# Improving Students' Grammar Competences in Writing Descriptive Text through Community Language Learning (CLL) Method

**Muh Misbahul Munir AP [1*]**
[1] Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kudus, Kudus, Indonesia

| Contact: | Muh Misbahul Munir AP | ✉ | misbahul.munir@stainkudus.ac.id |

**ABSTRACT**

This research aims at identifying: (1) whether and to what extent Community Language Learning (CLL) method can improve students' grammar competences in writing descriptive text, and explain (2) the class situation when Community Language Learning (CLL) method is used in teaching grammar in writing descriptive text. The students in the first year of junior high school have difficulty in their grammar competences that causes many errors in writing descriptive text. The classroom action research was conducted in two cycles. The research findings show that: (1) Community Language Learning (CLL) method can improve the students' grammar competences in writing descriptive text, and (2) Community Language Learning (CLL) method provides enjoyment to support the effective classroom situation when used to teach grammar in writing descriptive text. This method can be an alternative method for the teacher or the future researchers who will conduct the similar research.

**KEYWORDS:**
Grammar competence;
Descriptive text;
Community Language
Learning (CLL);
Classroom action research

## Introduction

According to Hall (1993), "a grammar is a description of certain organizing aspects of a particular language." Cameron (2001) states that grammar is closely tied into meaning and use of language, and is interrelated with vocabulary. Thornbury (2007) states, "Grammar is a description of the rules that govern how a language's sentences are formed. In short, grammar is an organizing aspect that is tied into meaning and governs how a language's sentences are formed.

Tense is one of the grammar's parts which students are mostly confused in mastering it. Grammar is the whole rules of constructing sentences and

tenses only deals with the time when an event occurs. There are 16 tenses that are taught on English subject. Since the subject of this research is the first grade of Junior High School, the tense focused to discuss here is simple present tense as it is the learnt tense. According to Azar as cited in Refnaldi (2012), simple present tense is used to describe daily habit or usual activities. Similarly, Folse & Azar (2016) states that simple present tense is used for habitual or repeated action and provides information about whether they are happening in the past, present, and future. The misuse of the tense leads to the vague meaning or at least, brings into the incorrect English pattern. The first year of Junior High School students are introduced to the simple present tense that is inductively taught in descriptive text material. Ideally, the students may compose a well arranged simple descriptive text since simple present tense is one of the language features in descriptive text. The descriptive text uses simple present tense as its language features.

However, the actual condition shows that the students are still having difficulty in using grammar in writing descriptive text. The data from the questionnaire strengthens this statement. 94% of students still feel difficult in using "suffix –s/-es (verbal sentences)", 82% in using *to be* (is, am, are)(nominal sentences)", 85% in using 'pronoun", 59% in using modal "can + V1", 53% in using "has/have + noun", 35% in using "adjective", and 29% in using "adverbs".

Some interviews with several new students of SMP N 2 Jekulo Kudus in academic year 2014/2015 are done. All of them agree that English is difficult. The various reasons from the students about why they believe that English is difficult are: *"guru Bahasa Inggrisku dulu jarang masuk kelas"*(The English teacher of my elementary school seldom taught me), *"Aku gak mudeng Bahasa Inggris, angil"*( I don't understand English, it is difficult) and some of the students say, *"gak ada Bahasa Inggris di madrasahku"* (There is no English in my school). There are some students asked about simple present and they answer: *"Itu untuk membuat kalimat bahasa Inggris"* (It is to construct English sentences), *"present tense itu grammar"* (present tense is grammar), and mostly do not have

idea about what is simple present tense because they only construct a sentence by copying words from their LKS (students' worksheet) or merely look up the words in the dictionary. It means that they do not use grammar consciously. All they know is constructing sentences by following Indonesian sentence's pattern ("*S+P+O*"- Subject + Verb + Object). In order words, they are still lack of simple present tense knowledge.

The second interview is with the English teachers of the seventh grade classes of SMP N 1 Jekulo Kudus in academic year 2014/2015. All of the English teachers state that English is difficult subject for the new students because they mostly don't have sufficient background English knowledge from their elementary school". Confirming their question, they state that based on their experience, they say that English subject as *muatan lokal* in Elementary School is not seriously managed because there is no subject board of conference (Kelompok Kerja Guru/KKG) for English. The writer asks the seventh grade English teachers whether they ever be taught simple present tense, she answers yes. So far, the teacher still applies the same method in teaching and honestly says she gives more attention to the front to middle seat's students and the students on the rear get less attention. She claims that she has to reach the learning target material and does not prioritize the students' knowledge. The limited time forces her to do this. The way she does makes imbalance in attention among students and affects to the unequal retrieved knowledge.

