e-Journal of ELTS (English Language Teaching Society) Vol. 9 No. 3, September-December 2021
p-ISSN 2338-1841, e-ISSN 2721-2157 pp. 257-266

THE USE OF STUDENT CENTERED-LEARNING (SCL) TO DEVELOP STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL

***Uswatun Hasanah[1)], Anshari Syafar[2)]**

[1,2)]English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Tadulako University, Palu

*uswatunuswa010599@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui pengaruh teknik Student-Centered Learning (SCL) untuk mengembangkan keterampilan berbicara siswa kelas dua. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain eksperimen kuasi eksperimen. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas II yaitu kelas XI IPA 4 sebagai kelas eksperimen dan XI IPA 1 sebagai kelas kontrol. Dalam pemilihan sampel, sampel penelitian dipilih dengan menggunakan teknik convenience sampling untuk menentukan sampel. Pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui pre-test dan post-test. Data dianalisis menggunakan uji-tes untuk membandingkan nilai rata-rata pre-test dan post-test dari kelompok eksperimen dan kontrol. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa perbedaan rerata kemampuan klasikal siswa kelas control dan eksperimen adalah 45,1 dan 49 pada pre-test, sedangkan post-test adalah 61,16 dan 55,29. Analisis lebih lanjut menunjukkan t-hitung (3,85) lebih besardari t-tabel (1,67) yang berarti bahwa penggunaan SCL berdampak pada prestasi berbicara siswa. Oleh karena itu, hipotesis penelitian ini diterima yang berarti ada peningkatan kemampuan berbicara mereka..

Istilah Kunci: SCL, Keterampilan berbicara.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to find out the effect of the Student-Centered Learning (SCL) technique to develop the speaking skill of second grade students. This research applied the experimental design of quasi-experiments. The population of this research was the second-grade students that were XI IPA 4 as experimental class and XI IPA 2 as control class. In sample selection, the research sample was selected using the convenience sampling technique to determine the sample. The data were collected through pre-test and post-test. Data were analyzed using t-test to compare the mean score of the pre-test and the post-test from experimental and control groups .The results showed that the mean differences in the classical abilities of the control and experimental class students were 45.1 and 49 in the pre-test, while the post-test were 61.16 and 55.29. Further analysis indicates t-counted (3.85) is greater than the t-tables (1.67)which means that the use of SCL has an impact on students' speaking achievement. Therefore, the hypothesis of this research is accepted which means there is an improvement in their ability in speaking.

Key Terms: SCL, Speaking skil

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is a process where students are required to speak but use English. Speaking can also be interpreted as a forum for expressing opinions or words that we want to convey. Speaking is an important skill that students must master in order to

communicate in English fluently and clearly. Speaking entails interaction with one or more participants (Harmer, 2001:271), which means that effective speaking entails a significant amount of listening. In speaking, there are several things that must be considered when speaking in English, such as grammar and pronunciation. If you want to master a language, it is hoped that students will use speaking in everyday life. According to Brown (2004), grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension are the five components of speaking. Grammar is a set of structural rules in a sentence that includes elements such as a noun, verb, adverb, and adjective. If the speakers understand and can use English grammar, the spoken information can be well structured. As a result, the information is easier for the listeners to understand.

When English lessons arrive students need speaking to communicate with other people because speaking is the second skill after listening as a tool to accept and process information. You know speaking can be said an interactive activity in building up the thoughts such as the input of information, output of information, and giving out information.

When students learn to speak, students can speak fluently coupled with proper grammar and pronunciation and also master a lot of vocabulary. Spoken language means transferring thoughts to other people which can be done by speaking. When speaking with one another, there are some aspects that affect how speaking is taken place. These aspects are fluency, accuracy, and comprehensibility. In speaking, fluency is sometimes neglected or put aside like using correct grammar and pronunciation. Take an example, in Bahasa Indonesia, to say something that has been done yesterday, there is no change in the action word or verb. Thing has been done yesterday only explained by the adverb of the sentence. Meanwhile in English, to state what happened yesterday, the verb needs to be changed in past participle. Although, both of them still use the adverb to explain, the difference may be seen on the change of the action word. Sometimes this occurs because the speaker emphasizes more on the fluency than the accuracy.

