

**An-Najah National University
Faculty of Graduate Studies**

**The Influence of Community Language
Learning Approach on Improving the
Students' English Speaking Skills at the
Arab American University-Jenin**

**By
Islam Tayseer Fayed**

**Supervisor
Dr. Ahmed Awad**

**This Thesis is Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of the Degree of Master Methods of Teaching
English Language, Faculty of Graduate studies, An-Najah
National University, Nablus, Palestine.**

2016

**The Influence of Community Language
Learning Approach on Improving the
Students' English Speaking Skills at the
Arab American University-Jenin**

**By
Islam Tayseer Fayed**

This Thesis was defended successfully on 21/12 /2016 and approved by:

Defense Committee Members

Signature

Dr. Ahmed Awad / Supervisor

.....

Dr. Mohammad Farrah / External Examiner

.....

Dr. Ayman Nazzal / Internal Examiner

.....

Dedication

I dedicate this work to Allah who guides me and gives me strength to keep going.

To my home land Palestine, the land of beginnings and ends.

To those who sacrificed their souls for the sake of this land, those dignified martyrs who chose the other optimal life.

To my dear mother, my second soul in this life, the woman who has never left me alone, the woman who supported, cared, and always loved me.

To my dear father; my man, who was there for me in every single detail of my life, the man who cared, supported and always loved me.

To the kindest hearts, my sisters Shaima and Rayan. To my brothers for their constant love and support.

To my dear uncle Murad for his constant love and support.

To my precious friends: Rahma, Amal, Fardous, Naira, Samah and Raghad; who have always resembled the meaning of real friendship and sweetened my life.

To the memory of my grandmother Om Jihad.

To those who left their remains on the walls of my heart, whom effect is the like the butterfly effect.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my supervisor Dr. Ahmed Awad for his constant support and encouragement during writing this study. I also wish to thank him for making me a better researcher through his useful suggestions and guidance. Without his valuable recommendations and motivation, I wouldn't be able to finish this study.

I wish to express my gratitude to my uncle Mr. Murad Abu-Alhaija since this work couldn't have been accomplished without his help. He was there for me during my MA academic journey and during accomplishing this work. I also wish to thank the external examiner Dr. Mohammed Farrah for his valuable notes and comments. I further extend my thanks to the internal examiner Dr. Ayman Nazzal for his valuable recommendations.

Finally I would like to thank my family, my friends, my colleagues and those who believed in me, trusted me and supported me all the way long.

الإقرار

أنا الموقعة أدناه صاحبة الرسالة التي تحمل العنوان:

أثر استخدام اسلوب التعلم المجتمعي في تحسين المهارات

الشفوية لدى طلبة الجامعة العربية الأمريكية-جنين

**The Influence of Community Language
Learning Approach on Improving the
Students' English Speaking Skills at the
Arab American University-Jenin**

أُقر بأنّ ما اشتملت عليه هذه الرسالة إنما هي نتاج جهدي الخاص, باستثناء ما تمت الإشارة إليه حيثما ورد, و أنّ هذه الرسالة ككل, أو أي جزء منها لم يقدم من قبل لنيل أي درجة علمية أو بحث علمي لدى أي مؤسسة تعليمية أو بحثية أخرى.

Declaration

The work provided in this thesis, unless otherwise referenced, is the researcher's own work, and has not been submitted elsewhere for any other degree or qualification.

Student's Name: **Islam Tayseer Fayed** اسم الطالب:

Signature: التوقيع:

Date: **21/12/2016** التاريخ:

Table of Contents

Subject	Page
Dedication	III
Acknowledgement	IV
Declaration	V
Table of Contents	VI
List of Tables	VIII
List of Appendices	IX
Abstract	X
Chapter one: Introduction and Theoretical Background	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Theoretical Background	3
1.3 Statement of the Problem	13
1.4 Objectives of the Study	13
1.5 Questions of the Study	14
1.6 Significance of the Study	15
1.7 Limitations of the Study	17
1.8 Definition of Terms	17
1.9 Summary	18
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature	19
2.1 Introduction	20
2.2 Speaking	20
2.3 Community Language Learning Approach	25
2.4 The Effectiveness of CLL in Improving Students' Oral Communicative Skills	28
2.5 Studies that Deal with the Role of CLL in Creating a Student-Centered Classroom Environment	32
2.6 Studies that Deal with the Role of CLL in Reducing Students' Anxieties	33
2.7 Summary	36

Subject	Page
Chapter Three: Methodology and Procedures	37
3.1 Introduction	38
3.2 Study Approach	38
3.3 Methodology and Design of the Study	38
3.4 Study Questions	39
3.5 Study Instruments	41
3.6 Procedures of data collection and analysis	42
3.7 Study Population	43
3.8 Study Sample	44
3.9 Validity and Reliability of the Instrument	46
3.10 Study Variables	46
3.11 Summary	47
Chapter Four: Findings of the Study	48
4.1 Introduction	49
4.2 Findings Related to the Pre-test and Post-test	49
4.2.1 Findings Related to the Sub Questions	51
4.2.2 Findings Related to the Main Question	60
4.3 Summary	62
Chapter Five: Discussion of Results, Conclusion and Recommendations	63
5.1 Introduction	64
5.2 Discussion of the Study Results	64
5.2.1 Findings Relate to the Main Question	64
5.2.2 Findings Related to the Sub Questions	68
5.3 Conclusion	74
5.4 Recommendations	75
References	77
Appendices	85
الملخص	ب

List of Tables

Table No.	Subject	Page
Table (1)	Sample distribution according to methodology variable.	44
Table (2)	Sample distribution according to gender variable.	45
Table (3)	Sample distribution according to academic level variable	45
Table (4)	Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the Pre & Post Speaking Test of the Experimental Group.	51
Table (5)	Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the Pre & Post Speaking Test of the Control Group.	52
Table (6)	Independent Sample T-Test for respondents' results between the Post Speaking Test of the Control Group and the Experimental Group.	53
Table (7)	Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the Experimental Group for males.	54
Table (8)	Results of the Paired Samples T-Test of the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the Experimental Group for females.	55
Table (9)	Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the Experimental Group due to Academic level.	56
Table (10)	Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the control Group for males.	57
Table (11)	Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the control Group for females.	58
Table (12)	Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the control Group due to Academic level.	59
Table (13)	Independent Sample T-Test for respondents' results between the Post Speaking Test of the Control Group and the Experimental Group.	60
Table (14)	Independent Sample T-Test for respondents' results between the Post Speaking Test of the Control Group and the Experimental Group for each speaking aspect.	61

List of Appendices

Appendix No.	Title	Page
Appendix A	English Speaking Tests	85
Appendix B	The Validation Committee of the Test	91
Appendix C	Permission of The English Language Center at The Arab American University	92
Appendix D	Assessment Sheet	93

**The Influence of Community Language
Learning Approach on Improving the
Students' English Speaking Skills at the
Arab American University-Jenin**

By

Islam Tayseer Fayed

Supervisor

Dr. Ahmed Awad

Abstract

This study investigated the influence of using Community Language Learning Approach (CLLA) on improving the students' English speaking skills at the English language center at Arab American University in Jenin. The study also investigated the influence of these variables (gender and academic level) on the students' performance in a speaking test. So as to achieve this purpose, the researcher used a speaking test on a 56-student sample that consisted of two groups out of the English intermediate level students. Results revealed that there were statistical significant differences at $\alpha = 0.05$ between the means of the two groups in favor of the experimental group which proved the effectiveness of using CLLA in improving the students' English speaking skill. In the light of the study findings the researcher recommended the appropriate use of CLLA in classrooms along with students' intensive participation in all class activities. Additionally further research was recommended on the influence of CLLA on improving the students' speaking skills.

Chapter One

Introduction and Theoretical Background

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Theoretical background

1.3 Statement of the problem

1.4 Questions of the study

1.5 Objectives of the study

1.6 Significance of the study

1.7 Limitations of the study

1.8 Definitions of terms

1.9 Summary

Chapter One

Introduction and Theoretical Background

1.1 Introduction:

Speaking is the human's means of communication since the beginning of life. People use speaking to express their needs, feelings, desires and ideas. Since English became a wide spread language among nations, spoken in most countries and used in all life walks, it became important to emphasize teaching English in our country. The four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing are very interrelated, but in most of the real life situations students are judged upon their speaking ability that's why efficient teaching approaches and methods should be employed in teaching speaking skills.

In the early 1970's Community Language Learning Approach showed up. It's a communicative method developed by Curran; which is resembled in a counseling learning system. It aims to build a counselor-client relationship between teachers and students. This method enables students to speak freely about what they wish to learn. It also makes students more responsible and it eliminates their anxieties towards learning which leads to more effective teaching (Curran, 1976).

1.2 Theoretical background:

1.2.1 Constructivists Learning Theory: Cognitive constructivism and social constructivism:

The first principle of constructivist education inspired by Piaget's theory is to develop a socio moral atmosphere in which mutual respect is continually practiced. The Piagetian constructivist teacher promotes a feeling of community in the classroom, makes it possible for children to make classroom rules and many decisions about life in the classroom, conducts discussions about social and moral issues, promotes conflict resolution, and consults children about what they want to learn. Vygotsky's theory in education suggests that the child is not a passive recipient of adult guidance and assistance; in instructional programs, the active involvement of the child is essential. Both Piagetians and Vygotskians consider that curriculum should be based on children's interests and needs. They also emphasize the role of the social education in child development (Devries, 2000).

Constructivists believed that learners develop knowledge through active participation in their learning. However, Piaget believed that cognitive development is achieved through observation and experimentation whereas Vygotsky viewed it as a social process, achieved through interaction with more knowledgeable members of the culture. Piaget's theory of cognitive development suggested that humans are unable to automatically understand and use information, because they need to

“construct” their own knowledge through previous personal experiences to enable them to create mental patterns. Therefore, the primary role of the teacher should be to motivate the learners to learn from their own knowledge through their own experiences. Vygotsky referred to his work as “social” constructivism. Vygotsky’s theory was very similar to Piaget’s assumptions about how children learn, but Vygotsky placed more importance on the social context of learning. Learning activities in constructivist settings are characterized by active engagement, inquiry, problem solving, and collaboration with others. So the teacher here is a guide, facilitator, and co-explorer who encourages learners to question, challenge, and formulate their own ideas, opinions, and conclusions (Weeger & Pacis, 2012).

