

## ***Improving Speaking Ability Through Community Language Learning of The Eleventh Grade Students at SMK Negeri 5 Medan***

**Marlina Isa Dora Hutabarat**  
[hmisadoraa@gmail.com](mailto:hmisadoraa@gmail.com)

Magister of Education - English Department  
Graduate School Nommensen HKBP University Medan

### **Abstract**

This study is intended to find out whether Community Language Learning can improve significantly students' speaking ability. Community Language Learning is very important in teaching learning process because they give students an opportunity to practice communicating in different social context in different social rules, Community Language Learning can be set up so that they are very structured or in a less structured way. This study is conducted by using Class Action Research. The subject of this study was the second grade students of SMK Negeri 5 Medan. The sample of the study is the students XI-TPM1 consisting 30 students. These following suggestions are directed for the students of English Department, it is suggested to know or learn kinds of method so they are easier to express their ideas and for the teachers, it would be better using some of the method and asked the students to make a conversation based on the time sequence. The teacher is suggested to make variation technique for students to improve students' speaking ability and, so the students interested in the speaking English.

Keywords: *Community Language Learning, Speaking Ability*

### **1. Introduction**

Speaking is a language skill that can be performed by any speaker of a language although this skill may be acquired naturally. Speaking involves at least two people; one speaker and one listener. Thronbury (2005: 1) states that speaking is so much a part of daily life that people take it for granted. Thus, speaking is important to be learnt as early as possible especially in vocational high schools. As one of the basic skill of English, speaking has an important role in language learning process. In school, the student learns how to speak English easier because there are teachers and friends who can be their their facilitators and pairs to practice English. So, speaking is ability of people to communicate with other people by using verbal language.

Based on the writer's observation and interview in SMK Teladan Medan, there were some problems that the writer found from the students. It was found that most of the students had low ability in speaking English. To improve the students' ability in speaking by applying Community Language Learning (CLL) method where was originally developed by Charles Curran, the writer believed that it will be able to motivate the learners. the writer intended CLL is a model of education was extended to language learning contexts which learners in a classroom were regarded not as a "class" but as a "group" in need certain therapy and counseling" said Charles Curran (1972:89). Students can learn from their relationship and their interaction with each other as well as their interaction with the teacher. CLL can

stimulate the students to express their mind in the class and represents the use of counseling-learning theory to teach languages.

The current study for this problem is “Does CLL method improve speaking ability of eleventh grade students at SMK Negeri 5 Medan?”

### **Communicative Competence**

Savignon (1970:9) defines communicative competence as “the ability to function in a truly communicative setting-that is, in a dynamic exchange in which linguistic competence must adjust itself to the total information input, both linguistic and paralinguistic of one or more interlocutors”. In other words, it can be stated that someone can achieve communicative competence through the mastery of the language grammar, uttering the words, a number of vocabulary needed, experiencing the language which through enough natural conditional practice.

There are four characteristics of communicative competence according to Savignon (1985:49):

1. Knowledge of rules of speaking.
2. Knowledge of the grammar and vocabulary of the language.
3. Knowing how to use and respond to different types of speech acts.
4. Knowing how to use and language appropriately.

### **Transactional Language**

Transactional language is one of types of speaking which has interaction and it includes more participants to give the message as an aim. Brown&Yule (1994:14) said in transactional situation, where information transference is the primary reason for the speaker choosing to speak, the language tends to be clearer, more specific than in primarily interactional situation. So they assume that normal speaker of language achieve an ability to express their need to communicate information. Speaking is also one of the language arts that is most frequently.

### **Purpose for Speaking**

Many ways gaining speaking task that we can do to collect students score. According to Nunan (1999:229), speaking task and carried out by telling, chatting, calling, discussing, gossiping, answering, and ordering, and others. Based on the purposes for speaking, all of these criteria are important, but the effectiveness to the students' speaking purposes are only telling, calling, discussing, answering, and ordering. The students can use the actualization in the teaching learning process such as:

1. To tell what is the information which they know. For example, the teacher says something about the information from news based on the topic in teaching learning process. The students tell something about the news by their words.
2. To call someone in the classroom. For example, the student calls his friends to borrow or give something and to excuse to the teacher when wants to go out from the class.
3. To discuss the material in teaching learning process. For example, the teacher asks the students to discuss the topic based on the group. In discussing, they will tell about their ideas, suggestions, and views.
4. To answer the question. For example, the student answers the question from the teacher or the other students when teaching learning process.

