzed the data manually and described the data by based on the graduated standard (SKL) of English subject of the second year students at State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency. The graduated standard of English here is 78. It means, if the students' score  $\geq 78$ , they passed graduated standard. In contrary, if the students' score  $< 78$ , it means that they do not pass the graduated standard yet.

### 1. The Students' Score before Giving New Treatment (Communicative Language Teaching) for Experimental Group

The description of the students' writing ability on pre-test of class experimental and control group can be seen in the following tables:

#### a. Experimental Group

**Table IV.8**  
**The Simple Description of Experimental Group's Score on Pre-Test**

Score	Frequency	Fx	Percentage	Graduate Standard
47.5	1	47.5	2.78%	Not Pass
49.5	1	49.5	2.78%	Not Pass
50	1	50	2.78%	Not Pass
52	1	52	2.78%	Not Pass
53	1	53	2.78%	Not Pass
54.5	2	109	5.56%	Not Pass
55.5	1	55.5	2.78%	Not Pass
56	2	112	5.56%	Not Pass
56.5	1	56.5	2.78%	Not Pass
58	1	58	2.78%	Not Pass
58.5	2	117	5.56%	Not Pass
60.5	1	60.5	2.78%	Not Pass
62.5	2	125	5.56%	Not Pass
63	1	63	2.78%	Not Pass
63.5	1	63.5	2.78%	Not Pass
64	6	384	16.67%	Not Pass
64.5	1	64.5	2.78%	Not Pass
67.5	1	67.5	2.78%	Not Pass
69	2	138	5.56%	Not Pass

70	1	70	2.78%	Not Pass
71.5	1	71.5	2.78%	Not Pass
72.5	1	72.5	2.78%	Not Pass
73	1	73	2.78%	Not Pass
74.5	1	74.5	2.78%	Not Pass
75	1	75	2.78%	Not Pass
78	1	78	2.78%	Pass
<b>Total</b>	<b>N=36</b>	<b>=2240.5</b>	<b>100%</b>	

The data above indicated that the experimental students' score on pre-test was still low, it can be seen from the data above that only 1 student or 2.78% passed graduated standard. In addition, the other students (35 or 97.22%) did not pass graduated standard of English subject.

#### b. Control Group

**Table IV.9**  
**The Simple Description of Control Group's Score on Pre-Test**

Score	Frequency	Fx	Percentage	Graduate Standard
42.5	1	42.5	2.86%	Not Pass
47	1	47	2.86%	Not Pass
47.5	1	47.5	2.86%	Not Pass
48.5	1	48.5	2.86%	Not Pass
49.5	1	49.5	2.86%	Not Pass
53	5	265	14.29%	Not Pass
54.5	1	54.5	2.86%	Not Pass
55	3	165	8.57%	Not Pass
56	1	56	2.86%	Not Pass
58.5	1	58.5	2.86%	Not Pass
59	1	59	2.86%	Not Pass
59.5	2	119	5.71%	Not Pass
60.5	3	181.5	8.57%	Not Pass
61.5	2	123	5.71%	Not Pass
66.5	3	199.5	8.57%	Not Pass
67	1	67	2.86%	Not Pass
67.5	1	67.5	2.86%	Not Pass
68.5	1	68.5	2.86%	Not Pass
71.5	1	71.5	2.86%	Not Pass
75.5	2	151	5.71%	Not Pass

76	1	76	2.86%	Not Pass
76.5	1	76.5	2.86%	Not Pass
<b>Total</b>	<b>N=35</b>	<b>=2094</b>	<b>100%</b>	

The data in the table above indicated that the control students' score on pre-test was very low, it can be proved from the data above that none student or 100% did pass graduated standard. By comparing the students' score between experimental group and control group, the writer concluded that experimental group score was still higher than control group score. Because the minimal score gotten by experimental group was 47.5, the maximum was 78, and one of them got graduated standard (Pass). In addition the minimal score which was gotten by control group was only 42.5, the maximum was 76.5, and nobody of them got graduated standard (Pass).

