

**STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY THROUGH  
COMMUNITY LANGUAGE LEARNING**  
(Kemampuan Berbicara Siswa Melalui Community Language Learning)

**Mirawati Abdullah**  
Universitas Negeri Makassar  
*mirawatiabdullah@gmail.com*

***Abstrak***

*Penelitian ini bertujuan: (1) untuk menemukan apakah penggunaan community language learning dapat mengembangkan kemampuan berbicara siswa daripada metode lama, (2) dan apakah penggunaan community language learning meningkatkan minat siswa. Metode penelitian ini menerapkan quasi experimental. Data penelitian dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan dua Instrumen; Tes speaking dan angket (skala likert). Tes speaking diberikan dalam bentuk wawancara untuk mengetahui prestasi siswa pada kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris dan angket untuk mengetahui minat siswa terhadap penggunaan community language learning. Hasil tes speaking dianalisa dengan menggunakan Independent sample t-test dan minat siswa dianalisa dengan menggunakan deskriptif statistic, hasil means score dari minat siswa 81.35. Kajian ini menyimpulkan bahwa (1) penggunaan community language learning mengembangkan kemampuan berbicara siswa secara significant lebih baik daripada metode biasa, (2) penggunaan community language learning meningkatkan minat siswa dalam berbicara menggunakan bahasa Inggris.*

***Kata Kunci:*** Kemampuan berbicara, community language learning

**Abstract**

This research aimed at finding out how the community language learning improves speaking ability and how does the community language learning enhances the interest of students to speak English in speaking class. This research applied quasi-experimental method. The research data were collected through speaking test and questionnaire. The speaking test was given in the form of interview to know the students' achievement on speaking ability and the questionnaire was to know the students' interest toward community language learning in speaking class. The findings on speaking ability of the participants were analyzed by using independent sample t-test and the students' interest was analyzed by using descriptive statistics. The study concluded that: (1) Community Language Learning improve the first semester students of SMP Negeri 19 Makassar to speak English significantly better than conventional method, and (2) the participants were highly interested in speaking English by community language learning.

**Keywords:** speaking ability, community language learning

## A. Introduction

Nowadays, good mastery of English is essential for Indonesian people, because it is imperatively taught as a foreign language subject as it has become a perceived and realized need. Some needs for English are school curriculum, English for academic purposes, promotion, and reputation (Agustina, 1999:2). In this case, English has been taught from elementary school up to university, but the facts show that English teaching is still considered unsuccessful.

Some researchers have found that English students who have dedicated much time for English still could not speak English as expected. In foreign language teaching, teaching speaking is considered to be difficult among the other skills. Learning to speak is obviously more difficult than learning to understand the spoken language. Someone who wants to speak to others sometimes faces 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 opportunities to practice their speaking.

Nunan (1991:14) states that speaking is one of fundamental languages skill. It is considered as the most important aspect of learning a foreign language. The success of people in learning language is measured in terms of 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 and Yule, 1983:6).

The researcher had experienced that through CLL he is able to improve his English speaking ability, so the researcher is interested to investigate the effectiveness of CLL in improving the students' English speaking ability.

As speaker of foreign language, the writer asserts, "*The more reluctant a student is, the poorer his speaking will be*". Therefore, researcher wants to find the solution and one of the useful things that we can do in speaking English by applying CLL. The simply of this method represent the use of counseling-learning theory to teach language. CLL draws on the counseling metaphor to the redefine the roles of the teacher as the counselor and learners as 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 has a problem in speaking or is in some way in need.

This CLL also builds up the relationship with and among students. Students can learn from their relationship and their interaction with each other as well as their interaction with the teacher. A spirit of corporation, not competition, can prevail. Through these principles, CLL, enable the teacher to encourage the students in speaking English. Community Language Learning is not only students- or teacher but also teacher- students centered, with being decision makers in this class (Larsen, 1986:101).

## **B. Speaking**

### **1. The concept of speaking**

Speaking is the way to bring a message from one person to others in order to interact with them. Communication will not be running well without speaking. The successful communication can be seen when mutual understanding between speaker and listener in exchanging ideas works as they wanted. Besides that the writer formulates that speaking is not only verbal; means by changing ideas, message or feeling with our mouth but also we can translate that conversation can be done by action other means is kinesics (body language). Is one statement, language traditionally have emphasized verbal and non-verbal, but recently have begun to consider

communication that take place without words. In some types of communication people express more nonverbally than verbally (Levine, 1979:44).

Manser in oxford Leaner's dictionary (1995: 398) speaking defined as:

- a) Say things; talk or address about the planning.
- b) Be able to use language.
- c) Make a speech.
- d) Make a known express say the truth.
- e) Speaking terms known, somebody well enough to speak to him.
- f) Speak one's mind express one's opinion openly.
- g) Speak for somebody, in purposing;
- h) Give somebody's views, etc
- i) Give evidence for somebody; speak out give (an opinion)
- j) For the definition above, the writer concludes that speaking is a form of expressing something for other for getting response or a way of conveying message in order to make understanding of wishes to another and to contribute all of them, in the other way we can use speaking neither verbal nor non verbal action.

### **2. The nature of speaking**

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 integral part of language. It means that when we study language we also think of how people speak and understand each other (Clark in Wandia, 1990:25).

