

Improved Reading Skills Trough Peer Tutor in Class III

Ratna Dewi
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
 Yogyakarta, Indonesia
 ratna1644pasca2015@student.uny.ac.id

Hendra Erik Rudyanto
*Department of Elementary Teacher
 Training*
Universitas PGRI Madiun
 Madiun, Indonesia
 hendra@unipma.ac.id

Taufik Hidayat Eko Yunianto
*Department of Elementary Teacher
 Training*
Universitas PGRI Madiun
 Madiun, Indonesia
 mr77vick@gmail.com

Abstract—This paper aims to reveal the effectiveness of Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) approach and Scientific Approach to the teaching of writing skill. This research used a quasi-experimental design. The population was grade VIII students of Redion School. Three classes were randomly selected as the sample. They are class 8A which used the CTL approach, and class 8B which used the scientific approach as the experimental groups, while class 8D became the control group which used the conventional approach. The data were collected by using a writing test. The data were analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics with the SPSS 20 for Windows computer program. The results were as follows: (1) there were significant differences in the writing achievement among the students taught by using the CTL approach, the scientific approach, and the conventional approach, (2) the use of the scientific approach and the TL approach were more effective than that of the conventional approach to the teaching of writing skill, and (3) the use of the scientific approach was not more effective than that of the CTL approach to the teaching of writing skill. Therefore, the CTL approach and the scientific approach offered the new insights in enhancing the students' writing ability.

Keywords—*contextual teaching and learning (ctl) approach, scientific approach, teaching writing skill.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The effective learning of writing allows the students to learn easy and fun. This needs teacher's roles to assist and to guide students to achieve learning objectives. For instance, teacher has the roles in choosing and in using an appropriate approach to the learning process of writing. Unfortunately, in Indonesia, in practice, the learning of writing that often occurs in the classroom is dominated by teachers [1]. This viewpoint is usually called as the learning using a teacher-centered approach or a conventional approach. The learning activity in the classroom is spent by the teacher in explaining the lesson, whereas the learners take note and listen to the teacher [2]. The traditional approach is not effective to educational solutions that should refer to the active learning [3]. Therefore, this perspective in the process of teaching and learning writing should be changed from using the teacher-centered approach to the student-centered approach. Two types of the learning approaches based on the student-centered approach are CTL approach and Scientific approach.

The effectiveness of the CTL approach and the Scientific approach have been often examined in the separate/independent studies on different scopes and contexts, e.g. [4-8]. However, the comparison of their effectiveness specifically in the teaching and learning of writing in different contexts need further exploration. Therefore, in this current research, the CTL approach and the Scientific approach were investigated simultaneously to know their differences and effectiveness in the teaching writing of recount texts.

The rest of this paper is organized as follow: Section II presents the related work. Section III describes the proposed research method. Section IV presents the obtained result and following by discussion. Finally, Section V concludes this work.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing is how a person communicates his or her thoughts and feelings by visible signs, understandable not only for himself but also for all other people. It means that when one writes, she or he can express her or his feelings and thoughts, from words into sentences and sentences into paragraphs which have meaning [9]. Thus, writing is defined as a 'process of thinking' [10]. Hence, writing is as a linguistic communication, since this language skill is used to communicate to each other [11], [10]. For students, writing skill is a significant skill to be possessed by the second language learners [12] because it gives positive impacts on the students' life. Unfortunately, learners still have difficulties in writing, such as the problems of language, cognition? and content [13]. In this case the teacher is a very important part in the process of teaching writing. As educators, teachers must ensure that their students learn something useful, beneficial and lasting for their future. Three roles of the teacher in the teaching and learning process of writing are as a motivator, a resource (giving clarification and facilitation), and a feedback provider [14]. Therefore, teacher has full responsibilities and significant roles in the teaching and learning process of writing.

