



THE EFFECT OF COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT) THROUGH SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION ON STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION AND WRITING ABILITY FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

***Abdullah Hasan**

State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 27th January, 2018
Received in revised form
18th February, 2018
Accepted 26th March, 2018
Published online 30th April, 2018

Key Words:

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Small Group Discussion, Reading Comprehension and Writing Ability.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to find out the significant effect of using CLT through Small Group Discussion on students' reading and writing skills for Senior High School level in Kampar regency of Riau province..It was carried out by using a quasi-experimental design. The research participants were the tenth-grade students that consisted of 72 students divided into two classes, namely an experimental group and a control group. In the process of data collection, pre-test, post-test and observation were used. In analyzing the collected data, statistical analyses of descriptive and inferential statistics were used. The data were analyzed by using T-test of Independent sample t-test, a paired sample t-test and effect size formula. The research findings showed that there was a significant effect of using CLT through small group discussion on students' reading comprehension and writing ability. The effect size of CLT on students' reading comprehension was 89%, while on writing ability was 76%. In other words, there was a significant effect of using CLT through Small Group Discussion on the students' reading and writing skills; and its effect size was categorized into good. In conclusion, the use of CLT through Small Group Discussion could be implemented in teaching and learning of reading and writing skills for senior high school level in Kampar regency.

Copyright © 2018, Abdullah Hasan. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Abdullah Hasan, 2018. "The effect of communicative language teaching (clt) through small group discussion on students' reading comprehension and writing ability for senior high school", *International Journal of Development Research*, 8, (04), 19968-19976.

INTRODUCTION

Since English is an international language, English has crafted huge demand for English teaching around the world. It is supported by Crystal (2012), he stated that English is the language that has spread throughout the world most extensively and is dominating in a number of important fields including international commerce, education, and communication. Nowadays, millions of people want to improve their command of English or to ensure that their children achieve a good command of English. Especially, for students, English becomes very important because by learning English, they are expected to absorb and keep up with the development of science, technology, and art. As an international language, English is also very potential and has been widely used as a communication by many people all over the world.

That is why, the Ministry of National Education of Indonesian states that English is taught as a foreign language at all levels of Indonesian schools, starting from junior high school up to university. (Curriculum 2013). It means that the students are demanded to be able to use English to fulfill their daily needs such as to read text books, newspaper, magazine and communicate both spoken and written languages to solve their life problems. Therefore, the purpose of English teaching in School is to reach communication target. It refers to discourse competence, comprehension and production both in written and spoken English. In Indonesia, many people believe that English is undoubtedly important, for instance, senior high school students are expected to master four language skills of English. The Curriculum 2013 (K13), They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Listening and reading are called receptive skills while speaking and writing are productive skills. Besides using spoken language in the form of conversation, we also use language in the written one. So, it shows that acquiring of writing and reading skills plays an

important role in our living, because we use both for communication. Writing is one of the four important language skills that students should master in learning English. Writing cannot be separated from other subjects in learning language since the students are often required to complete many assignments in written forms. For example, in reading, speaking or listening classes, students still do writing activity in doing some assignments. Writing is also a way to communicate each other because through writing students can express their ideas, thoughts, and feeling. In addition, Reid (1993) says that writing is a complex skill because some components should be focused by writer in writing, like the purpose of writing and writer's knowledge of writing like paragraph components and pattern organization. Some researchers have claimed that writing can be experienced as one of the most difficult skill, requiring an intricated combination of neurological, physical, cognitive and affective competencies Others (perhaps most notably Bartholomae, Megan, et al. 2010. Claim that even if writing makes complicated demands on your skills and abilities, it is possible to make writing easy, or at least easy enough for it to feel worth tackling regularly and with good effect.

