

The Effect of using Community Language Learning Method to Improve Students' Speaking Ability

Syamsia¹ & Hatima Kaunar²

¹STKIP Kie Raha Ternate

²STKIP Kie Raha Ternate

Correspondence: syamsia@stkipkieraha.ac.id

Received: March 16th, 2020

Accepted: March 16th, 2020

Abstract

This research was conducted to know the effectiveness of using *community language learning method (CLLM)* is to improve speakingability. The significant of this research can improve students speaking ability in used community language learning method to teach speaking. It can be proved from t-test, and then based on the analysis data of result students worked value lower than 75.77 for level significance 78.85, so there are differences speaking achievement between experiment and control class. The students who are the taught by using community language learning method have higher score than those are taught by using CLLM. The result of the data analysis proven than student's score of speaking taught by using community language learning is better. It means that the used of community language learning method to teach speaking is quite effectives.

Keywords: *Speaking, community language learning method, CLLM, speaking ability, learning method*

© Langua – 2020

1. Background

Speaking is an interactive activity using the language spoken by speakers in combine, speaking in a foreign language it self more difficult than speaking in a mother tongue. Many people assume that speaking is a hard skill in listening, writing, and reading. That's because talking is an interactive activity between two or more people and usually the person you are talking to waiting for you to speak directly to them.

The students of SMP ISLAM 2 KOTA TERNATE have problem in speaking ability, such as the students are lazy to learn English language, sometimes they are know what they want to say but they are shy to speak, they are also and afraid to take part in conversation, and the teacher only apply the same method to teach English language, so the students get bored while learning process and also do not have any vocabulary in their mind of their speaking skill.

Based on the problem above, the researcher look for a solution to solve the problems. It was through Community Language Learning Method (CLLM). Community Language Learning Method (CLLM) is one kind of method in studying English. Language is instrument of

communication which the communication is focus to speaking. So CLLM is used by the researcher to improve student's speaking ability. According to Nagaraj (2010) that CLL method encourages teachers to view their students as whole persons including their intellect, relationship, feelings, desires, etc. In community language learning the students determines what is to be learned, and makes the role of the teacher as the facilitator in learning activity. The purpose of this research is to know whether community language learning method (CLLM) improve student's speaking ability.

2. Theoretical Basis

2.1. The Nature of Speaking

Speaking skill is the one of the four skills in learning English. However it is not easy for the students communicate in English speaking, they have to think more often when speaking English. Speaking skill is one of the abilities when students have to communicate with other.

Chastain (1988) cites that speaking is a productive skill which involves many components. It is more than making the right sounds, choosing the right words or getting constructions. Many students regard speaking ability as the measure of knowing a language. These students define fluency as the ability to converse with others, much more that the ability to read, write, or comprehend oral language. They regard speaking as the most important skill they can acquire and they asses their progress in terms of their accomplishments in spoken communication (Burn kart, 1998).

Speaking is an interactive activity using the language spoken by speakers in combine, speaking in a foreign language itself more difficult than speaking in a mother tongue. Many people assume that speaking is a hard skill in listening, writing, and reading. That's because talking is an interactive activity between two or more people and usually the person you are talking to waiting for you to speak directly to them..

2.2. Community Language Learning

Curran (1976) state that the concept of community refers to group with the task of learning is applied specifically. It has been used in this method because such relationship mentioned above is applied specifically to groups with the task of learning a second language. In this community, the language teacher and the learners build the intense atmosphere of warmth, security and support one another among them during the classroom activity. This kind of security and support from another in the group is really typical in this method and almost the exact opposite of the atmosphere in the schooling.

Based on the theory of it, made researcher desire to do research and applying this method in classroom. Nagaraj (2010) cites that CLL encourages teachers to view their students as whole persons, including their intellect, relationships, feelings, desires, etc. In community language learning the student determines what is to be learned, and make the role of the teacher as the facilitator. The teachers can indicate her acceptance of the students, by understanding students' fears and being sensitive to them, he can help students overcome their negative feelings and turn them into positive energy to further their learning. CLL aims to remove anxiety from learning by changing the relationship between the teacher and student.

The Community Language Learning is method which is oriented on human is approach. In accordance with the statement above, the researcher particularly need to formulate the example of Community Language Learning take place in classroom. A group of learners sit

in a circle with the teacher standing outside of circle, and student whispers a message in the native language (L1); next, the teacher translates the message of the learners into the foreign language (L2), while the students repeat the message in the foreign language into a student's composed further message in the foreign language with teacher's help. Students reflect about their feelings and wishes. It means that the client-counselor in psychological counseling has a relationship between the learner-known in Community Language Learning.