1.2.2 Student- centered classroom and counseling learning:

Any classroom is a place for learning. However, the modern attitudes towards learning call for changing the conventional methods used in classrooms. Changing the classroom environment from a quiet and strict one into physical environment which includes changing the students' seating and forming small groups according to activities and situations is considered an effective modern strategy. Classrooms should include a variety activities and demonstrations in order to enrich the teaching-learning process, so teachers should be able to engage students with their all senses to focus their attention on the learning material. Most of the time, students’ progress and proficiency are judged based on their oral

participation in the classroom, sometimes students' anxieties and fears stand as an obstacle in front of the learning progress especially when talking about shy, timid, and low self-esteem students, they find it difficult to speak especially in a conventional classroom, so using modern communicative student-centered techniques help improve students speaking skill; therefore, improving their overall performance (Jones, 2007).

Counseling learning, a new approach to speech correction was introduced in the 1950's, which was the one that called for the principles of teaching foreign languages based on counseling. Backus believed that the reduction or removal of possible barriers in terms of interpersonal relationships would benefit clients in a better acquisition of speaking skills. Her work could be considered as a fundamental psychology of CLLA via the plain rapport between the teacher as a counselor and the learner as a client (Backus, 1952).

1.2.3 Community Language Learning Approach:

Community Language Learning Approach, which differs from other traditional methods, has a variety of techniques that help reduce students anxieties concerning speaking. These techniques and activities deal with students as members of community who follow the teacher's guidance. Making students work together in a collaborative groups helps to make them feel comfortable while learning in a non-competitive environment, furthermore, Giving students the chance to choose the topic that interest

them to talk about, creates understanding between the teacher and the students and accordingly help students to feel more secure (Freeman, 2000).

Community language learning approach as a communicative, student-centered approach places a great focus on group work and pair work, especially in teaching speaking skill. Group work and pair work have been popular in language teaching for many years and have many advantages. They both foster cooperative activities in that the students involved in working together to complete a task. In pairs and groups, students tend to participate more actively, and they also have more chance to experience the language more than it is possible in a whole-class arrangement (Harmer, 2007).

One of the major characteristics in CLLA is to create an atmosphere of community to which all the learners belong, as they participate in group activities. Another characteristic is the resource person, who is more or less a counselor who tries to reduce tension as well as to break the traditional concept of the teacher-student relationship by not teaching but counseling, not evaluating nor praising. The relationship between the learner and the resource person as that of a child and a parent. The understanding and acceptance without any evaluation on the part of the resource person is the heart of the success of CLL. It is worth mentioning the fact that there is no test period in the regular sense of a test set in the CLL procedure, but the

"reflection" phase can provide the same effect as self-evaluation to the learners (Tamura, 1983).

CLLA enables the teacher to focus on the whole class while students immediately react positively to work in a community. They respond well to peer-correction without any embarrassment, so by working together they overcome their fear of speaking. Quieter students are able to offer corrections to their peers and gladly contribute to the recording stage of the lesson, so CLLA is a teaching method that involves all students in the teaching-learning process, not just focusing on certain group of them. By employing this approach, both teacher and student will find it easy to develop students' speaking skill within a friendly and effective classroom environment (Moskowitz, 1978)

1.2.4 CLL syllabus and class activities:

CLLA is most often used in teaching speaking. CLL does not use a traditional syllabus, which sorts out the language in advance into sets of grammar, vocabulary, and other linguistic items to be covered and the order in which they will be taught. CLLA course syllable is topic based, in which learners choose things they wish to talk about and messages they wish to convey to other learners. The teacher's responsibility is to provide the suitable forms for these meanings in a way that matches the learners' proficiency level. CLL teachers should fit what learners want to express to appropriate translations that students may use at that level. In this sense CLL syllabus comes out from the interaction between the learner's

expressed utterances and the teacher's reformulations of these into suitable target language chunks. Some grammatical and lexical patterns will sometimes be separated by the teacher for more detailed study. Each CLL has its own syllabus since what develops out of teacher-learner interactions in one course will be different from what happens in another (Nagaraj, 2009)

1.2.5 Types of learning and teaching activities:

As explained by Richards and Rodgers (2001) CLL has a variety of learning tasks and that include translation collaboration via group work, recording, transcription, analysis, listening and reflection among other activities that can affect students' speaking and personalities as well.

1.2.6 The Importance of Speaking and Communication Skills:

From the early beginning, speaking was the first means of communication. People used to communicate through sounds and then these sounds had shaped a meaningful language units in order to build a comprehensible structure. The four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing are very interrelated. In most of the real life situations, students are judged upon their speaking ability. Proficiency in speaking is a clear indication of competency in using words in the right order to express right meanings, thoughts, ideas and needs. Speaking skill and interaction skills are very integrated. Interaction skills involve making decisions about communication such as: What to say and how to say it while maintaining

the desired relation with others. Communication skills or what we can call interaction skills is to use the person's speaking skill besides their knowledge and perceptions (Bygate, 1987).

Real life communicative environment, the sense of community atmosphere and interactive student-centered classrooms can boost the students' communication capabilities. Argumentative oral group discussions and debates can make students share and exchange ideas, contribute equally to achieve the task purpose and this can be reinforced by stimulations or realistic items such as pictures and stories. That's why teachers should maintain a regular basis speaking practice in their classrooms (Jones, 2007).

Teachers have to motivate students by making lessons enjoyable, allowing them to participate, involving them in lessons through a variety of activities, using texts and materials which are relevant to students' needs and also finding interesting ways to help them study exam materials. Furthermore, teachers should find topics that hover around the students' lives and reflect their interests to encourage them to perform a real communication inside and outside the classroom walls (Shalaby, 2012).

Speaking is a very essential skill in which people can't accomplish their work or reflect their needs without it. Learners need to communicate with their colleagues and teachers, they need to discuss, make conversations, negotiate, construct a meaningful discourse, and stand in front of others and just speak. At advanced stage of the learner's academic

life, they may need to give oral speeches and be interviewed or tested verbally, so good speaking skills help in enhancing both personal and academic life (Gillis, 2013).

Speaking is a productive skill of language learning. It involves communicative performances and acts, and other important elements, such as, pronunciation, structure, grammar and vocabulary. In order to make learners able to use the target language in real life situations, teachers have a responsibility to prepare the learners as much as possible to be able to speak English in daily situations. As a global language, English is used in many things we find in our daily life and in many kinds of modern technology, such as mobile phones, computers, social media/networks, electronic machines, transportation, banking, even used in many labels of typical substance or materials, such as, chemicals, medicine, cosmetics, foods and beverage, etc. Other impact of English as a global language is the English mastery as a condition to have a job especially that governments and organizations at the current time hire the staff who have good speaking and communication skills (Nirmawati, 2015).

Harmer (2007) said that communication skills comprise receptive skills and productive skills. Listening and reading are receptive skills while speaking and writing are productive skills. Receptive skills are these in which students receive and process the information but do not need to produce a language to do this, while productive skills require the production, for instance, a speech. Human communication is a complex

process. People need communication when they want to say something. Speakers use communication when they want to express or inform someone about something. They use language according to their purpose and it is necessary to have a listener and a speaker for effective communication.

There are three main reasons for getting students to speak in the classroom. Firstly, speaking activities provide rehearsal opportunities, it also provides chances to practice real-life speaking in the safety of the classroom. Secondly, speaking tasks in which students try to use any or all of the language they know, provide feedback for both teacher and students. Everyone can see how well they are doing, how successful they are, and also what language problems they are experiencing. Finally, the more students have opportunities to activate the various language elements they have in their brains, the more automatic their use of these elements become. As a result, students gradually become autonomous language users. This means that they will be able to use words and phrases fluently and unconsciously (Harmer, 2007).

Palmer (2011) stated that well spoken English is more than a guide for helping students write better speeches. It also contains many practical ideas for teaching students how to deliver better speeches. He stated that how a speech is performed may be more important than how it is build. Well spoken English offers excellent strategies to help students to capture

the right tone and voice to achieve the right kind of eye contact, and to be aware of how one's appearance and actions affect a speech.

As noted by Goh and Burns (2012), second language learners who attend schools where teaching is conducted in the target language can be engaged effectively in the discourse of an academic environment if they have good speaking abilities. Inability to do so can cause learners to be disadvantaged in a system where not only proficiency in the target language is desirable, but also the ability to control the academic register in the spoken mood is highly valued. Speaking also directly benefits learners because it facilitates second language acquisition. This can occur if learners get a chance to receive feedback on their spoken performance and are pushed to pay attention to linguistic forms that are causing their communication problems.

Goh (2007) stated that speaking is an essential tool for language teaching and learning. It can facilitate language acquisition and development, and it can be beneficial to learners' academic achievement. As an important aspect of language skills. Goh (2005) also found that good speaking competence is essential to English learners, especially for those English majors at normal universities, for English teaching is likely to be their lifelong career.

1.3 Statement of the problem:

Based on the long experience of the researcher in teaching English for the Arab learners at the English language center at the Arab American university-Jenin, the researcher noticed that Arab learners of English as a second language face problems in English specially in speaking due to their personal anxieties, threatening classroom environment, few practice and uninteresting topics that don't match their levels or interests. The researcher investigated if there are any significant differences between students' speaking skill taught via the various techniques of CLLA in which the students are the players and the teacher is the referee and those taught by a teacher-centered method in which the teacher is the player and the referee.

1.4 Objectives of the study:

This study has two objectives which are:

1. To investigate the influence of CLLA on improving students' speaking skills
2. To Find out if there are any statistical significant differences in the students' speaking results in the speaking tests after applying CLLA due to gender and to university academic level.

1.5 Questions of the study:

This study tried to answer the following questions:

1. What is the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students 'speaking skills'?
2. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group?
3. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group?
4. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the post-tests for both the control group and the experimental group?
5. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to gender?

6. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to the academic level?
7. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to gender?
8. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to the academic level?

1.6 Significance of the study:

This study is important for two reasons

Firstly, conventional methods treat students as passive receivers. It resembles the teacher as a sacred source of knowledge who should talk while students only listen and try to absorb and benefit from what they hear. These methods of teaching deprive students from having opportunities to speak and to practice the language the way that suits their level. Exposing students to such classes and restricted topics wouldn't give them the chance to practice speaking in real life situation or even to speak in the topics that interest them. Students' performance will be enhanced if

they choose the material that suit their interests and reflect their needs hence CLLA is a good attempt to provide students with this opportunity. The diversity of the CLLA techniques such as translation, transactional conversations, debates, recording and reflection creates a good chance for students to speak more and to practice English in real life situations using topics that matches their level of proficiency and meets their interests. Using CLLA in teaching enables students to learn through speaking and sharing ideas with their colleagues and with the teacher himself. So CLLA is efficient because it enhances the students' speaking abilities, helps the teacher in creating a student-centered classroom and gives feedback for teachers about the students' progress and performance.