Furthermore, Murcia (2000), also explains that writing is the production of the written word in the form of text; hence, it must be read and comprehended in order communication takes place. English teachers need to understand that writing is a complicated process because a writer has to consider not only the content of his/her writing, but also the reader who will read his/her writing. One has to express his/her ideas by considering who reads the writing and how he/she receives and understand his/her message through it. Oshima and Hogue (1999, p.2) state that whenever you write, consider your specific audience, that is, the people who will read what you have written. Alfaki, M I, (2015, p. 44) states some common problems faced by the students in writing. They are as follows: grammatical problems, problems of sentence structure, problem of word choice, and cognitive Problems. Learners have a number of problems in their attempts to write in the second language. "As verbs take different forms depending on tense and subjects they are used with, they create problems for second language writing students" (Tyner, 1987). On the other hand, in teaching and learning English, writing and reading cannot be separated, reading is also as important as writing in English and reading is the most important single skill. Then, reading is the skill of recognizing and understanding written language in the form of sequences of graphic signs and its transformation into meaningful speech, either as a silent comprehension or by reading aloud. Besides in reading students do not only have the capabilities to read material or vocalize the sequence words in sentences, but also they should comprehend what they read. Moreover, in Indonesia, reading becomes one of the skills that is tested in National Examination. The students are required to take entrance examination before they are granted access higher education. It must be noted that the entrance test contained more part that students need to comprehend reading texts. Besides, in English curriculum, reading comprehension takes more portions compared to three other language skills. For university entrance test, reading comprehension is tested dominantly.

On the other hands, based on preliminary study conducted at some senior high schools, students get difficulties in writing and reading comprehension, In writing, it was found that most of students' writing consisted of ungrammatical sentences;

their ideas moved away from focus and sometimes did not have any supporting details because they had problems with vocabularies mastery. Besides, incorrect spellings and punctuation errors also frequently occurred in their writing. Besides in reading comprehension, the majority of students fail to determine the topics, main ideas, inferences, references and general structure of a text. Discussing reading, it is important to underline that reading is the act of interpreting printed and written words. Reading requires understanding and comprehending the means of print. According to Curriculum 2013, the purpose of teaching English at Senior High School is the students are expected to be able to have ability in 3 discourse categories; 1) Interpersonal, 2) Transactional, and 3) Functional, either spoken or written at the level of functional literacy, to perform the social functions in the context of personal life, social, cultural, academic, and professions, by using various forms of texts for basic literacy needs, with acceptable structure is coherent, cohesive and linguistic elements appropriately. One of the competences is the students are able to comprehend, proofread/correct, and write texts by using correct grammar.

Derrick (2017) has stated that whole class instruction is direct instruction using traditional textbooks or supplemental materials with minimal differentiation in either content or assessment. It is typically provided through teacher-led direct instruction. The teacher provides the entire class with the same lesson regardless of where any particular student is, but there is something missing here. The teachers give little space to students to accept, discuss, and listen to others' diverse perspective, useful for topic introduction, general direction, read aloud, closure, and group building, meaning that the teacher still focuses on teacher centered instruction. To solve this problem and reach some objectives in learning, the students and teachers should have some good learning approaches, methods, strategies, or strategies. These have some advantages for them in learning process to become easier, faster, more enjoyable, and more effective. Based on those phenomena, the teacher must use an appropriate strategy in teaching reading and writing in order to help students write and comprehend the texts well. In this study, the researcher assumes that the use of Communicative Language Teaching through small group discussions is a suitable method in teaching writing and reading. By applying CLT, students are expected to be able to write and comprehend the texts. CLT tends to be applied, Richard (2003) states that by applying CLT the students have to participate in classroom activities that are based on a cooperative rather than individualistic approach to learning. The students have to become comfortable with listening and interact to their peers in group work or pair work tasks, rather than relying on the teacher for a model. They are expected to take on a greater degree of responsibility for their own learning. Teachers' role become facilitators and monitor, rather than being a model for correct speech and writing and one with the primary responsibility of making students produce plenty of error-free sentences, the teachers have to develop a different view of students' errors and of her/his own role in facilitating language learning.

In the classroom, the teacher must create the situation that can encourage real communication, many activities can be designed to make majors' element lively. In this study, the researcher focuses on applying CLT as a method in teaching and learning process. The reason is because CLT assumes that the students are able to acquire written or spoken language

when they are motivated and not nervous. So, learning new language is easier and more enjoyable when it is truly meaningful. Richard (2006, p.20) and Brown (2003, p.45) mention that Communicative Language Teaching can be applied through the activity which is called group work or small group discussions, because small group discussion fulfills two important languages learning needs: prepare students with real-life language use, and encourage the atomization of language knowledge. Moreover, small group discussion is an effective way that can be used in teaching reading and writing since it increases the amount of time for students' discussion during the given period time. Beebe and Masterson (2003) add that people remember group discussions better. Group learning fosters learning and comprehension. The student working in small groups have a tendency to learn more of what is taught and retain it longer than when the same material is presented in other instructional formats

Those are the impacts of applying CLT through small group discussions on students' problem in writing and reading. CLT through small group discussion allow the students easier to identify the ideas and generic structure of procedure texts and it also helps them to write and understand a procedure text. With this kind of method, it is expected that teacher and students would enjoy teaching and learning writing procedure text. Based on the explanation above, it is assumed that using Communicative Language Teaching through small group discussions can give effect on the students' reading comprehension and writing ability.

