

**THE USE OF COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT)
APPROACH THROUGH ENGLISH VILLAGE FOR IMPROVING AN
TRANSACTIONAL LANGUAGE FUNCTION OF
SPEAKING SKILL**

Hengki,
E-mail: Hengki@Uniska-bjm.ac.id
Ratna

FKIP Universitas Islam Kalimantan MAB Banjarmasin

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study are to investigate the effectiveness of CLT approach in interpersonal function of speaking and to investigate the effectiveness of CLT approach in transactional function of speaking.

It was an experimental study by using one-group pretest-posttest design. The target population of this study was students of English department at the Islamic University of Kalimantan Indonesia Determining one class as research sample.

The achievements of the students were further compared in terms of pre-test and post-test using the dependent t-test, the study found that students who are taught with CLT approach through English Community have better score on the post-test than on the pre-test for transactional function of speaking, it found the t-test is 9.417 with critical view of t at $p > 001$ of one tailed test is 3.307 (df =34). It means that there is a very significant impact on students' skill in transactional function of speaking after following English community using CLT approach.

Keywords: Communicative language teaching, English village

INTRODUCTION

The language environment encompasses everything the language learner hears and sees in the new language. It may include a wide variety of situations, conversation with friends, watching television, reading newspaper, as well as classroom activities. The quality of the language environment is of paramount importance to success in learning a new language. If students are exposed to list of words and their translations, together with a few simple readings in the new language. They will perhaps be able to attain some degrees of reading skill in language, but listening and speaking skills will remain follow.

It is true that communication in the classroom is not quite the same as real communication outside the classroom. But teachers still can do much, in the sense of creating the best situation and condition for learning. To make the use of language more realistic, it can be done by class simulations and role plays.

Based on a previous research finding indicates that the English speaking skill of many Indonesian students and lectures is still far from being sufficient. Murdani (2008), for example, in his research on the problem of speaking ability in teaching and learning English at the second semester of English Education Department of Islamic University of Kalimantan Indonesia found that the students' ability was still very low in the sense that their speaking was not sufficient yet for speaking English texts.

Speaking and speech course are compulsory courses in English Education Department of Islamic University of Kalimantan, each student is obligated to take them. Out of students who enroll in the courses, only about 50% of them can reach a satisfactory result with the accumulation 10% of them got A criterion and the other 40% got B criterion. It denotes that there is something wrong in teaching and learning process in these courses. It may be attributable to the wrong approach usage. As the repetitious case, naturally if there any question about what is wrong? Nevertheless, a good lecturer would never blame the students but she would evaluate herself instead, including the approach of teaching that applied. Therefore, of the several approach in teaching speaking, one of them is CLT approach as focus on this study.

The writer means to take CLT approach as focus on this study . It has a strong version of communicative teaching advances the claim that language is acquired

through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing the inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself.

In language learning, Brown (2004) divides five types of speaking, they are:

- Imitative

At one end of types of speaking performance is the ability to simply parrot back a word or phrase or possibly a sentence. While this is a purely phonetic level of oral production, a number of prosodic, lexical, and grammatical properties of language may be included in the criterion performance. It only in what is traditionally labeled “pronunciation”; no inferences are made about the test-takers ability to understand or convey meaning or to participate in an interactive conversation.

- Intensive

A second type of speaking frequently employed in assessment context is the production of short stretches of oral language designed to demonstrate competence in a narrow band of grammatical, phrasal, lexical, or phonological relationships. The speaker must be aware of semantic properties in order to be able to respond, but interaction with an interlocutor or test administrator is minimal at best.

- Responsive

Responsive assessment task include interaction and test comprehension but at the somewhat limited level of very short conversation, standard greetings and small talk, simple request and comments, and the like. The stimulus is almost always a spoken prompt with perhaps only one or two follow-up questions or retorts.

- Interactive

The difference between responsive and interactive speaking is in the length of the interaction, which sometimes includes multiple exchanges and/or multiple participants. Interaction can take the two forms of transactional language which has the purpose of exchanging specific information, or interpersonal exchanges, which have the purpose of maintaining social relationship.

- Extensive

Extensive oral production tasks include speeches, oral presentations, and story-telling, during which the opportunity for oral interaction from listeners is either highly limited or ruled out altogether. Language style is frequently more deliberative

(planning is involved) and formal for extensive tasks, but we cannot rule out certain informal monologues such as casually delivered speech.