## 2. The Students' Score After Giving New Treatment (Communicative Language Teaching) For Experimental Group.

The description of the students' writing ability on post-test of class experimental and control group can be seen in table below:

### a. Experimental Class

**Table IV.10**  
**The Description of Experimental Group's Score at Post-Test**

Score	Frequency	Fx	Percentage	Graduated Standard
62.5	1	62.5	2.78%	Not pass
63.5	1	63.5	2.78%	Not pass
64.5	1	64.5	2.78%	Not pass
67.5	3	202.5	8.33%	Not pass
69.5	1	69.5	2.78%	Not pass
71.5	1	71.5	2.78%	Not pass
74	1	74	2.78%	Not pass
75	1	75	2.78%	Not pass

76	1	76	2.78%	Not pass
76.5	3	229.5	8.33%	Not pass
77.5	2	155	5.56%	Not pass
78	1	78	2.78%	Pass
78.5	1	78.5	2.78%	Pass
79	1	79	2.78%	Pass
79.5	2	159	5.56%	Pass
81	1	81	2.78%	Pass
81.5	1	81.5	2.78%	Pass
82.5	1	82.5	2.78%	Pass
83	1	83	2.78%	Pass
83.5	1	83.5	2.78%	Pass
84.5	3	253.5	8.33%	Pass
85.5	1	85.5	2.78%	Pass
86.5	1	86.5	2.78%	Pass
89	1	89	2.78%	Pass
90	1	90	2.78%	Pass
90.5	1	90.5	2.78%	Pass
91	2	182	5.56%	Pass
<b>Total</b>	<b>N=36</b>	<b>=2820.5</b>	<b>100%</b>	

By looking the result of data calculation in the table above, it indicated that the experimental students' score on post-test increased than pre-test, it can be proved from the amount of students who got or achieved graduated standard. Here, there were 20 students or 56% achieved graduated standard and only 16 students or 44% did not achieve graduate standard.

#### **b. Control Class**

**Table IV.11**  
**The Description of Control Group's Score at Post-Test**

Score	Frequency	Fx	Percentage	Graduated Standard
44	1	44	2.86%	Not pass
44.5	1	44.5	2.86%	Not pass
46.5	1	46.5	2.86%	Not pass
47	1	47	2.86%	Not pass
49	1	49	2.86%	Not pass
49.5	1	49.5	2.86%	Not pass
50	2	100	5.71%	Not pass
52.5	3	157.5	8.57%	Not pass
55	1	55	2.86%	Not pass
55.5	1	55.5	2.86%	Not pass
56	1	56	2.86%	Not pass
57	1	57	2.86%	Not pass
57.5	2	115	5.71%	Not pass
58	1	58	2.86%	Not pass
60	4	240	11.42%	Not pass
63.5	1	63.5	2.86%	Not pass
64	1	64	2.86%	Not pass
65	2	170	5.71%	Not pass
78	3	234	8.57%	Pass
78.5	2	157	5.71%	Pass
79	1	79	2.86%	Pass
80	2	160	5.71%	Pass
81	1	81	2.86%	Pass
<b>Total</b>	<b>N=35</b>	<b>= 2137</b>	<b>100%</b>	

From the result of data calculation in the table above, it indicated that the control group's score on post-test also increased than pre-test. It can be seen from the amount of students who achieved graduated standard. In this case, there were 9 students or 25.71% who achieved graduated standard. Here, all of scores were increased than before. Based on the pre-test data, nobody achieved graduated standard and the lowest score was 42.5.

By comparing the students' scores between taught by Communicative Language Teaching and conventional strategy, the writer concluded that experimental group score was still higher than control group score. Because the minimal and maximum scores achieved by

experimental group was higher than control group. The minimal score gotten by experimental group was 62.5 and the maximum was 91. Then, the minimal score which was gotten by control group was only 44 and the maximum was 81. Besides, the amount of students who were achieved graduated standard in experimental group were more than control class. There were 20 students or 55% from experimental group who got graduated standard, and there were only 9 students or 25.71 who got graduated standard from control group.

### **3. The Effect of Using Communicative Language Teaching Method Toward Students' Writing Ability**

To make sure whether there was or not significant effect of using Communicative Language Teaching method toward students' writing ability, the researcher analyzed the post-test data by comparing scores of both experimental and control groups manually by T-test formula. The t-test formula was taken from Hartono's book, the formula which was used

as follows: 
$$t_0 = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Explanation:

$t_0$  = Table Observation

$M_x$  = Mean score of Experimental Class

$M_y$  = Mean Score of Control class

$SD_x$  = Standard Deviation of Experiment class

$SD_y$  = Standard Deviation of Control class

$N$  = Number of students/Sample

To get the mean score and standard deviation of the scores of both classes, it was found out by using the table below:

**Table IV.12**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of the Score**

Students' Code	Experimental Group (X)	Control Group (Y)	X	Y	$x^2$	$y^2$
S-1	79.5	80	1.15	18.95	1.3225	359.1025
S-2	67.5	80	-10.85	18.95	117.7225	359.1025
S-3	77.5	55.5	-0.85	-5.55	01.7225	30.8025
S-4	84.5	52.5	6.15	-8.55	37.8225	73.1025
S-5	67.5	64	-10.85	2.95	117.7225	8.7025
S-6	83	78	4.65	16.95	21.6225	287.3025
S-7	62.5	79	-15.85	17.95	25.2225	322.2025
S-8	69.5	78	-8.85	16.95	78.3225	287.3025
S-9	91	78	12.65	16.95	160.0225	287.3025
S-10	85.5	81	7.15	19.95	51.1225	398.0025
S-11	63.5	52.5	-14.85	-8.55	220.5225	73.1025
S-12	77.5	60	-0.85	-1.05	0.7225	1.1025
S-13	64.5	58	-13.857	-3.05	191.8225	9.3025
S-14	75	49	-3.35	-12.05	11.2225	145.2025
S-15	89	57.5	10.65	-3.55	113.4225	12.6025
S-16	84.5	46.5	6.15	-14.55	37.8225	211.7025
S-17	81.5	52.5	3.15	-8.55	9.9225	73.1025
S-18	79.5	49.5	1.15	-11.55	1.3225	133.4025
S-19	82.5	63.5	4.15	2.45	17.2225	6.0025
S-20	71.5	47	-6.85	-14.05	46.9225	197.4025
S-21	83.5	60	5.15	-1.05	26.5225	1.1025
S-22	90.5	78.5	12.15	17.45	147.6225	304.5025
S-23	76	65	-2.35	3.95	5.5225	15.6025
S-24	74	60	-4.35	-1.05	18.9225	1.1025
S-25	78	57	-0.35	-4.05	0.1225	16.4025
S-26	91	44.5	12.65	-16.55	160.0225	273.9025
S-27	90	78.5	11.65	17.45	135.7225	304.5025
S-28	76.5	60	-1.85	-1.05	3.4225	1.1025
S-29	78.5	65	0.15	3.95	0.0225	15.6025

S-30	76.5	55	-1.85	-6.05	3.4225	36.6025
S-31	80.5	44	8.15	-17.05	66.4225	290.7025
S-32	81	50	2.65	-11.05	7.0225	122.1025
S-33	84.5	50	6.15	-11.05	37.8225	122.1025
S-34	79	57.5	0.65	-3.55	0.4225	12.6025
S-35	67.5	50	-10.85	-5.05	117.7225	25.5025
S-36	76.5		-1.85		3.4225	
<b>Total</b>	<b>X= 2820.5</b>	<b>Y= 2137</b>	<b>X= 0</b>	<b>Y= 0</b>	<b>x<sup>2</sup>= 1997.7100</b>	<b>y<sup>2</sup>= 4819.2875</b>

The table above indicated that the mean of the scores is:

$$M_x = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$= \frac{2820.5}{36}$$

$$= 78.35$$

$$M_y = \frac{\sum y}{N}$$

$$= \frac{2137}{35}$$

$$= 61.05$$

Standard deviations of the scores are as follows:

$$SD_x = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{1997.7100}{36}}$$

$$= \sqrt{55.49}$$

$$= 7.45$$

$$SD_y = \sqrt{\frac{\sum y^2}{N}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{4819.2875}{35}}$$

$$= \sqrt{137.69}$$

$$= 11.73$$

Based on the data calculation above, the mean of the score gotten by experimental group was 78.35 and standard deviation was 7.45. In addition, the mean score of control group was 61.05, and its standard deviation was 11.73. Next, Mean and the standard deviation of both scores above were analyzed by using T-test formula as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{To} &= \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}} \\ &= \frac{78.35 - 61.05}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{7.45}{\sqrt{36-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{11.73}{\sqrt{35-1}}\right)^2}} \\ &= \frac{17.3}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{7.45}{\sqrt{35}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{11.73}{\sqrt{34}}\right)^2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{17.3}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{7.45}{5.91}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{11.73}{5.83}\right)^2}} \\
&= \frac{17.3}{\sqrt{(1.26)^2 + (2.01)^2}} \\
&= \frac{17.3}{\sqrt{1.5826 + 4.0401}} \\
&= \frac{17.3}{\sqrt{5.6277}} \\
&= \frac{17.3}{2.37} \\
&= 7.30
\end{aligned}$$

### C. Testing Hypothesis

The final of this research is testing the hypothesis. From the calculation of the data above, it can be seen that  $t_o$  was 7.30 (the t table was compared by getting degree of freedom (DF)). Degree of Freedom can be found by using the formula below:

$$\begin{aligned}
df &= (N1 + N2) - 2 \\
&= (36 + 35) - 2 \\
&= 71 - 2 \\
&= 69
\end{aligned}$$

The degree of freedom was 69. After looking at t-table, 69 did not find. In this case, the writer took df 70 as the nearest. The degree of freedom 70 in significant 5% and 1% are 2.00 and 2.65. (Find out the T table in the appendixes list).