In term of medium, speaking and listening relate to language expressed through the aural medium and reading and writing relate to language expressed through visual medium. In term of activity of the users, speaking and writing are said to be productive skill whereas listening and reading are said to be receptive skills. These can the expressed in a diagram as follows:

	Productive	Receptive
Aural Medium	Speaking	Listening
Visual Medium	Writing	Reading

Rasyid in Wandia (1990:100-101)

Bird in Nurlaila (2001:11) divides that oral communication consists of five general types:

a. Interpersonal communications, in which an individual communicates with him or herself, usually by thinking but occasionally aloud.

b. Interpersonal communications, in which two individuals communicate with each other face to face.

c. Group communication, in which several people meet face-to-face discussion whatever matters, may be at hand, and in which thus people share the course and receive ideas.

d. Public communication (public speaking) in which one speaker present a message to a group of receiver in a face-to-face setting. While the receives occasionally may adopt the source role, generally the speaker does most or all of the thinking.

e. Mass communication, in which one speaker transmit a message to a group of receiver via some mass medium such us radio or TV. Since the source occur on a debated basis.

Oral communication is a two-way process between speaker and listener, and involves the productive skill of speaking and receptive skill of listening. It is important to understand that receptive does not imply passive both listening and speaking have a appositve function to perform in the process of interpreting and listener have a positive function to perform (Byrne D, 1976:8).

Relate with the statement above, because speaking is productive skills differ from listening activity, of course there are several reasons probably make people engage conversation to each other, we can be fairly sure that they are doing so for reason probably make the following generalizations (Harmer, 1983:41-42).

- a. They want to say something: wants is used here in general way to suggest that a speaker make definite decision address to someone by making a conversation with other people, they can express what they need to do or to have.
- b. He has some communicate purposes: a speaker says things because they want something to happen as a result from what they say.
- c. He selects his language store: the speaker has an infinitive capacity to create new sentences if he is a native speaker.

### **3. The elements of speaking**

The elements of speaking consist of (1) pronunciation, (2) vocabulary, and (3) grammar.

Pronunciation is the act or manner of producing something; articulate utterance (Webster's Third New International Dictionary: 1982). Certainly, pronunciation cannot be separated from intonation and stress.

Pronunciation, intonation, and stress are largely learnt successfully by imitating and repetition. Therefore, the teachers should have good standards of pronunciation in order that the students can imitate their teacher in any teaching and learning process, but we cannot expect our students to sound exactly like an American or Britain and the teachers should introduce the activities will be done in order to give them opportunities to make a lot of repetition.

According to Yapping (in Ariyani, 2004) there are three kinds of pronunciation namely native pronunciation, native like pronunciation, and non-native like pronunciation.

- a. Native pronunciation. Native pronunciation is the way in expressing words by native speaker. The style of his pronunciation is a typical one that is difficult to non-native to do the same thing.
- b. Native like pronunciation. Native like pronunciation is the way expressing words by non-native speaker but sounds like a native one. The style of his pronunciation usually found in the countries where English is taught and learned as a second language. This includes our country Indonesia.
- c. Non-native pronunciation. Non-native like pronunciation is all English learner in countries where English is used as foreign language. The learner of the language finds it very

difficult to use a native like pronunciation. They use their own ability to pronounce the words as it is. For this kind, we can find it in many countries in Asia to do the same things.

It is important to choose the words carefully because if the students do not know that the words that they produce could be inappropriate with the topic. At the same time, they must have something to say, they must have meanings that they want to express, and they need to store the words that they select from when they want to express the meanings. If the students want to describe how they feel at this very moment, they have to be able to find a word, which reflects the complexity or their feeling.

Since knowledge of grammar is essential for competent users of a language, grammar is clearly necessary for the students. Obviously, for example, they need to know that verbs in the third singular have an “s” ending in the present simple (e.g., “he swims”, “she runs”, “it takes”). They also need to know that the modal auxiliary are followed by bare infinitive without “to” or “in” so that they can eventually avoid making mistakes like “He must to go” or “He can opening the window”. However, the aim of using the grammar should be to ensure that students are communicatively efficient with the grammar. This means that they should be aware that they could use what they know.

Furthermore, Ariyani (2004: 12-14) states that there are four elements of speaking skills. They are:

- a. Pronunciation: the act of manner of pronouncing something, articulate utterance.
- b. Vocabulary: the context and function words of language.
- c. Accuracy: the state of being or exact and without error as a result of careful effort.
- d. Fluency: the key element in developing fluency in expression.

#### **4. Characteristics of a successful speaking activity**

There are four characteristics of a successful speaking activity as follows:

- a. Learners talk a lot. As much as possible of the period of time allotted to the activity is in fact occupied by learner talk. This may seem obvious, but often most time is taken up with teacher talk or pauses.
- b. Participation is Classroom discussion is not dominated by a minority of talkative participants; all get chance to speak, and contributions are fairly evenly distributed.
- c. Interest is high. Learners are eager to speak because they are interested in the topic and have something new to say about it,

or because they want to contribute to achieving and ask objective.

- d. Language is of an acceptable level. Learners express themselves in utterances that are relevant, easily comprehensible to each other, and of an acceptable level of language accuracy.

### 1. **Problems with speaking activities.**

Below there are four problems with speaking activities:

- a. Inhibition. Unlike reading, writing and listening activities, speaking requires some degree of real-time exposure to an audience. Learners are often inhibited about trying to say things in a foreign language in the classroom; worried about making mistakes, fearful of criticism or losing face, or simply shy of attention that their speech attracts.
- b. Nothing to say. Even if they are not inhibited, you often hear learners complain that they cannot think of anything to say; they have no motive to express themselves beyond the guilty feeling that they should be speaking.
- c. Low or uneven participation. Only one participant can talk at a time if he or she is to be heard; and in a large group this means that each one will have only very little talking time. This

problem is compounded by the tendency of some learners to dominate, while others speak very little or not at all.

- d. Mother-tongue use. In classes where all or a number of learners share the same mother tongue, they may tend to use it, because it is easier, because they feel less exposed if they are speaking their mother tongue. If they are talking in small groups it can be quite difficult to get some classes-particularly the less disciplined or motivated ones-to keep to the target language.