Usually, in the classroom, teaching writing skill is frequently seen as a way of finishing the homework and assignments, especially at the elementary and intermediate levels [15], and the process of teaching and learning of writing skill is still taken control fully by the teacher. It is

clearly in contrast with the opinion which said that the learning is a constructive process, where the learners construct actively the knowledge, and not received passively from the teacher [16]. As a consequence, Piaget and Dewey's theories refused this traditional learning approach [16]. Thus, the teacher has to select and apply the appropriate learning approach to teach the material. Literally, specifying what approach will be used in learning is an important thing for teachers because an approach is defined as someone's perspective toward the learning process [17]. Therefore, applying the suitable approach can help and affect the successful of teaching writing in the class.

There are two kinds of the learning approaches, namely Teacher-centered approach and Student-centered approach [18]. The teacher-centered approach generally uses a traditional approach which is based on the behaviorist theory. It is claimed that the behaviorism concept that recommends stimulus-response became a prominent paradigm in the learning system in the last third of the twentieth century [19]. Hence, this approach is called 'focus on forms' approach [20]. Nevertheless, the implementation of the conventional approach gives the positive impacts, such as teachers can organize students' activities in the classroom and recognize their characteristics [18]. Thus, this approach still has the magnetism to be used by some teachers in the process of teaching and learning. For instance, in Indonesia, teacher still dominates the whole teaching and learning process in the classroom [1], mainly in the teaching of writing skill. On the other hand, this approach also has some weaknesses. It tends to make the learners passively receive information only from the teacher [21], limits the students' ability to think creatively [22], and puts the learners as the learning object and the teacher as the only one source of learning in which it has classical learning activities [17] where the learners only do and finish some assignments and homework [15]. Furthermore, the teacher-centered approach represents the passive learners and the active teacher [18] in which the learners take notes and listen to the teacher and the teacher delivers the knowledge to them [2], thus, the learners do not have an opportunity to engage in the activities appropriate with their wants and interests [17]. Therefore, the teacher-centered approach is not fit to apply in the teaching and learning processes considering the students have different abilities and characteristics [1], mainly in teaching of writing skill. As the results, the students' achievement yields the unsatisfactory results and ineffective learning. Hence, the traditional approach is not effective to educational solutions that should refer to the active learning [3]. Therefore, this paradigm should be changed to the student-centered approach to make the learners more active in developing their knowledge and abilities.

The students-centered approach means the learners as the learning subject [17]. Two types of the learning approaches based on the student-centered approaches are the Scientific approach and the CTL approach. The Scientific approach is based on the Bruner's theory which stated that the student's study and construct the knowledge through the cognitive process [23]. Furthermore, this approach emphasizes the students on the learning process to seek the knowledge rather than to transfer it. In the scientific approach, the learning

process aims to support and to assist the students' learning process in finding and in using their knowledge [24]. Therefore, in implementing this approach, the students are expected to be able to think critically [6]. The Scientific approach is suitable to teach the English language, especially to teach writing skill. Teaching writing skill aims to train the students in communicating ideas, particularly in writing [23]. This means that the scientific approach is effective to promote the students' language skills, particularly in the writing skill. This is reinforced by the results of studies which stated that the use of the scientific approach is more effective than that of the traditional approach [24] and it could improve students' learning activities and develop their characteristics of responsibility [8]. In implementation, five steps offered by the Scientific approach are observing, questioning, exploring, associating, and communicating [23]. Those stages can help students in the learning process to be active learners. Therefore, the use of the Scientific approach is expected to be able to affect students' ability in writing and to make the process of teaching and learning writing becomes effective.

The other approach oriented on the student-centered approach is the Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) approach. The CTL approach is supported by the theory of Dewey who stated that learners will learn better if what they are learning related to what they know and events around them [23]. Therefore, the CTL approach is defined as a notion that focuses on students' experiences in building their new knowledge. Thus, the CTL approach establishes students' learning through the experience, not through the verbalism manner. Then, the learner's role changes, not as a receiver of meaning, but as a constructor of meaning [25]. Hence, by relating the knowledge obtained from the inside and the outside of the classroom, the learning becomes more relevant and meaningful for the learners to be used in their future lives [23]. Thus, the CTL approach is a trusted approach that actively engages students and promotes improved learning and skills development, and it can make the learning process more relevant and effective [25]. Moreover, the CTL approach can help teachers and students to link between the materials being learned and the real life situations, and to encourage students to make connections their knowledge to be applied in their lives as members of family and society. The CTL approach encourages the students to have their own learning, to connect their knowledge to their lives and to study the material through experiencing, not by memorizing [26].