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

In this research, the researcher used quasi-experimental design. Quasi-experimental is an experimental design which does not need all needed requirements to control the effect variable with this case especially the use pre-test and post-test control group design. Borden and Abbott (2011: 109) state that in this most basic of experimental design, the group receiving the treatment is called the experimental group and the other group is the control group.

In the population of this research were all students of SMP Islam 2 Kota Ternate in the academic years 2018/2019, and the sample of this research were 26 students. 13 students as experimental group and 13 students as control group.

3.2. Techniques of Data Collection and Data Analysis

In this research, the researcher used test to collect the data, the researcher used two tests: pre-test and post-test. The pre-test is given at the beginning and the post-test is placed at the end. The comparison between the pre-test and post-test after using CLLM, and the scores will show the student's speaking ability for transactional conversation related to the student's fluency in speaking.

After the data have collected, the researcher will analyze the students' scores in speaking were obtained, the following steps were carried out:

- 1) Getting mean score of each group (the experimental group and the control group).
- 2) Comparing the mean score of the two groups.
- 3) Finding out which one is the higher.
- 4) Explaining the meaning of differences of the mean score.
- 5) Checking the significance of differences by using T-test. Explain the implication of the findings to the teaching of reading comprehension.

In order to know the difference effect between the two groups, the writer used T-test formula. The formula stated by Arikunto (2002:57), is as in the following:

$$t = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{X^2 + Y^2}{N_x + N_y} - 2\right)\left(\frac{1}{N_x} + \frac{1}{N_y}\right)}}$$

Where:

t = the effect

M_x = Mean of experimental group

M_y = Mean of control group

X^2 = the deviation square of experimental group

Y^2 = the deviation square of control group

N_x = the sample of experimental group

N_y = the sample of control group

4. Finding and Discussion

4.1. Result of Pre-Test

The result of pre-test in experimental and control group to class VII A at SMP Islam 2 Kota Ternate can be seen as followed:

Table 1.1 The result of pre-test in experimental and control group

Experimental Group			Control Group		
No.	Students	Score	No.	Students	Score
1	Naj J	55	1	Tss S	45
2	Nal H	60	2	Frn H	60
3	Fai A	50	3	Ast A	50
4	Fnt N	60	4	Arg Ji	55
5	Rbn F	60	5	Ftr A. R	40
6	Srla D	60	6	Rfi T. U	60
7	Sri Tnt	60	7	Rvn I	60
8	M. F M. J	60	8	M. Rvn D	30
9	Bng I	45	9	Jlfr	60
10	Srl S. U	60	10	M. Hkl	65
11	Mlt S. F	60	11	Dln H	30
12	Hrpn H	55	12	Sndr A. M	45
13	Hsnnt	50	13	Dv Kktsr	60
Average		56.54			50.77

Based on the data pre-test in the table above, result of speaking ability to every students is differentiated. It is can seen total score of students. Total score 55 get of three students, total score 66 get of thirteen students, total score 50 get of three students, total score 45 get of three students, total score 30 get of one students, total score 40 get of one students. Whereas based on the assessment criteria, which is attainment of high score is thirteen students that is 60, and lower score get of thirteen students, that is 30, 40, 45, 50, 55.

Treatment

The researcher was used treatment after pre-test in class VII A at SMP Islam 2 Ternate. In this research, the researcher only used one class, but divided in two groups. The researcher done the treatment based on the procedures of CLLM. The first class (and sub sequent classes) may begin with a period of silence, in which learners try to determine what is supposed to happen in their language class. In later classes, learners may sit in silence while they decide what to talk about (La Forge, 1983: 72). The researcher may note that the awardees of silence become sufficiently agonizing for someone to volunteer to break the silence. The knower may use the volunteered comment as a way of introducing discussion of classroom contacts or a stimulus for a language interaction regarding how learners felt about the period of silence.

The researcher might then form the class into facing lines for three minutes pair conversation. These are seen as equivalent to the brief wrestling sessions by which judo students practice. Following this the class might be reformed into small groups in which a single topic, chosen by the class or the group, is discussed. The summary of the group discussion may be presented to another group, who in turn try to repeat or paraphrase the summary back to the original group.

Finally, the teacher asks learners to reflect on the language class, as a class or in groups. Reflection provides the basis for discussion of contracts (written or oral contracts that learners and teachers have agreed to accomplish within the course), personal interaction, feelings toward the knower and learner and the sense of progress and frustration.

4.2. The Result of Post-Test

The accumulation of post-test experimental group and control group

Table 1.4 post-test score of Experimental group and Control group.