Based on the explanation above what the teacher/lecturer can do to help the students to solve the problems in the class are as follows:

- a. Using group work, this increases the sheer amount of learner talk going on in a limited period of time and also lowers the inhibition of learners who are unwilling to speak in front of the full class.
- b. Base the activity on easy language, in general, the level of language needed for a discussion should be lower than that used in intensive language-learning activities in the same class; it should be easy recalled and produced by the participants, so that they can speak fluently with the minimum of hesitation.
- c. Make careful choice of topic and task to stimulate interest. On the whole, the clearer the

purpose of the discussion the more motivated participants will be.

- d. Give some instruction and training in discussion skills. If the task is based on group discussion, then include instruction about participation when introducing it, for example, tell learners to make sure that everyone in the group contributes to the discussion; appoint a chairperson to each group who will regulate participation.
- e. Keep students speaking the target language. You might appoint one of the group as monitor, whose job is remain participants to use the target language, and perhaps report later to the teacher how well the group is managed to keep to it.

Ideas to run all the programs which have been set in the meeting club. This club functions to present the regular programs that chance the English learners to their speaking ability and it does not limit the members due to the ages and educational background, so that, there are various English learners come to be the members.

There are two categories of the members: the permanent and temporal members. The permanent members are the ones who are registered in the organization agenda and the non permanent members, on the other hands, are the ones who just come and join but they do not register their names as well. The permanent members have the responsibility to attend the meeting

regularly and thing about the surviving of the club while non permanent do not.

Everywhere in the world, where English is spoken as a foreign language, there usually some English learners form an organization and cooperate among them to improve their English.

## 6. Students reluctant in speaking

Manser (in Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary, 1995:349) reluctant is defined as:

- a. Unwilling to do something
- b. Worried in making mistakes: anxious

Similarity, in Webster Elementary Dictionary (1956:397) reluctant is defined as:

- a. Lacking willingness: unwillingness
- b. Showing hesitation
- c. Done or given against one's will
- d. Faltering in speech
- e. To stop or pause because of forgetfulness or uncertain.

Based on definition above, the writer can trace the students performance are in various speech situation, which is affected by internal or external factors. Many researchers define that reluctant, as anxiety effect is a state of uneasiness and apprehension or fear caused by the anticipating of something threatening. *The more reluctant a students, the poorer his speaking performance will be.*



## 7. Factors influence students' reluctance in speaking

In learning speaking skill, many of inhibitions that make students difficulties in speaking, Nurlaila (2001:18) in her research that the students feel difficult in speaking are caused by many factors as follows:

- a. Psychological factors, in which the students are ashamed and afraid of making mistakes.
- b. Linguistic factors, in which the students are lack of mastery of language elements (vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, spelling, structure).
- c. Lack of practicing, in which students rarely speak either inside or outside the classroom.

Relate to the statement above, the writer consider many factors that influencing students to be reluctant; it seems a very complex problem it can be seen into two general effects, namely internal and external factors. Internal factor means individual factor or psychological factor like shy, anxiety, lack of self-confidence, lack of motivation and another case is from external factors like as Linguistics factors (grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary), factor of speaking setting, factor of speaking participant, factor of English language practice are some factors that make students to be reluctant in speaking.

Explanation above the writer formulates ideas about these symptoms:

- a. Psychological factors. Psychological factors that make students frequently be reluctant in speaking English. Those are influence under the motivation, shy to speak, fear for getting correction, anxiety, self-confidence, and attitude.
- b. Self-confidence. Speaking is oral communication. In speaking English the students need braveness. There are many students who have no confidence in themselves so they cannot communicate well with their second language (foreign language). Lack of self-confidence can make students worried about making mistakes, fearful or losing face, simply shy of the attention about something.
- c. Attitude. Webster's elementary dictionary (1956:280) defined that attitude is a person's position or manners showing his feeling or purpose; as, a threatening attitude. An attitude can be defined as attend to respond positively or negatively to people decision institution, and organization. Manser in oxford learner's pocket dictionary (1995:23) attitude is the way of thinking or

behaving or of position of body.

- d. Anxiety in speaking performance. The term 'anxiety' has been defined in numerous ways Nur (1993:4) defines that "anxiety is a general symptom which can be rooted in previous failure, being afraid to loose face, or lacking of self Confidence". And Derlega (1986:140) defines it "feeling of apprehension, tension and fear in the absence of realistic threat".
- e. Fear for correction. Many condition make the students sometimes afraid of making mistakes. It can cause, they are fear for getting some correction from their teacher in order that they cannot speak English well. They are usually very afraid of making mistakes, not only in front of their teachers, but also in front of their friend.

They are suffering from "*lichtheim's aphasia*" it is the condition where the students cannot say or produce anything. It does not necessarily mean the learner does not know anything, but he or she merely gets stuck and could not produce or say anything, and is not aware why it happens. It could be due to low risk taking (Nur, 1993:2).

David in Derlega, et al (1986:344) who differentiated between fear and anxiety as follows:

- a. The object or fear is easy to Pont Point. For example, some people fear high place or speaking in public.
- b. The object of anxiety is often unclear. People may feel anxious without knowing why.

## **C. The Concept of Interest**

### **1. What is interest?**

Interest is mentally conditions of someone that produce a response to particular situation or object that give pleasure as well satisfaction. According strong in Atkinson in Ishak (2007) experimentally an interest is a response of liking. Interest is present when we aware of our set or disposition toward the object.

In relation to the teaching and learning process, interest is desire to learn or to know about something so, the researcher concludes that the students can be interested depend on teacher' methods or teacher' techniques in teaching.