In addition, the CTL approach is declared as an effective approach to promote students' abilities in English language, especially in writing skill because writing based on the relevant context will make the learners are easy to write paragraph or sentences. Then, the CTL approach is also convinced as the potent approach to associate new knowledge for students' lives [26], thus the CTL approach is a better approach than non-CTL approach [7]. Therefore, the CTL approach is appropriate to be applied in the teaching and learning process of English language, especially in the teaching of writing skill. In its application, there are seven components of the CTL approach that can be created and used as the classroom steps by the teacher, started from modeling, questioning and inquiry, learning community and

constructivism, authentic assessment, and reflection [17] and [27]. Therefore, those components make the teaching and learning process is more successful and effective.

III. MATERIAL & METHODOLOGY

A. Data

The data were collected by using the tests (pretest and posttest) in the form of writing composition. The tests aimed to measure the students' ability in writing of recount text. The tests were given to two experimental groups and one control group. To obtain the scores of the students' writing, the raters used a writing rubric.

The validity of the instruments was obtained through content validity. It means that the content of the tests must contain the overall material to be tested. Therefore, the researcher asked an expert judgment to verify the validity of the instruments. The validity of the data was found since the teacher treated the students similarly even though they were given different treatments. For the reliability, *Inter-rater reliability* was used in which two raters were chosen to assess the scores of the students' writing, both the pretest and the posttest. Then, the scores were calculated by using *Intraclass Correlation (ICC)* in SPSS 22 for windows. ICC was divided into 5 levels: *small* (0.00-0.25), *low* (0.26-0.49), *moderate* (0.50-0.69), *good* (0.70-0.89), and *excellent* (0.90-1.00) [28]. Based on Table I, the results of ICC on the pretest and the posttest got high values of ICC (i.e .941, .969, .968, .984) with the excellent correlation rate. Thus, the high-reliability coefficient of rating showed that the results of each rater were consistent or reliable in giving scores [29]. Therefore, based on the results, the raters gave the consistent/reliable scores in assessing the students' writing.

TABLE I. THE RESULTS OF ICC

	ICC	Results	
PRE	Single Measures	.941	Excellent
	Average Measures	.969	Excellent
POST	Single Measures	.968	Excellent
	Average Measures	.984	Excellent

B. Method

This research used a Quasi-experimental design with type of non-equivalent control group design with pre-test and post-test. The population was all grade VIII students of Redion School (pseudonym). The sample was three classes that were established using the Cluster Random Sampling technique which aims to take the sample not based on an individual but based on the existing/intact classes. It was divided into two experimental groups; class 8A which used the CTL approach and class 8B which implemented the scientific approach; and one control group; class 8D which applied the conventional approach.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Result

The data were analyzed statistically through descriptive statistic and inferential statistic to test the hypotheses. The descriptive analysis of the pretest and posttest results have been shown in the statistical data in Table II below.

TABLE II. THE RESULTS OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST

		Min	Max	Mean
Pretest	8A	43.5	72.75	56.13
	8B	40	68.75	51.22
	8D	35	69.25	50.98
Posttest	8A (CTL)*	82.50	95.75	88.55
	8B (SA)*	83	95.5	89.66
	8D (Conv)*	65.25	83.25	74.94

*Note: CTL: Contextual Teaching and Learning approach; SA: Scientific Approach; Conv: Conventional approach

Referring to Table II above, it presented the differences in the scores of the pretest and the posttest of three groups. In the pretest, the students' scores from three classes gave the unsatisfactory results with the mean scores 56.13, 51.22, and 50.98 respectively. Then, after giving the treatments, the posttest scores of each group yielded quite satisfying results with the mean scores of 88.55, 89.66, and 74.94 respectively.

