THE USE OF COMMUNITY LANGUAGE LEARNING (CLL) IN TEACHING SPEAKING

[1]*Irwandi,* [2]*Eka Sukmawati*

[1] *Lecturer of English Department University of Muhammadiyah Mataram*
[2] *Student's of English Department University of Muhammadiyah Mataram*

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to find out the effectiveness of using CLL in teaching speaking at the first grade students of SMP N 18 Mataram in academic year 2014 / 2015. This is kind of quantitative research with quasi experimental method. The population of this research involved 67 students'   from the first grade in SMPN 18 Mataram. The reseacher took 44 students as a sample that divided into two groups, 22 students belong to the experimental group and 22 students belong to the control group. To find out the differences of x and y, the writer used pre- test and post- test to collect the data. The data collected was analized by t-test formula. Therefore, the writer gave different treatment to prove that CLL is better than conventional method. After the writer gave the treatment, it showed that the mean of post test of experimental group is higher than control group. After that, the result of mean score of Experimental and group is proved by the t-test and compared with t-table, so the result in t-test is 3,8 and t-table (0,05%) is 2,02 and (0,01 %) is 2,70. In addition, the result of the t-test is higher than t-table (3,8 > 2.02 > 2,70). This means that there is significant different between experimental and control group. From the explanation above, the writer concludes that Community Language Learning (CLL) was effective in teaching speaking for the first grade students of SMP N 18 Mataram in academic year of 2014/2015.

Key words : *Community Language Learning (CLL), Speaking Skill*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is a way to express someone's idea or thought in spoken form. According to Cameron (2001:40), speaking is the active use of language to express meanings so that other people can make sense of them. Speaking is a multifaceted construct. Thornbury and Slade (2006) point out that this complexity derives from speaking being so ubiquitous in our daily language usage (p. 5). In other words, speaking is so relevant with daily interactions that it is difficult to define.

Speaking classes must be guided by the elements of conversation as previously mentioned and the means to generate genuine conversation. In other words, to succeed speaking classes, the uses of correct approach, interesting

activities, proper equipments, and high motivation are necessary. But, teaching speaking in not easy cases, there are some problem faced by the students in learning speaking. First, the students do not have adequate vocabulary. Hence, they cannot express their ideas. Then students cannot pronounce the words correctly and it makes them feel embarrassed and it can increase their anxiety to speak because they are afraid of making mistake. Beside that the students are less motivation in the classroom. As a result, they do not engage actively in learning process. In covering those problems, one the role of teacher is very important. The teacher who can "understand" can indicate his acceptance of the student. By understanding students fears and being sensitive to them, he/she can help students overcome their negative feelings and turn them into positive energy to further their learning. Based on the problems above, the researcher suggests the interesting and appropriate strategy to encourage the students to speak English in the classroom, that is Community Language Learning (CLL).

Community Language Learning (CLL) as one kind of method in language learning where teachers to consider their students as "whole person". Whole person learning means that teachers consider not only their students "feeling and intellect, but also some understanding of the relationship among students' physical reactions, their instinctive protective reactions and desire to learn. The teacher become "language counselors". A language counselor does not mean someone trained in psychology, it means someone who is a skillful understander of the struggle students face as they attempt to internalize another language (Diane Larsen-Freeman : 1986).

Based on the background of the study, the researcher formulated the research problem as follows : "Is the use of CLL method effective to teaching speaking at the first grade students of SMP N 18 Mataram in the academic year 2014 / 2015?"

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Concept of CLL

The community language learning is the name of a method which is oriented on humanistic approach. Another term of Community Language Learning is counseling learning where it is a non-direct therapies approach which is designed to ease the learners in acquiring the target language.

In accordance with the statement above, the writer particularly needs to formulate the example of community language learning takes place in the classroom. A group of learners sit in a circle with the teacher standing outside of the circle, and a students 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 repeats the messages in the foreign language into a cassette; students compose further messages in the foreign language with teacher's help; so students reflect about their feelings and wishes. It means that the client-counselor in psychological counseling have relationship between the learner-knower in community language learning.

Furthermore, community language learning represents the use of counseling-learning theory to teach languages.