### **2. Types of interest**

Atkinson et al in Ishak (2007:18) categorized interest into four types they are:

- a. Expressed interest

In general expressed interest is the verbal expression of liking or disliking something. These expressions

often are relation to maturity and experiences.

b. Manifest interest

Manifest interest is observable because of individuals' participation in a given activity. However, this type of interest also can be misleading for participation in a given activity may be necessary for certain fringe benefits occur. It is usually valuable to observe the activity related to the event, as well as the individual participation to determine the degree of manifest interest.

c. Tested interest

Tested interest can be ascertained by measuring the knowledge of vocabulary or other information. The examinee has in a specific interest area.

d. Inventoried interest

Inventoried interest is the interest determined by interest checklist. The examinee is asked to check whether they like or dislike certain activities or situation.

e. Indicator of interest

There are some indicators showing that someone is interested in something, they are:

- 1) Having concentration, someone pay attention intensely in something or doing something;
- 2) Having sympathy with object, Someone supports and approval to the object;
- 3) Having desires, strong wish to do something
- 4) Having enthusiasm, Someone enthusiast in doing something;
- 5) Having curiosity, that is eager to know or to learn about something.

f. The measurement of interest

According to Aiken in Atkinson in Ishak (2007: 18), there were four approaches that are applicable to measuring an interest. They are (1) asking people what they are interest in, (2) observing persons behaviors in various situation or participation, (3) inferring interest from knowledge of special terminology or other information, and (4) administering an interest inventory.

Table 1. The interval score of the students' interest

No	Interval Score	Category
1	85-100	Highly Interested
2	69-84	Interested
3	52-68	Moderate
4	36-51	Uninterested
5	20-35	Very Uninterested
		Total

## **D. Community language learning (CLL)**

### **1. Concept of community language learning**

Community Language Learning (CLL) is developed by Charles A. Curran and his associates. 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 (Richard, 1986:90).

Curran believed that to success in teaching foreign language teacher should consider their students as “whole Person”. Whole-Person learning means that teacher consider not only their students ‘feelings and intellect (ability to master all the component of language skill), but also have some understanding of relationship among students’ physical reactions, their intrinsic protective reactions and their desire to learn. Community Language Learning takes its principle of “whole-person” as a part from CLL method (Larsen, 1986:90).

Basic procedure of CLL can be related to the client-counselor relationship in psychological counseling. Consider the following CLL procedures: A group of learners sit

in the circle and the teacher standing outside the circle; a learner tells a message in the native language; teacher accepts and understands what students say then teacher translates it orally into the foreign language; students repeat and record the message in the foreign language with the teacher’s help; students reflect about their feeling. We can compare are client-counselor relationship in psychological counseling with the learner-knower relationship in psychological counseling with the learner-knower relationship CLL.

Table 2. Comparison of client-counselor relationship in psychological counseling and community language learning

Psychological counseling (Client-Counselor)	from the counselor-client relationship Community Language Learning (Richard, 1986:90) (Learner-Knower)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Client and counselor agree (contract) to counseling</li> <li>2. Client articulates his or her problem in language of effect</li> <li>3. Counselor listen carefully</li> <li>4. Counselor restates client message in language of cognition</li> <li>5. Client evaluates the accuracy of counselor's message restatement</li> <li>6. Client reflects on the interaction of the counseling session</li> </ol>	<p>This method examined to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Learner and knower agree to advise the teacher to consider their language learning</li> <li>2. Learner presents to the knower a message he or she wishes to deliver to another</li> <li>3. Knower and learner both understand some understanding of relationship among students physical reactions, orally into the foreign language their self-confidence, competence, their</li> <li>5. Learner repeats the message, into instinctive reactions and their desire to learn from to its addressee</li> <li>6. Learner replays (from memory) and Reflects upon the messages exchanged during the language class.</li> </ol> <p>Djunaidi. (1987:66) stated, the principle that underlying of (CLL) is</p>

(Richard, 1986:113-114)

**2. Definition of community language learning**

Community Language Learning represents to use of counseling learning theory to teach language. As the name indicates, CLL derives its primary insights, and in the same indicate CLL as the counseling theory, means that teachers as a counselor giving advice, assistance, and support to their students whose have a problem or is in some way in need. In this case Community Language Learning indicates on counseling metaphor to redefine the role of the teacher (as counselor) and Learners (as the client) in the language classroom. So the first basic of the procedure from Community Language Learning can thus be seen as derive

the international theory. It means that this theory considers language as a tool for making interact of each individual in a society. In Community Language Learning teacher takes interaction to their students and making the strong relationship to them.

The writer adds that the teacher sometimes become authority, corrector, and sometimes give punish to their students, visa versa through Community Language Learning teacher has to lessen their students whose feel reluctant in speaking that hampering their activity in learning process.

**3. What are the goals of the teacher who uses the community language learning?**

Teacher who use the Community Language Learning want their students to learn how to use the target language communicatively. In addition, they want their students to learn about their own learning: to take increasing responsibility for it. Both of these are to be accomplished in a no defensive manner. No defensive learning can result when teacher and learner treat each other as a whole person, and do not separate each other's intellect from his or feelings (Larsen, 1986:99).

- a. Learner roles. Richard (1986:120) defines that in Community Language Learning learners should become members of a community and active to learn foreign language through interacting with other members of the community. Learners are expected to listen attentively to knower, to freely provide meanings they wish to express, to repeats target utterance without showing hesitation, to support fellow members of the community, to report deep inner feelings and frustrations as well as joy and pleasure, to become good friend to other learners to other learners and show the best attitude.