Secondly, most of learners these days use modern communication means like internet applications, so all what they do is sitting in front of their mobiles or laptops screens and speak freely by sending typed messages. From a psychological point of view, learners prefer this way to avoid the pressure of face to face communication. Even though this kind of technology is very beneficial but it creates anxieties for learners to speak orally. CLLA helps students to overcome these anxieties and feel free to speak through the plenty of speaking practice. It also gives feedback for the teacher about their students' attitudes and feelings.

1.7 Limitations of the study:

This study considered the following limitations:

1. Topical limitations: the study investigated the influence of CLLA on improving students' speaking skills at AAUJ.
2. Human limitations: the study was conducted on 56 male and female of the intermediate English students.
3. Locative limitations: the study was conducted at the English language center at the Arab American University in Jenin.
4. Temporal limitations: the study was carried out during the summer semester of the academic year 2015-2016.

1.8 Definitions of terms:

Community language learning approach:

Community language learning approach is a humanistic approach. It represents the use of counseling-learning theory to teach language. The basic procedure of CLL is derived from counselor-client relationship. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

Speaking skill:

Bailey (2005) defines speaking as a process of constructing meaning. The main goal of learning speaking is to enable students to communicate with other people by using English language being learned. The

communication here means to talk to others orally or in the spoken form. It is necessary to pay attention to some aspects like aim, time, and subject.

1.9 Summary:

This chapter dealt with the theoretical background of CLLA. It spot the light on the importance of this approach and highlighted its effectiveness in TEFL and in improving the students' speaking skills. The chapter also included statement of the problem, objectives of the study, questions of the study, significance of the study, limitations of the study and it ended with definition of terms that are used in the study.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Speaking

2.3 Community Language Learning Approach

2.4 The Effectiveness of CLL in Improving Students' Oral Communicative Skills

2.5 Studies that Deal with the Role of CLL in Creating a Student-Centered Classroom Environment

2.6 Studies that Deal with the Role of CLL in Reducing Students' Anxieties

2.7 Summary

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

2.1 Introduction:

This chapter presents the review of related literature which discusses review of the previous studies, general concept of speaking, general concept of community language learning approach, and the influence of CLL on the students' performance in speaking English. The researcher arranged the different related studies topically for the sake of facilitation, clarity and for making reading of the previous studies easy and enjoyable

2.2 Speaking:

2.2.1 Speaking definition:

Burns and Joyce (1997) define speaking as an interactive process in which speakers send and receive processed information in order to communicate with others. Language form, meaning and function depends on the context itself. Participants use certain patterns and functions in certain discourse based on the situation. Speaking is an ongoing process, people speak spontaneously to express their needs and desires, but sometimes speech is unpredictable.

Bailey (2005) defines speaking as a process of constructing meaning. The main goal of learning speaking is to enable students to communicate with other people by using English language being learned. The

communication here means to talk to others orally or in the spoken form. It is necessary to pay attention to some aspects like aim, time, and subject.

Speaking is the way lexical items are organized to express meanings so that other people can make sense of them. Moreover, it is recognized as an interactive, social and contextualized communicative event. Speaking requires learners to have a good knowledge about how to produce language linguistically, syntactically, and pragmatically to construct appropriate utterances in other words, learners need to know how to use the language in context Cameron (2001).

Ur (1996) considered speaking as the most important skill among four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) because people who know a language are referred to as speakers of that language. This indicates that using a language is more important than just knowing about it because there is no point knowing a lot about language if you can't utter it in a meaningful context.

2.2.2 Speaking Difficulties Encountered by EFL learners:

Al Hosni (2014) revealed in her study that there are three major speaking difficulties encountered by the students at this level, and they are linguistic difficulties, mother tongue use, and inhibition.

➤ Linguistic Difficulties:

The researcher showed that students struggle to find the appropriate vocabulary item when trying to speak in English, which reflects their insufficient vocabulary repertoire.

➤ Mother Tongue Use:

The majority of students in EFL classes speak the same language so they tend to communicate with each other using their mother tongue which they use outside the classroom, so they transfer their own cultural patterns into the target language whenever they want to use it, which is a result of target language vocabulary lacks, inadequate vocabulary repertoire and weak sentence building skills.

➤ Inhibition:

Many students experience inhibition in the classroom which is caused by many issues as shyness and fear of making mistakes. In this perspective Ur (2000: 111) stated that: “Learners are often inhibited about trying to say things in a foreign language in the classroom. Worried about, making mistakes, fearful of criticism or loosing face, or simply shy of the attention that their speech attracts.” Belhabib (2015) found in her study that the pre-mentioned difficulties are due to:

1. Nothing to Say: When students are obliged to share their thoughts and talk about a given topic, most of them prefer to keep silent while

others might say “I have no idea” or “No comment”. These expressions are due to the lack of motivation in expressing themselves on the chosen topic. The teacher may ask his students to talk about an unfamiliar topic or about an unknown subject, thus, they don't know what to say even in their mother tongue.

2. **Low or Uneven Participation:** Since participation is an unrequested response from students, there are some of them tend to be dominant and take the place of others who prefer to keep silent or they are uncertain whether what they will say is correct or not and the situation will get worst. So, classroom discussion is dominated by a minority of talkative participants and contributions are not evenly distributed. This may be a result of mixed ability groups.

2.2.3 Criteria of Good Speaking Skill:

Speaking is not simply expressing something orally. However, the students need to acquire some speaking aspects to have a good speaking skill. As proposed by Brown (2004), those aspects are fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary, comprehension and task.

1. **Fluency:** When teaching speaking, teachers have the same goal to achieve which is oral fluency; the main important trait in performing speaking. Skehan (1996 as cited in Wang 2014) claimed that fluency refers to the ability to produce the spoken language without pausing

or hesitation. Too many hesitations and pauses in speaking may obstruct the speaking fluency and also depress the speaker.

2. Accuracy: “Accuracy is freedom from mistakes or errors: the quality or state of being accurate: the ability to work or perform without making mistakes” Merriam Webster dictionary. Speakers need to follow the rules of the language such as grammar and structure to be able to speak accurately. Yuan and Ellis (2003) explained that speaking accuracy indicates the extent to which the language produced conforms to target language norms; which involves the correct use of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar.
3. Pronunciation: “Pronunciation is how we say certain words or names” Merriam Webster dictionary. To make a successful communication, the speakers need to be able to deliver clear message for listeners. In speaking, teaching pronunciation including stress, rhythm, and intonation is very important.
4. Vocabulary: To be able to speak fluently and accurately, speaker of foreign language should master enough vocabulary and use it appropriately to convey the wanted message, so knowing word classes and derivations help students express themselves accurately. (Nation, 2001) stated that it takes learners effort to put the receptive vocabulary knowledge into productive use. Levelt (1989) also reported that EFL students should store a god amount of vocabulary

in their long-term memory since the ability to quickly recall words from one's mind may affect the speaking fluency.

5. Comprehension: "The ability to understand completely and be familiar with a situation, facts, and how well students understand and respond in written or spoken language" Cambridge dictionary. Speakers are required to take in their considerations both content and meaning to make a clear message.
6. Task: Accomplishing the objective of the elicited mission considering certain aspects like aim, time, and subject. According to Lee (2000) a task is a classroom activity or exercise that has an objective attainable only by the interaction among participants, a mechanism for structuring and sequencing interaction, and a focus on meaning exchange. It is a language learning attempt that requires learners to comprehend, manipulate, and/or produce the target language as they perform some set of work plans.

2.3 Community Language Learning Approach:

2.3.1 Definition of Community Language Learning:

Community language learning approach is a humanistic approach. It represents the use of counseling-learning theory to teach language. The basic procedure of CLL is derived from counselor-client relationship. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

According to Curran (1972), as adopted by Richards and Rodgers (2001). Learners in the classroom are regarded not as a class but as a group that needs to learn in a certain counseling approach. So, there are no big gap between a teacher and students which usually build a comfortable atmosphere. The group will form a supportive community sense for the students to communicate in the target language.

2.3.2 Teachers' Roles:

According to Richard and Rodgers (1986), Curran (1976) as cited in Azaizah (2014); The teachers (counselors' role) is to respond calmly and non-judgmentally, in a supportive manner and help the client try to understand his or her problems better by applying order and analysis to them.

They agreed that CLL teachers operate in supportive roles and provide target language translation and imitation on request of the clients. Later, interaction may be initiated by the students and the teacher monitors learner' performance, providing assistance when requested. So the student become increasingly capable to accept the criticism and the teacher may directly intervene to correct incorrect utterances. The teacher is also responsible for providing safe environment in which students (clients) can learn and grow. Here, the learners feel secure and free to focus their attention on the tasks of communication and learning rather than feeling anxious of being mistaken by the teacher or by their peers.

2.3.3 Students' Roles:

In CLLA, learners become members of a community. They learn through interacting with members of the community. Learning is not viewed as an individual accomplishment but as something that is achieved collaboratively. Learners are expected to listen attentively to the knower, to freely provide meanings they wish to express, to repeat target utterances without hesitation, to support fellow members of the community, to show their feelings and frustrations as well as joy and pleasure, and to become counselors to each other. CLL learners are typically grouped in a circle of six to twelve learners, with the number of counselors varying from one per group to one per student (Curran, 1976).

Learning is a "whole person" process, and the learner at each stage is involved in the accomplishment of cognitive tasks as well as being committed to the classroom values. CLL compares language learning to the stages of human growth. Laforge in (Richard & Rodgers, 1986: 121) stated that there are five stages of CLLA as follows:

- 1) The learners are like an infant that completely dependent on the counselor for linguistic content. Here the learner repeats utterances made by the teachers in target language.
- 2) The learner achieves a measure of independence. In this stages, the learners begin to establish their own self-reliance and dependence by using simple expressions and phrases they have previously heard.

- 3) In the third stage, the learners begin to understand others directly in the target language. They feel more involved and start making their own contributions.
- 4) A kind of adolescence. In this stage, the learners function independently. They learn how to elicit knowledge from the teacher.
- 5) The independent stage. This last stage explained that learners improve their understanding of the register and vocabulary as well as grammatically correct language use. Students then start to imitate their teacher by being counselors to their group members.

2.4 The Effectiveness of CLL in Improving Students' Oral Communicative Skills:

Parker (1991) found that CLLA seems to provide a methodological framework in which there may be a convergence of learning and acquisition sequences. Immediacy of communicative need will determine both the potential acquisition sequence during investment phases and the teaching-learning sequence during the reflection phase. So CLL is a helpful way that supports the natural order of language skills.

Nagaraj (2009) study stated that CLLA is the most responsive of the methods which is reviewed in terms of its sensitivity to learned communication skills especially speaking. It is applied in various settings; it is used as an aid for language learning. CLL emphasis is on whole-person learning; the role of a supportive, non-judgmental teacher; the passing of

responsibility for learning to the learners. The teacher must also be relatively non-directive and must be prepared to accept and even encourage the adolescent aggression of the learner as he or she strives for independence.