Of the five types of speaking, the writer emphasize a interactive speaking where interaction form consists of transactional function and interpersonal function.

Everything has functions the same goes for language. As we know that language is a tool for communication, without language communicative will never created. Some opinions related to language functions as follows:

Linguist' Views

There are three opinions said by linguists related to language functions. The first language functions refers to how individuals use language to accomplish specific tasks (Halliday 1975; Wilkins 1976). The second, most commonly used language functions are those used to describe or give information or to express feelings (Bachman 1990). the last, language function have been identified for both social communicative and academic purposes by Chamot andf O'Malley (1994).

Cummins' View

Cummins (1984) distinguish the language function into two categories, both are communicative language function and academic language functions. Communicative language function are those used to express meaning in a routine social context that is not cognitively demanding. Communicative langue function include greetings and level-takings, giving information/assistance, describing, and expressing feelings.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

The origins of CLT are to be found in the change in the British language teaching tradition dating from the late 1960s. Until then, Situational Language Teaching represented the major British approach to teaching English as a foreign language. in Situational Language Teaching, language was taught by practicing basic structures in meaningful situation-based activities.

In many countries where English is taught either as a second language or foreign language, those key phrases in ELT are still burning issues. This part of literature review takes one of them as the major topic, namely CLT. Communicative

language teaching means little more than an integration of grammatical and function teaching.

We can see from the following proposals on the concepts of CLT, that CLT used to explored to find out its own shape and identity.

According to:

Howatt's View

Howatt (1984) distinguishes between a 'strong' and a 'weak' version of CLT. The weak version which has become more or less standard practice in the last ten years, stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purpose and, characteristically, attempts to integrate such activities into a wider program of language teaching. On the other hand, the strong version of communicative teaching advances the claim that language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing the inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself. In other words, we could say that the weak version of CLT can be described as learning to use language, and the strong version can be described as using the language to learn it.

English Village

EV was opened in 2006 as a purpose-built immersion environment where English language and related cultures can be experienced by "low level" learners in a relatively unstructured way (Kitazume, 2010). Only English is permitted within and immediately surrounding the building, although this rule is not strictly enforced. There are also attractions such as a café, analog games, a reading material, and musical instruments.

a. English Village as EFL

English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) have been seen as rather distinct learning contexts. According to Richards and Schmidt (2010), ESL is frequently understood as referring to acquisition of English as an additional language in a setting where it is the dominant mode of communication, while EFL is envisioned as classroom study in a region where English does not play much of a role internally.

EFL programs where in learners are exposed to a target language in small doses over a long period are sometimes referred to as 'drip feeding'. While this is probably the most common experience of classroom foreign language learners, it has been found relatively ineffective in leading to functional fluency (Baker, 2011). Drip-feed EFL contexts have been associated with supposedly less-motivated learners. According to Gass and Selinker (2001) there also tends to be minimal access to English speakers, and therefore fewer learning opportunities. The view of the second/foreign continuum, according to prominence of a target language in a learners' community and the extent to which learning occurs in classrooms.

Transactional Language Function of speaking

Transactional activities can be thought of as consisting of a sequence of individual moves or functions which, together, constitute a 'script'. For example, when people order food in a restaurant, they usually look at the menu, ask any necessary questions and then tell the waitperson what they want. The waitperson may ask additional questions and then repeat their order to check. When people check into a hotel, the transaction usually starts with a greeting, the clerk enquires if the person has a reservation, the client confirms and provides his or her name and so on. In using language in this way, the goal is to carry out a task.

Communicating information is the central focus, and making oneself understood, unlike small talk or conversation, where social interaction is often as important as what the participants actually say. In addition, the language used in carrying out transactions is often predictable, contains many fixed expressions and routines, and, as we noted in the earlier example, and may contain elliptical or short forms instead of fully-formed sentences, since transactions can often be performed using key words and communication strategies, but not necessarily employing grammatically appropriate language.

Communication strategies are tactics learners use to compensate for limitations in their linguistic skills and that enable them to clarify their intentions, despite limitations in grammar, vocabulary or discourse skills. The skills involved in using English for transactions thus include: selecting vocabulary related to particular transactions and functions, using fixed expressions and routines. expressing functions, using scripts for specific transactions and situations. asking and answering

questions, clarifying meanings and intentions, confirming and repeating information, and using communication strategies.

