International Journal of Social Science And Human Research

ISSN(print): 2644-0679, ISSN(online): 2644-0695

Volume 05 Issue 11 November 2022

DOI: 10.47191/ijsshr/v5-i11-11, Impact factor- 5.871 Page No: 4893-4900

The Communicative Approach Implementation to Improve Speaking Ability Students of Class VIII-2 SMP Negeri 7 Ambon Indonesia



Everhard Markiano Solissa¹, Marlen Wariunsora²

¹Department of Indonesian Language and Literature Education, FKIP Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia ²Departement of Teacher Certification Program, FIPK Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Ambon, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: This study aims to improve the speaking ability of students in class VIII-2 at SMP Negeri 7 Ambon through the communicative approach. The research data is in the form of speaking ability test results in each cycle. The research subjects were students of class VIII-2 SMP Negeri 7 Ambon. The final score of each student is obtained from the acquisition score divided by the total score then multiplied by the ideal score (100). The final value is then converted according to the specified criteria. The results showed that there was an increase in students' speaking ability at class VIII-2 SMP Negeri 7 Ambon through communicative approach. This can be seen from the number of students who achieved the minimum completeness criteria (in Indonesia = KKM) in the first cycle, namely 12 students (54,54%) to 18 students (81,81%) in the second cycle.

KEYWORDS: completeness, communicative approach, learning outcomes, speaking ability

INTRODUCTION

Learning is a complex process that occurs in everyone throughout life. The learning process occurs because of the interaction between a person and the environment (Raibowo et al., 2019; Roziqin & Khanif, 2022; Saodah et al., 2020). Therefore, learning can happen anytime and anywhere. One sign that someone has learned is a change in behavior in that person which may be caused by a change in the level of knowledge, skills or attitudes.

One form of potential learning resources is that which is developed based on communication theory and utilizes or utilizes various forms and types of communication technology. That is, mass communication media have great potential to be used or utilized as a source of learning and learning(Hadi, 2010). According to Danim (2008) educational technology is a combination of learning, learning, development, processing, and other technologies that are applied to solve educational problems.

Each learning process carried out by students will produce learning outcomes. In the learning process, the teacher as a teacher as well as an educator holds a large role and responsibility in order to help improve student success, which is influenced by the quality of students, the quality of teachers and the internal factors of the students themselves.

In the learning process at school, it is certain that every student expects to get good learning outcomes, because good learning outcomes can help students achieve their goals. Good learning outcomes are only achieved through a good learning process. If the learning process is not optimal, it is very difficult to expect good learning outcomes to occur.

According to Hamalik (2003) learning outcomes indicate learning achievement, while learning achievement is an indicator of the degree of change in student behavior. Nasution said that learning outcomes are the result of an interaction between teaching and learning activities and are usually indicated by the test scores given by the teacher.

In the process of language learning, there are important things that need to be considered, namely language skills. Language skills have 4 components, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills (Sulistiana et al., 2019). The unity of these components is very closely related, so it is called single chess. These skills can only be acquired and mastered through practice and lots of practice. Practicing language skills also means training thinking skills. To reach a higher level, it can be started by listening, speaking, reading and writing.

Speaking ability as language skills are the ability to pronounce articulation sounds or words to express, say and convey thoughts, ideas, and feelings (Tarigan, 1990). Listeners receive information through pitch, pressure, and joint placement. if the communication takes place face-to-face coupled with the movement of the hands and facial expressions (mimic) of the speaker.

In addition, it is said that speaking is the skill of conveying messages through spoken language. The link between messages and spoken language as a medium of delivery is very heavy. The message received by the listener is not in the original

form, but in another form, namely the sound of language. The listener then tries to divert the message in the form of the sound of the language into its original form (Tarigan, 1990).

Speaking ability is the ability to pronounce sentences to express, state, convey thoughts, ideas, and feelings (Aprinawati, 2017; Melasarianti, 2018; Tambunan, 2018). Some of the opinions above can be concluded that speaking is more than just saying sounds or words, but rather a tool to communicate ideas that are compiled and developed according to the needs of the listener or listener.

The communicative approach has an important role in the learning process. The communicative approach is an approach in language learning that emphasizes the ability to communicate and interact in everyday situations. The communicative approach is the instinctive mastery of a native speaker to use and understand language naturally in the process of communicating or interacting and in relation to social contexts (Astami et al., 2013; Ismail, 2004; Rifa'i, 2021).