METHOD

The researcher used experimental research to see the cause and effect relationship of the research variables, which is quasi-experimental. This research

consists of two groups, they were experimental class and control class. Both of the groups get pre-test and post-test. The technique given in the treatment was Students-Centered Learning technique.

In addition, both the experimental and the control groups were compared by seeing the result of the pre-test and the post-test. In analyzing the data, the researchers employed a simple statistical analysis. First, the researcher analyzed the individual scores of the students both on pretest and posttest using the formula proposed by Arikunto (2006:240) as follows:

$$\sum = \frac{x}{N} \mathbf{x\ 100}$$

After getting the students' individual scores, the researcher analyzed the group mean score on pre-test and post-test using the formula suggested by Arikunto (2006:307) as shown below:$\mathbf{M} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$

Next, the researcher analyzed the sum of the square of the pre-test and the post-test using the following formula of Arikunto (2006:312)

$$\mathbf{d = X_2 - X_1}$$

After that, the researcher used square deviation formulas proposed by Arikunto (2006:312) which are as follows:

1. The formula applied for the experimental group :$\sum x^2 = \sum x^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{n}$
2. The formulaapplied for the control group : $\sum y^2 = \sum y^2 - \frac{(\sum y)^2}{n}$

After calculating all of the formulae above, the researchers applied them into the t-test formula in order to find out whether or not there is an effect of the treatment which is SCL Activities method for the experimental class in improving the students' ability in speaking. The t-test formula used is proposed by Arikunto (2006:311) which is as follows:

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$

After that, to analyze scores of students' speaking ability, the researcherand the second rater computed the score of the testby applying the formula also proposed by Purwanto (2004) to get their individual score.

$$NP = \frac{R}{SM} \times 100$$

After obtaining scores from the two raters, the researcher discovered gained score of students' speaking tests. The formula can be seen as follows:

$$R = \frac{r1+r2}{2}$$

DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

DATA PRESENTATION

Since the results of this research were analyzed statistically, in offering data, the researcher analyzed the data taken from pre-test and post-test that was given to both control and experimental class. The data was to measure the effectiveness of the treatment used in this research, which is Student Centered-Learning (SCL) in improving speaking skill at SMA Negeri 1 Dampal Selatan. Further, the researcher elaborates the pre-test and the post-test results in the following points:

Based on the table, it can be seen that there were 28 students of the experimental class who received the pre-test. There are two students who are not able to join in the pre-test and post-test; therefore the researcher did not input their results. Further, the researcher only provided one kind of test which was an oral presentation test. The researcher asked the experimental class' students to individually speak in front of the class when the researcher was recording the students.

Moreover, referring to the four scales written in the previous chapter, the pre-test's results of the experimental class discover that there were only two students who acquired 75 as the highest standard score and there were also two students who acquired 25 in the standard score as the lowest. Those two students received the *"Fair"* category. On the other hand, the two students who acquired 25 received the "*Very poor"* category. Further, there are four students who received the "*Fair"* category and 22 students who received the "*Poor"* category. Further, it also can be obviously seen that from the total

maximum score which is 224, the students' obtained score was 101 in total, and the students' total standard score was 1,262.5.

After analyzing the students' individual scores, The researchers provides the calculation as follows:

$\bar{X} = 45.1$

Table showed that the minimum of students' speaking score was 37.5 Minimum score means the lowest score with which students will be considered to have passed the minimum project threshold requirement related to scoring. The maximum of students' speaking scores was 75. The median of students' speaking score is 45.75. The mode of students' speaking score was 37.5 and the mean of students' speaking score was 47.76 a mean scale score is the average performance of a group of students on an assessment.

Additionally, the results of the pre-test conducted in the experimental class showed that there were 20 students categorized as "*poor"* in the pre-test. Those students acquired 37.5 and 50 respectively, which 37.5 is the lowest standard score of all. On the other hand, six students were in the *"fair"* category because their standard scores were 62.5, and 75 respectively.Further, the results also show that the students' total obtained score was 102 while the maximum score was 208 in total. Besides, the students' total standard score of the control class gained in the pre-test was 1275.