The classroom observation is also be done to reveal the problem during teaching and learning process. It is uncovered that the students from the middle to the rear seats do not get enough attention from the teacher since it is a big class. They also feel embarrassed to ask even though they are still unclear. There is no seat shifting. Wali kelas (classroom advisor) had ordered the seat shifting but as the time went by, the students return to the seats where they like. Actually the teachers in explaining the lesson is quite clear and always gives the students opportunity. However, the class management cannot cover the entire students. It made the knowledge not evenly distributed. Moreover

the students on the back also seem not paying attention to the lesson. The students in the front row learn better but still imperfect. They only remember more vocabularies but in composing text, some errors in grammar are still found. The total of the mean of pre-test was only 66.47. With 75 as the required passing grade, the result reveals that the students had bad understanding of the simple present tense.

Confirming the findings from the questionnaire and the interview with the students, there are some points to concern. First, the method used by the teacher must cover the students entirely. Second, the method must solve the students' problem in grammar personally because every single student has respective problem. Third, the situation of the classroom must enable the teacher to know the students personally during the lesson.

Based on facts above, the implementation of Community Language Learning (CLL) was proposed as the solution. According to Richards. Jack C & Rogers (1986), Community Language Learning (CLL) method is a method which can be used by English teachers to develop any language skills and components of the students. They add that it can also motivate students to express their ideas and thought in learning English especially in writing skill in descriptive text because this method treats the students as human not as robot. The teachers are asked to handle his/her students. They have to listen and understand what their students' problems are. Then, they have to guide their students patiently to motivate and help them in order to solve their students' problems by themselves. Community Language Learning (CLL) as a method in language learning where the learners become members of community allows learners and the teacher learn through interaction 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 provide meanings they wish to express utterance without hesitation to support fellow members of community, to report deep inner feelings as well as joy and pleasure, and to

become to the other learners (Curran, 1976). The basic step in conducting CLL is translation by the teacher. The students say what sentence they are going to write, and the teacher translates the sentence into the target language and the students write the sentence as accurate as possible. This way, everybody will know the correct sentences of simple present tense, and in the reflection, the teacher explains more comprehensively about the pattern. The students also must write their sentence on the board in order that the teacher recognizes the error in spelling and fix it. After everybody is regarded able to write independently, the teacher tests them by applying the usage of simple present tense in composing descriptive text. Simple present tense takes important place in writing, particularly in writing the descriptive text since it is one of the lexicogrammatical features in the descriptive text (Mukrimah, 2013). Harmenita & Tiarina (2013) pinpoint in descriptive writing, the writer transfers the images, the feeling that writer experienced to the reader. The writer tries to convey the image, feeling and experience to readers in order that the readers can imagine or as if, they are also engaged on it. As one kind of the text types, descriptive text aims to describe particular place, person or thing (Mongotjaya, 2009).

Community Language Learning (also called Counseling Language Learning) is created by Charles A Curran, a Jesuit priest and professor of psychology, and Paul La Forge inspired by the humanistic psychology of Carl Rogers. Community Language Learning originates from the field of psychology, it stems from a psychological view of man and hard man's nature of learning. Curran outlines the ideology of learning as an interrelated process of an entire person which was not traditionally accepted. The accepted psychological view of man's learning is segmented until Curran's time. Hence CLL approach to language teaching aims to remove the anxiety from learning by changing the relationship between the teacher and student.

Nagaraj (2009) defines Community Language Learning as the method to encourage teachers to see their learners as whole persons, where their feelings,

intellect, interpersonal relationships, protective reactions, and desire to learn are addressed and balanced.

The CLL view of learning is a holistic one, since "true" human learning is both cognitive and affective. This technique is used over a considerable period of time, until learners are able to apply words in the new language without translation, gradually moving from a situation of dependence on the teacher-counselor to a state of independence. The value of CLL has been its emphasis on whole-person learning; the role of a supportive, non-judgmental teacher; the passing of responsibility for learning to the learners. The humanistic approach of CLL views learners and teachers as a community, and thus the teacher as more facilitator than teacher, fits in nicely with current trends in education. Community language learning (CLL) is Language-teaching method in which students work together to develop what aspects of a language they would like to learn. It is based on the Counseling-approach in which the teacher acts as a counsellor and a paraphraser, while the learner is seen as a client and collaborator (Richards. Jack C & Rogers, 1986)

Then, Koba, Naomi, and Naoyoshi Ogawa, (2000) explain that "Community Language Learning" appears different 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. The desirable size of the conversation circle is less than ten. 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 or classroom action research.