For the inferential statistic, the data were analyzed through the statistical tests, they are Normality Distribution test, Homogeneity of Variance test, and Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) in SPSS 22 for windows to test the hypotheses where the conclusions were drawn at level 0.05. They were presented in Table III.

TABLE III. THE RESULTS THE INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

		Sig.	Results	
Normality Distribution	Pretest	CTL	.200*	$p > 0.05 = \text{normal}$
		SA	.200*	$p > 0.05 = \text{normal}$
		Conv	.200*	$p > 0.05 = \text{normal}$
	Posttest	CTL	.200*	$p > 0.05 = \text{normal}$
		SA	.200*	$p > 0.05 = \text{normal}$
		Conv	.170	$p > 0.05 = \text{normal}$
Homogeneity of Variance	Posttest	.588	Sig. $> 0.05 = \text{homogeneous}$	
ANCOVA		.000	Sig. $< 0.05 = \text{significant differences}$	

Referring to Table III, the result of the normality distribution test showed that the data distribution of the pretest and posttest for the control group and the experimental groups were normal. Then, it also can be concluded that the variances of the groups were homogeneous. Thereafter, it is continued to test the Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA). Its results presented in Table III, where the sig. value (p -value) was less than Sig. level_(α)(0.05) (0.000 < 0.05). In conclusion, there are significant differences in the students' achievement in writing of recount text among the students taught by using the CTL approach and the scientific approach, and those taught by using the conventional approach to the eighth-grade students of Redion School. Furthermore, to determine which groups have significant differences, it could be proceeded to the *Post Hoc* test where the output was served in Table IV.

TABLE IV. THE RESULTS OF POST HOC TEST

Groups (I)	Groups (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Results
CTL	SA	-1,11102	Not significant
	Conv	13,61667*	Significant
SA	CTL	1,11102	Not significant
	Conv	14,72769*	Significant
Conv	CTL	-13,61667*	Significant
	SA	-14,72769*	Significant

Table IV above explained that the significant differences were seen between the use of the CTL approach and the conventional approach, with mean difference of 13.61, and between the scientific approach and the conventional approach with mean difference of 14.72. However, between the CTL approach and the Scientific approach, there is no significant difference with mean difference of 1.11. In conclusion, the use of the CTL approach and the Scientific approach were more effective than that of the conventional approach in the teaching writing of recount texts, and the use of the scientific approach was not more effective than that of the CTL approach in the teaching writing of recount texts.

B. Discussion

The process of learning writing is focused on the students' activities (learning process) rather than the learning product. It should be designed well in order to give the experiences and understanding to the students in learning writing. Thus, they role is as the constructors of meaning, not as the receivers the meaning [25]. Thus, it needs the appropriate learning approaches to assist the teacher and the learners in the process of teaching and learning writing. Theoretically, the learning approaches like CTL approach and Scientific approach are two effective approaches that can be applied in teaching and learning writing. Therefore, this study aimed to reveal the effectiveness of CTL approach and Scientific approach in teaching writing of recount text at the eighth-students of Redion School.

The effective learning was achieved if 75% of students reach a predetermined score of minimum criteria of mastery learning or *KKM* [30]. In this study, the predetermined value of minimum criteria of mastery learning is 75. The pretest scores of the students indicated that over 75% of students had scores under *KKM* value. This caused the low mean scores of each class (see Table 2); class 8A (56.13), class 8B (51.22), and class 8D (50.98). Therefore, it could be concluded that the students' learning was less effective. After giving the treatments, the results of the posttest score pointed out that over 75% of the students from class 8A and class 8B had scores above *KKM* value, but from class 8D only half of the students got scores above 75. Thus, it caused the change of the means scores of 3 classes; class 8A (88.55), class 8B (89.66), and class 8D (74.94). It meant that the learning writing which used the CTL approach and Scientific approach were effective, but the learning writing which applied the conventional approach was still less effective. Then, based on the result of ANCOVA in Table III, it shows that the students' achievement in the writing of recount texts who were taught by using the scientific approach, the CTL approach, and those taught by using the conventional approach had significant differences.

