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**Abstrak**:

Tujuan penelitian ini untuk mengetahui pengaruh metode Pembelajaran Bahasa Komunitas dan Kecerdasan Emosional terhadap Keterampilan Berbicara Siswa Kelas VIII SMP Darussalam Ciputat. Penelitian ini menggunakan eksperimen semu dengan desain faktorial yang melibatkan 60 siswa sebagai sampe (kelompok eksperimen kontrol), dengan teknik purposive sampling. Instrumen terdiri dari tes keterampilan berbicara percakapan, dan angket kecerdasan emosional. Analisis data dilakukan dengan uji ANOVA faktorial. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa: (1) Metode Community Language Learning (CLL) lebih efektif dalam meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara bahasa Inggris siswa daripada metode konvensional. (2) Siswa yang memiliki kecerdasan emosional tingkat tinggi memiliki keterampilan berbicara yang lebih baik daripada siswa yang memiliki kecerdasan emosional tingkat rendah. (3) Tidak ada pengaruh interaksional antara metode pengajaran dan kecerdasan emosional (EI) terhadap keterampilan berbicara siswa. Artinya, siswa tingkat IE tinggi pada metode CLL maupun konvensional lebih baik daripada tingkat IE rendah.

**Abstract**:

The objective of the research was to know the effect of Community Language Learning method and Emotional Intelligence on students’ speaking skill at the eighth grade of SMP Darussalam Ciputat. This research used a quasi-experimental with factorial design which involved 60 students as a sample, (as experimental and control group), was choosen by a purposive sampling technique. The research data were collected through test of speaking skill , and the questionnaire to test emotional intellegence . Data were analyzed by factorial ANOVA test. The findings of this study revealed that: (1) Community Language Learning (CLL) method is more effective in enhancing students’ English speaking skill than conventional method. (2) The students who have a high level of emotional intelligence is better speaking skill than those who have a low level of emotional intelligence. (3) There is no interactional effect between teaching method and emotional intelligence (EI) on students’ speaking skills.
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**INTRODUCTION**

In this research, many students are difficult to speak English in the learning process. Because they do not master pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehensibility. Then they were cannot participate actively in the learning of speaking English. Almost all students are afraid of oral tests. They were still nervous and shy when they express something. Besides that, they lack self-confidence and self-awareness. Students were not fluent when they speak English and lazy when learning English. Afterward, they lack of motivation in speaking English and speaking English has not become a habit at school. Besides that, there are some difficulties in students' speaking, such as fear of mistakes, shyness, anxiety, and lack of trust (Al-Nakhalah, 2016, p. 96). Based on the explanation, the students need to improve their speaking skills.

The English teacher should be able to understand and select the appropriate teaching method to overcome students’ problem in speaking English. Method of teaching is needed to motivate the students because it makes them more active in the learning. Appropriate learning

methods help the students to improve their speaking skill. Consequently the researcher chooses community language learning method because it helps the students more easily learn in speaking. Community language learning is a method to stimulate the students able to express their ideas in the learning. This method can remove anxiety from learning by changing the relationship between the teacher and students. P. Prabhavanthy and Mahalakshmi (2012, p. 38) stated that the community language learning is useful for students to achieve the target language. The students can speak any more about the topic, then they able to ask the teacher as a counselor while finding the difficult to talk the words or phrases. The teacher only as a whisper and student to converse continues until they can speak English well.