Design of CLL

Design of CLL discusses about activities of teaching learning using CLL method such as: types of learning and teaching activities, learner roles, and teacher roles

There are several simple steps of Community Language Learning. Those simple steps are taken from Brown (2000:104), and they are shown as follows :

1. The group of clients are seated in a circle with the counselor on the outside of the circle. Those clients first of all have to establish an interpersonal relationship and trust in their native language. The clients may consist of complete beginners in the foreign language.
2. When one of the clients wants to say something to the group or to an individual, he say it in the native language.
3. The counselor translates the utterance back to the client in the target language.
4. The client repeats the translation as accurately as possible.
5. When another client responds in his native language, again the counselor translates his utterance in the target language. This is done over and over again with other clients who wants to speak.
6. If possible the conversation is taped for later listening, and at the end of each session the clients try to get information about the new language.
7. The counselor may take a more directive role and explain certain linguistic explanation rules.

Based on the statement above that steps of Community Language Learning is very simple. Hopefully, this learning process will lead the students become more confident and do not afraid to do same mistakes when they are doing conversation. So, student's can improve their speaking skills through this method.

METHOD

This study used Quasi Experimental Design. The kind of this study is quantitative study, where there is no randomization between control group and experimental group or called as nonequivalent control group design. Quasi Experimental Design is used because it is difficult to randomize the sample (Sugiyono: 2014).

This research used cluster sampling that took the subject based on the level of class. The experimental class would be class VIIA and control class would be VIIB. Class VIIA is taken as a sample of experimental group with treatment and class VIIB

as control group without treatment. In this research, the data would be taken through pre-test and post-test.

Table 3.3 Oral Proficiency Scoring Categories

No	Criteria	Rating Scale	Comments
1	Accent	1	Pronunciation frequently unintelligible
		2	Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition.
		3	"Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening and mispronunciation lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.
		4	Marked "foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding.
		5	No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.
		6	Native pronunciation, which no trace of "foreign accent"
2	Grammar	1	Grammar almost entirely inaccurate except in stock phrases
		2	Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication
		3	Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding
		4	Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that causing misunderstanding
		5	Few errors, with no patterns of failure
		6	No more than two errors during the interview
3	Vocabulary	1	Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversation
		2	Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc.)
		3	Choice of words sometimes inaccurate, limitation of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics
		4	Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interest; general vocabulary permits discussion of any non-technical

			subject with some circumlocutions
		5	Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situation
		6	Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educated native speaker
4	Fluency	1	Speech is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible
		2	Speech is very slowly and uneven except for short or routine sentences.
		3	Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted
		4	Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and grouping for words
		5	Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptibly non-native in speed and evenness
		6	Speech is on all professional and general topics as effortless and smooth as a native speaker's
5	Comprehension	1	Understand too little for the simplest type of conversation.
		2	Understands only slow, very simple speech on common social and touristic topic; requires constant repetition and rephrasing.
		3	Understand careful, somewhat simplified speech directed to him, with considerable repetition and rephrasing.
		4	Understands quite well normal educated speech directed to him, but requires occasional repetition and rephrasing.
		5	Understands everything in normal educated conversation except for every colloquial or low-frequency items, or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech
		6	Understands everything in both formal and colloquial speech to be expected of an educated native speaker.

(Hughes, 2003: 131-132)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

At the first meeting, before the the teaching and learning activities were undertaken, the researcher performed pre-test in two classes namely class VIIA as experimental group and class VIIB as control group. In this research, there were 44

students involved, 22 students for experimental group and 22 students for control group. Each of the students asked to practice about instruction that given. The following table point out the student's speaking score in pre-test for experimental group and control group.

Table 4.1 The Result of Pre-test for Experimental Group

No	Name/ Subject	Accent	Grammar	Score Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehension	Total	Score
1	A.S. Aliffia	2	2	3	2	3	12	60
2	Bq. Aisya A. R.	3	3	3	3	3	15	75
3	Bq Cindra W.N.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
4	Cindy C. A.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
5	Chintya D. N. S.	3	2	2	3	3	11	55
6	Echa S.	3	3	3	3	3	15	75
7	Fachrul R.	2	2	30	2	2	10	50
8	Ina Ismayani	2	2	∠	2	2	10	50
9	Inggo N.	1	1	2	1	1	6	30
10	Irwan H.	1	1	2	1	1	6	30
11	Jihan M.	2	2	3	3	3	13	65
12	Laisa A.	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
13	M. Adji F..	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
14	M. Al Maliki	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
15	Mahendra H,	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
16	Maherani	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
17	Mela H.	3	3	3	3	3	15	75
18	Noval N. R.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
19	Opan S.	1	1	2	1	1	6	30
20	Riski A.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
21	Shinta N.	3	3	3	3	3	15	75
22	Wisnu Y. M.	3	2	3	2	2	12	60
	Total	47	45	53	47	48	238	1190

