

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING “CLT” IN TECHING SPEAKING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXTS TO THE SECOND YEAR OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING “CLT” IN TECHING SPEAKING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXTS TO THE SECOND YEAR OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Septiawan Dwi Mauludin

English Education, Languages and Arts Faculty, The State University of Surabaya
11020084224.septiawan@gmail.com

Abstract

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) aims broadly to apply the theoretical perspective of the communicative approach by making communicative competence the goal of language teaching and by acknowledging the interdependence of language and communication (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). CLT helped the students to get the main goal of learning language that was being able to communicate. Therefore, the students had more time to practice the foreign language that they learnt because CLT was emphasizing on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language. This study was conducted to find out the implementation of CLT in teaching hortatory exposition texts to the second year of senior high school students. Descriptive qualitative research was used by the researcher in conducting this study. It means that the result was described qualitatively without statistical calculation. The researcher chose some of instruments that could be used in this research. Those were observation checklist, field notes, and scoring rubric. The implementation of CLT in this study was conducted into two stages: pre-communicative activity and communicative activity. Those stages were in line with the theory stated by Littlewood (1981). Moreover, it proved that the students' grammatical mastery was in the different levels although the students were in the same grade. Some of students were good in grammar during speaking class. However, the rests were low on it. In addition, the observer also found that the students who talked actively often made more grammatical mistakes.

Keywords: *CLT, Speaking, Hortatory exposition text.*

Abstrak

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) bertujuan untuk menerapkan pendekatan komunikatif secara perspektif teoritis dengan membuat kompetensi komunikatif dalam pengajaran bahasa dan dengan mengetahui saling ketergantungan bahasa dan komunikasi (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). CLT membantu siswa untuk memperoleh tujuan utama dari belajar bahasa yaitu mampu berkomunikasi. Oleh karena itu, para siswa lebih memiliki banyak waktu untuk berlatih bahasa asing yang mereka pelajari, karena CLT menekankan pada belajar untuk berkomunikasi melalui interaksi dalam bahasa. Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mengetahui pelaksanaan dari CLT dalam mengajar teks hortatori eksposisi untuk murid kelas dua SMA. Teks deskriptif kualitatif digunakan oleh peneliti dalam melakukan penelitian ini. Itu berarti bahwa hasil di dikripsikan secara kualitatif tanpa adanya perhitungan statistik. Peneliti memilih beberapa instrumen yang dapat digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Mereka adalah *observation checklist*, *field note*, dan *scoring rubric*. Pelaksanaan yang dilakukan guru dalam penelitian ini terbagi dalam dua tahap: aktivitas pra-komunikatif dan aktivitas komunikatif. Tahap tersebut sejalan dengan teori yang dinyatakan oleh Littlewood (1981). Selain itu, terbukti bahwa penguasaan tata bahasa siswa berada di tingkat yang berbeda meskipun mereka berada di kelas yang sama. Beberapa siswa baik dalam penguasaan tata bahasa selama kelas berbicara. Namun, sisanya rendah. Selain itu, pengamat juga menemukan bahwa siswa yang berbicara aktif lebih sering membuat kesalahan tata bahasa.

Kata Kunci: *CLT, berbicara, Teks hortatory eksposisi.*

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING "CLT" IN TEACHING SPEAKING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXTS TO THE SECOND YEAR OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

INTRODUCTION

The structural theories of language could not explain the creativity and variety evident in real communication, and focus on structure is not helping to develop communication skill and functional competence. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) aims broadly to apply the theoretical perspective of the communicative approach by making communicative competence the goal of language teaching and by acknowledging the interdependence of language and communication (Larsen-Freeman 2000). CLT helps the students to get the main goal of learning language that is to be able to communicate. On the other hand, the students will have more time to practice the foreign language that they learn, because CLT is emphasizing on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) stated that there are three common features used in truly communicative activity: information gap, choice, and feedback. Information gap exists when one person in communicative activity knows more than her/his interlocutors, it means that if we both know something so it is not really communicative. In communication, the speaker has a choice of what they want to say and how to say it in their own way. If they are controlled in what they say, it means that it is not communicative. Feedback is a kind of giving response given to the speaker. If the listeners do not have an opportunity to provide the speaker with such feedback than the exchange is not communicative.