In the area of fluency, Nurhayati (2011) found that the main goal in teaching speaking is the use of the language for communication fluency and effectiveness. There are a three reasons for getting students to speak in a classroom. Firstly, speaking activities provide rehearsal opportunities. Secondly speaking tasks in which students try to use any or all what they know about the language provide feedback for both teacher and students. Finally, the more students have opportunities to activate the more experience they gain.

In the area of activities, Oradee (2012) found that teachers should construct a variation of English speaking activities which motivate the students to learn. Communicative activities such as discussion, problem solving, and role-playing can be effected used in the language classroom in Thai context. Other important factors in using these activities are the order or sequence of these activities. In breaking the students into small groups, optimal group size is four individuals. This leads to better success and achievement in learning foreign languages. Teacher roles should be changed as a provider, an assistant, a consultant to increase effectiveness in the learning environment. Interaction in the language classroom can

decrease students' anxiety in learning English speaking skills. Students should change their role from passive to active learners.

Sari, Jismulatif and Syarfi, (2012) found in their study that after using CLLA, the students were interested because they could comprehend the material given by the teacher. This method helped in developing the students' social skill; therefore, increase their self-esteem and their ability to solve the problems that they may face in learning and sharing it with their friends in pairs or in group. CLLA proved a good effect in improving the students' speaking ability as follows:

- Most of the students can express their ideas and opinions freely.
- Most of students can work in group freely. As the result, they will be more confident.
- Teaching speaking through Community sense creates more interaction in the speaking class.

Language learning specially speaking needs motivation, so teachers should stimulate their students to use their newly acquired English. English teachers are also expected to give students the chance to speak by using the following tips:

- Choose the discussion topics within the students' interest to avoid boredom.
- Spot the light on the students' achievements of language production.

- Giving students more speaking practice to improve their fluency and comprehension.

Azizah (2014) stated that CLL proved better results in speaking skills than students who are taught with other traditional method. He found that students should be given the chance to practice and speak freely to improve the students speaking ability. He indicated the importance of the media used to present the speaking material which should reflect the community sense. The study also stated that language is a vehicle for the expression of functional meaning. This theory emphasizes the semantic and communicative dimension rather than merely the grammatical characteristics of language.

Ulfa (2014) found that the majority of the students like their mother language than English language while they consider that English is difficult but exciting. After practicing CLLA at school, students were interested and they made a progress learning English. According Ulfa's study, CLL method can be applied to improve the style of teaching and learning process. Most of them think that CLL method is very important to be applied in their lesson, because they can expand the students' mind and can make them feel secure in the class. The researcher also found that students speaking skill mastery was increased after using the chunks technique in which the students were more comfortable and productive learning by chunks rather than learning by longer conversations.

However, Al-Humaidi (2009) study stated that the danger of CLL approach is that learners would be used to think in their first language and transfer their message to the second which might lead obviously to negative transfer of patterns and structures. Learners of a second language should be trained through the target language with no, or at least minimum, resort to the source language to avoid mother language interference. In this method, learning is not viewed as an individual accomplishment but as something that is achieved collaboratively. This does not take into account differences between learners in terms of proficiency and language ability. The result would be having proficient students bored awaiting their counterparts to intake a certain aspect of language before moving on to another.

Ghossani, Daya and Wisnu (2012) found that the success of CLL depends largely on the translation expertise of the teacher in which any default in the teacher translation according to the languages interference would affect the students speaking skill and encourage negative habit formation. One of the weaknesses points of CLLA that it has reliance upon an inductive strategy of learning which doesn't consider the students' individuals' differences. The teachers are too non-directive which suits skillful students and unfair for the weak ones.

2.5 Studies that Deal with the Role of CLL in Creating a Student-Centered Classroom Environment:

Methodologies of Communicative Language Teaching advocate the use of authentic materials in communicative activities and recommend that

learners be given opportunities to put their language skills to practice in real life situations (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Therefore, it is important to create an English-speaking environment for our students to use English, also students feel encouraged to practice the language and participate when they are engaged in daily activities such as games and social expressions.

In the area of the classroom environment, Puspitasari (2011) stated that CLL method is an effective technique to improve students' ability in speaking for transactional conversation. By using CLL, students can be brave to convey their ideas and feelings or speak in front of many people. Not only be brave in speaking but also students can be easier and faster to learn English especially speaking because this method uses some ways which are very appropriate for students. Students can feel so comfortable and relaxed in doing learning activities. The teacher only has a role as a counselor. She or he only helps and leads them if they face a difficulty in making a conversation.

2.6 Studies that Deal with the Role of CLL in Reducing Students' Anxieties:

Students are usually reluctant to participate orally because of fear and worry. Those students express fear and anxiety over speaking than any other language skill. That's why teachers find themselves seeking for new ways to get their students to speak in the foreign language and promote communication in the classroom. Young stated that one of the viral ways to reduce students' anxieties concerning speaking is through voluntary

responses, group work and accepting students' contributions (Young, 1990).

Anxiety is the affective factor that most pervasively obstructs the learning process. Arnold and Brown (1999). Most of EFL students are rather nervous in class especially when they are asked to speak in class without any preparation. Too much nervousness makes learners lost their words. This absolutely influences their achievement in foreign language classroom. That's why, EFL learners should be supported enough before speaking, so that they can lessen their anxiety and perform better in speaking (Shumin, 2002).

Bertrand (2004) found that CLL is primarily meant as a 'whole' approach to teaching and it is equally useful for an occasional lesson, especially with teenagers. It enables teachers to refocus on the learner while they immediately react positively to working in a community. Students are also exposed to peer-correction and by working together they overcome their fear of speaking. CLL is a teaching method which encompasses all four skills while simultaneously revealing learners' styles.

Koba, Ogawa, and Wilkinson (2000) stated that Community Language Learning differs from traditional language learning in many ways. One of the most significant issues is that it has many techniques to reduce anxiety. First, the form of the class, that is, the conversation circle itself, provides security. Second, understanding between the teacher and learners produces a sense of security, which reduces anxiety. Finally, a

sense of security is woven into each activity of a typical CLL cycle. They added that understanding is another key issue in CLL. Active and empathetic listening is essential to understanding. The teacher has to be a good listener. When a teacher is an understanding person, learners feel secure, and then can be open and non-defensive in learning. Within this rapport, students' anxieties may disappear and effective learning can take place. Without communication, defensive learning prevents a learner from speaking a foreign language fluently although he knows the grammars and linguistic theory but because of the learner's anxiety from committing mistakes.

From the previous studies the researcher concluded that some studies showed the influence of using CLLA in improving the students speaking skills such as: Koba, Ogawa, & Wilkinson (2000), Richards & Rogers (2001), Corbett (2003), Bertrand (2004), Nagaraj (2009), Nurhayati (2011), Puspitasari (2011), Oradee (2012), Azizah (2013), Parker (1991), Young (1990), Sari et al (2012), and Ulfa (2014). On the other hand, some studies showed that there is no correlation between using CLLA and improving students' skills such as: Al-humaidi (2009) and Ghossani et al (2012).

Considering the researchers above, the researcher found out many advantages for CLL in teaching speaking. But there is still an area of studies that has not been explored. It is the peers' role in learning English especially in discussions and conversation activities. When students choose a topic in a group they don't do that individually, they agree on one topic

collaboratively. After that students start to pass the topic amongst themselves. This way students will have the chance to speak and reflect their knowledge and share it with others with interest and joy, considering that they will make friends with each other. The researcher also found that among the uncovered areas is the role of recording in improving students' oral proficiency. the researcher also revealed the effectiveness of using a diversity of activities in enhancing the students' speaking abilities through employing the CLLA techniques such as translation, transactional conversation, debates, recording , reflection , analysis and listening.

2.7 Summary:

This chapter reviewed the related literature to the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' English speaking skills. The chapter presented the effectiveness of using CLLA in improving the students' speaking skills, creating a student-centered classroom and reducing the students' anxieties.

Chapter Three

Study Methods

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Study Approach

3.3 Methodology and Study Design

3.4 Study Questions

3.5 Study Instruments

3.6 Techniques of data collection and analysis

3.7 Study Population

3.8 Study Sample

3.9 Validity and Reliability of the instruments

3.10 Study Variables

3.11 Summary

Chapter Three

Study Methods

3.1 Introduction:

Chapter three presents the methodology and procedures used in carrying out the research objectives. It is divided into several parts. They are approach of the study, research design, population and sampling, variables, instrument of collecting data, method of analyzing data and the validity and reliability of the instrumentation.

3.2 Study Approach:

The study approach used in this research is descriptive quantitative. The researcher used experimental research design in conducting this study. Pre and post tests were conducted to find out the influence of using CLL in improving students' speaking skill.

3.3 Methodology and Study Design:

So as to achieve the goal of the study which is to investigate the influence of CLL in improving the students speaking skills, this study was conducted using an experimental group who was treated by CLLA and a control group who was taught by a traditional method. The researcher used a quantitative descriptive approach which is suitable to this study.

Experimental group: students who were taught by using CLLA

Control group: students who were taught by using any traditional method

EG: O_1 X O_2

CG: O_1 O_2

O_1 : pre-test

O_2 : post-test

X: treatment

3.4 Study Questions:

The study tried to answer the following questions:

1. What is the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills?
2. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group?
3. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on

improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group?

4. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the post-tests for both the control group and the experimental group?
5. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to gender ?
6. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to academic level?
7. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha\leq 0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to gender?
8. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha\leq 0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to academic level?

3.5 Study Instrument:

The instrument used in this research is a speaking test. The test included different parts. It contains pictures to describe and to answer questions about and it contains a written part which is for the students themselves to give them time to build the discourse they are going to utter. The study tool was restricted to a pre-test and post-test technique to investigate the influence of using CLLA on improving the students' speaking skills.

3.5.1 Pre-test and Post-test:

A pre-test was conducted on both the control group and the experimental one, but only the experimental group has received the treatment which is using CLL strategies and techniques in teaching the curriculum units in hands. At the end of the experiment a post-test was conducted on both groups. The results of the given tests were gathered as the data of this study.

A pre-test might increase or decrease a subject's sensitivity or responsiveness to the experimental variable. Indeed, the effect of pretest to subsequent tests may hinder the testing validity (Cook & Campbell, 1979). To avoid this threat, the pre and the post tests were not fully similar. The researcher used a similar section in both tests; which requires students to answer general questions related to their background knowledge of English language or let's say their language competency "repertoire". The

researcher manipulated the formulation of these questions in order not to be fixed and memorized by students. As for the variant section in the tests, the questions in each test were related to the units were given using traditional method in the control group and CLL in the experimental group; this is to extract the effect of the independent variable. The pre-test was conducted at the beginning when both groups were taught using conventional method. The post test was conducted at the end after using CLL only on the experimental group.