The researchers provides the computation of students' speaking ability of the control class as follows:

$$\bar{X} = 49$$

Hence, by having the result of students' speaking ability, in the pre-test, the control class only gained 49. Further, since the students' speaking ability of the experimental class in the pre-test was nearly equal to the students' ability of the control class, it can be inferred that the ability of both students of control and experimental class in speaking waspoor.

Table indicates that the minimum score of students was 31.25, the maximum score was 75, the median score was 50, the mode score was 37.5 and the mean score was 48.79.

The table shows that there were 28 students of the experimental class receiving the post-test. There are two students who did not join the class, therefore, from 30 students there are only 28 students participated in the research. From 28 students, there were two students gaining 100 in standard scores. Those students were categorized as "*good"*. Besides, 13 students were in "*fair"* category. Thirteen students gained 37.5 and 50 respectively in the standard score meaning that they were in *"poor"* category.Further, it also can be seen that the students' total obtained score was 131, and the students' standard score was 1,712.5 in total.

The researchers after that continued computing the students' speaking ability of the experimental class in the post-test. The researchers provide the calculation as follows:

$\bar{X}$ =61.16.

As written on the table, it can be obviously seen that from 18 students in the control class, there were only two students who got 87.5 and 100 in the standard score and were categorized as *"good"*. Twenty-four students were in*"fair"* and *"poor"*category. Furthermore, the table also shows that the students' total obtained score in the post-test was 117 while the standard score of the students in total was 1,437.5.

Therefore, by having the result, it can be obviously seen that the students' ability of the control class in the post-test was 55.29. Moreover, by looking at the data of the experimental class, it can be inferred that the comparison of the pre-test's results and the post-test's results were slightly improved. Nevertheless, the experimental class had improvement that is more significant rather than the control class had.

Having calculated the students' speaking ability of control and experimental class in pre-tests and post-tests, the researcher continued analyzing the data by finding out the data of deviation and the square deviation of both experimental and control classes.

From the table, it can be seen that the students' total standard score of the control class in the pre-test was 1,275 while students' standard score of the post-test in total was 1,437.5. Furthermore, the highest square deviation was 625 and the deviation

was 25. On the other hand, the lowest square deviation was 0 gained by 18 students, for their score of deviation was 0. Additionally, the 4.6 table also reveals that the total deviation score of the control class was 150. Meanwhile, the sum of square deviation of the experimental class was 3,125.

The researchers used the same formula as what was used to calculate the previous mean score deviation. The researcher then provides the calculation as follows:

$M_y = 5.77$

Before analyzing the data by using t_{-test} formula, the researchers afterward continued the calculation by computing the sum square deviation of both control and experimental class. Below is the calculation of the sum of square deviation of the experimental class.

$\sum x^2 = 2{,}762.7$

The researchers also provide the sum of square deviation of the experimental class which is as follows:

$\sum y^2 = 2{,}259.6$

Therefore, the sum of square deviation of control class and experimental from those calculations were 2,259.6 and 2,768.7 respectively. The formula used was the formula proposed by Arikunto (2008) stated in the previous chapter. The researcher then presents the calculation below:

$$t = 3.85$$

Thus, by having the formula, it can be determined that the $t_{counted}$of this research was obviously 3.85.

Before deciding whether the hypothesis of this research is accepted or rejected, the researcher then needed to find out the critical t_{table} by using 0.05 level of significance. Additionally, the degree of freedom (df) of this research was 52. It was determined by adding the number of students of the experimental class ($N_{x)}$ and control class ($N_{y),}$ subtracting by 2.

Since there was no 52 df on the t-distribution table, the researcher then applied an interpolation formula in order to determine the t_{table}. The researcher presents the calculations as follows:

$$\frac{a}{b}\ c = \frac{2}{10}\ 0.005 = \ 0.001$$

Then, in order to find out the critical t_{-table} value, the computation was 1.671−0.001=1.67. Hence, by looking at the value the researcher believes that the research hypothesis is accepted for the reason that the $t_{-counted}$ (3.85) is much higher than the t_{-table} (1.67). To sum up, the implementation of Student Centered-Learning (SCL) can improve the students' speaking skill.