Moreover, there are some factors which contribute to students’ speaking skills. One of them is emotional intelligence. It is a psychological factor, exactly a high and low level. The students who have high level of emotional intelligence are better in speaking than students who have low-level of emotional intelligence. It happened because the student with a high level of emotional intelligence is more enthusiastic to attend speaking classes and good social interaction in the class. However, students who have low emotional intelligence are less active when studying in class. This condition happened because of the lack of motivation, self-confidence, and self-awareness of the learners. According to Bora, F. D. (2012, p. 2094), students of a high level of emotional intelligence are more eager to attend and brain-based activities because they have self-esteem and able to manage to cooperate with others due to their social skills. But the student with a low level of EQ is not less relations with the society. He tends to isolate himself from the classroom atmosphere. Based on the descriptions above, this research investigates the effect of Community Language Learning and Emotional Intelligence on students’ speaking skill (A Quasi-experimental Study at the Eighth Grade of SMP Darussalam Ciputat)”.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

The research method applied a quasi-experimental research design. The research used factorial designs 2 by 2, it consisted of two independent variables and one dependent variable. The population h was 234 students from eight classes, used a purposive sampling technique. The sample was chose two classes based on prior information of the English teacher. Every class consisted of at least 30 students. Class VIII 5 as the experimental group conducted with the method of Community Language Learning and VIII 6 as the control group carried out with conventional method. The research data were collected through test of speaking ability of introduction before treatment and test of speaking skill of conversation after treatment. Then gave the questionnaire to test emotional intellegence the students. .

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The analysis of the speaking skill variable was performed by using the Mann-Whitney test, Kruskal-Wallis test, and factorial ANOVA. The computation of data analysis by using some test above test can be seen on the table below:

# Table 1. The Speaing Skill Method Based

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Groups | N | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks |
| Methods | CLL Method | 30 | 41,45 | 1243,50 |
| Conventional Method | 30 | 19,55 | 586,50 |
| Total | 60 |  |  |

From the analysis result on table 1. (test of Mann-Whitney), it was found the Ranks, the column of Sum of Ranks, that sum of ranking CLL Method was 1243.50 and ranking conventional method is 586.50. It means the students’ speaking skill that was taught by the community language learning (CLL) method was higher than those who are taught by the conventional method.

# Table 2. Test Statisticsa

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Methods |
| Mann-Whitney U | 121,500 |
| Wilcoxon W | 586,500 |
| Z | -4,954 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 |

Furthermore on the table above was retrieved, p-value/ Sig. = 0.000 < 0.05, showing that the value of Sig. for high level and low level of emotional intelligence was smaller than

0.05. It means, H0 was rejected and H1 was automatically accepted. It can be concluded that there are significant differences between the students who have a low level of emotional intelligence and a high level of emotional intelligence on their speaking skills.

# Table 3. Test of Kruskal Wallis

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | N | Mean Rank |
| Speaking | A1B1 | 7 | 22,07 |
| A1B2 | 7 | 18,14 |
| A2B1 | 7 | 12,29 |
| A2B2 | 7 | 5,50 |
| Total | 28 |  |

Based on hypothesis testing criteria, if the value of Sig. > 0.05, it means that H•0 was accepted and H1 is automatically rejected. On the other hand, if the value of Sig. < 0.05 means that H0 is rejected and H1 was automatically accepted. From the analysis result on table 4.16 (test of Kruskal Wallis), it was found the Ranks, column of Sum of Ranks, that sum of ranking

A1B1 (speaking skill by using CLL method with a high level of emotional intelligence) was 22.07, ranking A1B2 (score of speaking skill by using CLL method with a low level of emotional intelligence) is 18.14, ranking A2B1 (score of speaking skill by using the conventional method with a high level of emotional intelligence) is 12.29 and ranking A2B2 (score of speaking skill by using the conventional method with a low level of emotional intelligence) is 5.50. It means, the students who have a high level of emotional intelligence have better speaking skills than those who have a low level of emotional intelligence.

# Table 4. Test Statisticsa,b

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Speaking |
| Chi-Square | 17,252 |
| Df | 3 |
| Asymp. Sig. | ,001 |

Furthermore on the table of Kruskal Wallis was retrieved, the Chi-Square line is 17.252 and p-value/ Sig. = 0.001 < 0.05, showing that the value of Sig. for high level and low level of emotional intelligence was smaller than 0.05. It means, H0 is rejected and H1 was automatically accepted. It can be concluded that there was a significant difference between the students who have a low level of emotional intelligence and a high level of emotional intelligence on their speaking skills.