Objectives and Research Questions

The purpose of the study is to investigate the effect of using Communicative Language Teaching through small group discussions on students' reading comprehension and writing ability in procedural texts.

Particularly, the objectives of the study are stated below

- To find out the effect of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) through small group discussions on students' reading comprehension.
- To find out the effect of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) through small group discussions on students' writing ability.

Two research questions are formulated as follows:

- Is there any significant effect of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) through small group discussions on students' reading comprehension?
- Is there any significant effect of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) through small group discussions on students' writing ability?.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research design is a quasi-experimental pre-test-post-test design, and two research questions with eight hypotheses are posed to explore the effect of applying CLT through small group discussions on students' problem in reading comprehension and writing ability. Cohen, L. Manion, L and Morrison, K state that this research design is one of the most commonly used quasi-experimental design in educational research. A quasi-experimental design is selected for this study

because of the following factors: Abdullah Hasan (2018) (a) the administrative constraints by the selected school that does not allow for the random selection (b) based on the real condition, it is not realistic to conduct the study in true experimental design due to the complexity of human behavior and language behavior, and the difficulty of defining various variables involved in language learning (c); quasi-experimental design can reflect what happens in the real life settings without any disruption in the educational set-up. (d) the results of quasi-experimental research, is still 'compelling' and particularly prominent in evaluation research studies; and (e) the use of intact classes in quasi-experimental designs could reduce the threat. The participants of the study consisted of 72 students of grade 10 of state senior high school in Kampar regency of Riau province They were divided into an experimental group and a control group.

The second set of subjects consisted of two English teachers who have the same qualifications and volunteered to teach the experimental group using CLT through small group discussion and non CLT on students' reading comprehension and writing ability. Cluster sampling was used that randomly selected groups, not individuals. All members of selected groups had similar characteristics. A good sample is one that is representative of the population from which it is selected, and cluster sampling is the best single way to obtain a representative sample Gay and Airisian (2003). The data were obtained by using a pre-test and a post-test. The pre-test was used to determine the basic English reading and writing mastery before the treatment. The post-test was administered to determine the students' reading comprehension and writing ability. This research was conducted for 8 meetings or 16 class-hours for each class within two months. The implementation of each meeting was observed to see the procedures of CLT through small group discussion provided by a lesson plan and a procedure. The procedure was divided into three steps; pre-activities consisted of opening the lesson, motivating strategy and apperception; whilst-activities covered the steps of CLT through small group discussion; and then, ended by post-activities implemented reflex-ion, conclusion and closure.

Wood (2011, p.231) states there are many interpretations and definitions of CLT. Savignon (1984) says that CLT means different thing to the different people who practice it. Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics defines the Communicative Approach or Communicative Language Teaching as an approach to foreign or second language teaching which emphasizes that the goal of language learning is communicative competence. Brown (2007) gives his definition of CLT as "an approach to language teaching methodology that emphasizes authenticity, interaction, student-centered learning, task based activities, and communication for the real world, meaningful purposes". Brown (2000:43) also offers six interconnected characteristics of CLT:

Classroom goals are focused on all of components of CC (communicative competence) and restricted to grammatical or linguistic competence. Language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes. Organizational language forms are not the central focus but rather aspects of language that enable the learners to accomplish those purposes. Fluency and accuracy are seen as complimentary principles underlying

communicative techniques. Time fluency may have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use. In the communicative classroom, students ultimately have to use language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed context outside the classroom. Students are given opportunities to focus on their own learning process through an understanding of their own styles of learning and through the development of appropriate strategies for autonomous learning. The role of the teacher is that of facilitator and guide, not an all-knowing bestower of knowledge. Students are therefore encouraged to construct meaning through genuine linguistic interaction with others.