The communicative approach is an approach that integrates the teaching of language functions and grammar (Baroroh & Tolinggi, 2020; Herawati, 2016; Rusnah, 2019; Tur'aeni, 2019). From some of the opinions above, it seems that the communicative approach wants to emphasize the function of language as a communication tool in the process of human interaction. Communication here can also be in the form of oral and written communication.

The results of observations in class VIII-2 of SMP Negeri 7 Ambon showed that the speaking ability of students in that class had not reached the specified Minimum Completeness Criteria (KKM). Therefore, this research was conducted with the aim of improving students' speaking ability through a communicative approach.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Definition of Learning

The word learning is interpreted as an activity towards a better direction in a systematic way. Bruner (Herawati, 2020; Nursalam et al., 2017) suggests that the learning process consists of three stages, namely the information, transformation and evaluation stages. The information stage is the stage of explanation, decomposition, or knowledge of the principles of the structure of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. The transformation stage is the process of transitioning or transferring the principles of the structure into students. The transformation process is carried out through information. However, that information must be analyzed, changed or transformed into a more abstract or conceptual form in order to be used in a wider context. It requires the role and assistance of teachers.

Learning theory was also put forward by Gagne who determined the learning process through careful analysis through a teaching contribution. He makes teaching contributions based on the description of variations in change (Mayliana & Sofyan, 2013; Sirait, 2016; Sundari & Muliyawati, 2017). What is meant by depiction variations are changes in behavior that occur in students. The word learning means the process of changing behavior in students due to the interaction between individuals and their environment through experience and practice. These changes occur as a whole, involving cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects.

Skinner (Dimyati & Mudjiono, 2002) states that learning is a behavior when people learn. Then the response becomes better and vice versa if you do not learn the response will decrease. Meanwhile, according to Gagne, learning is a set of cognitive processes that change the nature of environmental stimuli, through processing information, into new capacities (Dimyati & Mudjiono, 2002).

Learning in this study is defined as all the efforts given by the teacher so that students are able to master what they have received in this case is Indonesian language lessons.

2. Learning Outcomes

Learning outcomes are the abilities that students have after receiving their learning experiences (Sudjana, 2010). Meanwhile, according to Horwart, there are three kinds of teaching and learning outcomes (1) skills and habits, (2) knowledge and direction, (3) attitudes and ideals (Sudjana, 2010).

From the opinion above, it can be concluded that learning outcomes are the skills, attitudes and skills acquired by students after receiving the treatment given by the teacher so that they can construct knowledge in everyday life.

The learning outcomes achieved by students are influenced by two factors, namely internal factors and external factors (Juniarti et al., 2015; Mawarsih & Hamidi, 2013; Nurmala et al., 2014; Syafi'i et al., 2018). Clark and Clark (Sudjana, 2010) stated that 70% of school student learning outcomes are influenced by students' abilities and 30% are influenced by the environment. Likewise, factors from outside the student's self, namely the environment that is the most dominant in the form of learning quality.

So, it can be said that student learning outcomes are influenced by two factors from within individual students in the form of personal abilities (internal) and external factors, namely the environment. Thus, learning outcomes are something that is achieved or obtained by students thanks to their efforts or thoughts which are expressed in the form of mastery, knowledge and

basic conversations contained in various aspects of life so that it appears in the individual, the use of assessments of attitudes, knowledge and skills obtained by students. found in various aspects of life, so that it appears in the individual changes in behavior quantitatively.

3. Speaking Ability

Speaking ability as language skills are the ability to pronounce articulation sounds or words to express, say and convey thoughts, ideas, and feelings (Tarigan, 1990). Listeners receive information through pitch, pressure, and joint placement and duration. If the communication takes place face-to-face coupled with the movement of the hands and facial expressions (mimic) of the speaker.

Tarigan (1990) states that speaking is a skills to convey messages through spoken language. The link between messages and spoken language as a medium of delivery is very heavy. The message received by the listener is not in the original form, but in another form, namely the sound of language. The listener then tries to divert the message in the form of the sound of the language into its original form.

Speaking ability is the ability to pronounce sentences to express, state, convey thoughts, ideas, and feelings (Aprinawati, 2017; Melasarianti, 2018; Tambunan, 2018). So, speaking is more than just saying sounds or words, but a tool for communicating ideas that are carefully arranged so that they are understood by listeners.