3.6 Procedures of data collection and analysis:

3.6.1 Applying CLLA:

Based on the researcher's in depth class observation through her classroom practices while applying her method, the researcher evaluated the students' performance after using CLLA and using other conventional way in the classroom. The control group class was a teacher centered one which depended on the teacher speaking all the time while students should listen and answer the teacher's questions when necessary, students here felt board and demotivated with a low acquisition of the target language skills, they felt frustrated and like forced to learn what the teacher imposed on them. As for the experimental group, it was more learner centered where students felt more independent, engaged, activated, and responsible about their learning because they have the chance to choose what they like to

learn about. A variety of CLLA activities were used such as group work, discussions, recording, transcription, and transactional conversations.

The researcher conducted a pre-test on both groups before treating the experimental group with CLLA and a post-test on both groups after employing CLLA.

3.6.2 Pre-test and Post-test:

The researcher then conducted a pre-test and a post-test on both the experimental group and the control group. Both of the pre-test and the post-test were out of 30 marks distributed on five areas: planning, fluency, vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation.

3.6.3 Data Analysis:

To analyze the results of the pre and post exams, basic statistical description was used showing means, standard deviations, and percentages. Independent-Samples T Test and Paired-Sample T Test were used.

3.7 Study Population:

The population of the study covered all male and female intermediate students at the English Language Center at the Arab American University-Jenin for the academic year 2015-2016, summer semester. The population contained 180 students from different academic levels

3.8 Study Sample:

The study sample was selected randomly and consisted of 56 male and female intermediate students at the ELC_AAUI. The control group consisted of 30 male and female students while the experimental group consisted of 26 male and female students.

The students were taught using material from Cambridge University Press for listening and speaking. Both teaching and testing took place in the Arab American University English labs which is fully provided of the needed tools in the academic year 2015-2016, summer semester.

The sample was distributed according to one independent variable and two moderator variables. The first three tables show the distribution of the sample according to methodology, gender and academic year.

A. Methodology:

Table (1): Sample distribution according to methodology variable:

Methodology	Frequency	Percent
Traditional	30	53.6
CLLA	26	46.4
Total	56	100.0

The above table shows that the study frequencies are (30) students for the control group which was taught using a traditional method; which composed %53.6 and (26) for the experimental group which was taught using CLL; which composed %46.4.

B. Gender:**Table (2): Sample distribution according to gender variable:**

Gender	Frequency	Percent
male	35	62.5
female	21	37.5
Total	56	100.0

The above table shows that the study frequencies are (35) for the male participants and (21) for the female participants, which means that the male participants composed %62.5 while female participants composed %37.5.

C. Academic year:**Table (3): Sample distribution according to Academic Year variable:**

Academic year	Frequency	Percent
1.00	9	16.1
2.00	34	60.7
3.00	7	12.5
4.00	6	10.7
Total	56	100.0

The above table shows that the study frequencies are: (9) for the first year students, which means the first year students composed %16.1; (34) for the second year students, which means that they composed %60.7; (7) for the third year students, which means that they composed %12.5; (6) for the fourth year students, which means that they composed %10.7. The total number of students composed %100.

3.9 Validity and Reliability of the instrument:

The pre-test was adapted from the international book “FCE listening and speaking skills 2” for Virginia Evans, James Milton 2002. The post test was adapted from Cambridge University Press curriculum for listening and speaking “unlock listening and speaking skills 2” for Stephanie Dimond-Bayir 2014. Both of the oral tests were reviewed by a group of experienced in English language teaching at schools and universities.

3.10 Study Variables:

The study included the following variables

Dependent variables:

Students’ speaking skills

Independent variables:

Community language learning approach

Moderator variables:

- Gender variable which is divided into two levels: males and females
- Academic year variable which is divided into four levels:
 - a) First academic level
 - b) Second academic level

- c) Third academic level
- d) Fourth academic level

3.11 Summary:

Chapter III presented the methodology and procedures used to investigate the influence of CLLA on improving the students' speaking skills. The approach of the study, research design, population and sample, variables, instrumentation, and procedures of data collection and analysis were precisely discussed.

Chapter Four

Study Findings

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Findings Related to the Pre-test and Post-test

4.2.1 Findings Related to the Sub Questions

4.2.2 Findings Related to the Main Question

4.3 Summary

Chapter Four

Study Findings

4.1 Introduction:

In this chapter, the researcher presents findings of the research and test results to investigate the influence of CLL on improving the students' speaking skills at Arab American University of Jenin.

4.2 Findings Related to the Pre-test and Post-test:

The main question of the study is:

What is the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students 'speaking skills'?

This question is considered the main question because it achieves the objective of the study which is to investigate the influence of CLLA on improving students' speaking skills at the ELC at AAUJ. The question generates the following sub questions:

1. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group?
2. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on

- improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group?
3. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the post-tests for both the control group and the experimental group?
 4. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to gender?
 5. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to the academic level?
 6. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to gender?
 7. Are there any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to the academic level?

4.2.1 Findings Related to the Sub Questions:

1. Findings Related to the 1st Sub Questions:

The hypothesis generated from the first sub question is as follows: There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group at ($\alpha=0.05$) level of significance.

To answer the first sub question, the researcher used a test for differences using the Paired Samples T-Test. A summary of the results of this analysis is shown in the following table:

Table (4): Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the Pre & Post Speaking Test of the Experimental Group.

test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	df	t	Sig
Pre	9.8846	2.94383	-4.30769	25	-5.388	.000
post	14.1923	4.95596				

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the significance is .000 which is less than $\alpha =0.05$, hence we reject the Hypothesis and conclude that there are significance differences at ($\alpha =0.05$) between the results of the pre-test($M=9.88$, $Std=2.94$) and the post-test($M=14.19$, $Std=4.955$) of experimental group in the favor of the post- test since ($Sig=.000$, $Df=25$, $Std=4.076$, $M=-4.3076$, $N=26$). The table shows that there is an improvement of test results after getting some treatments using CLLA in favor of the post test.

2. Findings Related to the 2nd Sub Questions:

The hypothesis generated from the first sub question is as follows: There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance.

To answer the second sub question, the researcher used a test for differences using the Paired Samples T-Test. A summary of the results of this analysis is shown in the following table:

Table (5): Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the Pre & Post Speaking Test of the Control Group.

test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	df	t	Sig
Pre	10.1333	5.29628	.56667	29	.894	.379
post	9.5667	4.57643				

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the significance is .379 which is more than $\alpha = 0.05$, hence we accept the Hypothesis and conclude that there are no significance differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the results of the pre-test (M=10.1333, Std=5.29628) and the post-test (M=9.5667, Std=4.57643) of control group since (P=.379, Df=29, Std=3.470, M=.56667, N=30). The table shows that there is no improvement of test results using a traditional method.

3. Findings Related to the 3rd Sub Questions:

The hypothesis generated from the first sub question is as follows: There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the post-tests for both the control group and the experimental group at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance.

To answer the third sub question, the researcher used a test for differences using Independent Sample T-Test. A summary of the results of this analysis is shown in the following table:

Table (6): Independent Sample T-Test for respondents' results between the Post Speaking Test of the Control Group and the Experimental Group.

group	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	df	t	Sig
Post-test control	9.5667	4.57643	-4.62564	54	-3.630	.001
Experimental	14.1923	4.95596				

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the significance is .001 which is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, hence we reject the Hypothesis and conclude that there are significance differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the results the post-test of the control group (M=9.5667, Std=4.5764, N=30) and the post-test of the experimental group (M=14.1523, Std=4.9559, N=26) in favor of the experimental group since (Df=54, T=-3.630, Sig=.001). The table shows that there is an improvement of test results for the favor of the experimental group using CLLA.

4. Findings Related to the 4th Sub Questions:

The hypothesis generated from the fourth sub question is as follows: There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to gender at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance.

To answer the fourth sub question, the researcher used a test for differences using the Paired Samples T-Test. A summary of the results of this analysis is shown in the following table:

Table (7): Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the Experimental Group for males.

test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	df	t	Sig
Pre	9.2857	2.92018	-3.71429	13	-3.451	.004
post	13.0000	4.36771				

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the significance is .004 which is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, hence we reject the Hypothesis and conclude that there are significance differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the results of the pre-test (M=9.2857, Std=2.92018) and the post-test (M=13.0000, Std=4.36771) of experimental group for males in favor of the post- test since (Sig=.004, Df=13, T=-3.451). The table shows that there is an improvement of post-test results for males after getting some treatments using CLLA.

Table (8): Results of the Paired Samples T-Test of the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the Experimental Group for females.

test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	df	t	Sig
Pre	10.5833	2.93748	-5.00000	11	-4.124	.002
post	15.5833	5.41812				

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the significance is .002 which is less than ($\alpha=0.05$), hence we reject the Hypothesis and conclude that there are significance differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) between the results of the pre-test (M=10.5833, Std=2.93748) and the post-test (M=15.5833, Std=5.41812) of experimental group for females in favor of the post- test since (Sig=.004, Df=11, T=-4.124). The table shows that there is an improvement of post-test results for females after getting some treatments using CLLA.

5. Findings Related to the 5th Sub Questions:

The hypotheses generated from the fifth sub question is as follows: There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to academic level at $\alpha =0.05$ level of significance.

To answer the fifth sub question, the researcher used a test for differences using the Paired Samples T-Test. A summary of the results of this analysis is shown in the following table:

Table (9): Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the Experimental Group due to Academic level.

Academic Level		Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig.
1.00	pre total - post total	-8.00000	4.18330	-4.276	4	.013
2.00	pre total - post total	-3.26667	3.97252	-3.185	14	.007
3.00	pre total - post total	-4.50000	3.31662	-2.714	3	.073
4.00	pre total - post total	-2.50000	.70711	-5.000	1	.126

Based on the table above, the results indicate that:

1. There are significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group in the first academic level sig=.013 which is less than $\alpha = 0.05$ (M=-8.00000, STD=4.18330, Df=4, Sig=.013).
2. There are significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group in the second academic level sig=.007 which is less than $\alpha = 0.05$ (M=-3.26667, STD=3.97252, Df=14, Sig=.007).
3. There are no significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group in the third academic level sig=.073 which is more than $\alpha = 0.05$ (M=-4.50000, STD=3.31662, Df=3, Sig=.073).

4. There are no significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group in the fourth academic level $\text{sig}=.126$ which is more than $\alpha =0.05$ ($M=-2.50000$, $\text{Std}=.70711$, $\text{Df}=1$, $\text{Sig}=.126$).