To achieve communicative competence, students need to be competent in four aspects: linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence (Canale, 1983; Canale and Swain, 1980; Swain, 1985). According to Canale (1983) and Canale and Swain (1980), linguistic competence, which is also called grammatical competence, concerns learners' use of lexis, syntax, and structures. Lexis is the total bank of words and phrases of particular language, the artifact of which is known as a lexicon. Syntax is the set of rules, principles, and processes that govern the structure of sentences in a given language. Structure is a fundamental, tangible or intangible notion referring to the recognition, observation, nature, and permanence of patterns and relationships of entities.

In contrast, Krashen's (1982, 1985) Monitor hypothesis suggests that grammar instruction is unnecessary and has a minimal effect on second language acquisition (SLA). Since the revised version of the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996), CLT has become interested in integrating form-focused instruction with communicative activities (Spada and Lightbown, 2009). Pica (2000) argues that communicative teaching that focuses mainly on meaning with very little attention to forms are not adequate to prepare learners for attaining native-like proficiency. As such, the role of grammar in CLT needs to be justified.

Dealing with Pica (2000), grammar needs to be justified since it can help the students to communicate. If the students communicate ungrammatically, it can make

the listeners hard to catch the meaning of the communication itself. As a result, there will be a misunderstanding between speakers and listeners because the speaker could not interpret the passage which they want to deliver.

Based on Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Budaya RI (2014), it is stated that there are some genres of text to be taught to the Senior High School students. Hortatory exposition is one of it that is chosen to be the text in speaking activity. Speaking through hortatory exposition could make the students speak actively in the class activity because it is kind of argumentative texts that could make the students deliver their critics, suggestion or opinions related the topic.

Concerning to the researcher's observation when the teacher implements CLT during teaching hortatory exposition texts, the students do not have enough time to practice the language because the teacher often takes over them so it minimizes the students' chance to speak up and they cannot develop their understanding and critical thinking related to the topic because the speaker speaks ungrammatically. As result, the speaker could not deliver the content of what they speak and affect the listeners could not catch the content of what the speaker's said.

Other problem is the implementation that the teacher used in the classroom activities is not suitable with the real implementation of CLT, because the teacher is still active in the classroom activities. The teacher manages the class situation actively. She stops and plays the activity when the students do errors or mistakes when they deliver something in the classroom activities. Those should be minimized because it is contrary with the principal of CLT itself. In CLT, the students get responsibility to manage the class's situation. Because of that, the teacher has to give a big role to the students to manage class situation. In the new curriculum, the students should be able to develop their understanding and critical thinking because the new curriculum asks the students to understand not to know. It means that they do not have to memorize the lesson but they have to be creative, productive, and effective.

Even though there have been some previous researchers that conducted research in same area such as, Nurhayati (2011), Dedi Efrizal (2012), and Wong & Marlys (2012). Those studies only focused on the improvement of students' speaking skills through CLT. Thing that differs this study from those studies is this study observes how the implementation of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts and How is the students' grammatical mastery during the use of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts which can inhibit students' understanding and critical thinking. In this study, the researcher focuses on grammatical mastery in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts. So it is important to have an empirical study to find out if the implementation of CLT is accurate in senior high school.

Based on the background of the study above, the researcher formulated some research question to carry out the study. Those are: a. How is the implementation of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts to

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING "CLT" IN TEACHING SPEAKING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXTS TO THE SECOND YEAR OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

the second year of senior high school students?, b. How is the students' grammatical mastery during the use of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts to the second year of senior high school students?

RESEARCH METHODS

This study conducted to find out the result of the CLT in teaching hortatory exposition texts to the second year of senior high school students. Descriptive qualitative research was used by the researcher in conducting this study, it meant that the result described qualitatively without statistical calculation. Qualitative descriptive study was the method of choice when straight descriptions of phenomena were desired. Sandelowski (2000) suggested that qualitative descriptive designs typically are an eclectic but reasonable combination of sampling, and data collection analysis, and representation technique. Researcher conducted this qualitative descriptive studies stayed close to their data and to the surface of words and event.

The researcher chose SMAN 1 porong – Sidoarjo to get the required data. The observer conducted in the eleventh grade students. This school was one of the schools that conduct K13 curriculum with peminatan class (LM) in Sidoarjo. The subject of this study were the teacher and the students of SMAN 1 Porong - Sidoarjo. The researcher got one of the teachers randomly who taught in XI peminatan using CLT in the classroom activity. In this study, the researcher chose six samples of the students to be analysed, because the researcher used purposeful maximum variation sampling in order to choose participants who would maximize the diversity of potential participants (Patton, 1990).