Referring to Table IV, the students who were taught by using the scientific approach and the conventional approach yielded a significant difference, with the mean difference of 14.72. This was in line with the result of research which found that the Scientific approach and the conventional approach had the significant difference, with the mean difference of 11.97 [4]. Therefore, the use of the Scientific approach was more effective than that of the conventional approach in teaching writing of recount texts.

In this study, initially the class situation was very noisy, the students were passive learners, and the teacher could not control them well. They even could not create a recount text and did not understand what the recount text is. However, after applying the Scientific approach with some activities, they were active, had mutual interaction among them, and could produce a recount text. The students also participated physically and mentally in developing the knowledge [31]. In addition, the scientific approach could promote the students' traits, expressed their thoughts, acquired satisfactory achievements, and had the chance to train their writing ability [23]. Therefore, in this study, it can be said that the use of the scientific approach is more effective than that of the conventional approach. It also confirms the result of study which stated that this approach is more effective than the conventional approach or teacher-centered approach. Although the researcher had trained the teacher, the teacher was still nervous and looked awkward. Eventually, in the first meeting, the Scientific approach was not fully implemented by the teacher because the teacher still unconsciously mixed the steps of the Scientific approach to the conventional approach. This was indicated by the result of teacher's interview where the teacher said that it was difficult for him to understand every step in the procedures of the Scientific approach [32]. However, at subsequent meetings, the teacher began to understand the stages of the Scientific approach and fully applied it during the process of teaching and learning writing. Therefore, the scientific approach can promote the teacher's motivation.

Then, the learners' achievement in writing of recount texts using the CTL approach and the conventional approach also had a significant difference with mean difference of 31.61. This is like the studies which found that the CTL approach and the conventional approach had a significant difference with the mean difference of 13.4 [7], thus the CTL approach was a better approach than non-CTL approach [7]. The learners actively constructed information and created their own knowledge from their experiences. Therefore, the CTL approach can effectively associate the new knowledge with the students' lives, and the students learn through 'experiencing', not by 'memorizing' [26]. For instance, in this study, at the beginning of the meeting, only a few of the learners were active, while the others looked passive during the learning writing process. They still depended on the information from the teacher only. Nevertheless, at the next meetings, the students started to be motivated and engaged actively in the writing activities, and they tried to create their own writing. It confirmed its advantages in which it involves the learners in the writing activities and makes them participated in the writing class, as well as it helps them to communicate with others [26]. Therefore, the use of the CTL

approach was more effective than that of the conventional approach in teaching writing.

Furthermore, this study also found that the use of the CTL approach was not more effective than that of the Scientific approach. It confirmed the result of research which found that the scientific approach was not more effective than that of the CTL approach in mathematics subject [30]. It is because they brought the insignificant difference and the strengths that they have. For example, the scientific approach can promote the learners' traits, express their thoughts, acquire satisfactory achievements, and provide the chance to train students' writing ability [23], the CTL approach was a better approach to encourage the learners to be more active and to develop their skills [25]. Therefore, the uses of the Scientific approach and the CTL approach were proven effective to be applied in teaching writing skill.

Unlike the Scientific approach and the CTL approach, the conventional approach was less effective to teach the writing of recount texts. This approach did not have particular steps in its implementation. In practice, the teacher only used the textbooks and notes [22]. It means that the traditional approach presents students with the minimal activity where the students only sit and listen to the teacher. Moreover, the implementation of the conventional approach (e.g. drilled method and memorized the lesson) resulted in limited students' knowledge [3]. In fact, the students have to practice rather than sit and listen to the teacher [34], and they also need rooms for their personal growth [21]. The positive side of the conventional approach lies on the teacher who can entirely control the class and activities in orderly fashion [18]. This statement was in contrast with the reality of this study because the students were very noisy and the class situation was difficult to manage by the teacher. Hence, the conventional approach was an inefficient approach to solve the problems in education, and it was contrary to the active learning concept [3]. It also focused on the teacher-centered approach that was not efficient compared to the student-centered approach [34]. Therefore, the results indicated that the use of the conventional approach was less effective in teaching writing skill compared to the other two approaches.

