

Improving the speaking ability of secondary school students through Community Language Learning (CLL) in the Indonesian context

Muliaty Ibrahim¹, Andi Miftahul Maulidil Mursyid²

¹English Education Department, STKIP Mega Rezky Makassar, Indonesia
e-mail: muli.ibrahim97@gmail.com

²School of Education, Faculty of Arts, the University of Adelaide, Australia
Email: andimiftahul.mursyid@student.adelaide.edu.au

Abstract

This research aimed at finding out whether or not community language learning improves speaking ability significantly better than the conventional method. This research applied the quasi-experimental method. The research data was collected using two kinds of instrument speaking test. The speaking test was given in the form of an interview. The speaking test was to know the students' achievement on speaking ability toward using community language learning in speaking class. The findings on the speaking ability of the participants were analyzed by using independent sample t-test. The findings of the study indicated that the result of post-test was higher than of the pre-test. It means that using community language learning in teaching English with emphasizes on speaking ability to the students' speaking skill was higher contributed than the conventional method. The study concluded that: Community Language Learning improves the students' ability to speak English significantly.

Keywords:

Community; language; learning; teaching; speaking

1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of learning a language is to use the language for communication. Communication is the interaction between speaker and listener. Speaking English is one of the components of language that has essential role beside writing, reading, and listening (Harmer, 2007; Patak, 2018; Patak, Said, & Asik, 2013). The aim of teaching speaking is to enable students to speak English in order the students can express their idea orally. The communicative function of language can facilitate this interaction. One of the language skills that should be mastered by students in learning English is speaking. Without mastering this skill, students will not be able to make interaction in communication.

In foreign language teaching, teaching speaking is considered to be difficult among the other skills. Learning to speak is more difficult than learning to understand the spoken language. Someone who wants to speak to others sometimes faces from some troubles. He cannot produce his ideas, arguments, or feelings communicatively. Someone sometimes can understand what others

say, but he is not able to communicate it. This happens because of the lack of practice, low motivation, and less communicative competence. The students who have low motivation and achievement in speaking English is probably due to lack of opportunity in practicing it, so teachers or lectures should give the students opportunity to practice their speaking for most students, from secondary schools up to universities, English is one of the most challenging subjects and most feared. Teachers and lectures of English are also often heard to complain about their students who are difficult to understand English, and most of them make some mistakes in speaking as in pronunciation, spelling, and vocabulary.

Nunan, Lai, and Keobke (1999) states that speaking is one of fundamental language skill. It is considered the most crucial aspect of learning a foreign language. The success of people in learning language is measured concerning the ability to converse in the language. One of the aims of teaching English as a second or foreign language is to make the learners be able to communicate the information effectively in spoken English (Brown, 2000). As speaker of the foreign language, the writer asserts, "the more reluctant a student is, the poorer his speaking will be." Therefore, the writer wants to find a solution and one of the useful things that we can do in speaking English by applying CLL. The simplicity of this method represents the use of counseling-learning theory to teach the language. CLL draws on the counseling metaphor to the redefine the roles of the teacher as the chancellor and learners the clients in the language classroom. It means that CLL is one style of technique in learning speaking English is giving advice, assistance, and support to students who have a problem in speaking or is in some way in need.

Communication with language is carried out through two basic human activities namely speaking and listening. In speaking, we put our ideas into word for other to grasp or to understand our ideas and hope people give us feedback. That is why the two activities cannot be separated from one to another. They are an integral part of the language, when we study language, we also think of how people speak and understand each other (Mercer, 2002). Several reasons probably make people engage conversation with each other; we can be reasonably sure that they are doing so for a reason probably make the following generalizations (Harmer, 2007). They want to say something: wants is used in a general way to suggest that a speaker make decision address to someone by making a conversation with other people, they can express what they need to do or have. He has some communicate purposes: a speaker says things because they want something to happen as a result from what they say. He selects his language store: the speaker has an infinitive capacity to create new sentences if he is a native speaker.