# Table 5. Test of Between-Subjects Effects

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Type III Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Corrected Model | 2443,429a | 3 | 814,476 | 19,796 | ,000 |
| Intercept | 150969,143 | 1 | 150969,143 | 3669,389 | ,000 |
| A | 2057,143 | 1 | 2057,143 | 50,000 | ,000 |
| B | 329,143 | 1 | 329,143 | 8,000 | ,009 |
| A \* B | 57,143 | 1 | 57,143 | 1,389 | ,250 |
| Error | 987,429 | 24 | 41,143 |  |  |
| Total | 154400,000 | 28 |  |  |  |
| Corrected Total | 3430,857 | 27 |  |  |  |
| a. R Squared = ,712 (Adjusted R Squared = ,676) |

From the analysis result in table 5, it was found the interactive teaching method (A) and emotional intelligence (B) have p-value/sign. is 0.250 > 0.05, it means, H0 is accepted and H1 is automatically rejected. It can be concluded that there was no interaction effect between teaching methods and emotional intelligence on students’ speaking skills.

# Table 6. Teaching Method \* Emotional Intelligence

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Teaching Method | Emotional Intelligence | Mean | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval |
| Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| CLL | High level | 84,000 | 2,424 | 78,996 | 89,004 |
| Low level | 80,000 | 2,424 | 74,996 | 85,004 |
| Conventional Method | High level | 69,714 | 2,424 | 64,711 | 74,718 |
| Low level | 60,000 | 2,424 | 54,996 | 65,004 |

**Table 7. The Result of Analyzing Research Design**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Emotional Intelligence (B)** | **Teaching Method (A)** | **Total** |
| **Community Language Learning (A1)** | **Conventional (A2)** |
| High level (B1) | 84 | 79 |  |
| Low level (B2) | 80 | 70 |  |
| **Total** | 164 | 149 |  |

Besides that, from the analysis result in table 6 and 7, it was found that there was no interaction effect between teaching method and emotional intelligence on students’ speaking skills. It means the high level of emotional intelligence students who were thought CLL method (A1B1) was better than a low level of emotional intelligence students who were thought CLL method (A1B2). And the high level of emotional intelligence students who were thought of conventional methods (A2B1) was better than a low level of emotional intelligence students who were thought conventional methods (A2B2).

Furthermore, emotional intelligence was a significant factor in language teaching in the world of language education. This finding was relevant by Mirhadizadeh, Nazanin (2016) he explains that one of the main effective elements in learning is self-efficacy. It was parts of emotional intelligence, that contribute to students’ speaking English. It happened because the student with a high level of emotional intelligence is more enthusiastic to attend speaking classes and good social interaction in the class. Moreover, according by Genç, Gülten et. al., (2016) explains that the relationship between speech achievement and “interpersonal management” and “Stress” in the statistics is significant. The relationship between independence as one component of Intrapersonal EQ skills. Social responsibility as one component of interpersonal EQ skills and stress tolerance as one of stress management EQ skills effective on student achievement in speaking skills. So that it can be concluded that the data support the hypothesis. It means the method of community language learning and emotional intelligence give effect on students' speaking ability.

**CONCLUSION**

The first, students speaking skills between students who were taught by the community language learning method was higher than taught by the conventional method. So that, community language learning (CLL) method was more effective in enhancing students’ speaking skill than conventional method. The second, there was a significant difference in students speaking skill scores between students who were taught by the community language learning method and those who were taught by the conventional method for students who have a high level and low level of emotional intelligence. The students who have a high level of emotional intelligence who were taught by the CLL and conventional method obtained a higher score. It means, the students who have a high level of emotional intelligence have better speaking skills than those who have a low level of emotional intelligence. The third, there was not the interactional effect of teaching method and emotional intelligence students’ speaking skill. The high and low emotional intelligence of students taught with community language learning and conventional method, give an effect on students' speaking skills. Then, the results of the data analysis indicated a significant increase in both emotional intelligence and speaking skills.
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