RESULTS

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The descriptive statistics was used to find frequency counts, percentages, total scores, mean scores and standard deviation; while the inferential statistics, an independent sample t-test and a paired sample t-test with Eta Square were used to analyze the data in order to test hypotheses based on participants' responses of pretest and post-test.

The data were analyzed by descriptive statistics as follows:

Table 1. The result of students' reading comprehension pre-test and post-test scores

Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Sum	Mean	S.D
Pre exp.	36	1958.29	54.39	14.83
Pre- cont.l	36	1900.05	52.7792	12.90
Post- Exp.	36	2916.62	81.0172	8.35
Post-test	36	2033.33	56.4814	11.11
Valid N	36			

Based on Table 1, it can be determined that the number of participants of the experimental group is 36 with pre-test standard deviation (14.83), post-test standard deviation (8.35), with pre-test mean score (54.39) and post-test mean score (81.01), and the number of participants of the control group is 36 with pre-test standard deviation (12.90), post-test standard deviation (11.11), pre-test mean score (52.77), and post-test mean score (56.48).

Table 2. The result of students' writing ability pre-test and post-test scores

Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Sum	Mean	S D
Pre-test exp.	36	2067.50	57.43	6.61
Pre. Control	36	1987.50	55.20	4.68
Post-test Ex	36	2977.50	82.70	10.81
Post control	36	2457.50	68.26	8.67
Valid N	36			

Based on Table IV.2, it can be determined that the number of participants of the experimental group is 36 with pre-test standard deviation (6.61), post-test standard deviation (10.81), with pre-test mean score (57.43) and post-test mean score (82.70), and the number of participants of the control group is 36 with pre-test standard deviation (4.68), post-test standard deviation (8.67), pre-test mean score (55.20), and post-test mean score (68.26).

Inferential statistics

Hypothesis 1

The procedure of inferential statistics begins with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho1 : There is no significant difference of students' reading comprehension pre-test mean scores between an experimental group and a control group.

The result of pre-test reading comprehension for experimental and control group without considering student group is analyzed by using an Independent Sample T-test and presented at the following Table IV. 3

Table 3. The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Pre-test reading comprehension scores between experimental and control group

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t	P
Exp. Group	36	54.39	14.83	70	.494	.623
Control group	36	52.77	12.90			

Based on Independent T-test analysis for pre-test reading comprehension score of experimental and control groups on Table IV.3 above, it shows that there is no significant difference on students' reading comprehension pre-test mean score between experimental and control groups. T-test result is 0.494, its df is 70, standard deviation of the experimental group is 14.83 and the control group is 12.90. So, in the conclusion $p = 0.623$, the 2-tailed value is bigger than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). The result shows that the mean scores do not differ much between both groups. It can be determined that the subjects in both groups are equivalent before being given the treatment, Based on the analysis of Table IV.3, of the first hypothesis Ha1 is rejected and Ho1 is accepted. So, it can be concluded that "There is no significant difference of students' reading comprehension pre-test mean scores between an experimental group and a control group"

Hypothesis 2

The procedure of inferential statistics begins with the statistical test on the following alternative hypothesis:

Ha2 : There is a significant difference of students' reading comprehension post-test mean scores between an experimental group and a control group.

The result of post-test reading comprehension for experimental and control groups without considering students group is analyzed by using an Independent Sample T-test and presented at the following Table IV.4.

Table 4. The analysis of independent sample T-test of post-test reading comprehension mean scores between experimental and control groups

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	T	P
Exp. Group	36	81.01	8.35	70	10.588	.000
Cont. group	36	56.48	11.11			

Based on an independent sample T-test analysis for post-test reading comprehension mean score of experimental and

control groups on Table IV.31 above, it shows that there is a significant difference on students' reading comprehension post-test mean score between experimental and control groups. T-test result is 10.58, its df is 70, standard deviation of experimental group is 8.35 and control group is 11.11. So, in the conclusion $p = 0.000$, the 2-tailed value is smaller than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). The result shows that the mean scores do not differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups are not equivalent after giving the treatment. Based on the analysis of table IV.4, of the second hypothesis Ha2 is accepted and Ho2 is rejected. So, it can be concluded that "There is a significant difference of students' reading comprehension post-test mean scores between an experimental group and a control group."