Curran (in Richard, 1986:121) compares the learner roles to the five states of human growth as follows:

- 1) Stage one. Learner is like an infant, completely dependent on the knower for linguistic content. "A new self of the learner is generated of born in the target language" (La forge in Richard, 1986:121). The learner repeats utterances made by the teacher in the target language and "overhears" the interchanges between other learners and knower.
- 2) Stage two. "Child achieves a measure of independence from the parent" (La forge in Richard, 1968:121). Learner established their own self-affirmation and independence by using simple expressions and phrases they have previously heard.
- 3) Stage three. "The separate-exercise stage", learners begin to understand others directly in the target language. Learners will resent uninvited assistance provided by the knower/parent at this stage.
- 4) Stage four. Consider "a kind of adolescence". The learner functions independently, although his or her knowledge of the foreign language is still

rudimentary. The role of “psychological understanding” shifts from knower to learner. The learner must learn how to elicit from the knower the advanced level of linguistic knowledge the knower possesses.

- 5) Stage five. Called “the independent stage”. Learners refine their understanding of register as well as grammatically correct language use. They may become counselors to less advanced students while profiting from content with their original knower.

- b. Teacher roles. Larsen (1986:100) defines that in Community Language Learning teacher’s initial role is that of a counselor. It means that the teacher recognizes how threatening a new learning situation can be for adult learners, so the teacher should have skill and ability to understand and support his students in their struggle to master the target language.

Curran in Richards (1986:121-122) defines that in Community Language Learning teacher’s function are same with the function of the counselor-client relationship. As counselor the teacher’s role is to

respond calmly and non-judgmental, in a supportive manner, and help the client try to understand his or her problems better by applying order and analysis to them. The teacher is not responsible for paraphrasing the student’s problem word for word but rather for capturing the essence of the student’s concern, such that the client might say, “yes, that’s exactly what I mean”. Teacher is one person giving advice, assistance, and support to the students who has a problem to reflect about their feelings or other problem in foreign language learning.

- c. Nature of student-teacher interaction. The nature of student-teacher interaction in Community Language Learning changes within the lesson and over time. Sometimes the students are aggressive to conduct conversation. He physically removes himself from the circle, thereby encouraging students to interact with other students. At all time initially, the teacher structures the class: at later stages, the students may assume more responsibility for this.

Furthermore, when students get some mistakes, the teacher should work with what the learner has produced in a non-threatening way. One way of doing this is for the teacher to repeat correctly what the students have said incorrectly, without calling further attention to error.

#### **4. Community language learning procedure**

Curran (in Richard, 1986:120) Community Language Learning Procedure combines innovative learning tasks and activities with conventional one. They include:

- a. Translation. Learners form a small circle. A learner tell a message or meaning he or she wants to express by using their native language (mother tongue) or combinative the word into two language (native language and target language), the teacher translates it into (and may interpret it in) the target language, and the learner repeats the teacher's translation.
- b. Group work. Learner may engage in various group tasks, such as small group discussion of a topic, preparing a conversation or preparing a summary of a topic for presentation to another group.
- c. Recording. Student record or compose conversation in the target language from the teacher has been translated.
- d. Transcription. Students transcribe utterance and conversation they have recorded for practice and analysis of linguistic forms.
- e. Analysis. Student's analyses and study transcriptions of target language sentences in order to focus on particular lexical usage or on the application of particular grammar rules.

- f. Reflection and observation. Learners reflect and report on their experience of feelings-sense of one another, reactions to silence, concern for something to say, etc.
- g. Free conversation. Student's engage in free conversation with the teacher or with other learners. This might include discussion of what they learned as well as feelings they had about how they learned.

#### A. Method

In this research, the researcher used quasi experimental method which involves two groups (Gay, 2006:258). They were experimental and control groups. Both of groups have taught by using Community Language Learning in experimental group, and control group without Community Language Learning. The design is represented as follows:

E	O <sub>1</sub>	X <sub>1</sub>	O <sub>2</sub>
C	O <sub>1</sub>	X <sub>2</sub>	O <sub>2</sub>

Design of the research

Where:

- E = The experimental group
- C = The control groups
- O<sub>1</sub> = Pre-test
- O<sub>2</sub> = Post-test



X<sub>1</sub> = The treatment by Community Language Learning

X<sub>2</sub> = The treatment without Community Language Learning

## 1. Population

The population of this research was the first semester students of SMP Negeri 19 Makassar. The population consisted of nine classes. The total number of the population was 360 students.

## 2. Sample

The sample technique, which is used in this research, is cluster random sampling, which taken two classes as sample. One class for experimental group and other for control group. So, there were 40 for experimental group and 40 for control group.

## 2. Instrument of the research

In this research, the researcher used two kinds of instruments, namely speaking test and questionnaire.

### - The speaking test

The speaking test is used to see the students' participation, activeness, motivation, and even encouragement to speak English through CLL. The students are observed when CLL is going on. Furthermore, Pretest is intended to find the students' prior knowledge, while posttest is administered to find out the students' achievement of

speaking after conducting treatment by using CLL setting. There are three indicators in this research; accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility. To measure the students' speaking ability by using band score of Heaton. The test was interview form. The researcher using closed interview. It means that the researcher did interview to the participants one by one. The interview was done between the researcher as interviewer and the students as interviewee. The test of interview consisted of 4 items.

### - Questionnaire

A questionnaire was provided for students. It was in the form of close ended questions, asking about the students' interest towards the teaching of speaking skill using CLL. This questionnaire was distributed to the students after treatment had been given. It aimed at finding out the characteristic of the students' speaking ability using CLL in improving their speaking.

## 3. Procedure of collecting data

### a. Speaking test

Speaking test consisted of pre-test, treatment and post-test

#### Pre-test

Before presenting materials, pre-test is administered to know the students' prior knowledge of speaking.