The speaking performance could be measured by pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. There are three kinds of pronunciation namely native pronunciation (Tanner & Panttaja, 2012), native-like pronunciation (Birdsong, 2007), and non-native like pronunciation (Goronzy, Rapp, & Kompe, 2004). Vocabulary is a list of words and phrases usually alphabetically arranged and explained or designed. Harmer (2007) distinguished two types of vocabulary in general; they are active and passive vocabulary. Active

vocabulary is the words, which students will need to understand and use themselves, and passive vocabulary is the words, which we want students to understand, but they will not need to use themselves. Since knowledge of grammar is essential for competent users of a language (Quirk, 2010), grammar is clearly necessary for the students.

Charles A. Curran and his associates develop community Language Learning (CLL). Curran was a specialist in counseling and a professor of psychology at Loyola University, Chicago. His application of psychological counseling techniques to learning is known as counseling learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Curran believed that to success in teaching foreign language teacher should consider their students as "whole-Person learning means that teacher consider not only their students 'feelings and intellect, but also have some understanding of the relationship among students' physical reactions, their intrinsic protective reactions and their desire to learn. Community Language Learning takes its principle of "whole-person" as apart from the CLL method (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2013).

2 METHOD

2.1 Design of the research

In this research, the researcher used quasi-experimental method which involves two groups (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). They were experimental and controlled groups. Both groups have taught by using Community Language Learning in the experimental group, and control, a group without Community Language Learning. The design is represented as follows:

E	O ₁	X ₁	O ₂
C	O ₁	X ₂	O ₂

Figure 1. Design of the research

- E : the experimental group
- C : the control groups
- O₁ : Pre-test
- O₂ : Post-test
- X₁ : the treatment by Community Language learning
- X₂ : the treatment without Community

2.2 Population and Sample

The population of this research was the twelve grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Maros, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The population consisted of nine classes. The total number of the population was 360 students. The sampling technique, which is used in this research, is random cluster sampling, which taken two classes as a sample. One class for the experimental group and other for the control group. So, there were 40 for the experimental group and 40 for the control group.

2.3 The instrument of the Research and Technique of the Data Analysis

In this research, the researcher used a speaking test. The data, in the form of score gained from pre-test and post-test, were tabulated and calculated its inter-rater reliability. Then, calculate the minimal score, maximal score, and mean of the pre-test and the post-test and its standard deviation. The comparison of two means would be counted using Repeated Measures t-test that describes whether there is a difference of the students' speaking achievement before and after being taught through Community Language Learning and there was significant increase of the students' speaking achievement after being taught through Community Language Learning. Scoring of the speaking test was measured by rating scale were intend accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility.

In this research, the students' are categorized good, average and poor. The rating scale was used to measure the improvement of the speaking ability of participants of the students, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The researcher used the oral ability scale proposed by Heaton (1991) as the scoring standard for the students' speaking ability. Classification of students' speaking ability is based on the assessment standard of Community Language Learning. The results of the students' speaking test were used to determine the classification of the students. Independent sample t-test, descriptive statistics (standard deviation and mean). Calculating the value of the test was to find the differences between the experimental and control group by using SPSS (Hinton, McMurray, & Brownlow, 2014). The level of significance is set at $\alpha = 0.05$. The result was presented in the form of table, and it was described and discussed qualitatively.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Scoring Classification of Students' Pre-test

Before conducted the treatment, the researcher gave a pre-test to know the prior knowledge of students in speaking. After giving the treatment, the students get the post-test. The pre-test and post-test are compared to know the students' ability in speaking, the frequency and percentage of the students are firstly tabulated. Then, the researcher determine the quality of the students' score of the speaking ability of the students can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 The percentage of students' pre-test score