Richards (1990) states transactional uses of language are those in which language is being used primarily for communicating information. Transactional exchanges are interactions which have an outcome. In such contexts the range of language used is quite limited and therefore sensibly predictable. Most spoken interactions "can be placed on a continuum from relatively predictable to relatively unpredictable. According to Nunan (1991) interactional conversations are relatively unpredictable and can range over many topics, with the participants taking turns and commenting freely. In contrast, it also states that transactional encounters of a fairly restricted kind will usually contain highly predictable patterns and interactional speech is more fluid and unpredictable than transactional speech (such as telephoning for a taxi cab), which is shaped in part by the needs of the parties involved to successfully accomplish the exchange of information, goods, or services.

Transactional uses of language are those in which language is being used primarily for communicating. Brown (2007) stated transactional strategies are taught within the context of real reading events. They are not practiced in isolation. At first the teacher models and explains everything but gradually students are responsible for their learning. Speaking is a productive oral skill which is the hardest skill, in teaching English at a foreign language (EFL) because it happens in real time (Nunan, 2003). According to Haley and Austin (1989), to be more orally productive, learners would need to be more capable of responding in a relevant and socially appropriate manner to the communication of others). There are two strategies, interactional and transactional, for speaking skill. Brown and Yule (1983) described that interactional speech refers to conversation and it has a social function. The focus is more on the speakers and how they wish to present themselves to each other and transactional speech pays attention to what is said or done. The main focus is on making oneself understood. Interactional language is language for maintaining social relationship and transactional language is message-oriented. Speaking can be defined as the people way to convey the message to others.

METHOD OF RESEARCH

Research Design

The research design is illustrated as follows:

Table. Pre-experimental Design

Pre-test	independent variable	Post-test
Y1	X	Y2

Where:

Y1 refers to the observation in post-test

X refers to the treatment

Y2 refers to the observation in the post-test

This study was intended for testing hypotheses about the effect of CTL approach through English Village for teaching English speaking for both functions, interpersonal and transactional function.

Of the explanation above, it denotes that design of the research is experimental. According to Borg.,& Gall (1989: 639), experimental research is a powerful method to establish caused-and effect relationship

This study employed pre- experimental or *One-Group Pre-test-Post-test design*. This design usually involves three steps: (1) administering a pretest measuring the dependent variable, (2) applying the experimental treatment to the subjects, and (3) administering a post test, to measure the dependent variable. Differences attributed to application of the experimental treatment are then evaluated by comparing the pretest and post test scores.

Population and Sample

The population and sample of this study is all students at the fifth semester of English department of Islamic University of Kalimantan Indonesia who took speech course. The sample of this research is 36 English Department students.

Instrument

This study employed speaking test as the basic instrument for collecting data. The tests were an interview and role play test.

Procedure of Data Collection

In general, the process of data collection used in this study. It was classified into three parts: pre-testing, treatment, and post testing.

Pretesting

As soon as the results of try-out test were analyzed and some revisions were made accordingly, the final test form was obtained. The test was then administered as a pretest to the subjects. The pre test was done twice. The first pre test was aimed to know the students' speaking ability in interpersonal function of speaking before doing treatment. The second pre test did to know the students' speaking ability in transactional function of speaking before doing treatment.

Post Testing

In this last phase, two kinds of the test were applied namely interview test and speech delivery. Interview test was done to measure the students' ability in interpersonal function of speaking and role play test to measure the students' ability in transactional function of speaking. The two kinds of the tests were administered on September 9, in the morning. Each student was provided 3 minutes to interview test and 5 minutes to role-play test. Interview test was done individually while role play was done in team.

Procedure of Data Analysis

The final data analysis was done in order to get the answers to the research questions of this study. In this case, as presented earlier, since the analysis of the students' scores on the pretest indicated that they were significantly different in terms of their initial speaking ability, those scores were then disregarded. Moreover, since the levels of speaking skill were separated skills so that one can make a comparison of students' achievement in both levels. Therefore, to get rich answers to the research problems of the present study, the analysis was done by employing dependent t-test.

The following steps were the application of dependent t-test:

Computing average the differences between X_1 and X_2 (D)

Computing standard deviation of the differences (SD)

Computing standard error of the mean for difference (SXD)

Computing the T-value

FINDINGS

The analyzing of data was presented by employing paired samples t-test to identify the comparison between post test and pretest scores of the students on transactional and function of speaking.