4. Communicative Approach

The communicative approach is an approach that views language as something that can be done or acted on with language (function) or with respect to what meaning can be expressed through language (nosi), but not with regard to grammatical items (Aflisia & Hazuar, 2020; Batmang, 2014). In other words, we use language to apologize, greet, persuade, advise, praise, or to express certain meanings, but not to reveal the grammatical categories found by linguists. This is also in line with Sumardi's opinion (Patiung, 2017) that this approach is structured on the basis of the functions and needs of the learner, with the hope that the learner can use language to communicate in real situations and not artificial communication.

Finochiaro and Brumfit (Arsyad, 2019; Edi, 2017; Laily, 2015; Subur, 2008) offer an outline of learning with a communicative approach for junior high school level as follows.

- a) Presentation of a short dialogue. This presentation is preceded by giving motivation by connecting dialogue situations with learning experiences in everyday life
- b) Oral dialogue training presented. This training begins with an example conducted by the teacher. The students repeat the teacher's oral examples, either together, in half, in small groups or individually.
- c) Questions and answers. This was done in two phases. First, question and answer based on the topic and situation of the dialogue. Second, questions and answers about the topic are related to the students' personal experiences.
- d) Assessment. Students are invited to examine one of the expressions that occur in the dialogue. Next, the students were given the task of giving examples of other expressions that have the same communicative function.
- e) Drawing conclusions. Students are directed to make inferences about the grammatical rules contained in the dialogue.
- f) Interpretive Activities. Students are directed to interpret some of the spoken dialogues.
- g) Oral production activities. Assessed from guided communication activities to free activities.
- h) Assignment

METHOD

The type of research design used in the study is classroom action research (CAR), namely research used by teachers in the classroom with the aim of improving their performance as a teacher so that student learning outcomes increase (Arikunto, 2010). This CAR model refers to the CAR model described by Elliot (Yuliawati, 2012) namely planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting.

This research was conducted in class VIII-2 SMP Negeri 7 Ambon with the number of subjects as many as 22 students. Data was collected by using test, observation, and interview techniques. The main data of this research is test data which is analyzed by the following formula.

final score =
$$\frac{earned\ score}{tolal\ score} \times 100$$

(BNSP, 2007)

| | earned score | : | the total number of scores obtained by students |
|--------|--------------|---|---|
| | total skor | : | $4 \ge 3 = 12$ |
| | ideal score | : | 100 |
| 1. | 1 .1. | | |

To assess students' speaking ability, an assessment rubric is used as shown in table 1.

Table 1. Speaking Ability Assessment Rubric

| Indicators | Levels | Score |
|---------------|-----------|-------|
| pronunciation | Very Good | 3 |
| | Good | 2 |
| | Fair | 1 |
| grammar | Very Good | 3 |
| | Good | 2 |
| | Fair | 1 |
| vocabulary | Very Good | 3 |
| | Good | 2 |
| | Fair | 1 |
| comprehension | Very Good | 3 |
| | Good | 2 |
| | Fair | 1 |

(Nurgiantoro, 2018)

RESULT

(1) Learning Cycle I

The results of the assessment of the speaking ability of students of class VIII-2 SMP Negeri 7 Ambon in the first cycle of learning are presented in table 2.

Table 2. Speaking Ability Assessment Results

Class VIII-2 Students of SMP Negeri 7 Ambon

Cycle I

| No. Subject | Indi | cators | | | G | E1 C | Deservinet |
|-------------|------|--------|---|---|---------|-------------|-------------|
| - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | — Score | Final Score | Description |
| S1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 91.66 | Complete |
| S2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 41.66 | - |
| S3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 83.3 | Complete |
| S4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
| S5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 50 | - |
| S6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 66,66 | - |
| S 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 83.33 | Complete |
| S8 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
| S9 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 66 | - |
| S10 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
| S11 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
| S12 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 41.66 | - |
| S13 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 50 | - |
| S14 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 83.33 | Complete |
| S15 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 66 | - |
| S16 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 83.33 | Complete |
| S17 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 41.66 | - |
| S18 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 50 | - |
| S19 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
| S20 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 83.33 | Complete |
| S21 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 66,66 | - |
| S22 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |

 $1 = \mathbf{Pronunciation}$

2 = Grammar

3 = Vocabulary

4 = Comprehension

Table 2 shows that 10 students (45.45%) have not reached the KKM, while 12 students (54.54%) have achieved the KKM. This means that there are still many students who have not finished. So, this research was continued in cycle II because completeness was still below the standard set by the researcher, namely at least 75% of all students.

