

Conference Paper

The Effect of Communicative Language Teaching and Audio-Lingual Method on English Speaking Skill Across Different Learning Styles

Abd. Ghofur, I Nyoman S. Degeng, Utami Widiati, and Punaji Setyosari

STKIP PGRI Lamongan, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to determine whether there is an interactive effect between learning methods (Communicative Language Teaching/CLT and Audio-Lingual Method/ALM) and learning styles (Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic) on English speaking skill. The researchers used a quasi-experimental research design with a population of 383 students and samples of 70, assigned into two groups: experimental and control. The data were collected using three instruments (i.e., a pretest, a posttest, and a questionnaire) and then descriptively analyzed. A 2x3 factorial of Two-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with parametric statistical method was utilized because the data were normally distributed as well as homogeneous. The results of the analysis of the pretest scores show that the English speaking skills of the two groups of students applying the two different methods are the same at the significance level of 0.080. The analysis of the posttest scores show that there was no interactive effect between the learning methods and the learning styles on the English speaking skill at the significance level of 0.138. This implies that no matter what learning styles they have, students in CLT class performed better in speaking English than those in ALM.

Keywords: CLT, ALM, learning styles, English speaking skill

Corresponding Author: Abd.
Ghofur; email:
ghofurkita@yahoo.com

Received: 1 March 2017
Accepted: 27 March 2017
Published: 12 April 2017

**Publishing services provided
by Knowledge E**

© Abd. Ghofur et al. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the LSCAC Conference Committee.

1. Introduction

Some studies [1, 7, 12] have come to a point that Communicative Language Teaching Method (CLT) can increase students' English speaking skill, and so can the Audio Lingual Method (ALM) [5, 6, 9, 13]. For example, [1] concludes that one of the methods that can be effectively applied in teaching spoken English was CLT. Different results, however, have been indicated in a study by [5], which showed that ALM plays an important role in developing students' speaking skills in a short span of time. In addition, [9] has also concluded that the ALM aims to develop students' communicative competence by using dialogs and exercises. Repetition of dialogues and exercises allow the students to make responses quickly and accurately in spoken language.

Philosophically, the two methods are different. CLT embraces constructivist learning theory, while ALM embraces behaviorist learning theory. In addition, these methods also have differences in the learning syntax. However, to connect these two different methods, we chose to combine them with the variable of learning styles in an effort

OPEN ACCESS

to prove whether CLT better improves students' English speaking skill. According to [2], there are several factors that influence the success of learning a foreign language, one of which is the student's learning styles. Therefore, efforts to explore individual differences in learning styles that exist among learners become necessary for teaching English better. So, this research tried to optimize these methods that accommodate learning styles among the students.

[11] Believes that visual students tend to be good readers while auditory students are articulate and communicative. Language teachers need to take into account the student's learning style differences so as to be in balance. Different teaching approaches can be integrated in the form of different tasks or activities to cater for all the students so that the achievements of the teaching can be better. [4] Conducted a study which looked at the students' learning styles and their impact on learning English in Iran. The study shows that visual learning style is the most dominant, followed with auditory and kinesthetic.

Classification of students' learning styles may enable students to define their own personal strengths and weaknesses and to make use of them effectively. Teachers can use the students' learning styles in the classroom by identifying ways of how each student learns, then adjusting the teaching styles accordingly for the provision of appropriate learning tasks, and encouraging the use of suitable learning strategies in line with the learning styles of the students.

2. Method

A quasi-experimental design was employed, involving 70 senior-high-school students assigned into experimental and control classes, selected from the total population of 383. A pretest on the English speaking skill was administered to both the experimental and control classes. Following the 6-session treatments of CLT and ALM, the next step was a posttest. A questionnaire on learning styles was developed by adopting that of [3]. The questionnaire was used to assess whether a student tends to be visual, auditory, or kinesthetic. A speaking test that had been validated was also used. A scoring rubric covering the aspects of content, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, pronunciation, intonation, diction, organization, interactive communications, and discourse management was also used. The ten aspects were used to assess the English speaking skill through monologues and interpersonal techniques. The analysis of the data was carried out using descriptive statistics and a 2x3 factorial design of Two-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

3. Findings and Discussion

Based on the results of the initial analysis through pretest, it was known that there was no difference in the English speaking skill between the experimental class and control class. The results of data analysis show that $t = 0.939 < t_{table} = 1,955$ at the significant level of $0.080 > 0.05$. This indicates that the two groups of students are eligible to be studied in order to determine the influence of both of these methods in developing

Independent Samples Test											
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
										Lower	Upper
Pretest	Equal variances assumed	.006	.939	-1.778	68	.080	-4.143	2.330		-8.792	.506
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.778	67.993	.080	-4.143	2.330		-8.792	.506

TABLE 1: Pretest Results.