Classification	Score	Experimental Group		Control Group	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent	96 – 100	0	0	0	0
Very Good	86 – 95	0	0	0	0
Good	76 – 85	0	0	0	0
Fairly Good	66 – 75	5	17.5	1	2.5
Fair	56 – 65	4	10	2	5
Poor	36 – 55	20	50	18	45
Very Poor	00 – 35	11	27.5	19	47.5
Total		40	100	40	100

The table 4.1 indicated that the students' pre-test result for the experimental group most of them were in poor category, 5 (17.5%) students

got fairly good, 4 (10%) students got fair, 20 (50%) students got poor and 11 (27.5%) students got very poor. In control group, the findings indicated that from the fourth respondent, 1 (2.5) student got fairly good, 2 (5%) students got fair, 18 (45%) students got poor, and 19 (47.5%) students got very poorly. It means that the two classes were almost the same. Both of them were classified in the poor and very poor category.

3.2 Scoring Classification of Students' Post-test

The table showed that the percentage of the students' post-test score on speaking ability who taught by using Community Language Learning was different from those who taught by using conventional method.

Table 2 The percentage of students' post-test score.

Classification	Score	Experimental Group		Control Group	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent	96 – 100	0	0	0	0
Very Good	86 – 95	3	7.5	2	5
Good	76 – 85	8	20	2	5
Fairly Good	66 – 75	10	35	3	7.5
Fair	56 – 65	13	32.5	12	30
Poor	36 – 55	4	15	18	45
Very Poor	00 – 35	0	0	3	7.5
Total		40	100	40	100

The findings above indicated that the students achievement in experimental group was increasing, 3 (7.5%) students got very good, 8 (20%) students got good, 10 (35%) students got fairly good, 4 (15%) students got poor and no one of them was classified very poor.

3.3 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Pre-test

After calculating the results of the students' pre-test showed that the control group was higher than the experimental group. It is showed in the table below:

Table 3 The mean score and standard deviation of students' pretest

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experiment	54.529	16.732
Control	52.829	13.650

Based on the table above, the researcher concluded that the students' mean score of the experimental and control group was relatively the same, it is indicated that they have the same productivity before they are given treatments.

3.4 The mean score and standard deviation of students’ post-test

After the treatment, the students both groups were given post-test to find out their speaking ability at the same level or not by using Independent sample t-test analyzed with SPSS 17.00. The finding of post-test are presented in table 4.5.

Table 4 The mean score and standard deviation of students’ posttest

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experiment	72.500	8.869
Control	65.885	5.672

Based on the table above showed that the mean scores of post-test of both groups are different after the treatment. The mean score of experimental group 72.50 which categorized as fair category and control group 65,885, which is categorized as a poor category ($72.500 > 65.885$), the standard deviation of the control group was 8.869, and standard deviation of the experiment was 5.672. To know the students’ mean score of post-test is the difference, I should decide whether or not it is statistically significant. In order to answer such question, the researcher applies Independent sample t-test analyses.

Table 5 The independent sample t-test of the students’ posttest

Variable	α	Probability Value
Post-test	.05	.000

The table above indicated that the statistical hypothesis is based on the statistics test in asymmetry. Sig (2-tailed), I concluded that the probability is smaller than .05 or $.000 < .05$. This means that H1 is acceptable and, of course, the statistical hypothesis of H0 is rejected, it means through Community Language Learning was able to give significantly more significant contribution than the conventional method. It could be stated through community language learning improve the students’ ability in speaking better.

4 DISCUSSION

The description of the data collected through the test as explained in the previous section shows that the students’ ability in speaking improves significantly. It is supported by the mean score of the students’ pre-test and post-test of the experimental group. The mean score of pre-test and post-test of the experimental group were 54.529 and 52.829. The finding in the previous section showed that the use of dialogue-games is significantly improved in learning English speaking. It is supported that the mean score of post-test of the experimental group and the control group is significant. The mean score of experimental group 72.500 was higher than control group 65.885.