6. Findings Related to the 6th Sub Questions:

The hypothesis generated from the sixth sub question is as follows: There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to gender at $\alpha =0.05$ level of significance.

To answer the sixth sub question, the researcher used a test for differences using the Paired Samples T-Test. A summary of the results of this analysis is shown in the following table:

Table (10): Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the control Group for males.

test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	df	t	Sig
Pre	8.6667	2.98887	-.09524	20	-.181	.858
post	8.7619	3.74038				

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the significance is .858 which is more than $\alpha =0.05$, hence we accept the Hypothesis and conclude that there are no significance differences at ($\alpha =0.05$) between the results of the pre-test($M=8.6667$, $\text{Std}=2.98887$) and the post-test($M=8.7619$, $\text{Std}=3.74038$) for males since ($\text{Sig}=.858$, $\text{Df}=20$, $T=-.181$).

The table shows that there is no improvement of post-test results for males after getting some treatments using a conventional method.

Table (11): Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the control Group for females.

test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	df	t	Sig
Pre	13.5556	7.77996	2.11111	8	1.258	.244
post	11.4444	5.93951				

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the significance is .244 which is more than $\alpha = 0.05$, hence we accept the Hypothesis and conclude that there are no significance differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the results of the pre-test (M=13.5556, Std=7.77996) and the post-test (M=11.4444, Std=5.93951) for females since (Sig=.244, Df=8, T=1.258). The table shows that there is no improvement of post-test results for females after getting some treatments using a conventional method.

7. Findings Related to the 7th Sub Questions:

The hypotheses generated from the seventh sub question is as follows: There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to academic level at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance.

To answer the seventh sub question, the researcher used a test for differences using the Paired Samples T-Test. A summary of the results of this analysis is shown in the following table:

Table (12): Paired Samples T-Test for respondents' results between the pre & Post Speaking Tests of the control Group due to Academic level.

Academic Level		Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig.
1.00	pre total - post total	.75000	1.50000	1.000	3	.391
2.00	pre total - post total	.21053	3.73540	.246	18	.809
3.00	pre total - post total	2.00000	6.24500	.555	2	.635
4.00	pre total - post total	1.00000	1.15470	1.732	3	.182

Based on the table above, the results indicate that:

- There are no significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the control group in the first academic level sig=.391 which is more than $\alpha = 0.05$ (M=.75000, Std =1.50000, T=1.000, Df=3, Sig=.391).
- There are no significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the control group in the second academic level sig=.809 which is more than $\alpha = 0.05$ (M=.21053, Std =3.73540, T=.246, Df=18, Sig=.809).
- There are no significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the control group in the third academic level sig=.635 which is more than $\alpha = 0.05$ (M=2.00000, Std =6.24500, T=.555, Df=2, Sig=.635).
- There are no significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the control group in the third academic level

sig=.182 which is more than $\alpha = 0.05$ (M=1.00000, Std =61.15470, T=1.732, Df=3, Sig=.182).

4.2.2 Findings related to the main question:

- What is the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students 'speaking skills'?

In fact, the third sub question answers the main question in which it determines if there are statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the post-tests for both the control group and the experimental group at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. The results of the question were as the following table shows

Table (13): Independent Sample T-Test for respondents' results between the Post Speaking Test of the Control Group and the Experimental Group.

group	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	df	t	Sig
Post-test control	9.5667	4.57643	-4.62564	54	-3.630	.001
Experimental	14.1923	4.95596				

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the significance is .001 which is less than $\alpha=0.05$, hence we reject the Hypothesis and conclude that there are significance differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) between the results the post-test of the control group (M=9.5667, Std=4.5764, N=30) and the post-test of the experimental group (M=14.1523, Std=4.9559,

N=26) in favor of the experimental group since (Df=54, T=-3.630, Sig=.001). The table shows that there is an improvement of test results for the favor of the experimental group using CLLA.

To find out the aspects of speaking that were improved in the students' results of the post-test after using CLL, the researcher used a test for differences using Independent Sample T-Test. A summary of the results of this analysis is shown in the following table:

Table (14): Independent Sample T-Test for respondents' results between the Post Speaking Test of the Control Group and the Experimental Group for each speaking aspect.

Speaking assessment aspects	t	df	Sig	Mean Mifference
planning	-3.688	54	.001	-1.84000
fluency	-3.384	54	.001	-.79231
vocabulary	-3.403	54	.001	-.75897
grammar	-2.450	54	.018	-.51795
pronunciation	-3.184	54	.002	-.69487
post total	-3.630	54	.001	-4.63333

Based on the table above, the results related to the different speaking aspects are as follows:

1. Planning: There are significant differences between the results of the post-test of the control group and the experimental group since (Sig=.001, Df =54, T=-3.688).

2. Fluency: There are significant differences between the results of the post-test of the control group and the experimental group since (Sig=.001, Df =54, T=-3.384).
3. Vocabulary: There are significant differences between the results of the post-test of the control group and the experimental group since (Sig=.001, Df =54, T=-3.403).
4. Grammar: There are significant differences between the results of the post-test of the control group and the experimental group since (Sig=.018, Df =54, T=-2.450).
5. Pronunciation: There are significant differences between the results of the post-test of the control group and the experimental group since (Sig=.002, Df =54, T=-3.184).

To conclude, there is a positive influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills. As shown in the above tables, the students' results in the experimental group were increased after applying CLLA on them, accordingly their performance in speaking was enhanced for all speaking aspects.

4.3 Summary:

This chapter presented the findings of the research and test results to investigate the influence of CLL on improving the students' speaking skills at Arab American University of Jenin. The study main and sub questions results were also presented and discussed in this chapter.

Chapter Five

Findings Discussion, Conclusion & Recommendations

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Discussion of the Study Findings

5.2.1 Findings Related to the Main Question

5.2.2 Findings Related to the Sub Questions

5.3 Conclusion

5.4 Recommendations

5.5 Summary

Chapter Five

Findings Discussion, Conclusion & Recommendations

5.1 Introduction:

In this chapter, the researcher presents the findings of the study questions to investigate the influence of CLL on improving the students' speaking skills at Arab American University of Jenin. In addition, the researcher presents conclusion and recommendations.

5.2 Discussion of the Study Findings:

5.2.1 Findings Relate to the Main Question:

- What is the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students 'speaking skills?

The researcher concluded that there is a positive influence of using community language learning approach on improving the students' speaking skills. The students' results were increased after applying CLLA on them, accordingly their performance in speaking was enhanced for all speaking aspects including planning (task and comprehension), fluency, vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation.

This result agrees with Puspitasari (2011) who found that CLL method can improve the students' ability in speaking skill in which students become more brave and confident in delivering their idea. Azizah (2014) also suggested that English teachers should use CLL as a teaching

method especially for teaching speaking because it give students more chance to practice English and to speak.

In addition, Sari, Jismulatif & Syarfi, (2012) Parker, (1991) and Ulfa, (2014) reported that after using CLLA, the students were interested because they could comprehend the material given by the teacher. This method helped in developing the students' social skills and speaking skills in which the students were more comfortable and productive. Nurhayati (2011) & Oradee (2012) also stated that one of the main goals for using CLL is to make use of the language for communication fluency and effectiveness.

5.2.1.1 Speaking problems:

According to the researchers' experience in teaching speaking skills during the accomplishment of this study, students face serious problems in speaking English. The researcher attributes these problems to several factors such as the conventional methods used by teachers, the used curricula and the mentality of students.

The conventional methods are used by most EFL teachers. Most EFL teachers use systematic functional methods which treats each language skill in isolation from the others. In addition, teachers are dominating the class time, they are the main authority while students are only passive receivers who are supposed to absorb the knowledge given from their teachers. Their classes are very teacher-centered in which students have few contributions

or even no contributions at all. They don't present the language as a mean of communication but as a set of patterns, structures and rules to memorize.

Most of the topics included in the given curricula are not within the interest of the students, they are not engaged and activated as they should be. Students need a material which relates their culture, needs, interests and lifestyle to the target language culture in order to use the language as mean of communication and sharing.

Mentality of students at the current time is attached to globalization means. Social media applications became an integral part of their daily routines. They keep sharing information about themselves with their friends or even with the public. They care about how others look at them, so their main concern became their image within their social zone. This lifestyle is time consuming and distracting at the same time. Therefore, it became more difficult for students to focus on their learning process and also for teachers to create a motivating effective teaching-learning environment that grabs the students' attention.

5.2.1.2 Students after applying CLLA:

By using CLLA, the researcher transformed the classroom from a conventional class to a small community where students are members of that community, they communicate with others in certain activities like group work and debates or discussions. They use the language as mean of communication, they use it to express themselves and share their

knowledge with their colleagues without feeling anxious or afraid. English became a language of use not just patterns that they force their minds to memorize and construct consciously.

This results agree with Young (1990); Koba, Ogawa, & Wilkinson (2000) and Bertrand (2004) who agreed that using CLL helps to achieve effective learning in which students' anxieties may disappear. They agree that CLL help students overcome their fear of speaking.

CLLA gives students the chance to choose the topic they want to learn about. Teachers and students don't find themselves restricted to certain topics that could be away from their interest or needs. Here comes the role of CLL framework which perceives the teacher as a counselor and students as clients. While conducting the study's experiment students were more activated and involves when they choose what to talk about or what topic to discuss especially while doing group work or making debates.

This results agree with Richard & Rodgers (1986) & Nagaraj (2009) who stated that Community Language Learning is very responsive methods compared to those methods which are reviewed in terms of its sensitivity to learned communication skills especially speaking. CLL emphasis is on whole-person learning. Richards & Rogers (2001) also reported that it is important to create an English-speaking environment for our students to use English, students also feel encouraged to practice the language.

While applying CLL the researcher noticed that students give very much attention to the recording technique. They found it funny and beneficial at the same time. They felt eager to listen to themselves and to each other using English, at the beginning they found it a little bit embarrassing to expose their mistakes in front of the class but after a short while they got used to it especially at the transcription and analysis stage where they reflect on their performance and give feedback to their peers when correcting their mistakes. This collaborative error correction made students feel serious towards learning English to the extent that they became eager to the next recording session.

To sum up, the study showed that there is a positive influence of CLL on improving the students' speaking skill, this was obvious from the researcher experience while implementing CLL, and it was proved statistically as shown in tables 13&14.

5.2.2 Findings Relate to the Sub Questions:

Findings Related to the 1st Sub Question:

The 1st sub question underlies the following hypothesis

“There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance.”