In short, CLL is a method to in which the teacher acts as a counselor and the students act as the client to produce a sense of security where their feeling, intellect, interpersonal relationship, protective reactions, and desire to learn are addressed and balanced.

The basic principle of the methodology is to establish interpersonal relationships between the teacher and learners to facilitate learning.

Community Language Learning was designed to ease the anxiety of Foreign Language Learners in educational contexts and promote group dynamics. In CLL, the aim is to involve the learner's whole personality. The teacher understands the fears of the learner and vulnerabilities as they struggle to master another language. By being sensitive to the learner's fear, the teacher can turn the negative energy of those fears into positive energy and enthusiasm for learning. This methodology is not based on the usual methods by which languages are taught rather the approach is patterned upon counseling techniques and adapted to the peculiar anxiety and threat as well as the personal and language problems a person encounters in the learning of foreign languages. Consequently, the learner is not thought of as a student but as a client. The language-counseling relationship begins with the client's linguistic confusion and conflict. Then slowly the teacher-counselor strives to enable him to arrive at his own increasingly independent language adequacy.

According to Richards. Jack C & Rogers (1986), the Community Language Learning (CLL) method is not just attempt to teach student how to use languages communicatively; it also tries to encourage the students to take increasingly more responsibility for their own learning, and to learn about students' learning. It means, this method is not only concerned to the result of learning but also focuses on the learning process itself which is experienced by the students. There are several principles in Community Language Learning (CLL) method; students are to be "learner-clients" and the teacher as a "teacher-counselor", a relationship of mutual trust and support is considered essential to learning process, students are permitted to use native language, and are provided with the translation from the teacher which they then attempt to apply, grammar and vocabulary are taught as the main course, "problems" of the target language produced by the students are solved by discussing between the teacher and students, and students apply the target language independently and without any translation when they feel inclined/ confident to do so.

There are several simple steps of Community Language Learning method that can be applied in real life. Those simple steps are taken from Brown (2000), and they are shown as follows; the group of clients is seated in a circle with the counselor on outside the circle. Those clients first of all have to establish an interpersonal relationship and trust in their native language. The clients may consist of complete beginners in the foreign language. When one of the clients wants to say something to the group or to an individual, he writes it in the native language. The counselor translates the clients' writings back to the client in the target language. The client repeats the translation as accurately as possible. When another client writes in his/her native language, again the counselor translates his/ her writing in the target language. This is done over and over again with other client who wants to write by him/ herself. If possible the writing is rewritten for later discussion, and at the end of each session the clients try to get information about how to write target language accurately. The counselor may take a more directive role and explain certain linguistic explanation rules. After the clients are supplied with sufficient knowledge, they are ready to write a simple descriptive text. Through the process of writing, the counselor still guides the clients to write as accurate as possible. In the end of the session, the counselor gives homework to the students to write descriptive text. In the next session, the written text is discussed and the correction is given if necessary. The process is done all over again until the clients master the descriptive text, simple present tense and its rules.

Humaidi (2009) states CLL is an attempt to overcome some of the threatening affective factors in Foreign Language learning. The threat of the teacher, of making blunders in the foreign language in front of classmates, of competing against peers all threats which can lead to a feeling of alienation and inadequacy are presumably removed. It creates a warm, sympathetic and trusting relationship between the teacher and learners and recognizes that language learning is a sensitive process. The counselor allows the learner to determine the type of conversation and to analyze the foreign language

inductively. The learner-centered nature of the method can provide extrinsic motivation and capitalize on intrinsic motivation. In addition, the cultural aspect of the target language learning is enhanced in that students are found to have freedom and high motivation in the community language learning class.

There are some practical and theoretical problems with CLL. Humaidi (2009) adds, the counselor-teacher can become too non-directive. The learner often needs direction, especially in the first stage. Supportive but assertive direction from the counselor could strengthen the method. Another problem with CLL is its reliance upon an inductive strategy of learning. Inductive learning in the early stage of language learning is not effective and less successful. The third problem is the success of CLL depends largely on the translation expertise of the counselor. Translation is an intricate and complex process that is often easier said than done. If subtle aspects of language are mistranslated, there could be a less than effective understanding of the target language. The fourth problem is communication under way in class is constrained by the number and knowledge of fellow learners. The fifth problem is CLL method is too demanding for language teachers who must be proficient in the culture of the target language and have knowledge in many other fields. Therefore, it places high demands on language teachers, who must be highly proficient and sensitive to nuance in both L1 and Foreign Language. They must be familiar with and sympathetic to the role of counselors in psychological counseling. They must also be relatively non-directive and be prepared to accept even encourage the "attack" from the learners. They must operate without conventional materials, depending on student topics to shape and motivate the class. They must be culturally prepared to deal with different learners. Despite its weaknesses CLL is a potentially useful method for the foreign language teaching if the teachers adapt it properly to our curricula.