Based on the objective of the study, the researcher chose some of instruments that could be used in this research. Those were observation checklist, field notes, and scoring rubric. For the first research question which was to describe the implementation of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition text to the second year of senior high school students, the instruments used were observation checklist and field notes. For the second research question which was to find out the students' grammatical mastery during the use of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition text to the second year of senior high school students, the researcher used scoring rubric and field notes.

In this study, the researcher collected the data by observing the activity during the teaching and learning process. The researcher observed the activity during the implementation of CLT in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts, the students presented their hortatory exposition text orally in front of their classmate. The teacher did not have to manipulate the situation in the class and the situation had to be as natural as possible, because it could make the data is not accurate. Qualitative research describes social phenomena as they occur naturally, Hancock (2002).

This qualitative research described the implementation of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts to the second year of senior high school students. After collecting all of the data which obtained from the observation checklist, field notes, and scoring rubric, the researcher then analyzed them descriptively. Those data were interpreted in descriptive manner in which the observer described the information concerning what happened in the classroom during the use of CLT in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts and the grammatical mastery during the use of CLT in teaching hortatory exposition texts in speaking class. The observer described the teacher and the students' activities in the teaching and learning process.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The first finding was gained to answer the first research question that was about the implementation of CLT in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts and the second finding was the description of the students' grammatical mastery during the use of CLT in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts..

The Implementation of "CLT" in Teaching Speaking Hortatory Exposition Texts

The result of the observation showed that the implementation used by the teacher was good. It could be explained by the researcher by using this script.

The learning activities that the teacher used were divided into two stages pre-communicative activity and communicative activity, it was the same line with the theory stated by Littlewood (1981). In the pre-communicative activities, the teacher brainstormed the students to understand about the materials that they want to learn and gave a time to them to ask everything that they want to know. Then, the teacher divided the class into small groups and each group consisted of six to seven members. After groping the students, the teacher gave the topic that they wanted to present and discussed, and the teacher explained the rules of the activities. Second, the teacher gave time to the students to discuss and prepare something that they wanted to present related to the topic. Each group presented the result of their discussion in the whole class activity and other groups could ask or give a feedback. Last, the teacher corrected their errors during the speaking activities, it aimed to make them understand which one was correct and which one was incorrect.

The Description of the Students' Grammatical Mastery during the Use of "CLT" in Teaching Speaking Hortatory Exposition Texts.

After the researcher observed and took the recording of the students' grammatical mastery during the use of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition text, he analyzed the result in this part. The researcher analyzed the students' grammatical mastery by

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING "CLT" IN TEACHING SPEAKING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXTS TO THE SECOND YEAR OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

using scoring rubric that he got during the observation. And he used the recording to sharpen the information. The researcher used scoring rubric to analyze the ability of the students. The researcher analyzed specifically in the students' grammatical mastery by looking at their performance during teaching learning process.

Based on the scoring rubric developed by Oller (1979), the researcher chose six samples of the students to be analysed, the researcher used purposeful maximum variation sampling in order to choose participants who would maximize the diversity of potential participants (Patton, 1990).

The students were categorized into 6 levels, because the researcher just focused in one component. One is the lowest level that students got whether grammar almost entirely inaccurate except in stock phrases. On the other hand, the students would be in sixth level if there were no more than two errors. Those were the result below:

The researcher concluded that the first student was in the first level, because the researcher found some mistakes that the first student had made in her discussion time. She made some mistakes in one time when she wanted to ask to the presenter and also she often made inaccurate grammatical.

Based on the result of his speaking during the discussion time, the researcher concluded that the second student belonged to the second level because he made Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns. He used *bahasa* when he talked to the questioners, although the audiences had given information about the missing word. The examples, he used the word "wilayah" constantly and then he often forgot to put auxiliary in his sentences.

Based on the result, the researcher found some mistakes that created misunderstanding between the presenter and the questioner, the example: "we can drink a glass of water **every time**", the third student often used it, and some of the audiences asked about "what actually means with every time" then the third student changed it into "every morning" but with grammatically mistake "we can **drunk** a glass of water every morning". With those mistakes that the researcher had found, the researcher agreed that the third student was in the third level, because he often repeated a word that made misunderstanding. Actually those were not only the problem that the third student made but also the use of *bahasa* in his statements. He often used Indonesian to complete his statements.