V. CONCLUSION

This research has explored how the effectiveness of the CTL approach and Scientific approach in teaching writing of recount text. The results can be summarized as follows. (1) There are significant differences in the students' achievement in writing of recount text among the students taught by using the CTL approach and the Scientific approach, and those taught by using the conventional approach to the eighth-grade students of Redion School. (2) The use of the CTL approach and the Scientific approach were more effective than that of the conventional approach in teaching and learning writing of recount texts. (3) The use of the CTL approach was not more effective than that of the scientific approach in teaching writing of recount texts.

In a nutshell, the process of teaching and learning writing need a creative teacher and active learners. A creative teacher surely chose and used a good approach to make students more interested and want to learn writing. By focusing on the students or commonly known as the student-centered principle, like the CTL approach and the Scientific

approach, the students are able to develop their whole abilities, potential, achievement and behavior through meaningful and useful activities, thus their knowledge would be more worthwhile for their life. Therefore, these two approaches, the CTL approach and the Scientific approach, indeed offer new insights in enhancing the students' writing ability.

For the next researchers, it is expected to develop further study regarding the implementation of the Scientific approach and the CTL approach in the education field to explore their effectiveness to other variables or scopes by using other data collection techniques, thus, the results of the study can be more comprehensive to generalize the advantages of the Scientific approach and the CTL approach.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank the advisor who has provided the useful suggestions, advice, and guidance for the progress of this research and article. Then, the author also would like to thank the school parties and the teacher who have given permission and assistance to this study. In addition, the author also thanks to the colleagues for the suggestion and help in improving this article.

REFERENCES

- [1] Antika, R. R. Proses Pembelajaran Berbasis Student Centered Learning (Studi Deskriptif di Sekolah Menengah Pertama Islam Baitul 'Izzah, Nganjuk). *Jurnal BioKultur*, 3, 251–265, 2014.
- [2] Chang, S. C. A Contrastive Study of Grammar Translation Method and Communicative Approach in Teaching English Grammar. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 13.
- [3] Kompa, J. S. Disadvantages of Teacher-Centered Learning. *Joana Stella Kompa. Np*, 25, 2012.
- [4] Astuti, D. Efektivitas Pendekatan Sainifik Terhadap Keterampilan Menulis Karangan Narasi di Kelas IV SD Jomblangan, Bantul. *Basic Education*, 4(3), 2015.
- [5] Ekowati, C. K., Darwis, M., Upa, H. M. D. P., & Tahmir, S. The Application of Contextual Approach in Learning Mathematics to Improve Students Motivation at SMPN 1 Kupang. *International Education Studies*, 8(8), 2015.
- [6] Komariah, E. The Implementation of Scientific Approach in Teaching Writing: Teacher's Teaching Performance and Classroom Activities. In *Proceedings of English Education International Conference* (Vol. 1, pp. 164–168). 2016.
- [7] Muhlison. *The Effectiveness of Contextual Teaching and Learning to Teach Reading Comprehension (An Experimental Study at the Eight Grade Students of MTs At-Thosari Kalirejo Ungaran Timur in Academic Year of 2010/2011)*. IAIN Walisongo, Semarang. 2011.
- [8] Oktarina, O. *Penerapan Pendekatan Scientific untuk Meningkatkan Aktivitas Pembelajaran dan Mengembangkan Karakter Tanggung Jawab serta Disiplin Siswa yang Berorientasi pada Kurikulum 2013*. Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu. 2014.
- [9] Siddiq, A. The Use of Semantic Mapping Technique to Improve Writing Skill in Descriptive Text. *JP3*, 1(12), 8–15. 2013.
- [10] Rukayah. The Writing Skill of 3th Grade Students of Sibulue Subdistrict Junior High School of Bone Regency. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2). 2014.
- [11] Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. *A Comprehensive grammar of the English language*. NY: Longman. 1985.
- [12] Javed, M., Juan, W. X., & Nazli, S. A Study of Students' Assessment in Writing Skills of the English Language. *Online Submission*, 6(2), 129–144. 2013
- [13] Wigati, F. A. Meningkatkan Kemampuan Essay Writing dengan Menerapkan Metode Collaborative Writing Plus pada Mahasiswa