5. To order something. For example, the student orders himself like pen, books, or food to his friend or his teacher.

All of the purposes for speaking and the applications in the classroom make the students speaking spontaneously.

### **The Concept of Teaching Speaking**

Teaching is an activity where ones try to help and to lead someone in getting, changing or developing skills, attitude, idea, appreciation, and to knowledge. Form a communicative, pragmatic view or the language classroom, listening and speaking skill are closely intertwined. Brown (2002:256) explain about perspective in teaching speaking to the more practical consideration as follows:

1. Conversation Discourse

The conversation class is something of a sigma in language teaching. The goals and the techniques for teaching conversation are extremely diverse. Depending on the students, teacher, and overall context.

2. Teaching Pronunciation

There has been some controversy over a role of pronunciation work in a communicative, interactive course of study because the overwhelming majority of adult learner will never acquire an accent-free command of a foreign language.

3. Accuracy and Fluency

Classroom must not become linguistics course but rather than the locus of meaningful language involvement, or so the argument went. Fluency is an initial goal in language teaching. Yet accuracy is achieved to some extent by allowing students to focus on the elements of phonology, grammar, and discourse in their spoken output.

4. Affective Factor

One of major obstacles learners have to overcome in learning to speak is the anxiety generated over the risk of burling things out that are wrong stupid.

### **The Function of Speaking**

In general there are many functions of speaking but according to Yule & Brown (1983:1), there are three, namely: talk as interaction, talk as transaction, and talk as performance. Each of these speeches active is quite distinct in terms of form and function different teaching approaches.

1. Talk as Interaction

Talk as interaction, means the conversation that describe interaction and serve as a primary social function. When people meet, they exchange greetings, engage in small talk, recount experiences and so on because they wish to be friendly and to establish a comfortable zone of interaction with others. The focus is more on the speakers and how they wish to present themselves to each other than on the message. Some of the skills involved in using talk as interaction are opening and closing conversation, choosing topics, making small-talk, turn-taking, interrupting, and so on.

Mastering the art of talking as an interaction is difficult and may not be a priority for all learners. However students who do need such skills and find themselves lacking report that they sometimes feel awkward and at a loss of words when they find themselves in a situation that requires talk for interaction. They feel uneasy in presenting a good image of themselves and sometimes avoid situations which call for this kind of talk. This can be a disadvantage for some learners where the ability to use talk in conversation can be an important factor in the process of speaking.

## 2. Talk as Transaction

This type of talk refers to situations where the focus is on what is said or done. The message is the central focus here and making oneself understood clearly and accurately rather than the participants and how they interact socially with each other.

There are two different types of talk as interaction. One is situations where the focus is on giving and receiving information and where the participants focus primarily on what is said or achieved (e.g asking someone for the time). Accuracy may not be priority as long as information is successfully communicated or understood. The second type are transaction which focus on obtaining good or services, such as checking in the hotel. Some of skills involved in using talk for interaction are explaining a need or intention, describing something, asking questioning, confirming information, making suggestion, and so on.

Talks as performancean audience such as morning talk, public announcement, and speeches.

### **Previous Research**

Improving students speaking ability through Community Language Learning is an interesting field for research. Many researchers have conducted the research about improving students speaking ability through community language learning. Related to this study, the writer choose the previous research which are relevant to speaking ability based on community language learning. In this research, the writer takes the previous of literature from thesis as principle or comparison with this research.

The first was taken from Mirawati Abdullah (2014) Semarang. *Students' speaking ability through community language learning*. This research applied quasi experimental method. The research data were collected through speaking test and questionnaire. The study concluded that: first, CLL improve the first semester students of SMP Negeri 19 Makassar to speak English significantly better than conventional method, the second the participants were highly interested in speaking English by community language learning.

The second researcher is Siti Nurhasanah (2009). *The Use of Community Language Learning Method to Increase the Students' Participation in Classroom Conversation*. This study was carried out for the students of International Class Program State Institute of Islamic Studies (IAIN) Salatiga Batch 2013/2014 Academic Year 2013. Based on the results and findings, the students could develop their participation which can be seen by the increasing average between pretest and posttest from the cycle 1 to the cycle 2.