Based on table 2, it is known that the difficulties faced by students in speaking are as in table 3.

Table 3. Student Difficulty DataCycle I

| | Difficulty Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| No. Subject | Pronunciation | Grammar | Vocabulary | Comprehension | | | | | |
| S1 | | | | | | | | | |
| S2 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S 3 | \checkmark | | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S4 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S5 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S 6 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S 7 | \checkmark | | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S 8 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S9 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S10 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S11 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | | |
| S12 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S13 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S14 | \checkmark | | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S15 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S16 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | | | |
| S17 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S18 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S19 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S20 | \checkmark | | | | | | | | |
| S21 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S22 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |

Table 2 shows that the aspects that have not been achieved by students are pronunciation (22 students), grammar (17 students), vocabulary (11 students) and comprehension (18 students).

(2) Learning Cycle II

The results of the assessment of the speaking ability of grade VIII-2 SMP Negeri 7 Ambon students in the second cycle of learning are presented in table 4.

Table 4. Speaking Ability Assessment ResultsClass VIII-2 Students of SMP Negeri 7 Ambon

Cycle II

| No. Subject | Indio | cators | | | Saama | Eta al Garage | D |
|-------------|-------|--------|---|---|---------|--------------------|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | — Score | Final Score | Description |
| S1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 100 | Complete |
| S2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
| S3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 91,33 | Complete |
| S4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 100 | Complete |
| S5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
| S6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 83,33 | Complete |
| S 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 83.33 | Complete |
| S8 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 83,33 | Complete |

| S9 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
|---------------------|-----------|---|---|---|----|-------|----------|
| S10 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
| S11 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 83,33 | Complete |
| S12 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 58,33 | - |
| S13 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 58,33 | - |
| S14 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 91,33 | Complete |
| S15 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 83.3 | - |
| S16 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 91,33 | Complete |
| S17 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 58,33 | - |
| S18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 58,33 | - |
| S19 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 75 | Complete |
| S20 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 83.3 | Complete |
| S21 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 83.3 | Complete |
| S22 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 91,66 | Complete |
| $1 = \mathbf{Pron}$ | inciation | | | | | | |

 $1 = \mathbf{Pronunciation}$

2 = Grammar

3 = Vocabulary

4 = Comprehension

Table 4 shows that there are 4 students who have not reached the KKM (18.18%), while those who have reached the KKM are 18 students (81.81%). This means that there is a very significant change, namely students who have not achieved the KKM decreased from 45.45% to 18.18%, while students who achieved the KKM experienced an increase from 54.54% to 81.81%. So, it can be said that the use of a communicative approach can improve students' speaking ability. Thus, this study was ended because classical completeness had exceeded the specified standard, namely 75%.

Based on table 2, it is known that the difficulties faced by students in speaking are as shown in the following table 5.

| Table 5. | Student Difficulty Data |
|----------|-------------------------|
| Cycle II | |

| | Difficulty Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| No. Subject | Pronunciation | Grammar | Vocabulary | Comprehension | | | | | |
| S1 | | | | | | | | | |
| S2 | \checkmark | | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S3 | | | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S4 | | | | | | | | | |
| S5 | \checkmark | | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S6 | | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S7 | \checkmark | | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S 8 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S9 | | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S10 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S11 | | \checkmark | | | | | | | |
| S12 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S13 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S14 | \checkmark | | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S15 | | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S16 | | \checkmark | | | | | | | |
| S17 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S18 | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S19 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S20 | \checkmark | | | | | | | | |
| S21 | | \checkmark | | \checkmark | | | | | |
| S22 | \checkmark | \checkmark | | | | | | | |

Table 5 shows that the aspects that have not been achieved by students are pronunciation (13 students), grammar (14 students), vocabulary (7 students) and comprehension (16 students). This shows that there is a decrease in student difficulty for each aspect from cycle I to cycle II, namely the pronunciation aspect of 22 students to 13 students (a decrease of 40,90%), grammar aspects of 17 students to 14 students (a decrease of 17,64%), the vocabulary aspect of 11 students became 7 students (a decrease of 36,36%), the comprehension aspect of 18 students became 16 students (a decrease of 11,11%).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of data analysis, it is concluded that the communicative approach can be one approach that motivates students to grow understanding and self-confidence and become active in learning.