- dengan Level English Proficiency yang Berbeda. *Majalah Ilmiah Solusi*, 2(05). 2015.
- [14] Harmer, J. *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd ed). England: Longman.
- [15] Byrd, D. R. Putting the writing process into action in the L2 classroom: Pre-writing techniques that work. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 64–77. 2011.
- [16] Pardjono. Active Learning: The Dewey, Piaget, Vygotsky, and Constructivist Theory Perspectives. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Jilid* 9(3). 2002.
- [17] Rusman. *Model-Model Pembelajaran: Mengembangkan Profesionalisme Guru*. Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Persada. 2014.
- [18] Al-Zu'be, A. F. M. The difference between the learner-centred approach and the teacher-centred approach in teaching English as a foreign language. *Educational Research International*, 2(2), 24–31. 2013
- [19] Ortega, L. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Routledge. 2013.
- [20] Ellis, R. Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221–246. 2009
- [21] Ahmed, A. K. Teacher-centered versus learner-centered teaching style. *Journal of Global Business Management*, 9(1), 22. 2013.
- [22] Li, Y. W. Transforming Conventional Teaching Classroom to Learner-Centred Teaching Classroom Using Multimedia-Mediated Learning Module. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 6(2), 105–112.
- [23] Hosnan. *Pendekatan Saintifik dan Kontekstual dalam Pembelajaran Abad 21*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia. 2014
- [24] Suharyadi. Exploring “Scientific Approach” In English Language Teaching. *Prosiding 2 Seminar Nasional Exchange of Experiences, Malang*, 1348–1355. 2013.
- [25] Baker, E. D., Hope, L., & Karandjeff, K. Contextualized Teaching & Learning: A Faculty Primer. A Review of Literature and Faculty Practices with Implications for California Community College Practitioners. *Academic Senate for California Community Colleges*. 2009.
- [26] Satriani, I., & Emilia, E. Contextual Teaching and Learning Approach to Teaching Writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 10–22. 2012.
- [27] Supinah. Pembelajaran Kontekstual? Mengapa Tidak? Retrieved from p4tkmatematika.org. 2012.
- [28] Volistiana, R. N. *Uji Reliabilitas Step Test Untuk Keseimbangan Anak Usia 5-6 Tahun* (Thesis). Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. 2014.
- [29] Sujarwanto, & Rusilowati, A. Pengembangan Instrumen Performance Assessment Berpendekatan Scientific pada Tema Kalor dan Perpindahannya. *Unnes Science Education Journal*, 4(1), 780–787. 2015.
- [30] Syahid, U., & Tuharto. Studi Komparasi Model Pembelajaran Matematika dengan Pendekatan Saintifik dan Pendekatan Kontekstual Ditinjau dari Kemampuan Pemecahan Masalah Matematika Siswa Kelas VIII SMP. *Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika Dan Sains*, 1–13. 2015.
- [31] Sarwanti, S. Scientific Method in English Language Teaching. *Transformatika*, 12(1), 60–75. 2016.
- [32] Kartikawati, Y. *The Implementation of Scientific Approach In Teaching English at The Eight Grade of SMP Muhammadiyah 10 Surakarta In 2014/2015 Academic Year: A Naturalistic Study* (Thesis). Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. 2015