From those explanations above the research about "*Improving Speaking Ability Through Community Language Learning at SMK Negeri 5 Medan*" is never done yet before by the other writers. So, the writer interested to conduct this study.

## **2.Methodology**

### **Participants of The Study**

The total number of the participants in this research are 150 students into 6 classes, XI-TPM1 until XI-TPM3. Based on the participants which was devided into three classes, the sample of this study would be XI-TPM1 class of SMK Negeri 5 Medan academic year 2018/2019, where the total number of the students were 30 students.

### **Instrument**

The writer gives task to collect data in the speaking test. By speaking, the writer choose the conversation conduct the test to measure students' achievement to speak. In this study, the writer would get data by giving pre-test. A pre-test would give before the students get some activities of speaking ability through CLL. Evaluation test is used during the cycle to measure the students understanding. A post-test is given after students get some activities of speaking ability through CLL. It is used to measure the students' achievement after being taught.

In order to know the improvement of students' achievement, the writer analyzed the different between mean of pre-test and two evaluations of test scores.

### Scoring

Some criterions were considered which should adapt FSI Proficiency Rating, the component which needs to be scored are: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and comprehension. Each component would be rated on four-point scale. It can be seen from the table.

**Table 3.5 Assessment in Speaking Ability**

Proficiency	Feature	Score	
Pronunciation	Pronunciation Frequently unintelligible.	0	
	Frequent gross errors and very heavy accent make understanding, difficult, requires frequent repetition.	2	
	Foreign accent' require concentrated listening and mispronunciation lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.	2	
	Marked 'foreign accent' and occasional mispronunciation that do not interfere with understanding.	2	
	No conspicuous mispronunciation, but will not be taken for a native speaker.	3	
	Native pronunciation, with no trace of 'foreign'.	4	
	Grammar almost entirely inappropriate or inaccurate, phrases.	6	
Grammar	Constant errors showing control of very few controversies micro skill major patterns, and frequently preventing communication.	12	
	Frequent errors showing some major pattern uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.	18	
	Occasions errors showing imperfect control of some conversation micro skill or some pattern, but no weakness that causes misunderstanding.	24	
	Few, errors with no pattern of failure.	30	
	No more than two errors during the conversation.	36	
	Vocabulary	Vocabulary limited to minimum courtesy requirements.	4
		Vocabulary limited to the basic personal areas and very familiar topics (time, food, transportation, family).	8
Choice of the words sometimes inaccurate, limitations of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common familiar topic.		12	
Vocabulary adequate to discuss special interest and any		16	

	nontechnical subject with some circumlocutions.	
	Vocabulary broad, precise and adequate to cope with complex practical problem and varied social situations.	20
	Vocabulary apparently as accurate and as extensive as that of an educated native speaker.	24
Fluency	Speech is a halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible.	4
	Usually hesitant; often forced into silent by language limitations.	8
	Speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language problem.	12
	Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problem.	15
	Understands everything in normal educated conversation, expect for every colloquial or low-frequency items or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech.	19
	Understands everything in informal and colloquial speech to be expected of an educated native speaker.	23

### 3.Data Analysis Procedure

The data in this study consisted of two kinds of data: the quantitative and the qualitative. The quantitative data were taken from speaking test, while the qualitative ones were taken from observation sheet.

#### The Quantitative Data

The quantitative data were taken from the result of the pre-test, post-test cycle I, and post-test cycle II. Which was carried out in two cycles. In two cycles the writer conducted the study in eight meetings. Before conducting the first cycle, the pre-test was given in the first meeting. The writer asked the students to practice speaking in front of the class by using English language. The score of the students in the pre-test was given with the topic is “asking and giving opinion” without giving treatment. In pre-test there was no student who got score 70, but the highest score was 66 and the lowest score was 30. It can be seen in table 4.1 below:

**Table 4.1**  
**The Improvement Students’ Scores in Pre-Test**

No	Students	Pre-Test
1	AK	33
2	AP	30
3	APR	39
4	AR	66
5	ASH	63
6	DEM	53
7	DS	53
8	FA	40
9	GAF	50
10	GSW	49
11	GA	30
12	MA	55
13	MAF	39
14	MARS	56
15	MAS	50