Based on the standard deviation of both group the experimental group and the control group, the standard deviation of the experimental group was higher than the control group of the pre-test. The standard deviation of the experimental group was 16.732, while the control group was 13.650. At the post-test, the standard deviation of the experimental group was 8.869, while the control group was 5.672. The smaller the standard deviation shows how close the gain score to the mean. The smaller the standard deviation is the closer the score to the mean. So, the experimental group scores were closer than the control group was at the post-test. The mean score of the experimental and the control group increased after they were given treatments. The experimental group learns to speak English by using Community Language Learning while the control group learns to speak English by using the conventional method.

The improvement of students' speaking ability, which is marked by the results of the post-test occurring in the both the experimental and control group. However, the improvement rate of the experimental group was higher than the control group. The comparison of the improvement of the speaking ability of both groups can be proved by analyzing the post-test result. In other words, 4 (15%) students still needed remedial teaching. In other words, using Community Language Learning significantly improve the speaking ability of participants or give more significant contribution than conventional one in teaching English with emphasize on speaking ability.

The given material to the students or participants should master several tenses like present, past, future form and it could be used in speaking, and the activity given to the students based on the condition of students and the available time. It means that the topic given to the students should relate to their knowledge background so they could express their ideas easily or they could give their opinion. The students had a large chance to practice English. Using Community Language Learning insists the teacher or instructor be professional one in learning teaching process. The instructor must understand and have the ability to improve the speaking ability of the students by using some topics for discussions and dialogue with several materials. Also, the instructor should make the students fun and enjoy, in a theory of language learning based on the development of communicative competence. It means that the instructor must have a good plan to carry out the teaching.

The implication of using community language learning in improving speaking ability enhance the students' achievement. This case is based on finding that mean score of students' pre-test (54.529), and after giving treatment, the mean score of students' pre-test enhances to the mean score of students' post-test (72.500). In other words, the students could increase their ability in speaking because in applying the use of Community Language Learning, the students were interested, fun, enjoy until they tried and practiced, participated and active in each group activity. The students were not ashamed to practice how to pronounce, to talk or give an opinion.

5 CONCLUSION

The use of community language learning improved the students' ability to speak; it was proved by the mean score of post-test of students. The mean score of experimental group 72.500 and the control group 65.885 which were categorized as good. So, both groups have a contribution in improving the students' ability in speaking.

REFERENCES

- Birdsong, D. (2007). Nativelike pronunciation among late learners of French as a second language. *Language Experience in Second Language Speech Learning*, 99–116.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications, student value edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Goronzy, S., Rapp, S., & Kompe, R. (2004). Generating non-native pronunciation variants for lexicon adaptation. *Speech Communication*, 42(1), 109–123.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.
- Heaton, J. B. (1991). *Writing English Language Test*. New Edition. Longman Handbook for Language Teachers). New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Hinton, P. R., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2014). *SPSS explained*. Routledge.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2013). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching 3rd edition - Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=pO2dBgAAQBAJ>
- Mercer, N. (2002). *Words and Minds: How we use language to think together*. Routledge.
- Nunan, D., Lai, J., & Keobke, K. (1999). Towards autonomous language learning: Strategies, reflection, and navigation. In *Learner autonomy in language learning: Defining the field and effecting change* (pp. 69–77). Peter Lang Frankfurt, Germany.
- Patak, A. A. (2018). *The influence of the online learning environment, lecturers' assessment practice, and students' writing skills on students' plagiarism practices*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. Retrieved from <http://eprints.utm.my/id/eprint/79243/1/AndiAntoPatakPFP2018.pdf>
- Patak, A. A., Said, H., & Asik, N. (2013). *Proceedings of Technology, Education, and Science International Conference (TESIC) 2013: Developing Innovative Technology towards Better Human Life*. Ibnu Sina Institute for Fundamental Science Studies, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Quirk, R. (2010). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Pearson Education India.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Tanner, M. D., & Panttaja, E. M. (2012, October 9). Recognition of proper nouns using native-language pronunciation. Google Patents.