

ABSTRACT

Lesangi, P. Tenri. 2016. *The Comparison of Student's Speaking Ability Taught by Using Communicative Language Teaching and Grammar Translation Method at the second Year Students of MTsN 1 Model Pare Kediri*. Thesis, Teacher Training and Education English Department, Kadiri Islamic University of Kediri.

Advisor : (1) Dr. H. Mohammad Naim Musafik, SH.MH, M.Pd
(2) Sri Wulandari M.Pd

Key Words : *Comparison, Speaking Skill, Grammar Translation Method, Communicative Language Teaching.*

There are many English teachers who have been teaching speaking by using conventional method, which is one way or passive teaching method and not the interactive method in class. Furthermore, many teachers just inquire their students to do some exercises and spend their time at the class in mastering other skill such as writing and reading because they have to make their students achieve a good result in the last examination. Therefore, the students lack practice in English communicating orally.

If a problem occurs, it can be solved by choosing a suitable method and several techniques that will build the student initiative in interacting and communicating in the class. After words, the students will improve their competent in speaking skills.

In this research, the research design used is quantitative experimental design by using two classes experiment. The subject of this research is the students of MTsN 1 Model Pare Kediri in 8.i and 8.g class. The data collected by using speaking test namely presentation. From the result of post-test and to know the significant difference between students' speaking skill after being taught by using CLT and GTM, and the comparison of teaching speaking by using CLT and GTM as a media. And the data analyzed by using independent sample t-test

The result of t-test calculation is GTM method is more suitable and effective than CLT method. The mean difference of GTM and CLT is same - 6,846. The standard error difference of CLT is 394 and GTM is 395. The df CLT is 72 and GTM is 68,287. Then the significant 2 tailed is shown 0,000. It means that the accuracy of H_0 rejection is 100% right or 0% wrong. The hypothesis alternative is accepted. So, teaching speaking using GTM is proven more effective than CLT.

It is similar with expert recommendation such as Widdowson (1999) in Shih-Chuan Chang(17, 2010) stated that "learners do not very readily infer knowledge of the language system from their communicative activities". CLT is an inappropriate methodology in those cultural contexts where the teacher is regarded as a fount of wisdom, and where accuracy is valued more highly than fluency" Thornbury, S.(2003) in Shih-Chuan Chang(17, 2010). And According to Larson-Freeman (1986) in Shih-Chuan Chang (18, 2010), the most obvious characteristics of CLT is that everything that is done with a communicative