16	MI	60
17	MH	66
18	MS	64
19	NFW	45
20	NU	50
21	NR	37
22	OMN	58
23	RA	66
24	RS	60
25	SA	50
26	SJ	45
27	TH	60
28	TO	38
29	YH	65
30	YTS	55
<b>Total</b>		$\sum x = 1525$
<b>Mean</b>		$X = 50,83$

After the pre-test, the writer gave once treatment before gave the post test I with the same topic is “asking and giving opinion” they work in a group but the writer asked them to practice speaking in front of the class by using English language. The score of the students in the post-test cycle I as followed: the highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 45. It can be seen in table 4.2 below:

**Table 4.2**  
**The Improvement Students’ Score in Cycle I**

No	Students	Test Cycle I
1	AK	47
2	AP	55
3	APR	45
4	AR	70
5	ASH	65
6	DEM	60
7	DS	66
8	FA	55
9	GAF	50
10	GSW	56
11	GA	47
12	MA	69
13	MAF	47
14	MARS	60
15	MAS	66
16	MH	71
17	MI	81
18	MS	71
19	NFW	56
20	NU	60
21	NR	55
22	OMN	67
23	RA	75
24	RS	71
25	SA	70

26	SJ	55
27	TH	65
28	TO	55
29	YH	70
30	YTS	65
<b>Total</b>		$\sum x = 1855$
<b>Mean</b>		$X = 61,83$

After the post-test of cycle I was given to the students, the writer gave the treatment more detail before testing them in post-test cycle II with the same topic that is “asking and giving opinion” and the writer asked the students to be more creative and active in group, then asked the students to practice speaking in front of the class, one by one by using English language. The score of the students in the post-test cycle II as followed: the highest score was 85 and the lowest was 60. It can be seen in table 4.3 below:

**Table 4.3**  
**The Improvement Students' Scores in Cycle II**

No	Students	Test Cycle II
1	AK	60
2	AP	70
3	APR	63
4	AR	81
5	ASH	71
6	DEM	70
7	DS	71
8	FA	70
9	GAF	60
10	GSW	60
11	GA	60
12	MA	71
13	MAF	60
14	MARS	71
15	MAS	81
16	MH	81
17	MI	85
18	MS	81
19	NFW	71
20	NU	71
21	NR	70
22	OMN	81
23	RA	85
24	RS	81
25	SA	85
26	SJ	70
27	TH	75
28	TO	70
29	YH	75
30	YTS	75
<b>Total</b>		$\sum x = 2175$
<b>Mean</b>		$X = 72,5$

The scores of the pre-test, post-test cycle I, and post-test cycle II can be seen as follows:



**The Qualitative Data  
 Observation Sheet**

Observation sheet used to monitor the students' during the teaching learning process. It was focused on the situation of teaching learning process in which CLL as a method was used including students' activities and behavior students' speaking ability and the situation of the class and also the materials were thought. It got in the first cycle performed that the study was not success event though teacher and students had done all the process of teaching and learning in a good way it was because CLL was still new for the students, so that they needed more time to adapt with this method. In the second cycle, they could use CLL in speaking ability.

The quantitative data were taken from the result of speaking test score. The first test as a pre-test was given without treatment. The test of the post-test of cycle I and the post-test of cycle II were given to the students after teaching of each cycle had been completely finished.

In the pre-test, the total score of students in speaking English was 1525 and the number of students who took the test were 30, so the students' mean score was 50,83.

In the post-test of cycle I, the total score of students in speaking English was 1855 and the number of students who took the test were 30, so the students' mean score was 61,83.

In the post-test of cycle II, the total score of students in teaching speaking English was 2175 and the number of the students who took the test were 30, so the students' mean score was 72,5.

The students score in speaking English through CLL can be seen from the mean of the students' score during the research. To know it, the writer applied the formula:

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

Where:

**X= The mean of students**

**$\sum x$ = The total score**

**N= The number of students**

The increasing of the students' score in speaking ability by applying CLL could be seen from the mean of the students' score in pre-test (test I), post-test cycle I (test II), up to the test in cycle II (test III). The mean of test in cycle II was the highest among the other tests.