DISCUSSION

In the Experimental class at the time of the pretest students got a total score of 101 with a standard value of 1,262.5. Meanwhile, at the post-test (Table 4.3) students got a total score of 131 with a standard score of 1,712.5. This proves that the students' ability in speaking increased during the post-test because the initial mean score of 45.1 at the time of the post-test could be categorized as Good because the mean score was 61.16.

Similarly, in the Control pretest class students got a total score of 102 with a standard value of 1275. Meanwhile, during the post-test students got a total score of 117 with a maximum score of 1,437.5. In the control class, there was a slight increase with the initial mean score of 49 while the second mean score of 55.29.

After calculating the speaking ability of the experimental class and control class students in the pre-test and post-test, the researcher continued to analyze the data by finding the value of the square deviation of the experimental class and the control class. In table 4.5 for the experimental class, one of the students obtained the lowest squared deviation of 0, while the highest deviation was 37.5, which means the squared deviation was 1,406.3. By obtaining a total deviation of 450 and a squared deviation of 9,994.8. The mean deviation score obtained in the experimental class is 16.07. In table for the control class, the highest squared deviation is 625 with a deviation of 25. On the other hand, the lowest squared deviation is 0 which is obtained by 18 students, for their

deviation score is 0. By obtaining a total deviation of 150 and a squared deviation of 3.125. The mean deviation score obtained in the control class is 5.77.

The next researchers did the calculation of deviation in the experimental class and the control class. In the class, the score is 2,762.7. Meanwhile, in the control class, the score is 2,259.6. After calculating the squared deviation of each class. The next researcher calculated the t-counted and got the result of 3.85. Then after that calculate the t-table value again using the interpolation formula to get the result of 1.67. From the comparison of t counted and t table, the value of t counted is greater than t table so it can be said that this research is categorized as successful.

CONCLUSION

The researchers draw a conclusion which the implementation SCL Approach in SmaNegeri 1 Dampal Selatancan improve the students' speaking skills. Through 6 meetings, the students show improvement in their ability in speaking. The differences between the classical students' ability of both control and experimental class on post-test were respectively 61.16 and 55.29. Furthermore, to strengthen, the $t_{counted}$(3.85) was higher than the t_{tables} (1.67) which means there is a significant improvement in the students' achievement. Therefore, the hypothesis of this research is accepted.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers give all our praises to the almighty God, Allah SWT, for all blessing, mercy, health, and opportunity given to us, so that weare able to complete this research. The researchers also do not forget to thank to the students from grade XI at SMA Negeri 1 Dampal Selatan who have participated in our research investigation.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. (2006).*ProsedurPenelitianPendekatanPraktek (EdisiRevisi VI)*, Jakarta: PT. BinaPuraAksara.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2007).*Research Method in Education.* Canada: Routledge.

Gerard, K. (2000).*How to Teach Pronunciation*. Toronto: Copp Clark LTD.

Harris, David. 1974. *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: Mc. Graw. Hill Book Company.

Harris, D.P. 1969. *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: TataMcGraw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd

Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* Harlow: Longman.

_____ . (2001).*The Practice of English Language Teaching Third Edition.* London. Longman Press.

_____ ..(2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching (Fourth Edition). England.*

Hamed Saeid Ben Nadia. (2018). *Role- Play Technique and the Oral Skill Improvement :A Case Study of Some Libyan Students at the English Language Centre of the Libyan Academy in Tripoli.* University of Tripoli.

Kamal, F. (2014). *Developing Speaking of Grade Tenth Students at PPM Al-Istiqamah Palu through Acoustic Song.* Unpublished Skripsi. Palu: Universitas Tadulako.

Larasati Finza. (2018). *Student centered learning: an approach to develop speaking skill in efl classroom.* UniversitasMuhammadiyah Palembang.

Nunan D (2003). *The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educatinal Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pasific Region TESOL Quarterly 37(4).589-613*

Paulston, C. B. &Bruder, M. N. (1976).*Teaching English as a Second Languag:* Techniques and Procedures. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Winthrop Publishers.

Richards Jack C. & Schmidt R. (2002).*Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.* London.

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

Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. 2005. *The TKT Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thornbury, (2005).*How to Teach Speaking.*New York: Pearson Education Limited.

Widiawati ShelaPutu, (2020). *The Effect of Debate Technique towards Eleventh Grade Students' Speaking Competency*. 3 Ganesha University of Education