After data analysis, it was found that there are significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) between the results of the pre-test and the post-test of experimental group in the favor of the post- test. As illustrated in table (4) there is an improvement of test results after getting some treatments using CLLA in favor of the post test. It means that the students' results in the post test increased, accordingly their speaking performance enhanced. The researcher attributes this result to the fact that CLLA techniques proved its effectiveness in improving the students' speaking skills.

Findings Related to the 2nd Sub Question:

The 2nd sub question underlies the following hypothesis:

“There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group at ($\alpha =0.05$) level of significance.”

After data analysis, it was found that there are no significant differences at ($\alpha =0.05$) between the results of the pre-test and the post-test of control group. Table (5) showed that there is no improvement of test results using a traditional method. The researcher attributes this to the fact that most students used to be taught using traditional methods that's why the treatment using a traditional method made no change in their results.

Findings Related to the 3rd Sub Question:

The 3rd sub question underlies the following hypothesis:

“There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students’ speaking skills between the post-tests for both the control group and the experimental group at ($\alpha = 0.05$) level of significance.”

After data analysis, it was found that there are significant differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the results the post-test of the control group and the post-test of the experimental group in favor of the experimental group. Table (6) showed that there is an improvement of test results for the favor of the post test of experimental group using CLLA. This shows the distinction between traditional teaching methods and community language learning approach as a whole person approach with its various strategies and techniques that drove students to get better results.

Findings Related to the 4th Sub Question:

The 4th sub question underlies the following hypothesis:

“There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students’ speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to gender at ($\alpha = 0.05$) level of significance.”

The data analysis of the fourth hypothesis suggested that there are significant differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the results of the pre-test and the post-test of experimental group due to gender in the favor of the post-test. The tables (7 & 8) showed that there is an improvement of post-test results for both males and females after getting treatments using CLLA.

The results suggested that speaking performance was improved for both males and females. CLLA strongly influenced their speaking performance since they became more interested in speaking English and in learning it as a whole.

The results also revealed that there is no distinction between males and females when it comes to how they were influenced by CLL, the researcher attributes this to that both of genders shared the same experience and both of them had similar attitudes towards this approach.

Findings Related to the 5th Sub Question:

The 5th sub question underlies the following hypothesis:

“There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students’ speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group due to academic level at ($\alpha = 0.05$) level of significance.”

As illustrated in table (9) the data analysis of the fifth hypothesis suggested that There are significant differences between the results of the

pre-test and post-test of the experimental group in the first and the second academic levels.

Simultaneously the data analysis revealed that there are no significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group in the third and fourth academic levels.

The researcher attributes the variation between the first two and the last two academic levels to the fact that first and second year students usually have more enthusiasm towards learning in general, at this stage they are concerned about proving their academic knowledgeable competency especially that intermediate English course is an obligatory one that is basically required to be registered during the first academic year. As for third and fourth year students, it's obvious that they have very poor English language skills since they have reached this stage while trying to reach and to pass this course. They only care about getting a mark that enables them to pass and move on, but with making no effort to achieve this. They are totally careless about real learning and they lack the inner incentive to learn.

Findings Related to the 6th Sub Question:

The 6th sub question underlies the following hypothesis:

“There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students’

speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to gender at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance.”

The data analysis suggested that there are no significant differences at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the results of the pre-test and the post-test for males and females. Table (10 & 11) shows that there is no improvement of post-test results due to gender after getting some treatments using a traditional method.

The researcher attributes this result to the fact that most students are used to be taught using traditional teaching method, so their responses wouldn't vary before or after the post-test.

Findings Related to the 7th Sub Question:

The 7th sub question underlies the following hypothesis:

“There are no statistical significant differences in the influence of using community language learning approach on improving students' speaking skills between the pre-test and the post-test of the control group due to academic level at ($\alpha = 0.05$) level of significance.”

The data analysis in table (7) showed that there are no significant differences between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the control group due to academic level. Just as the preceding hypothesis, most students are used to be taught using traditional teaching method, so their responses and performances wouldn't vary. The variety of academic levels didn't make any change in the performance because the teaching strategy remained the same.

5.3 Conclusion:

Based on the data analysis and the discussion above, the researcher concluded that CLLA is effective in improving the students' speaking skills. The statistical analysis showed that there are significant differences of students' speaking skill between the experimental group and control group because the mean of post test results of experimental group is higher than the mean of post test scores of control group. The data from the calculation indicated that the experimental group is more successful than the control group.

This study demonstrated that the experimental group who was treated by CLLA proved better results than the control group who was taught by a traditional way. The results of the present study revealed that diversity of CLLA techniques helped learners in improving their speaking skills through creating a community like environment using discussions, transactional conversations and recording. CLLA also helped in reducing the students' anxieties and fears thorough the counselling system. Students felt more responsible in CLL classroom because they had control over the content of the material. The study also revealed that peer correction and the recording technique have a strongly positive influence in enhancing students English speaking abilities. Also it's beneficial for teachers in which they receive feedback about the students' feelings and progress.

5.4 Recommendations:

Based on the conclusion above the researcher has major recommendations for the sake of improving the students' speaking skill. The researcher feels that the following classification will ease and explain the better:

Recommendations for students:

Students should be encouraged to participate in CLL activities such as: discussions and recording sessions and resemble their role as clients to feel more responsible for their learning. Students here should exploit the chance to choose the content they want to learn, also students should be encouraged to work in groups to get benefits from each other experiences. They would feel more secure and less threatened to have them speak freely without any restriction concerning their anxieties.

Recommendations for teachers:

The researcher recommends English teachers to use CLLA in their classrooms to enhance the students' speaking abilities. Teachers can achieve this by using CLL activities which help students to speak confidently and reflect their ideas and needs without hesitation, students can council their teacher to overcome problems and difficulties. The researcher advises teachers to focus on each technique of CLLA such as: group work, discussions, translation, recording and analysis. CLLA enables

teachers to create a comfortable environment with a high sense of collaborative interaction and effective communication.

Recommendations for further research:

Due to the study findings, the researcher advises other researchers to conduct similar studies to show the influence of gender in using CLLA to improve students' speaking skills.

The researcher also recommends other researchers to conduct studies to investigate the influence of the recording and analysis CLL technique.

5.5 Summary:

This chapter displayed the results of the study and related them to previous studies. The researcher in this chapter drew conclusions for the study questions. In addition, the researcher wrote recommendations for students, teachers and other researchers.

References

- Al Hosni, S. (2014). *Speaking Difficulties Encountered by Young EFL Learners*. **International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)**. Volume 2, Issue 6. Oman.
- Al-Humaidi, M. (2009). *Community Language Learning*. King Saud University scientific repository. Saudi Arabia.
- Arnold, J., & Brown, H. D. (1999). **A map of the terrain**. In J. Arnold (Ed.), **Affect in Language Learning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Azizah, M. (2014). *The Use of Community Language Learning (CLL) to Improve Speaking Skill (An Experimental Study of the Second Grade Students of SMP N 2 Banyubiru*. Indonesia.
- Bailey, M. (2005). **Practical English Language Teaching Speaking**, International Ed. Mc. Graw Hill.
- Belhabib, I. (2015). **Difficulties Encountered by Students in Learning the Productive Skills in EFL Classroom and the Relationship between Speaking and Writing: Case of First Year LMD Students at Abou Bekr-Belkaid**. University of Tlemcen. Algeria.
- Bertrand, J. (2004, Jun. 28). *Community language learning* .British Council. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/>.

- Brown, H. D. (2004). **Language Assessment Principle and Classroom Practices**. New York Pearson.
- Burns, A & Joyce, H. (1997). **Focus on Speaking**: National center for English Language Teaching and Research. Sydney
- Bygate, M. (1987). **Speaking: Speaking as a skill**. Oxford university press. New York. ISBN: 0194371344.
- Backus, O. (1952, June). The Use of a Group Structure in Speech Therapy. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, Vol. 17, 116-122.
- Curran, C. (1976). **Counseling-learning in Second Languages**. Apple River Press.
- Cambridge Dictionary. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
- Cameron, D. (2001). **Working with Spoken Discourse**. Oxford: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Curran, C. A. (1976). **Counselling Learning in Second Languages**. Apple River Press.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). **Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings**. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Devries, R. (2000). **Vygotsky, Piaget, and Education: A Reciprocal Assimilation of Theories and Educational Practices.** Regents' Center for Early Developmental Education. University of Northern Iowa.
- Freeman, Diane, L. (2000). **Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching: community language learning.** 2nd Ed. Oxford university press. New York. ISBN: 0194355748.
- Ghossani, F. Sustriono. Daya, A & Wisnu, G. (2012). **Teaching Method: Community Language Learning.** University of Purwokerto.
- Gillis, G. (2013). **The importance of speaking.** Retrieved from: <http://www.geraldgillis.com/>.
- Goh, C. C. M. (2005). **Oracy development in literacy-privileged learning environments: Too little, too late.** In Wang, Z. (2014). *Developing Accuracy and Fluency in Spoken English of Chinese EFL Learners.* English Language Teaching.
- Goh, C. C. M. (2007). **Teaching speaking in the language classroom.** Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Goh, C. C. M and Burns, A. (2012). **Teaching Speaking: A Holistic Approach, speaking and the language learner.** Cambridge university press. USA.

- Harmer, J. (2007). **The Practice of English Language Teaching**. 3rd Ed. Pearson Education. London. www.Longman.com.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English: teaching speaking*. Pearson Education. England. www.Longman.com.
- Jones, L. (2007). **The Student-Centered Classroom**. Cambridge University Press.
- Koba, N. Ogawa, N. and Wilkinson, D. (2000, Nov). *Using the Community Language Learning Approach to Cope with Language Anxiety*. **The Internet TESL Journal**, Vol. VI, No 11. Siebold University of Nagasaki .Nagasaki.
- Lee, J. (2000). **Tasks and Communicating in Language Classrooms**. New York: McGraw-Hill. <https://coerll.utexas.edu/methods/modules/speaking/03/>.
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). **Speaking: From intention to articulation**. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Merriam Webster Dictionary. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/>.
- Moskowitz, G. (1978). *Caring and Sharing in the Foreign Language Class*. Heinle & Heinle.

- Nagaraj, P. (2009, May.3). *Application of Community Language Learning for Effective Teaching*. The modern journal of applied linguistics. vol.1:3. ISSN: 0974-8741.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). **Learning vocabulary in another language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524759>.
- Nirmawati, L. (2015). **Improving Students' Speaking Skills through Speaking Board Games of Grade VIII of SMP N 13 Yogyakarta in the Academic Year of 2013/2014**. Yogyakarta state university. Indonesia.
- Nurhayati, S. (2011). **Teaching speaking skill through communicative language teaching**. University of Jakarta.
- Oradee, T. (2012, Nov. 6). *Developing Speaking Skills Using Three Communicative Activities (Discussion, Problem- Solving, and Role-playing)*. **International Journal of Social Science and Humanity**, Vol. 2.
- Parker, R. (1991). **Two Case Studies of Community Language Learning with Possible Implications for the Natural Order Hypothesis**. TESOL Centre.
- Palmer. E. (2011). *Well spoken*. Stenhouse publisher. USA.