Hypothesis 3

The inferential statistics procedures starts with the statistical test on the following alternative hypothesis:

Ha3: There is a significant difference of students' reading comprehension between pre-test and post-test mean scores of the experimental group by using CLT through small group discussion.

The result of the effect on implementing the treatment of CLT through small group discussion on students' reading comprehension mean scores for the experimental group of the composite comparing score for both pre-test and post-test is analysed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presents at the following Table IV.5:

Table 5. The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test between pre-test and post-test on students' reading comprehension for the experimental group

Group	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	P
Pre-test	36	54.39	14.83	35	-17.16	.000
Post-test	36	81.01	8.35			

From Table IV.5, the output of paired sample t-test shows that the t-test result is -17.164, its df is 35, by comparing number of significance. If probability > 0.05 , null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. If probability < 0.05 alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. Because the significance is $0.000 < 0.05$, thus, H_a is accepted while H_0 is rejected. Then, the writer finds out the percentage of significant effect between pre-test and post-test of the experimental group by seeking the effect size or eta-squared as follows:

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + n - 1}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{(-17.16)^2}{(-17.16)^2 + 36 - 1}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{294.46}{294.46 + 35}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = 0.89$$

$$Eta\text{-squared} = \tilde{\eta}^2 \times 100\%$$

$$Eta\text{-squared} = 0.89 \times 100\% = 89\%$$

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics which has been identified after conducting the treatment for 4 meetings or 8 class-hours by using CLT through small group

discussion can improve 89% on students' reading comprehension. Therefore, the Ho3 hypothesis is rejected and Ha3 is accepted that there is a significant difference on students' reading comprehension between pre-test and post-test mean score in the experimental group.

Hypothesis 4

The inferential statistics procedures start with the statistical test on the following alternative hypothesis:

Ha4: There is a significant difference of students' reading comprehension between pre-test and post-test mean scores of the control group.

The result of the effect on implementing the treatment of non-CLT through small group discussion on students reading comprehension for control group of the composite comparing score for both pre-test and post-test analysed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presents at the following Table IV.6.:

Table 6. The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test between Pre-test and Post-test mean scores on students' reading comprehension for the control group

Group	Mean	N	SD	df	T	P
Pre-test	52.77	36	12.90	35	-4.781	.000
Post-test	56.48	36	11.11			

From Table IV.6, the output of paired sample t-test shows that the t-test result is -4.781, its df is 35, by comparing number of significance. If probability > 0.05 , null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. If probability < 0.05 alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. Because the significance is $0.000 < 0.05$, thus, H_a is accepted while H_0 is rejected. Then, the writer finds out the percentage of significant effect between pre-test and post-test mean scores of the control class by determining the effect size or eta-squared as follows:

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + n - 1}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{(-4.78)^2}{(-4.781)^2 + 36 - 1}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{22.84}{22.84 + 35}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = 0.39$$

$$Eta\text{-squared} = \tilde{\eta}^2 \times 100\%$$

$$Eta\text{-squared} = 0.39 \times 100\% = 39\%$$

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics which has been identified after conducting the treatment for 4 meetings or 8 class-hours by using non-CLT through small group discussion can improve 39% on students' reading comprehension. Therefore, the Ho4 hypothesis is rejected and Ha4 is accepted that there is a significant difference on students' comprehension between pre-test and post-test mean score in the control group.

Hypothesis 5

The procedure of inferential statistics begins with the statistical test on the following null hypothesis:

Ho₅: There is no significant difference of students' writing ability pre-test mean scores between an experimental group and a control group. The result of pre-test writing ability mean score between experimental and control groups without considering student group is analysed by using Independent Sample T-test and presented at the following Table IV.7:

Table 7. The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of pre-test writing ability mean scores between an experimental group and a control group

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t	P
Experiment group	36	57.43	6.61	70	1.645	.104
Control group	36	55.20	4.68			

Based on independent T-test analysis of pre-test writing ability mean scores between experimental and control groups on table IV.7 above, it shows that there is no significant difference at pre-test writing ability mean scores between the experimental and control groups. T-test result is 1.645, its df is 70, standard deviation of the experimental group is 6.61 and the control group is 4.68. So, in the conclusion $p = 0.104$, the 2-tailed value is bigger than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). The result shows that the mean scores do not differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups are equivalent before giving the treatment. Based on the analysis of table IV.7, of the fifth hypothesis Ha₅ is rejected and Ho₅ is accepted. So, it can be concluded that "There is no significant difference of students' writing ability pre-test mean scores between an experimental group and a control group."