	Method	Kolmogorof-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Posttest	CLT	.143	35	.067	.954	35	.150
	ALM	.062	35	.200*	.985	35	.894

TABLE 2: The normality test of posttest value based on instructional methods. ^a Lilliefors Significance Correction. * This is a lower bound of the true significance.

the students' English speaking skill. The detailed calculation of the data is presented in Table 1.

We did a prerequisite test in the form of normality and homogeneity test data. The results show that the research data both in terms of teaching methods and learning styles were of normal distribution and were homogeneous. The normality test was performed on the null hypothesis (Ho) which states that the sample comes from a population that is normally distributed. The criterion for acceptance and rejection of the hypothesis is if the significance values (sig.) were over 0.05. Based on the test of Lilliefors Significance Correction of Kolmogorof-Smirnov, it is evident that the significance value (sig.) in the experimental class after getting the treatment of CLT is 0.067, while that of the control class given treatment using ALM is 0.200.

In addition, the prerequisite test regarding students' learning styles shows the significance value (sig.) of visual learning style of 0.200, auditory learning style of 0.182, and kinesthetic learning style of 0.200 (See Tables 2 and 3).

The second prerequisite test was the homogeneity test which was used to show that two or more groups of samples come from populations having the same variance. The testing of homogeneity of the sample variance used Levene's Test with a significance level of 0.05. Testing criteria to determine the homogeneity of variance were conducted by comparing the results count towards learning outcomes with the significance level of 0.05. If the significance value is > 0.05, it can be stated to the sample data comes from populations having the same variance, or they are homogeneous. The results of the statistical count shown in Table 4 reveal that the significance value is

	Gaya_Belajar	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Posttest	Visual	.114	32	.200*	.951	32	.151
	Auditory	.162	20	.182	.959	20	.515
	Kinesthetic	.164	18	.200*	.943	18	.320

TABLE 3: The normality test of posttest value based on learning styles. ^a Lilliefors Significance Correction. * This is a lower bound of the true significance.

	df1	df2	Sig.
.998	1	68	.321

TABLE 4: The value of homogeneity test of posttest Levene's test of equality of error variances. Tests of the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. ^a Design: Intercept + Method.

0.321, which means it is greater than 0.05. It implies that the sample variances are homogeneous.

The test results show normal data distribution and homogeneity, so they were analyzed using Two-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with the parametric statistical methods. The detailed results of the data analysis can be seen in Table 5.

Based on the analysis of the data shown in Table 5, it is known that there is a significant difference (0.000) between the English speaking skill of the group of students taught using CLT and those taught using ALM. Meanwhile, concerning the students' learning styles, there is no significant difference between the groups of students with visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning styles, with the significance value of 0.555, which is greater than 0.05.

Based on the differences in the two findings, we come to a point that there is no interactional effect between the instructional method of CLT and ALM and the learning styles of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic types on the students' English speaking skill.

Dependent Variable: Posttest					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2069.774 ^a	5	413.955	3.343	.010
Intercept	298790.317	1	298790.317	2.413E3	.000
Metode	1667.336	1	1667.336	13.467	.000
Gaya_Belajar	147.039	2	73.519	.594	.555
Metode * Gaya_Belajar	505.451	2	252.726	2.041	.138
Error	7924.069	64	123.814		
Total	331095.000	70			
Corrected Total	9993.843	69			

TABLE 5: The results of two-way analysis of variance on the research data tests of between-subjects effects. ^a R Squared = .207 (Adjusted R Squared = .145).

Dependent Variable: Posttest			
Method	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
CLT	63.23	12.329	35
ALM	72.23	10.012	35
Total	67.73	12.035	70

TABLE 6: The descriptive statistics of posttest data calculation of the English speaking skill by instructional methods.

Dependent Variable: Posttest			
Learning Style	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Visual	69.56	12.281	32
Auditory	66.10	10.935	20
Kinesthetic	66.28	12.942	18
Total	67.73	12.035	70

TABLE 7: The descriptive statistics of posttest data calculation of the English speaking skill based on learning styles.

This is supported by the results of the data analysis which shows a significance value of 0.138.

From the descriptive analysis, it is known that the students taught using CLT have the average score of English speaking skill of 63.23, while those taught using ALM have the average of 72.23. Meanwhile, regarding the learning styles, the students have the average score of 69.56 (visual), 66.10 (auditory), and 66.28 (kinesthetic).

The details of the average value of the English speaking skill based on teaching method and learning styles can be seen in the results of the descriptive analysis as shown in Tables 6 and 7.

Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that in general there is an increase in the value of the English speaking skill, either in the group that learned with CLT or in the group that learned with ALM. Nevertheless, there are suspicious data of the different grades between the two methods. In the group of students taught using CLT, there is a range of values quite high across different students. Among students who already have basic English communication, there is a significant increase after being given the treatment, while those with low English speaking skill background tend to be passive and show no significant increase in their skills. Although they have been engaged in learning activities, they seem to have taken little roles. This situation has also been observed by [8], stating that learning to speak a foreign language is difficult for students, because it requires the ability to use the language properly in social interaction. The social interaction in fact tends to be dominated by only a few students. In addition, the intensity of learning which is only in 6 meetings can be considered to be less than optimal for the application of such methods. In general the use of CLT

is effective in learning to achieve a smooth speaking, but it also requires long-term efforts, patience, and monitoring in the classroom [12].