Results of T-Test for Interpersonal and Transactional Function of Speaking

After doing two kinds of the tests (pre-test and post- test), they were then compared in terms of both functions, interpersonal and transactional. The results of the computation of students' scores in transactional function of speaking is summarized as follows:

Transactional Functions of Speaking score

$$N = 35$$

$$\sum D = 65$$

$$D = 1.857$$

$$\sum D^2 = 167$$

$$SD = 1.167$$

The table shows score of differences between the two means (D). they are students' scores in interpersonal function of speaking (4.343) and transactional function of speaking (1.857). The standard deviation of the differences (SD) of the students' scores in interpersonal function of speaking is 1.211 while in transactional function of speaking is 1.167

Computation of the standard error of the mean for the differences (SXD) in interpersonal function of speaking is 0.205 while in transactional function of speaking is 0.197. Finally, by dividing the average of the differences between the two means (D) and standard error of the mean for the differences, the t-value was obtained. In the present study the obtained t-test for the interpersonal function of speaking was 21.211, while the t-value for the transactional function of speaking was 9.417 on appendix .

To the critical value of t-test at $p < .001$ level significance of one-tailed test was 3.385 (df = 34)

Testing Hypotheses

On the basis of the results obtained from the data analyses, the working hypotheses as stated previous. To make it easier in testing them, however, null hypotheses were formulated as presented. In order that the testing of hypotheses could be restated here. The null hypotheses stated that students' score in transactional function of speaking who are taught with CLT through English Village was not significantly higher on the post test than on their pre test

Testing Hypothesis for Transactional Function of Speaking

The hypothesis for the students' score in transactional function of speaking who are taught with CLT through English Village is significantly higher on the post-test than on their pre -test. The computation of t-test was obtained 13.000 of t-value while the required critical t-value is at $p < .001$ of one-tailed is 3.385. This indicates that the obtained t-test exceeds the critical t-value.

As a result, the null hypothesis stating that the students' score in transactional function of speaking who are taught with the communicative language teaching through English Village is not significantly higher on the post-test than on their pre test is rejected. Conversely, the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This indicates that CLT through English Village of teaching speaking turns out to be more effective to improve the students' ability in transactional function of speaking.

DISCUSSION

This section is specialized for a discussion of the results of the analysis as presented before. The discussion is made by relating the findings to the existing theories and research findings which have already been reviewed. Then, to lead the discussion, each questions and answer is restated together with its interpretations and implications.

The Effectiveness of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) for Teaching the transactional language function of Speaking Through English Village

There are two research problems to be answered through the present research. The first question is related to the effect of CLT approach through English Village to develop students' speaking ability in interpersonal function of speaking. The research question is formulated as follows. "Do the students taught with CLT approach through English Village have better score in transactional language function of speaking on the post test than on their pre test?". The hypotheses used as the tentative answer to that question says. "The students who are taught with CLT approach through English Village have significantly better score in transactional language function of speaking on the post test than on their pre test". Converted into a null form, the hypotheses says, "The students who are taught with communicative language teaching approach through English Village have not significantly better score in interpersonal function of speaking on the post than on their pre test.

The analysis of T-test as presented. It finds that the application of CLT approach through English Village bring about positive effect to the students' speaking ability in transactional speaking skill. That is, students who are taught with CLT approach through English Village get better score in transactional of speaking skill on the post test than on their pre test. As a result, the null hypotheses is rejected, while the working hypotheses is accepted. It denotes that the present study proves that CLT approach more effectively to be applied through English Village to increase students' speaking ability in transactional language function of speaking.

The finding relates to what Littlewood (1981) states that functional communication activities" and "social interaction activities" as major activity types in CLT. Functional communication activities include such tasks as learners comparing sets of pictures and noting similarities and differences; working out a likely sequence of events in a set of pictures; discovering missing features in a map or picture; one learner communicating behind a screen to another learner and giving instructions on how to draw a picture or shape, or how to complete a map; following directions; and solving problems from shared clues. Social interaction activities include conversation and discussion sessions, dialogues and role plays, simulations, skits, improvisations, and debates.

The last analysis succeeds in proving that the students who are taught with CLT approach through English Village have significantly better score in transactional

function of speaking on the post test than on their pre test. Therefore, the null hypotheses is rejected, whereas the working hypotheses is accepted. This indicates that CLT approach turns to be more effective to develop students' speaking ability in transactional function of speaking through English Village.

SUMMARY

To summarize, the finding of the present study shows that CLT approach is more effective to be applied through English Village to develop students' speaking ability.