From this result can be seen that there was improvement, it meant that the students had comprehend with the treatment and started to active in express their idea. In the third test, the lowest score was 60 and the high one was 85. It could be said that the last test was good improvement because many of students got high score in test III and they could more active than before. The comparison of the students' score in the speaking test can be seen in the table.

**Table 4.2.1 Comparison of The Students' Score in Three Speaking Tests**

Name of Test	Pre-Test	Test I	TEST II
<b>LOWEST SCORE</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>HIGHEST SCORE</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>X</b>	<b>50,83</b>	<b>61,83</b>	<b>72,5</b>
<b>N</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>

It could be concluded that the students' speaking ability by applying CLL had increased from the mean of the first test was 50,83 to the mean of the last test 72,5 so the increase was 21,67. The students in SMK Negeri 5 Medan were decided mastering the lesson if they got score up to 70 because KKM of English subject in this school was 70. The percentage of the students who got score up to 70 also showed the improvement from the first meeting to the last meeting.

### The Percentage of Students' Improvement

The number of the students who got improvement in speaking was calculated as follows:

$$P = \frac{R}{T} \times 100$$

Where:

**P** = Percentage of students

**R** = The number of students who get the point above 70

**T** = The total number of students who do the test

$$P1 = \frac{0}{30} \times 100 = 0\%$$

$$P2 = \frac{5}{30} \times 100 = 16,66\%$$

$$P3 = \frac{18}{30} \times 100 = 60\%$$

**Table of The Improvement of Students' Speaking Asking and Giving Information**

Competence	Pre-Test	Post-Test (cycle I)	Post-Test (cycle II)
Score	1525	1855	2175
Mean	50,83	61,83	72,5
Number of students who got point up to 70	0	5	18
Percentage of students who got point up to 70	0%	16,66%	60%

### The Qualitative Analysis Data Observation Sheet

Observation sheet aims at finding out the students' data about their presence and activeness in teaching learning process. Observation sheet is useful to know the students' reaction and to find out exciting development due to the application of this method. Observation was done when the classroom was going. The writer kept the observation sheet in cycle I and cycle II. In the cycle I the students were not serious when learning process, but in the cycle II the students were serious, active, and enjoyable the learning process.

### Discussion

From the data analysis the finding of the study showed that using method could improve students' speaking ability through CLL. It can be seen from the mean of the students' scores. The mean of the pre-test 50,83 it was very low because the students did not know how asking and giving opinion to speak clearly. After the first cycle was conducted the mean score of asking and giving opinion cycle I was 61,83 and the mean of description speaking scores in

cycle II was 72,5. It can be seen from the percentage of students who got point up to 70, in the first cycle there were 0%, in the post-test I there were 16,66% and in the post-test II there were 60%. It can be concluded that using CLL could improve students' speaking asking and giving opinion from meeting to meeting. The writer also analyzed that the qualitative data was taken from observation sheets to support the students' interest and could understand about the lesson. Because they were enthusiasts and enjoy with the process of learning. They also were more active to participate in the process of learning.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Based on the study findings, the writer concludes that applying CLL on students' speaking ability could improve speaking ability in speaking. Because students very enthusiastic to study and speak up in class. It can be proved by the computation of the mean of the students' test score of each cycle. The improvement of students' ability in speaking is also proved by the observation sheet results, interview which indicate the improvement in teaching learning process from cycle I and cycle II. Based on these data, the writer concludes that teaching speaking through CLL could improve speaking ability.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Brown, H. D. (2002). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*. San Francisco: Pearson Education.
- Brown, Yule. (1999). *Teaching the Spoken Language*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Curran, Charles A. (1976) *Counseling-Learning in Second Languages*. Apple River, Illinois: Apple River Press, Retrieved 7 February 2013 from <http://www.articlesbase.com/langauges-articles/community-language-learning-4282256.html>
- Nunan, D. (2003). *The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educatinal Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pasific Region TESOL Quarterly* 37(4). 589-613
- Nunan, David. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston, Massachusetts 02116.U.S.A: Heinle & Heinle Publisher.
- Savignon Sandra J. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to Teach Speaking*. London: Longman.
- Yule and Brown. (1983). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*. San Francisco: Pearson Education.