A different situation happened in the group of students taught using ALM. The learning activities that use drills make the students involved in the process of practicing the right and correct speech. This greatly helps students who have poor basic English speaking skills. Indirectly they are trained to continue practice speaking. In addition, the students who already have good basic English speaking skills feel no boredom to participate in the learning activities. The exercises and continuous dialogues conducted both by the teachers and students make them accustomed to expressing relevant phrases and giving responses using the needed English expressions. This pattern is more effective, especially for those who have poor English language skills [9]. Furthermore, this method gives students the opportunity to practice what they have learned, including grammatical knowledge [10]. This has also been corroborated by [5] who showed that ALM plays an important role in developing students' speaking skills in a short span of time.

The fact that there was no effect of interaction between the instructional methods (CLT and ALM) and learning styles on the English speaking skill may be due to some factors such as (1) the absence of differences in the ability to speak English among the groups of students who have the learning styles of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic types, (2) the majority of the students can follow the learning path for speaking applied by CLT and ALM, so their speaking skill grows and improves, (3) the students' learning styles just help them make it easier to absorb the information being taught, but do not really help them increase confidence in the activity of speaking, (4) the students' development of the English speaking skills is influenced more by the basic English speaking skill they have, not so much by their learning style.

4. Conclusions and Suggestions

Based on the findings and discussion, some conclusions can be drawn. First, there is a significant difference in the English speaking skills of the students taught using CLT and those taught using ALM. Second, there is no difference in the English speaking skills among students with different learning styles (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic). Third, there is no effect of interaction between the instructional methods (CLT and ALM) and learning styles on the English speaking skills. Fourth, this study found that the implementation of ALM seems to more effectively develop students' English speaking skills in a relatively short period of time in accordance with the existing time allocation as stipulated in the 2013 curriculum. And the last, the study found that the dominant learning style possessed by the students had no effect on their English speaking skills.

This study suggests that behavioristic learning method of ALM appears to contribute to the development of basic speaking skills, whereas the constructivistic learning method of CLT is likely to shape speaking competences referring to appropriate contexts. It is therefore advisable that the two methods be integratedly implemented in EFL classrooms. In addition, further research can tap on the utilization of more various topics and media.

References

- [1] D. Afrizal, "Improving students speaking through communicative language teaching method at MTs Ja-Alhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia," *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, vol. 2, no. 20, pp. 127-134, 2012.
- [2] O. N. Ahmed, "The effect of different learning styles on developing writing skills of EFL Saudi learners," *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 220-233, 2012.
- [3] B. DePorter, R. Mark, S. Sarah, and Nourie, "Quantum teaching," Editor, Hernacki, M. Translated by Ary Nilandari., Bandung, Kaifa PT Mizan Pustaka, 2000.
- [4] A. Pourhosein Gilakjani, "Visual, Auditory, Kinaesthetic Learning Styles and Their Impacts on English Language Teaching," *Journal of Studies in Education*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 104-113, 2011.
- [5] N. Haq, "An analysis of the effects of audio - lingual method of teaching on the listening and speaking skills of students," *International Journal for Teachers of English*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 105-176, 2014.
- [6] Juliatuti, "Efektifitas penerapan model pembelajaran audiolingual method (ALM) untuk meningkatkan speaking skill mahasiswa ekonomi Islam STAIN Datokarama Palu. ISTIQRA," *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmiah*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 203-217, 2013.
- [7] N. U. Kumar, P. Philip, A. Kalaiselvi, "The application of CLT to teaching English as a second language - an assessment of practice in India," in *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, vol. 2, pp. 24-29, 2013.
- [8] M. Latha and P. Ramesh, "Teaching English as a second language: Factors affecting learning speaking skills," in *International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)*, vol. 1, pp. 1-6, 2012.
- [9] C. T. Mart, "The Audio-Lingual Method: An Easy way of Achieving Speech," *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 12, pp. 63-65, 2013.
- [10] U. Widiati, E. Irawati, Y. Basthomi, Suharmanto, and Z. Rohmah, *Metode pembelajaran bahasa Inggris*, Bintang Sejahtera Press, Malang, 2014.
- [11] W. Xu, "Learning styles and their implications in learning and teaching," *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 413-416, 2011.
- [12] Y. I. J. Yang, "The Implementation of Speaking Fluency in Communicative Language Teaching: An Observation of Adopting the 4/3/2 Activity in High Schools in China," *International Journal of English Language Education*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 193-214, 2013.
- [13] A. Yuliana, Syakur, and A. Soegito, "The application of audiolingual method to improve students speaking ability," *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris STKIP PGRI Sidoarjo*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 88-93, 2013.