Hypothesis 6

The procedure of inferential statistics begins with the statistical test on the following alternative hypothesis:

Ha₆: There is a significant difference of students' writing ability post-test mean scores between an experimental group and a control group.

The result of post-test writing ability mean score for the experimental and control groups without considering students group is analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test and presented at the following Table IV.8:

Table 8. The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of post-test writing ability mean scores between experimental and control groups

Group	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	P
Experiment group	36	82.70	10.81	70	6.251	.000
Control group	36	68.26	8.67			

Based on Independent T-test analysis of post-test writing ability mean scores between experimental and control groups on Table IV.8 above, it shows that there is a significant difference at post-test writing ability mean score between experimental and control groups. T-test result is 6.251, its df is 70, standard deviation of the experimental group is 10.81 and the control group is 8.67. So, in the conclusion $p = 0.000$, the 2-tailed value is smaller than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). The result shows that the mean scores differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups are not equivalent after giving the treatment. Based on the analysis of table IV.8, of the sixth hypothesis Ha₆ is accepted and Ho₆ is rejected. So, it can be concluded that "There is a significant

difference on students' writing ability post-test mean scores between an experimental group and a control group."

Hypothesis 7

The inferential statistics procedure starts with the statistical test on the following alternative hypothesis:

Ha₇: There is a significant difference of students' writing ability between pre-test and post-test mean scores of the experimental group by using CLT through small group discussion.

The result of the effect on implementing the treatment of CLT through small group discussion on students' writing ability for the experimental group of the composite comparing score between pre-test and post-test is analysed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at Table IV.9:

Table 9. The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test between pre-test and post-test on students writing ability mean scores of the Experimental Group

Group	Mean	N	SD	Df	T	p
Pre-test	57.43	36	6.61	35	-10.755	.000
Post-test	82.70	36	10.81			

From Table IV.9, the output of paired sample t-test shows that the t-test result is -10.755, its df is 35, by comparing number of significance. If probability > 0.05 , null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. If probability < 0.05 alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. Because the significance is $0.000 < 0.05$, thus, H_a is accepted while H_0 is rejected. Then, the writer finds out the percentage of significant effect between pre-test and post-test of the experimental class by determining the effect size or eta-squared as follows:

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + n - 1}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{(-10.755)^2}{(-10.755)^2 + 36 - 1}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{115.67}{115.67 + 35}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = 0,76$$

$$Eta\text{-squared} = \tilde{\eta}^2 \times 100\%$$

$$Eta\text{-squared} = 0.76 \times 100\% = 76\%$$

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics which has been identified after conducting the treatment for 4 meetings or 8 class-hours by using CLT through small group discussion can improve 76% on students' writing ability. Therefore, the H_0 hypothesis is rejected and H_a is accepted that there is a significant difference on students' writing ability between pre-test and post-test mean score in the experimental group.

Hypothesis 8

The inferential statistics procedure starts with the statistical test on the following alternative hypothesis:

H_{a8}: There is significant difference of students' writing ability between pre-test and post-test mean scores of the control group.

The result of the effect on implementing the treatment of non-CLT through small group discussion on students' writing ability mean score for the control group of the composite comparing score for both pre-test and post-test is analysed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at the following Table IV.10:

Table 10. The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test between pre-test and post-test on students' writing ability for the control group Paired Sample T-Test

Group	Mean	N	SD	Df	T	P
Pre-test	55.2083	36	4.68	35	-6.804	.000
Post-test	68.2639	36	8.67			

From Table IV.10, the output of paired sample t-test shows that the t-test result is -6.804, its df is 35, by comparing number of significance. If probability > 0.05, null hypothesis (H₀) is accepted. If probability < 0.05 alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. Because the significance is 0.000 < 0.05, thus, H_a is accepted while H₀ is rejected.