Pos-test					
Experimenal Group			Control Group		
No.	Students	Score	No.	Students	Score
1	Naj J	85	1	Ts S	80
2	Nil H	75	2	Fdn H	75
3	Fsl A	70	3	Ast A	80
4	Fnt N	75	4	Ag J	75
5	Rbn F	80	5	Ftr A R	70
6	Srl D	80	6	Rf T. U	89
7	Sri Tnt	75	7	Rvn I	89
8	M. F M. J	70	8	M. R D	80
9	Bng I	75	9	Jlfr	76
10	Srl S. U	85	10	M. Hkl	75
11	Mlt S F	70	11	Dln H	76
12	Hrpn H	75	12	Sndr A. M	75
13	Hsnt	75	13	Dv Kktsr	85
Average		75.77			78.85

Based on the data in the table above, result post-test speaking ability in experimental groups and control groups are differentiated. It can be seen to total score attained of students. Total score 85 get of three students, total score 75 get of ten students, total score 70 get of four students, total score 80 get of five students, total score 76 get of two students, and the last total score 89 get of two students. It is shows that differences result students ability, matching assesment criteria.

T-test

Based on data of result tested normality pre-test and post-test, so testing sign would next. Testing sign or t-test for known gain score between pre-test control, pre-test experimental and post-test control and pos-test experimental. With the point to hypothesis as follows:

Ho : using community language learning method not effect to students speaking ability.

Hi : using community language learning method effect to students speaking ability.

This table is data statistic gain control and gain experimental after the test pre-test and post-test.

Table 1.7 One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Gain Control	13	28.08	11.442	3.173
Gain Experimental	13	19.23	6.405	1.776

Based on the data of the table statistic above, which is accomodated gain score students at or to, in pre-test and post-test the result is with total responden 26. Gain score at or to pre-test and post-test seen differentiated that is 28.08 and 19.23. gain sore students at or to pre-test and post-test indicated differences result students speaking ability.

1.8 One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 0.05					
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Gain control	8.832	12	.000	28.027	21.11	34.94
Gain exprmntl	10.797	12	.000	19.181	15.31	23.05

Result t-test shows that at or to, pre-test and post-test score sig 2 tailed shows that $0,00 \leq 0,05$ so can conclude the H_0 is rejected the meaning that using community language learning method effect to students speaking ability.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher can concluded that the students conditions in experimental and control group who were taught by using community language learning was more effect, confident and interest with the learning process. Community language learning (CLL) is appropriate for potentially of students..

5. Conclusion

Based on the data analysis the researcher can conclusion this research as follows:

The significant of this research can improve students speaking ability in used community language learning method to teach speaking. It can be proved from t-test, and then based on the analysis data of result students worked value lower than 75.77 for level significance 78.85, so there are differences speaking achievement between experiment and control class. The students who are the taught by using community language learning method have higher score than those are taught by using CLLM. The result of the data analysis proven than student's score of speaking taught by using community language learning is better. It means that the used of community language learning method to teach speaking is quite effectives.

The researcher would like to give suggestion to the English teacher; the teacher can choose an appropriate method and technique based on the situation, it is recommended for the teacher to use Community Language Learning in teaching speaking. To the Students, The students should be active in the teaching and learning process do more practices in the class. To the researcher, the researcher is aware to her research is not the end of the problem being studied..

References

- Aryl, D, (2002). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Sixth edition. USA: Wordsworth Thomson Learning.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. retrieved 5 June 2013 from <http://let590.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/teaching-by-principles-douglasbrown.pdf>.
- Brown, H. D. (2015). *Teaching by principle*. New York. Pearson Education
- Borwn, H. D. (2001) *Teaching By Principle: an Interactive approach to Language pedagogy*, 2nd Ed. Calirofnia: san Francisco.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: Theory and practice*. 3rd edition. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Retrieved 3 February 2013 from cristinaghedeia.files.wordpress.com.
- Curran, C. A. *Counseling-Learning in Second Languages*. Apple River, Illinois: Apple River Press, (1976) Retrieved 7 February 2013 from <http://www.articlesbase.com/languages-articles/community-language-learning4282256.html>.

- Forge Paul G. La, (1983) *Counseling and Culture In Second Language acquisition* Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Harmer J. (2001). *How to Teach English*. England Person Education Limited.
- Nagaraj. G. (2010) *English Language Teaching Approache Methods and Technique*. 2nd (Ed) Orient Black swan Private limited.
- Richard, J. C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. (1986). *Approach and Method in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. and W. A. Renandya. (eds.). (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of. Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge Universities.
- Richard, J. C., (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language teaching* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevick, E. W. (1991) *Humanism in Language Teaching* Oxford: Oxford University Press.