Table 01. The Result of Pre-test for Control Group

No	Name/ Subject	Accent	Grammar	Score Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehension	Total	Score
1	Adam M.	2	2	3	3	3	13	65
2	Ahmad J.	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
3	Ardiansyah	2	2	3	3	3	13	65
4	Asianti	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
5	Asterius U. T.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50

53

No	Name/ Subject	Accent	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehension	Total	Score
6	Ervan M.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
7	Indah M.	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
8	Iswandi	1	1	2	1	1	6	30
9	Juwarni	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
10	Miftahul S.	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
11	Muh.Sito A. K.	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
12	M. Dhani A.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
13	Munawar	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
14	Paulus R.	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
15	Rachmat F.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
16	Rizaldi I.	1	1	2	1	1	6	30
17	Sahida A.	1	1	2	2	1	7	35
18	Siti I.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
19	Suciani	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
20	Tanwil N.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
21	Wawan A.	3	3	3	3	3	15	75
22	Yudi M. R.	2	2	2	2	2	10	50
	Total	42	42	54	48	44	230	1150

Analysis of Post-test Result for Experimental and Control Group

The last step in this research, the researcher gave post-test for Experimental group and control group in the last meeting, where the researcher was to evaluate the students's speaking progress and their achievement.

Table 02. The Result of Post-test for Experimental Group

No	Name/ Subject	Accent	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehension	Total	Score
1	A.S. Aliffia	2	3	4	3	3	15	75
2	Bq. Aisya A. R.	3	3	4	4	4	18	90
3	Bq Cindra W.N.	2	2	3	3	3	13	65
4	Cindy C. A.	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
5	Chintya D. N. S.	3	2	3	4	3	15	75
6	Echa S.	3	3	4	4	3	17	85
7	Fachrul R.	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
8	Ina Ismayani	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
9	Inggo N.	1	2	3	2	1	10	50
10	Irwan H.	2	2	3	2	1	10	50
11	Jihan M.	2	3	4	4	3	16	80
12	Laisa A.	2	2	4	3	2	13	65

13	M. Adji F..	2	2	3	3	3	13	65
14	M. Al Maliki	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
15	Mahendra H,	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
16	Maherani	2	2	3	3	3	13	65
17	Mela H.	3	3	4	4	3	17	85
18	Noval N. R.	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
19	Opan S.	1	2	3	2	2	10	50
20	Riski A.	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
21	Shinta N.	3	3	4	4	3	17	85
22	Wisnu Y. M.	3	2	4	3	2	14	70
	Total	22	50	74	69	53	295	1475

Table 03. The Result of Post-test for Control Group

No	Name/ Subject	Score					Total	Score
		Accent	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Comprehension		
1	Adam M.	2	2	4	4	3	15	75
2	Ahmad J.	2	2	4	4	2	14	70
3	Ardiansyah	2	3	4	4	3	16	80
4	Asianti	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
5	Asterius U. T.	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
6	Ervan M.	2	3	3	3	2	13	65
7	Indah M.	2	2	4	3	2	13	65
8	Iswandi	1	1	3	2	1	8	40
9	Juwarni	2	2	4	4	2	14	70
10	Miftahul S.	2	2	4	3	2	13	65
11	Muh.Sito A. K.	2	2	4	3	2	13	65
12	M. Dhani A.	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
13	Munawar	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
14	Paulus R.	2	2	4	3	2	13	65
15	Rachmat F.	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
16	Rizaldi I.	1	1	3	2	1	8	40
17	Sahida A.	1	1	2	2	1	7	35
18	Siti I.	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
19	Suciani	2	2	3	3	2	12	60
20	Tanwil N.	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
21	Wawan A.	3	3	4	3	3	16	80
22	Yudi M. R.	2	2	3	2	2	11	55
	Total	42	44	74	63	44	267	1335

The Calculation and Analysis of Means Score

a. The calculation of mean score
  1. The mean score of experimental group (Mx)

  $$Mx = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

  $$Mx = \frac{285}{22}$$

  $$Mx = 12,95$$

  2. The mean score of control group (My)

  $$My = \frac{\sum y}{N}$$

  $$My = \frac{185}{22}$$

  $$My = 8,4$$

b. The computation of deviation
  1. Square deviation of experimental group

  $$\sum X = \sum x^2 - \frac{(x)^2}{Nx}$$

  $$X^2 = 4075 - \frac{(285)^2}{22}$$

  $$X^2 = 4075 - \frac{81225}{22}$$

  $$X^2 = 4075 - 3692,0$$

  $$X^2 = 383$$

  2. Square deviation of control group

  $$\sum Y = \sum y^2 - \frac{(y)^2}{Ny}$$

  $$Y^2 = 1875 - \frac{(195)^2}{24}$$

  $$Y^2 = 1875 - \frac{38025}{24}$$

  $$Y^2 = 1875 - 1584,38$$

  $$Y^2 = 269, 3$$

The Calculation of T-test

$$t - test = \frac{MX - MY}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{(NX + NY) - 2}\left[\frac{1}{NX} + \frac{1}{NY}\right]}}$$