- Puspitasari, T. (2011). **The Effectiveness of Using Community Language Learning To Improve Students' Mastery of Speaking Skill for Transactional Conversation**. Semarang state university.
- Richard, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. (1986). **Approach and Method in Language Teaching**. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. Page: 121.
- Richards, Jack C. and Rodgers Theodore S. (2001). **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching 2nd ed**. Cambridge University press.
- Richards, Jack C. and Rodgers Theodore S. (2001). **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching 2nd ed**. Cambridge University press. Page: 94.
- Shumin, K. (2002). *Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities*. Forum; Vol 35, No 3. <http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/usia/E-USIA/forum/vols/vol35/no3/p8.htm>
- Shalaby, Kh. (2012). **Promoting the Speaking Skill: a Comparative Study between Group Work Classes in Fujeirah English and Non-English Speaking Schools**. UAE.
- Sari, N & Jismulatif & Syarfi, M. (2012). **The Use of Community Language Learning Method to Improve Students' Speaking**

Ability of the Second Year Students of SMP Muhammadiyah 2 Pekanbaru. Riau University.

- Skehan, P. (1996). **Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction.** Oxford: Heinemann.
- Tamura, F. (1983). **The Development of Community Language Learning, the Silent Way and Suggestopedia in Comparison with Other Methods. Trends in Language Methodology in the United States.** USA
- Ulfa, M. (2014). **Enhancing Speaking Skills using The Community Language Learning Approach.** English Department, Faculty of Language and Literature, University of Wijaya Putra.
- Ur, P. (1996). **A course in language teaching.** Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Ur, P. (2000). **“A course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory”.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Page: 111
- Wang, Z. (2014). **Developing Accuracy and Fluency in Spoken English of Chinese EFL Learners. English Language Teaching;** Vol. 7, No. 2; 2014 ISSN 1916-4742. Canadian Center of Science and Education.
- Weeger, M & Pacis, D. (2012). **A Comparison of Two Theories of Learning - Behaviorism and Constructivism as applied to Face-**

to-Face and Online Learning. National University, San Diego. USA.

- Young, D. J., (1990). **An investigation of students` perspectives on anxiety and speaking.** *Foreign Language Annals.*
- Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. (2003). **The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 monologic oral production.** *Oxford journal: Applied Linguistics.*

Appendices

Appendix A

The Arab American University/ ELC

Speaking Test (pre-test)

Intermediate English Lab

Dear students,

This test is the tool used by the researcher to collect the necessary data needed for completing a study entitled “The Influence of Using Community Language Learning Approach on Improving the Students’ English Speaking Skills at Arab American University-Jenin”.

This test consists of four parts. The first part is for personal information where you are required to provide your academic level and gender. At the second part you are going to answer three questions about yourself. The 3rd part will include three questions about the units’ topic. As for the 4th part you are expected to describe four pictures and answer questions about them.

The researcher would be pleased if you answer all the parts in the test in. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and used for the study purposes only.

Thank you for your cooperation

The researcher: Islam Tayseer Fayed

Part 1: Personal Information

Please put the mark (x) in the space that applies to you .

Gender:

a. Male () b. Female ()

Academic level:

a. first year b. second year c. third year . fourth year

Part 2: Answer the flowing questions about yourself

1. Introduce yourself, feel free to talk about anything you like
2. Why did you choose your current major? If have the chance to change your major, what would you choose and why?
3. What do you find difficult about learning English? Why?

Part 3: Answer the following questions about holidays and places

1. Would you like to go to Alaska for one winter? Why? Why not?
2. Do you think the life style there is healthy? Why?
3. What is your favorite type of holiday? Why? What three things you would take with you?

Part 4: Answer questions about the following photos

1. Describe these photos. Which one you would choose if you went on one of these holidays?



1. Compare between these houses. Which one do you like better? Why?

The Arab American University/ ELC**Speaking Test (post-test)****Intermediate English Lab**

Dear students,

This test is the tool used by the researcher to collect the necessary data needed for completing a study entitled “The Influence of Using Community Language Learning Approach on Improving the Students’ English Speaking Skills at Arab American University-Jenin”.

This test consists of three parts. The first part is for personal information where you are required to provide your academic level and gender. At the second part you are going to answer three questions about yourself. The 3rd part will include various questions about the units’ topic.

The researcher would be pleased if you answer all the parts in the test in. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and used for the study purposes only.

Thank you for your cooperation

The researcher: Islam Tayseer Fayed

Part 1: Personal Information

Please put the mark (x) in the space that applies to you .

Gender:

a. Male () b. Female ()

Academic level:

a. first year b. second year c. third year d. fourth year

Part 2: Answer the flowing questions about yourself

1. Introduce yourself, feel free to talk about anything you like
2. Why do you think your major is important in our community? In your opinion, what is the most important major?
3. How do you thing learning English will help you in the future to find a job?

Part 3: Describe a festival or holiday in your country.

”You should spend about 5 minutes on this task”. Choose a festival or holiday in your country and make notes in the table below.

Write key words and phrases.

	Facts	Opinions
When?		
Where?		
Why?		
What?		
Who?		

Use your plan you made above and talk about the topic for 1 minute. You should explain the facts about the festival (e.g. When is it? What happens?)

And you should also

- explain why these festivals or holidays are important to people in your country.
- suggest why do you think students might enjoy these festivals/holidays.

Appendix B**The Validation Committee for the English Listening
Comprehension Test**

1. Dr. Ahmed Awad	An-Najah National University
2. Dr. Graham Stott	The Arab American University
3. Dr. Tareq Fakhoury	The Arab American University
4. Dr. Mossadaq Barahmeh	The Arab American University

Appendix C

Permission of the English Language Center at the Arab American University

An-Najah
National University
Faculty of Graduate Studies



جامعة
النجاح الوطنية
كلية الدراسات العليا

التاريخ: 2016/7/28

حضرة السيدة مديرة مركز اللغات المحترمة
الجامعة العربية الأمريكية/جنين

الموضوع: تسهيل مهمة الطالبة / اسلام تيسير حسين فايد، رقم تسجيل 11457640، تخصص ماجستير
اساليب تدريس اللغة الانجليزية

تحية طيبة وبعد،،

تسهيل مهمة الطالبة / اسلام تيسير حسين فايد، رقم تسجيل 11457640، تخصص ماجستير اساليب تدريس اللغة الانجليزية، وهي بصدد اعداد الأطروحة الخاصة بها والتي عنوانها:

(The influence of community language learning approach on improving the students' English speaking skills at the Arab American university- Jenin)

يرجى من حضرتكم تسهيل مهمة الطالبة المذكورة اعلاه في تطبيق اداة الاختبار على طلبة مركز اللغات، وذلك لاستكمال اجراءات الأطروحة الخاصة بها.

شاكرين لكم حسن تعاونكم.

مع والفر الاحترام ،،،

د.فايز محاميد
جامعة النجاش الوطنية
كلية الدراسات العليا
رئيس قسم الدراسات العليا للعلوم الانسانية

مع اللواتي
سماح صلت
مركز اللغات
2016/7/28



Appendix C

Assessment Sheet

SPEAKING TEST: ASSESSMENT SHEET

NAME

DATE

TEST

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent
Planning	2	4	6	8	10
Fluency	1	2	3	4	5
Vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5
Grammar	1	2	3	4	5
Pronunciation	1	2	3	4	5

Comments

Total: ___/30

SPEAKING TEST: ASSESSMENT SHEET

NAME

DATE

TEST

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent
Planning	2	4	6	8	10
Fluency	1	2	3	4	5
Vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5
Grammar	1	2	3	4	5
Pronunciation	1	2	3	4	5

Comments

Total: ___/30

جامعة النجاح الوطنية
كلية الدراسات العليا

أثر استخدام اسلوب التعلم المجتمعي في تحسين المهارات
الشفوية لدى طلبة الجامعة العربية الأمريكية-جنين

إعداد

اسلام تيسير فايد

إشراف

د. أحمد عوض

قدمت هذه الأطروحة استكمالاً لمتطلبات الحصول على درجة الماجستير في أساليب
تدريس اللغة الانجليزية بكلية الدراسات العليا في جامعة النجاح الوطنية في نابلس،
فلسطين.

2016

ب

أثر استخدام اسلوب التعلم المجتمعي في تحسين المهارات الشفوية لدى طلبة الجامعة العربية الأمريكية-جنين

إعداد

اسلام تيسير فايد

إشراف

د. أحمد عوض

الملخص

هدفت الدراسة الى معرفة اثر استخدام اسلوب تعلم اللغة المجتمعي في تحسين المهارات الشفوية لدى طلبة مركز اللغات في الجامعة العربية الامريكية في جنين، كما هدفت لكشف اثر المتغيرات التالية: (طريقة التدريس، الجنس، السنة الدراسية) على اداء الطلبة في امتحان شفوي يقيس مهارات الطلاب في التحدث.

لتحقيق اهداف الدراسة قامت الباحثة بتطبيق امتحان شفوي على عينة تتكون من 56 طالب من طلاب المستوى المتوسط في اللغة الانجليزية، تتالف هذه العينة من مجموعتين، احدهما ضابطة حيث تم استخدام اسلوب تقليدي والاخرى تجريبية حيث قامت الباحثة بتطبيق اسلوب التعلم المجتمعي، كما قامت الباحثة بتوزيع امتحانات قبلية بعدية من اجل الحصول على نتائج دقيقة.

اعتمادا على التحليل الاحصائي بين نتائج المجموعتين القبلية و البعدية بعد تطبيق التجربة، اظهرت النتائج وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية عند مستوى الدلالة ($\alpha=0.05$) لصالح المجموعة التجريبية، الامر الذي اثبت فعالية استخدام اسلوب التعلم المجتمعي في تحسين المهارات الشفوية لدى الطلاب.

في ضوء نتائج الدراسة اوصت الباحثة معلمي اللغة الانجليزية باستخدام هذا الاسلوب الذي يتيح المجال للطلبة بالتحدث بحرية ويحد من مخاوفهم وقلقهم تجاه استخدام اللغة الانجليزية، اوصت الباحثة ايضا الطلبة بالالتزام بالنشاطات التي يطرحها هذا الاسلوب من اجل تحسين مهاراتهم في التحدث، كما اوصت باجراء دراسات اخرى حول اثر استخدام اسلوب التعلم المجتمعي في تحسين مهارات الطلاب الشفوية.