This study finds that CLT approach through English Village is effective to develop students' speaking ability. Both functions of speaking, interpersonal and transactional are increasing. Even t-test of students' interpersonal speaking score is higher than transactional function of speaking.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., C., Razavieh, A. 1997. *Introduction to Research in Education*, (6th Ed.)
- Agoestyowati, Redjeki. 2007. *102 English Games*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Gass, S. & Selinker, L. 2001. *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brown, H. D. 2007. *Prinsip Pembelajaran dan Pengajaran Bahasa*. (Ed.5) Jakarta
- Brown, H. D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Practices*. San Fransisco State University: Longman
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983a). *Teaching the spoken language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983b). *Teaching the spoken language: An approach based on the analysis of conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism, 5th ed*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., Krashen, S. 1982. *Language Two*: Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Hadley, A. O. (2001). *Teaching language in context*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Klippel, Friederike. 1987. *Keep Talking*: Cambridge University Press
- Junaidi. 1996. *The Effectiveness of Summarizing as a Technique of English Reading Comprehension*. Unpublished Theses. University of Malang

- Latif, M.A. 2010. *Tanya Jawab Metode Penelitian Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Malang: UM Press.
- Lighbown, P., M. and Spada, N. 1996. *How Languages are Learned (2nd Ed)*. New York: Oxford University Press
- O'Malley, J. M. and L. V. Pierce. 1996. *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners: Practical Approaches for Teachers*
- Murdani (2008), *The problem of speaking ability in teaching and learning English at the second semester of English Education Department of Islamic University of Kalimantan*, Theses
- Nunan, D. (ed.) (2003) *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.Press.
- Renshaw, Jason. 2007. *Boost Speaking*. Pearson: Longman
- Rasyid, M.A. 1992. *Developing Communicative Competence Through Topics and Interest and Learning Styles Using the Integrated Skills Approach. Doctoral Dissertation*. Hasanuddin University.
- Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R. (Eds.) 1983. *Language and communication*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Richards, J.C. and T.S. Rodgers. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A description and Analysis* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Thornbury, Scott. 2005. *How to Teaching Speaking*. England: Longman

Appendix 1

T-TEST PAIRS=Postest WITH Pretest (PAIRED) /CRITERIA=CI(.9500)

/MISSING=ANALYSIS.

T-TEST PAIRS=Postest WITH Pretest (PAIRED) /CRITERIA=CI(.9500)

/MISSING=ANALYSIS.

Test for Transactional Function Of Speaking

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 Postest	8.66	35	.968	.164
Pretest	6.80	35	1.132	.191

Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 Postest & Pretest	35	.392	.020

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Postest – Pretest	1.857	1.167	.197	1.456	2.258	9.417	34	.000

Appendix 2

Questionnaires for Interpersonal Function of Speaking Test

Kind of test: Interview

1. How do you do?
2. What's your name?
3. Where are you from?
4. How long have you been here?
5. With whom do you live?
6. Could you tell me about your family.
7. How many brother(s) and sister(s) do you have?
8. Are you student?
9. Where do you study
10. What department and semester are you in?
11. What is your hobby? And why do you like it?
12. What is your favorite color, food, and drink?
13. Why do you like it
14. Tell me about an interesting experience you have had.
15. What will you do ten years from now?

Test for Transactional Function of Speaking

Kind of test: Role-Play

1. Each team asked to prepare the drama (as like at the market).
2. Each student in a team has a role (Costumer or Shop Keeper)
3. The script was prepared by the team

Score	Description
0	Unable to function in the spoken language
0+	Able to satisfy immediate needs using rehearsed utterances
1	Able to satisfy minimum courtesy requirements and maintain very simple face-to-face conversation on familiar face topics.

- 1+ Can initiate and maintain predictable and face-to-face conversations and satisfy limited social demands.
- 2 Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements
- 2+ Able to satisfy most work requirement levels with language usage that is often, but not always, acceptable and effective.
- 3 Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.
- 3+ Often able to use the language to satisfy professional needs in a wide range of sophisticated and demanding tasks.
- 4 Able to use the language fluently and accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs.
- 4+ Speaking proficiency is regularly superior in all respects, usually equivalent to that of a well-educated, highly articulate native speaker.
- 5 Speaking proficiency is functionally equivalent to that of a highly articulate, well-educated native speaker and reflects the cultural standards of the country where the language is spoken.