Based on the result that the researcher found, the researcher concluded that the fourth student did not cause misunderstanding in delivering some statements to the audiences. Although, he made an occasional error that showed weak control of major pattern. Example: "It can **make reduce** the problem and *we must don't bring mobile phone*", the fourth student used grammatical mistake in producing that statement. Moreover, the fourth student used *bahasa* to complete the missing word, though it was once.

Based on the data, actually the fifth student did well when delivered the statements because he only made few errors with no patterns of failure. He only used some

words in *bahasa* to complete her statements when she did not understand about those words, but the patters were often accurate.

Based on the data the sixth student made no more than two errors during her speaking, for example: *They just can improve their ability in **they** day school and why you say that national examination can **make the students ability improve**?*. Besides that, the sixth student still used *bahasa* to complete her statements when she did not understand the words.

CONCLUSION

The researcher describes the conclusion related to the research questions that underline this study. Based on the result and discussion, there are two conclusions that can be drawn. The first conclusion is related to the first research question about the implementation of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts. It is concluded that the implementation of CLT in teaching hortatory exposition was suitable with the stages that Littlewood stated. During the activities, she acted as an adviser by answering students' question and monitoring their performance. Sometimes she was also a co-communicator, however more often she established situations that prompted communication between and among the students. The teacher made a note of their errors that was discussed in the last activity. This aimed to make them understand which the correct one was.

In connection with the second research question that is about the students' grammatical mastery during the use of "CLT" in teaching speaking hortatory exposition texts, it is concluded that the students' grammatical mastery was in the different levels although they were in the same graders. It happens because the quality of their grammatical mastery in their speaking were quite different. Some of the students were excellent in grammatical mastery during the speaking class. On the other hand, some of them were poor. Moreover, the researcher found that the students' who talked actively tend to make more grammatical mistakes than the passive ones.

REFERENCES

- Ary, Jacobs, and Sorensen. 2010. *Introduction to Research in Education (8th Ed)*. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Brown, H.D. 2001. "Teaching by Principles" *An Interactive Approach Language Pedagogy*. San Francisco: San Francisco University Press.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown university round table on languages and linguistics: Language, communication, and social meaning* (pp.223–237). Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second-language

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING "CLT" IN TECHING SPEAKING HORTATORY
EXPOSITION TEXTS TO THE SECOND YEAR OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

- teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Dawson R, Hancock. 2006. *“Doing Case Study Research: A Practical Guide for Beginning Researchers*. Teacher College Press
- Diane, Larsen-Freeman. 2000. *Techniques and Principle in Language Teaching (second edition)*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Efrijal, Dedi. October 2012, *“Improving Students’ Speaking through Communicative Language Teaching Method at Mts Ja-alhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia”*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. Vol. 2 No. 20 [Special Issue]. www.ijhssnet.com, 20 December 2014.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3rd Ed)*. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2004. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *How to Teach English. England: Pearson Education Limited*.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2012. *Teacher Knowledge*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning (5th Ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nunan, David. 1992. *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nurhayati, Siti. 2012. *Teaching Speaking Skill through Communicative Language Teaching*. Repository UIN Jakarta. repository.uinjkt.ac.id, 20 October 2014.
- Paulston, C. B. 1976. *Teaching English As a Second Language - Techniques and Procedures*. Boston: Little Brown & Company.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.)*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Permendikbud. (2014). *PMP bahasa inggris SMA/MA. Kurikulum 2013 sekolah menengah atas/madrasah aliyah*. Jakarta
- Pica, T. (2000). Tradition and transition in English language teaching methodology. *System*, 28, 1–18.
- Richards, Jack C. 2006. *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spada, N. & Lightbown, P.M. (2009). Interaction research in second/foreign language classrooms. In A. Mackey & P. Charlene (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction*, (pp. 157–175). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*, (pp. 235–256). New York: Newbury House
- Thornbury, Scott. 2007. *How to teach speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Wong & Marlys. 2012, *“The Role of Grammar in Communicative Language Teaching: An Exploration of Second Language Teachers’ Perceptions and Classroom Practices”*. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching 2012, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 61–75, <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/>, 20 December 2014