The communicative approach can maximize students' ability to achieve mastery standards of speaking ability. Before the communicative approach was applied, the average grade of the class did not meet the specified KKM, which was 75. After the implementation of the communicative approach, there was a very significant increase of 81.81%.

In the implementation of the first cycle, there were still difficulties experienced by students, namely in the aspects of pronunciation (22 students), grammar (17 students), vocabulary (11 students) and comprehension (18 students). These difficulties became the focus of researchers to be minimized in the next cycle. In the second cycle there was a very significant change, namely in the aspects of pronunciation (13 students), grammar (14 students), vocabulary (7 students) and comprehension (16 students). This shows that there is a decrease in student difficulty for each aspect from cycle I to cycle II, namely the pronunciation aspect from 22 students to 13 students (a decrease of 40,90%), grammar aspects from 17 students to 14 students (a decrease of 17,64%), vocabulary aspects from 11 students to 7 students (a decrease of 36,36%), aspects of comprehension from 18 students to 16 students (a decrease of 11,11%). This shows that the communicative approach is very appropriate to use in improving students' speaking ability.

REFERENCES

- 1) Aflisia, N., & Hazuar, H. (2020). Pengembangan Bahan Ajar Bahasa Arab Berbasis Pendekatan Komunikatif. *Arabiyatuna: Jurnal Bahasa Arab*, 4(1), 111.
- 2) Aprinawati, I. (2017). Penggunaan Media Gambar Seri untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berbicara Anak Usia Dini. Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, 1(1), 72–80.
- 3) Arikunto, S. (2010). Penelitian Tindakan Kelas. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- 4) Arsyad, M. H. (2019). Metode-Metode Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab Berdasarkan Pendekatan Komunikatif untuk Meningkatkan Kecakapan Berbahasa. *Jurnal Shaut Al-Arabiyah*, 7(1), 13–30.
- 5) Astami, T. S., Ningrum, R., & Budihardja, F. (2013). Efektivitas Pendekatan Komunikatif Pada Mata Kuliah Menyimak dan Berbicara II. *Lingua Cultura*, 7(2), 102–107.
- 6) Baroroh, R. U., & Tolinggi, S. O. R. (2020). Arabic Learning Base on a Communicative Approach in Non-Pesantren School/Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab Berbasis Pendekatan Komunikatif di Madrasah Non-Pesantren. *Ijaz Arabi Journal of Arabic Learning*, *3*(1).
- 7) Batmang, B. (2014). Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab di Pesantren Modern. Shautut Tarbiyah, 20(1), 38–51.
- 8) BNSP. (2007). *Model Penilaian Kelas SMP/MTs J*. akarta: Direktorat Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- 9) Danim, S. (2008). Media Komunikasi Pendidikan. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- 10) Dimyati & Mudjiono. (2002). Belajar dan Pembelajaran. Jakarta: Rineka cipta.
- 11) Edi, R. N. (2017). Pendekatan Komunikatif (Al Madkhol Al-Ittisholi) dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab. *Jurnal Al Bayan UIN Raden Intan*, 4(2), 74272.
- 12) Hadi, M. Y. (2010). Menyemai Benih Teknologi Pendidikan. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Grup.
- 13) Hamalik, O. (2003). Perencanaan Pengajaran Berdasarkan Pendekatan Sistem. Bandung: Bumi Aksara.
- 14) Herawati. (2020). Memahami Proses Belajar Anak. Bunayya: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak, 4(1), 27–48.
- Herawati, S. (2016). Pemanfaatan Media Pembelajaran Gambar Berseri untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Karangan Sederhana Pada Siswa Kelas III. Widyagogik: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Sekolah Dasar, 3(2), 35– 44.
- 16) Ismail, A. S. (2004). Prospek Pengajaran Bahasa Arab di Indonesia. Al Qalam, 21(102), 393–404.
- 17) Juniarti, N., Bahari, Y., & Riva'ie, W. (2015). Faktor Penyebab Menurunnya Hasil Belajar Siswa pada Pembelajaran Sosiologi di SMA. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 4(2), 1–11.
- 18) Laily, I. F. (2015). Pendekatan Komunikatif dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Di SD/MI. Al Ibtida: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru MI, 2(1), 1–17.
- 19) Mawarsih, S. E., & Hamidi, N. (2013). Pengaruh Perhatian Orang Tua dan Motivasi Belajar terhadap Prestasi Belajar

Siswa SMA Negeri Jumapolo. Jupe-Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi, 1(3), 12–24.