#### Treatment

Before giving posttest, the group is given English materials by using CLL setting for five meetings. Each meeting spent 90 minutes. In this CLL setting, the researcher gave explanation and instruction what the students would do in the activity. They were then divided the students into groups of four. In each group, the students are assigned as the leader of a group, a moderator, a speaker, and a secretary. The leader of a group organized the members in making paper, and in presentation. A moderator arranges the way of presentation, asking and answering the questions and giving comments. A speaker presents the paper to the participants. A secretary writes the questions of the questioners, and reports the result or the conclusion of the CLL. The leader of a group, the moderator, and the secretary has a chance to add the explanations on the speaker, to comment. Each group is asked to choose a different current topic to be presents in the CLL, and then the group is asked to make a paper based on the topic they choose. The length of presentation was ten minutes. Question and answer and suggestions took fifteen minutes. The form of this CLL setting was small group session.

#### Post-test

After doing the treatment. The post test is administered to know the students understanding about the materials which they got.

Table 3. The topics of CLL setting presented for each meeting

Meeting	Topic
1	Dialogue for self introduction
2	Accidents in the Home.
3	The Policeman's Ball
4	What time do you sleep?
5	Money.

## B. Result

This section deals with the presentation of students' achievement and students' interest on speaking ability.

### 1. Students' achievement on speaking ability

#### a. 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 determined the quality of the students' score of the speaking ability of the first semester students of SMP

Negeri 19 Makassar can be seen in Table 8.

Table 10. The percentage of students' pre-test score

Classification	Score	Experimental Group		Control Group	
		F	%	F	%
Excellent	9.6	0	0	0	0
Very Good	8.6 - 10	0	0	0	0
Good	8.6 - 9.5	0	0	0	0
Good	9.5	5	17.5	1	2.5
Fairly Good	7.6 - 8.5	4	10	2	5
Fair	8.5	20	50	1	45
Poor	6.6 - 7.5	11	27.5	8	47.5
Very Poor	7.5			1	5
	5.6			9	
	-				
	6.5				
	3.6				
	-				
	5.5				
	00 - 35				
Total		40	100	40	100

The table 10 indicated that the students' pre-test result for

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 fourth respondents, 1 (2.5) student got fairly good, 2 (5%) students got fair, 18 (45%) students got poor, and 19 (47.5%) students got very poor. It means that the two classes were almost the same. Both of them were classified in poor and very poor category.

b. 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 11. The percentage of students' post-test score.

Classification	Score	Experimental Group		Control Group	
		F	%	F	%

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation			
Experiment	43.18	13.243			
Control	37.70	9.853			
Excellent	9.6 – 10	0	0	0	0
Very Good	8.6 – 9.5	3	7.5	2	5
Good	7.6 – 8.5	8	20	2	5
Fairly Good	6.6 – 7.5	10	35	3	7.5
Fair	5.6 – 6.5	13	32.5	12	30
Poor	3.6 – 5.5	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 as very poor.

In the other hand, in control class, only 2 (57%) students were able to get very good, 2 (5%) students were able to get good, 3 (7.5%) students were able to get fairly good, 12 (30%) students were able to get fair, 18 (45%)

students were able to get poor and 3 (7.5%) students were classified as very poor.

c. The mean score and standard deviation of students' pre-test

Before the treatment, both experimental and control group were given pre-test to know the students ability in speaking. Furthermore, the purpose of the test was to find out whether both experimental and control group was at the same level or not.

The result of the students' pre-test score gained without Community Language Learning can be seen in a table as follows:

Table 12. The mean score and standard deviation of students' pre-test

Table 10 showed that the mean score of students' pre-test of experimental group, 43.18 is categorized as poor classification and control group, 37.70 is also categorized as poor classification. Based on the table above, I concluded that the students' mean score of experimental group is the same with control group. In other words, means score of the students between experimental and control group was relatively the same,

it is indicated that they have the same productivity before they are given treatments. Gay (2006: 124) states, when variables have equal interval, it is assumed that the difference between a score of 30 and a score of 40 is essentially the same.

To know the students' mean score of post-test is difference, we should decide whether it is statistically significant. In order to answer such question, the researcher applies Independent sample t-test test analyses by using SPSS version 15.0 (Appendix 5).

Table 13. The Independent sample t-test of the students' pre-test

Variable	Probability Value	Asymptotic significant
Pre-test	.05	.039

Based on the statistics test in asymptotic significant (2-tailed) column, in relation to the finding of pre-test, .039 was greater than .05. This means that  $H_0$  is acceptable or  $H_1$  is rejected on significant level of  $\alpha$  .05. Those experimental and control group have the same or relatively the same ability in speaking before treatment. In other words, there was not significant different between pre-test of both group.

Since the base level of students pre-test was at the same level, the

treatment was then conducted to both groups. The experimental group was taught by using Community Language Learning and control group was taught by using conventional method.

d. The mean score and standard deviation of students' post-test

In this part, the discussion deals with the argument of the difference of the students' speaking ability after treatment or post-test. Since the means score of two groups (experimental and control group) was at the same level, both groups were available to be treated. The experimental group was taught English by using Community Language Learning and control group was taught English by using conventional method with emphasizes on speaking ability. After the treatment, the students in 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 15.0. The findings of post-test are presented in Table 12.

Table 14. The mean score and standard deviation of students' post-test

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experiment	66.42	9.999
Control	54.35	13.870

Based on the table above showed that the mean scores of post-test of both groups is different after the treatment. The mean score of experimental group, 66.42, which is categorized as fair category and control group, 54.35, which is categorized as poor category ( $66.42 > 54.35$ ), the standard deviation of control group was 9.999 and standard deviation of experiment was 13.870.

To know the students' mean score of post-test is difference, I should decide whether it is statistically significant. In order to answer such question, the researcher applies Independent sample t-test analyses by using SPSS version 15.0 (Appendix 5).