By comparing at the degree of freedom above, the writer found that  $2.00 < 7.30 > 2.65$ . It indicates that t observed is higher than t table in significant 5% and 1%. So, its result could be concluded that  $H_0$  was rejected and  $H_a$  was accepted. It means that there is a significant effect of using Communicative Language Teaching Method on improving students' ability of the second year students at State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

#### A. Conclusion

Writing is one of the language skills that should be mastered by the students in English language learning. Writing English becomes very important in using English for communication. Someone is considered competent in language if he or she is clever to scrutinize, read, and speak in and by using language.

By observing the result of data analysis in chapter IV above, the writer makes some conclusions, as follows:

1. The students' writing ability in experimental group is higher than control group on pre-test. It can be proved from the mean score of both groups. The mean score of experimental is 62.23, while the mean score of control group is 59.82.
2. The students' writing score taught by Communicative Language Teaching method is higher than control group on post-test. It can be proved by looking at the mean score of both of those groups. The mean score of experimental group is 78.35, and the mean score of control group is 61.05. Besides, the amount of students who achieve graduated standard in experimental group is more than control class. There are 20 students or 55% from experimental group who get graduated standard, and there are only 9 students or 25.71 who get graduated standard from control group.
3. The hypothesis  $H_0$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. It means that there is a significant effect of using Communicative Language Teaching on improving students' writing ability of the second year students at State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency. It can be seen from the result of data calculation. The coefficient of t-test

is 7.30. The writer found that  $2.00 < 7.30 > 2.65$ . It indicates that  $t_{\text{observed}}$  is higher than that of  $t_{\text{table}}$  in significant 5% and 1%.

## **B. Suggestion**

On this occasion, the writer would like to give some suggestion to the people who get benefit from this research. The writer suggest to :

The principle of State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency is to give the teacher support to teach better, especially English teachers, to complete the facility of teaching learning process, and to give direction to the English teachers about suitable English teaching methods that are suitable for the students.

Furthermore, for the English teacher of State Senior High School 1 Kampar Timur District Kampar Regency are to teach or give the students more motivations to study hard and use effective techniques and methods in teaching and learning English. One of the good methods in writing ability is communicative Language Teaching.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, H. Douglas. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, San Francisco: Prentice Hall Regent. 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_, H. Douglas. *Teaching by Principle*. San Francisco: State University. 1994.
- Creswell, John W. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research (3rd Edition)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc. 2008.
- Diane Larson Freeman. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2000.
- Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian. *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Inc. 2000.
- Graves, F. Michael, et al. *Teaching Reading in 21st Century (Second edition)*. Singapore: Allyn & Bacon, A pearson Education Company. 2001.
- Hartono. *Statistik untuk Peniltian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar. 2004.
- Heaton, JB. *Writing English Language Text*. London: Longman Group Limited. 1997.
- Hornby, AS. *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2000.
- Hughey B. Jane et al. *Teaching ESL Composition: Principles and Techniques*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publisher inc. 1983.
- <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/knowledge-wiki/communicative-approach>. . Retrieved 12-04-2011
- <http://ulyarosyita.blogspot.com/2011/03/what-is-difference-between-strategy.html>. Retrieved 21-06-2012.
- Jacobs L. Holly. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publisher inc. 1981.
- John Langan. *English Skills (7th ed)*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 2001.
- Kalayo Hasibuan, et al. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press. 2007.
- Miller, Robert Keith. *Motives for Writing*. 5<sup>th</sup> Ed. New York: McGraw Hill. Inc. 2005.
- M. Syafi'I, S. *The Effective Paragraph Development; The Process of Writing for Classroom Setting*. Pekanbaru: LBSI. 2007.
- Nunan, David. *Language Testing Methodology*. London: Prentice hall International. 1991.
- Richards, Jack C and Rodgers, Theodore S. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1986.

Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2008.

Suharsimi, Arikunto. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta. 1997.