- 20) Mayliana, E., & Sofyan, H. (2013). Penerapan Accelerated Learning dengan Pendekatan SAVI untuk Meningkatkan Motivasi dan Hasil Belajar Kompetensi Menggambar Busana. *Jurnal Pendidikan Vokasi*, *3*(1).
- 21) Melasarianti, L. (2018). Peningkatan Keterampilan Berbicara Melalui Metode Debat Plus pada Mata Kuliah Berbicara. *Jurnal Lingua Idea*, 9(1), 23–28.
- 22) Nurgiantoro, B. (2018). Penilaian Otentik dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa. Yogyakarta: UGM Press.
- 23) Nurmala, D. A., Tripalupi, L. E., & Suharsono, N. (2014). Pengaruh motivasi belajar dan aktivitas belajar terhadap hasil belajar akuntansi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi Undiksha*, 4(1), 1–13.
- 24) Nursalam, N., Angriani, A. D., & Usman, H. (2017). Pengembangan Tes Kemampuan Penalaran Matematis Peserta Didik Madrasah Tsanawiyah di Makassar. *Lentera Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah Dan Keguruan*, 20(1), 85–97.
- 25) Patiung, D. (2017). Peran Guru dan Siswa dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Berbasis Pendekatan Komunikatif di SMA Negeri 1 Sesean Kabupaten Toraja Utara. Jurnal Inspiratif Pendidikan, 6(1), 110–127.
- 26) Raibowo, S., Nopiyanto, Y. E., & Muna, M. K. (2019). Pemahaman Guru PJOK tentang Standar Kompetensi Profesional. *Journal of Sport Education (JOPE)*, 2(1), 10–15.
- 27) Rifa'i, A. (2021). Kajian Filosofi Pendekatan Komunikatif dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab. Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pemikiran, 1(1 November), 60-74.
- 28) Roziqin, M. K., & Khanif, M. F. (2022). Pengembangan Modul Bergambar untuk Meningkatkan Pemahaman Materi Jenazah di Kelas VI. *Cendekia*, 14(01), 96–105.
- 29) Rusnah, R. (2019). Peningkatan Keterampilan Menulis Karangan Sederhana Melalui Alat Peraga Gambar Seri Pada Siswa Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Gentala Pendidikan Dasar*, 4(1), 100–109.
- 30) Saodah, S., Pratiwi, A. R., Pratiwi, S. A., & Halimah, S. (2020). Pengunaan Media dalam Pembelajaran PKn SD. *Pandawa*, 2(3), 386–395.
- Sirait, E. D. (2016). Pengaruh Minat Belajar terhadap Prestasi Belajar Matematika. Formatif: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan MIPA, 6(1), 35–43.
- 32) Subur, S. (2008). Pendekatan Komunikatif dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab. INSANIA: Jurnal Pemikiran Alternatif Kependidikan, 13(2), 214–227.
- 33) Sudjana, N. (2010). Penilaian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar. Bandung: Remadja Rosdakarya.
- 34) Sulistiana, E., Nadzifah, W., & Arifin, M. S. (2019). Intensive English Program (IEP) Meningkatkan Penguasaan Vocabulary. *Jurnal Studi Guru dan Pembelajaran*, 2(3), 236–240.
- 35) Sundari, F. S., & Muliyawati, Y. (2017). Analisis Keterampilan Dasar Mengajar Mahasiswa PGSD. *Pedagonal: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 1(1), 26–36.
- 36) Syafi'i, A., Marfiyanto, T., & Rodiyah, S. K. (2018). Studi Tentang Prestasi Belajar Siswa dalam Berbagai Aspek dan Faktor yang Mempengaruhi. *Jurnal Komunikasi Pendidikan*, 2(2), 115–123.
- 37) Tambunan, P. (2018). Pembelajaran Keterampilan Berbicara di Sekolah Dasar. Jurnal Curere, 2(1), 1–11.
- 38) Tarigan, H. G. (1990). Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa. Bandung: Angkasa.
- 39) Tur'aeni, E. (2019). Implementasi Pendekatan Fungsional Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab di Mtsn Al-Hilal. *Jurnal Shaut Al-Arabiyah*, 7(2), 173–192.
- 40) Yuliawati, F. (2012). Penelitian Tindakan Kelas untuk Tenaga Pendidik Profesional. Bandung: Remadja Rosdakarya.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution–Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.