Table 15. The Independent sample t-test of the students' post-test

Variable	Probability Value	Asymptotic significant
Post-test	.05	.000

The table above indicated that the statistical hypothesis is based on statistics test in asymp. Sig (2-tailed), I concluded that the probability is smaller than .05 or  $.000 < .05$ . This means that  $H_1$  is acceptable and, of course, the statistical hypothesis of  $H_0$  is rejected, it means that the use of Community Language Learning was able to give significantly greater contribution than conventional method. It could be stated that the use of

Community Language Learning improve the students' ability in speaking better.

This implies that the use of Community Language Learning should be taken for granted as one of the techniques that improve students' speaking ability in English to the first semester students of SMP Negeri 19 Makassar.

## 2. Interest

The questionnaire was distributed to the students to know their interest toward the use of Community Language Learning.

- The students' interest toward learning English using Community Language Learning

The findings showed that the use of Community Language Learning could enhance the interest of the first semester students of SMP Negeri 19 Makassar. This is indicated by the students' scores of the questionnaire as shown in the following Table:

Table 16. The percentage of students' interest

No	Interval Score	Category	Experimental Group	
			F	%
1	85-	Highly Interested	22	55
2	100	Interested	18	45
3	69-84	Moderate	0	0
4	52-68	Uninterested	0	0
5	36-51 20-35	Very Uninterested	0	0
Total			30	100

In relation to the findings of students' interest on the percentage analysis on the table above showed that no student states negative statements to the use of Community Language Learning, 22 (55 %) students were highly interested and got score 85-100 interval, and 18 (45%) students were interested and got score 69-84 interval. Based on students' score of questionnaire, it is found that the highest score is 92, which is categorized as highly interested and the lowest score is 69, which is categorized as interested category and most of the students indicated agree and strongly agree as the positive statements about the use of Community Language Learning in teaching speaking skill.

b. The mean score of the students' interest

In this part, the discussion deals with mean score of the students' interest to know their interesting in using Community Language Learning. The analysis was done by using SPSS version 15.0. The results of means score is presented in table 13.

Table 17. Mean score of the students' interest

Variable	Mean score	Std. deviation
Interest	81.35	8.411

The table above also showed that the mean score of interest is 81.35. This is categorized as highly interested category and the standard deviation was 8.411. I concluded that all the participants are interested and highly interested by using Community Language Learning in improving speaking ability.

### C. Discussion

This section deals with the interpretation of students' achievement of both pre-test and post-test results and presents the description of data gained from the questionnaire based on the students' interest toward English speaking.

#### 1. The students' achievement on speaking ability

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 experimental group. The mean score of pre-test and post-test of experimental group were 43.18 and 66.42. The finding in 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 significantly different (Table 8). The mean score of experimental

group, 66.42 was higher than control group, 54.35.

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 control group of pre-test. The standard deviation of the experimental group was 13.243, while of the control group was 9.853. At the post-test, the standard deviation of the experimental group was lower than control group. The standard deviation of the experimental group was 9.999, while the control group was 13.870. The smaller the standard deviation shows how closer 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 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 learnt to speak English by using Community Language Learning while the control group learnt 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 experimental and control

group. However, the improvement rate of the experimental group was higher than control group. The comparison of the improvement of speaking ability of both groups can be proved by analyzing post-test result. After giving treatments at the experimental group, the findings indicated that 3 (7.5%) students got very good classification, 8 (20%) students got good classification, 10 (35%) students got fairly good classification, It means that there were almost all the students enough capable to speak English. 4 (15%) students got poor and no one of them was classified as very poor. In other words, 4 (15%) students still needed remedial teaching.

While, the control group of post-test only reached 2 (57%) students were able to get very good classification, 2 (5%) students were in the good classification, 3 (7.5%) students were in the fairly good, 12 (30%) students were able to get fair, 18 (45%) students were able to get poor and 3 (7.5%) students were classified as very poor. In other words, using Community Language Learning significantly improve speaking ability of participants or give bigger contribution than conventional one in teaching English with emphasize on speaking ability.

The students of experimental group were free to construct their ideas, opinion and information based on the



given material or activity. It is in line with theory of Rosenberger and Sloan (1979) states that a dialogue is a real communication of ideas from one person to others that can be formed in question or in statement. The students participate and active in the group to give their opinion.

The given material to the students was designed and developed based on Community language Learning where 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 to be professional one in learning teaching process. The instructor must understand and have ability to improve speaking ability of the students by using some topic for discussions and dialogue with several materials and to 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 carryout the teaching.

The implication of using community language learning in improving speaking ability enhances the students' achievement. This case is based on finding that mean score of students' pre-test (43.18) and after giving treatment, the mean score of students' pre-test enhances to the mean score of students' post-test (66.42).

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 shame to practice how to pronounce, to talk or to give opinion. They also should respect their friends' opinion.

## **2. The students' interest toward learning English using Community Language Learning.**

The questionnaire that was given to the experimental group covered general statements about students' interest toward learning English speaking. The statements ranged from the interest on studying English, speaking activity in speaking class, and the willing to improve

speaking skill inside the classroom. All the statements are related to the use of community language learning in the experimental group by the researcher.

The findings of the experimental group's score of interest through questionnaire indicated that 22 (55%) students were in highly interested, and 18 (45%) were interested classification (Table 11). In other words, all the students in the experimental group were highly interested on speaking English after following speaking class by using community language learning. It is in line with Atkinson in Ishak (2007) theory that experimentally an interest is a response of liking. Interest is present when we aware of our set or disposition toward the object. In relation to the teaching and learning, interest is desire to learn or to know about something. It means that the students have interest to study depend on the lectures or instructors' techniques.