Then, the writer finds out the percentage of significant effect between pre-test and post-test of the control class by determining the effect size or eta-squared as follows:

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + n - 1}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{(-6.804)^2}{(-6.804)^2 + 36 - 1}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{46.29}{46.29 + 35}$$

$$\tilde{\eta}^2 = 0.56$$

$$\text{Eta-squared} = \tilde{\eta}^2 \times 100\%$$

$$\text{Eta-squared} = 0.56 \times 100\% = 56\%$$

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics which has been identified after conducting the treatment for 4 meetings or 8 class-hours by using non-CLT through small group discussion can improve 56% on students' writing ability. Therefore, H₀₈ hypothesis is rejected and H_{a8} is accepted that there is a significant difference on students' writing ability between pre-test and post-test mean score in the control group.

DISCUSSION

The main aim of this study is to find out a significant effect of using CLT through small group discussion on students' reading comprehension and writing ability. In this research, both pre-test mean scores of students reading and writing were found out that there were no significant differences between an experimental group and a control group. The findings of hypotheses 1 and 5 showed that both experimental and control groups were equivalent before conducting the treatment. It means that the capability of students either in reading comprehension or writing ability were homogeneous before

conducting the treatments. Two research questions are formulated in this study.

The first research question: Is there any significant effect of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) through small group discussions on students' reading comprehension in procedure texts. Based on the data analysis, it shows that there is a significant effect on students' reading comprehension between pre-test and post-test mean scores for state senior high school. Then, the percentage of the significant effect between pre-test and post-test of the experimental class by finding out the effect size or eta-squared as follows: Eta-squared = 0.89. Burke (2011), stated that students gain a better understanding of themselves. Group work allows people to gain a more accurate picture of how others see them. The feedback that they receive may help them better achievement of their interpersonal behaviour. He added people remember group discussions better. Group learning fosters learning and comprehension. Students working in small groups have a tendency to learn more of what is taught and retain it longer than when the same material is presented in other instructional formats (Barkley, Cross and Major, 2005. Wilson et.al (2012, p.33), state that having a small group discussion enables teachers to recognize struggling readers and attend to their needs. In addition, the students learn more vocabulary words and comprehend the texts better when the reading in small group discussions. In addition, Richard (2006), stated that by applying CLT the students were able to produce and understand different types of texts. Then, the students had to participate in classroom activities that were based on a cooperative learning rather than individualistic approach to learning.

Small group discussion technique can significantly improve students' reading comprehension. The improvement of students' reading comprehension also can be seen from the students' success in achieving indicators of successful reading that catches the meaning of the text and the content of the text by paying attention to content and vocabulary. Thus, it can be concluded that small group discussion is a suitable technique which can improve students' reading comprehension. Within the CLT context, an individual group member's success is contingent on the success of the group as a whole, and is carried out through individual responsibility, positive interdependence, and individual contribution. In addition, the improvement of students' reading comprehension also can be seen from the students' success in achieving indicators of successful reading that is catching the meaning of the text and the content of the text by paying attention to content and vocabulary. Thus, it can be concluded that small group discussion is a suitable technique which can improve students' reading comprehension.

The second research question: Is there any significant effect of using CLT through small group discussion on students' writing ability?

Based on the data analysis, it shows that there is a significant improvement on students' writing ability pre-test and post-test mean score for Senior High School. Then, the percentage of the significant effect between pre-test and post-test of the experimental class by finding out the effect size or eta-squared as follows: Eta-squared = 0.76.

By comparing the number of significance, if probability > 0.05 H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected while if probability < 0.05 H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected. Because the significance is 0.000 and $0.000 < 0.05$, thus, H_a is accepted while H_0 is rejected. So, there is a significant effect of using CLT through small group discussion on students' reading comprehension and writing ability in procedure text of the experimental group. Maghfuroh, 2015. states most of the students were interested in the use of small group discussion as a technique to teaching writing texts. They are more active and confident enough to state their ideas. Beside that the teacher also gives the students a good motivation while implementing small group discussion. The students also sat that small group discussion make them easier to get the idea and made them easy in writing texts. Using small group discussion makes students easy to absorb their new knowledge and they can write they idea based on the group discuss then produce good text.

In addition, Burke, 2011, mentions students gain a better understanding of themselves. Group work allows people to gain a more accurate picture of how others see them. The feedback that they receive may help them better evaluate their interpersonal behavior. Overall, effective student participation in group work is an important learning outcome for higher education courses. Although many students feel as though they can accomplish assignments better by themselves rather than in a group, instructors find that group work helps the students apply knowledge. Small group is a strategy that is implemented by using communicative language teaching. It is supposed to be more effective way to teach writing of procedure text. Through small group discussion, the students share their knowledge, ideas or experiences to each other particularly when they have best words (word choice) for writing procedure text, organizing text structure, and using language features appropriately. Richard and Roger 2001, p.200) state that small group will be carried out when students are required to have writing practice. This procedure involves cooperative writing and editing pair arrangements.