$$t = \frac{12,95 - 8,4}{\sqrt{\frac{383 + 269,3}{(22+22) - 2}\left[\frac{1}{22} + \frac{1}{22}\right]}} \qquad t = \frac{4,55}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{652,3}{42}\right]\left[\frac{2}{22}\right]}}$$

$$t = \frac{4,55}{\sqrt{[15,53][0,09]}}$$

$$t = \frac{4,55}{\sqrt{[1,39]}}$$

$$t = \frac{4,55}{1,17}$$

$$t = 3,8$$

The analysis of data in this research eventually aimed to find out the deviation means scores analysis it is referred to the score of t-test namely 3,8. Now, it is to be interpreted to find out if it is significant or not.

Before the writer check the table of distribution. Firstly. The writer determines the degree of freedom (df) that is x+y-2= 22 + 22 − 2 = 42. Based on the table of level significance have been pointed out, the coefficient. t-tes is directly checked on the table of t distribution. Based on the table, the critical value of t-table on the level of significance t 0,05% is 2,02 and t 0,01% is 2,70. So it is found that 3,8 > 2,02 and 2,70.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on result of the study, it could be concluded that the use of CLL method in teaching speaking is effective. This skill has been proved by analyzing data from the result between the deviations of mean scores of experimental group was 12,95 and control group was 8,4. Then the result of the statistical analysis of t-test in this research was 3,8. It was higher that critical values for t-table in degree of freedom (df) 42 as the nearest (df) of 40 is 2,02(0,05%) and 2,70 (0,01%) . From this fact, it was clear that mean score of both groups were significant. It means the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was definitely accepted.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher concludes that Community Language Learning (CLL) is effective in teaching speaking. That is because based on the observation, knowing that the students' can't express their ideas in Foreign language and pronounce the words correctly and all of that caused of less vocabulary.

All of these problem that make this method is appropriate in teaching speaking. Because in this method, the students' can express their ideas in native language and the teacher that translate in Foreign Language. This activity did continuously until they understand the meaning of word and can pronoune it correctly. So, score speaking that got students' taught by CLL method is mu· ˙ ˙ ᴣr. It has answered the research question that the use of CLL method in ꞑg speaking is quite effective. CLL also can makes the speaking and learning activity more interesting and enjoyable. Moreover it makes the class more active and existing and the students are willing to participate without any forces from the teacher.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek.* Edisi Revisi 2010. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

D, S. Fitriany.2010. Thesis : " *Meningkatkan kompetensi Berbicara Mahaiswa Program Studi pendidikan Bahasa Inggris dengan Metode pembelajaran Community Language Leraning*" Univ. Negeri Medan, Medan : Unpublished.

Emilia, Emi. 2009. *Menulis Tesis and Disertasi*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Freeman & Diane Larsen. 1986. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

H. Uswatun.2012. A Thesis : *The Use of Debate Technique to Increase Students Speaking Skill"* IAIN, Salatiga : Unpublished.

Hughes, A. 2003. *Testing for Langue Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Nazara, S. 2011. *Students' Perception on EFL Speaking Skill Development*. Journal of English Teaching, Vol. 1. No. 1, February 2011(Jakarta: Cristian University of Indonesia).

Richard, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. 1986. *Approach and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

R.F.Emma.2014. Article :"*Teaching Speaking of English as A Foreign Language : Problems and Solutions*" .Universitas Lambung Mangkurat : Banjarmasin.

Sugiyono. 2014. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sapri, A. 2014. Ap. Thesis :"*The Effect Of Community Language Learning (CLL) Toward Students Speaking Ability For The Eighth Grade Of Smpn 1*" Univ. 45, Makassar : Unpublished

Sugiyono.2013.*Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R & D*. Bandung : Alfabeta.

S, Rita. 2014. Article : "*Teaching Speaking Through inside/Outside Circle Strategy for Junior High School Students*" STKIP PGRI :West Sumatra.

Sahril. 2011. Thesis : "*The Effect of Community Language Learning Method toward Students Speaking Ability for Eight grade of SMP Darul Hikmah*". UMM, Mataram : Unpublished.