The students could cooperate and play in each group to improve their speaking. They were not doubtful to talk about what they had known, experienced, and felt. The instructor monitored and helped the students to overcome some difficulties as if a student did not know to mention or did not know the vocabulary. In other words, using dialogue games technique train the students to be able to speak

English and it can be begun with introducing their identity. Using this technique, the students were able to tell about their daily activities without feeling shamed and increased the students' confidence and enjoyed or fun in learning English particularly in speaking English. It is relevant to theory of Westwood and Oliver in Saepuddin (2007) states that the language program of teaching speaking should be based on the principles, such as (1) create an enjoyable, entertain social learning situation which gives pleasure to the students, (2) keep the pair work activity, (3) make the intensive meeting, (4) ensure that the students participate in speaking ability, (5) plan the short goals for each session, (6) observe the slow learners and give some degree of repetition, (7) make the students to pay great attention to the lesson, (8) use pleasure and praise as reinforcement.

Based on the description of finding above, I concluded that the implication of the students' interest in learning English by using community language learning influence the students' achievement on speaking skill. The students' interest supports the students' success in speaking. It means that their interest to the using community language learning enhance the students' achievement on speaking ability.

#### **D. Conclusion And Suggestion**

Based on the research findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher comes to the following conclusions:

1. The use of community language learning improved the students' ability of speaking; it was proved by the mean score of posttest of students. The mean score of experimental group 66.42 and the control group 54.35 which were categorized as good. So, both of groups have contribution in improving the students' ability in speaking.
2. Using community language learning enhances the students' interest in learning speaking of the first semester students of SMP Negeri 19 Makassar to speak English. The finding indicated that the students were highly interested in learning speaking English by using community language learning.

#### **Suggestions**

Based on the conclusions above, the researcher addresses the following suggestions and recommendation.

1. The teachers or instructors should be creative to manage the materials for the

teaching English specially speaking skill such as by using community language learning.

2. The teachers or instructors of English are suggested to use community language learning in improving speaking ability because it is effective to improve the students' achievement.

#### **Bibliography**

- Benson, J.M. 1991. *Attitude and motivation toward English: a survey of Japanese Freshman*, Relc Journal and Vol. 22 Number.
- Byrne, Dorne. 1976. *Teaching Oral I English*. New edition, New York: Longman Inc.
- Curran, C.A. 1976. *Counseling-Learning in Second Languages*. Apple River, III: Apple River Press.
- Derlega, J. Valerian & H. Janda. 1986. *Personal Adjustment the psychology of every day; the third edition*. London: Scoot, Foresman and Company.
- Djunaidi A. 1987. *Pengembangan dan Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris Berdasarkan Linguistik Konstruktif*. Jakarta: Proyek Pengembangan Lembaga

- Pendidikan Tenaga  
Kependidikan,.
- Gay, L.R. 1981. *Education Research*.  
New York: E. Merrill Publishing  
and Howell Company.
- Gilmer, Von Halmer. 1973.  
*Psychology*. The second edition  
New York: Harper and Low  
Publisher.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 1983. *The practice of  
English Language Teaching*.  
New edition, New York:  
Longman publishing.
- Jemma. 2003. *Telaah Kurikulum  
Bahasa Inggris*. Diedit kembali  
dari kurikulum mata pelajaran  
Bahasa Inggris, Makassar.
- Larsen- Freeman, Diane. 1986.  
*Technique and Principles in  
Language Teaching*. Oxford;  
University Press.
- Lubis, Yusnani. 1988. *Developing  
Communicate Proficiently in the  
English as a Foreign Language  
(EFL) Class*. Jakarta:  
Department Pendidikan dan  
Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal  
Pendidikan Tinggi Proyek  
Pengembangan Lembaga  
Pendidikan Tenaga Pendidikan.
- Levine, Deena R. 1979. *Beyond  
Language*, American Language  
Institute: San Diego University.
- Manser.Martin H with assistance from  
Fergus MC Gauren. 1995.  
*Oxford Learner's Pocket  
Dictionary*. New Edition.Oxford  
University Press.
- Muttaqin. 1997. *Activating Students in  
Speaking English through  
Communicative Approach*.  
Thesis unpublished. Ujung  
Pandang: FPBS. IKIP Ujung  
Pandang.
- Nur. J. Hafsah. 1993. *Affective Factors  
in Language Learning in  
Indonesia*. Ujung Pandang  
Thesis unpublished. Ujung  
Pandang: FPBS. IKIP Ujung  
Pandang.
- Richard Jack C and Theodore S.  
Rodgers. 1986. *Approaches and  
Methods in Language Teaching*.  
Cambridge University Press.
- Ronbepajung.J.J. 1988.*Pengajaran dan  
Pembelajaran Bahasa Asing*.  
Jakarta: Department Pendidikan  
dan Kebudayaan. Dirjen  
Pendidikan Tinggi Proyek  
Pengembangan Lembaga  
Pendidikan.
- River, Wilga M. 1968.*Teaching  
Foreign Language Skills*. New  
York: The University of Chicago  
Publish.

Samad, Muh. Yasin. 1989. *The Speaking Ability of the Third Semester of English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang*. Thesis unpublished. Ujung Pandang: FPBS. IKIP Ujung Pandang.

Santoso, Singgih. 2006. *Menguasai Statistik di era Informasi dengan SPSS 15.0*. Jakarta: PT. Elex Media Computindo

Sudjana. 1992. *Metode Statistika*. Cet.5. Bandung: Tarsito.

Webster, a Merriyam. 1956. *Webster's Elementary Dictionary*, New York: America Book Company.

Wandia, I Ketut. 1990. *Psychological Constrains Affecting Speaking Performance of the Firth Semester Students of the English Department Faculty of Letters*, Udayana University Denpasar, Bali. Ujung Pandang. Hasanuddin University.