In short, CLT through small group discussion strategies help the experimental group pay more attention to the target of learning, invest a higher level of ability and mental effort, and engage in a deeper cognitive processing. Then, as the reflection of this method is that, the teacher would notice that the student could achieve assignments better by group rather than by themselves. The students enjoy the discussion of their ideas because the teacher usually provides more opportunities to them. To solve the students' problem on reading comprehension and writing ability, one of the effective strategies is CLT through small group discussion. Based on the journal article about CLT and Small group discussion, it already gave a proof that CLT through small group discussion could help the student's reading comprehension and writing ability. The result of this study showed that most of the students were interested in the use of small group discussion as a technique to teaching writing descriptive text. They would be more active and confident enough to state their ideas. It could be seen that most students stated that the small group discussion was interesting for the teaching reading and writing skills.

Conclusion

The findings indicate that there are significant effects of using Communicative Language Teaching through small group discussion on students' reading comprehension and writing

ability. The significant effect of students' reading comprehension of CLT is 89%, and on students' writing ability is 76% which means that CLT on reading comprehension contributes more effect compared to writing ability. At last, it can be inferred that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Through Small Group Discussion on Students' reading Comprehension and Writing Ability can be applied to teach at any Senior High School levels in Kampar regency of Riau province.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah Hasan. 2018, *The Effect of Scientific Approach on Students' English Achievement for Junior High School Level in Riau Province. Indonesia.*
- Alfaki. 2015. *University Students' English Writing Problems: Diagnosis and Remedy.* European Centre For Research Training and Development UK Vol.3, No.3, pp.40-52, May 2015.
- Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. 2005. *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty.* San Francisco; Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bartholomae, Megan, et al. 2010. *Bringing Four Square Writing to Life.* Retrieved: December 20, 2016 from: <http://www.d46.k12.il.us/2011conference/pdf/454squarepres.pdf>
- Beebe, S. A., & Masterson, J. T. 2003. *Communicating in small groups.* Pearson Education Inc. Boston: Massachusetts.
- Brown, H.D. 2000. *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices.* New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H.D. 2003. *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices.* New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown. 2003. *How to writing process.* Retrieved: December 20, 2016 from: <http://www.nadabs.tripod.com/ghaith-writing.html>.
- Burke. (2011). *Group work: How to use groups effectively.* Ashland: Southern Oregon university
- Burke. 2011. *Group work: How to use groups effectively.* Ashland: Southern Oregon university
- Cohen, E. G. 1994a. *Designing group work: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom (2nd ed.).* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Crystal, David. 2012, *English as a Global Language.* 2nd edition, Institute for Cultural Diplomacy.
- Curriculum 2013 standard competency of English Language, Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Curriculum 2013 standard competency of English Language, Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Derrick Meador. June 9, 2017. *Exploring the Value of Whole Group Instruction.* <https://www.thoughtco.com/exploring-the-value-of-whole-group-instruction-3194549>,
- Gay L.R. and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and application,* 6th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc
- Guidelines, Curriculum 2013 the Ministry of Education and Culture Number 81A. 2013
- Maghfuroh. 2015. *Developing Descriptive Writing Skill by Using Small Group Discussion For Tenth Graders.* Surabaya: english education, language and art faculty, state university of Surabaya
- Murcia Elite Olstain and Celce. M. 2000. *Discourse and context in language teaching.* New York: Combridge University Press.

- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. 1999. *Writing Academic English*. (3rd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Reid, J. M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Richards, Jack C. 2003. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Second Edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Jack C. 2006. *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tyner, E. 1987. *Collage writing basics: A progressive approach*. Belmont. Wands worth Publishing Company.
- Wilson, et.al. 2012. *Small-group Reading Instruction: Lesson From the Field*. *Dimension of early childhood* Vol 40, No.3. 2012
- Wood, Joseph. 2011. *Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and communication strategies (CSs): Theory and Practice*.

- Richards, Jack C. 2006. *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savignon, S. 1983. *Communicative Competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Reading, MA: Addyson-Wesley