Krashen (1981) states the foreign language learners' tasks, according to CLL are to apprehend the sound system of the language, assign fundamental

meanings to individual lexical units and construct a basic grammar. After the implementation of the CLL in teaching grammar focused on simple present tense, the students are expected to be able to construct their own writing. At least, there are 5 stages of development of the students in the CLL implementation; "Birth" stage:  feeling of security and belonging are established, they achieve a measure of independence from the teacher as the learners' ability improve, learners can write independently, the learners are secure enough to take criticism and being corrected, and the child becomes an adult and becomes the know-er.

In doing the research, the writer finds previous research that can be the consideration for this research. The title of the research is "*The Effectiveness of Using Community Language Learning to Improve Students' Competences of Speaking Skill for Transactional Conversation (An Experimental Study of the Eighth Grade Students of MTs Miftahul Ulum Tambakromo in the Academic Year of 2010/2011)*". It is conducted by Puspitasari (2011) from Universitas Negeri Semarang. Based on this research, Community Language Learning (CLL) method is an effective method to teach speaking. It can be seen from the statement written by researcher that there is a significant difference in speaking for transactional conversation ability between the pre-test and post-test of the students who were taught using CLL. The results indicate that in the end, CLL method is an effective method to improve students' ability in speaking for transactional conversation. It is suggested to the teachers to apply the method as one of alternative teaching methods in speaking class". Though the skill to improve in the research is different from this research, it has the similarity; improve the skill. She focuses on the students' speaking ability and she reveals Community Language Learning method improves this ability. This makes the writer eager to apply Community Language Learning method in the classroom. The writer finally discovers that Community Language Learning method improves grammar competence.

The writer finds a skripsi entitled "the speaking ability of the eleventh grade students of MAN 1 Kudus in academic year 2011/2012 taught by using Community Language Learning (CLL) method". It is conducted by Agnisa (2012) from English Education Department Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Muria Kudus University at 2012. She concludes that using Community Language Learning (CLL) method is an effective method to teach speaking, because can improve the speaking skill of the eleventh grade students at MAN 1 Kudus in the academic year 2011/2012. It showed from the result of the test that mean is **53.00** and standard deviation is **5.60**. Meanwhile, the speaking skill of the eleventh grade students of MAN 1 Kudus in academic year 2011/2012 after being taught by using Community Language Learning (CLL) method is *good*. It is showed from the result of the test in which the mean is **70.05** and standard deviation is **8.52**. It is easy to understand from the mean score of pre-test and post-test that there is significant different. The mean of post-test is higher than the mean of pre-test. The skripsi clearly shows the improvement in students' speaking skill through the Community Language Learning implementation in the classroom. The writer, convinces that Community Language Learning method is an effective method to teach speaking. Likewise, the writer also proves that the method works well in improving grammar competence in writing descriptive text for seventh grade students.

The journal that talks about the effectiveness of Community Language Learning (CLL) method is from Parker (2008). In his journal entitled "Two Case Studies of Community Language Learning with Possible Implications for the Natural Order Hypothesis", he states Community Language Learning 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. Community Language Learning (CLL) method in his journal is effective on revealing the

Natural Order. The similar pattern found between this research and Parker's research. This research, Community Language Learning (CLL) Method is used to reveal the problem faced by individual students by the teacher, while Parker's research uses Community Language Learning (CLL) method to reveal the Natural Order of conversation for the TESOL students. This way, the teacher engages this method may reveal the truly problem faced by the students even if the students may not aware of the problem.

For the classroom improvement, the writer finds a journal entitled *"Application of Community Language Learning for Effective Teaching"*. It is conducted by Nagaraj (2009) who comes from Department of English and Foreign Language Languages, Bharathiar University, in Coimbatore. He concludes that Community Language Learning is the most responsive of the methods which is reviewed in terms of its sensitivity to learned communicative intent. It is applied in various settings; it is used as an aid for language-learning, under the radar, academically. The value of CLL has been its emphasis 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. The finding taken from the journal supports the writer's intention to overcome the communication problem dealing class situation. The journal proves that Community Language Learning method is effective to improve the classroom conduciveness since the teacher cares more towards every individual student, supporting without judging, and encourages the students to reach independence.

The writer also finds a journal entitled *"Using the Community Language Learning Approach to Cope with Language Anxiety"*. It is conducted by Koba, Naomi, and Naoyoshi Ogawa (2000) from Siebold University of Nagasaki (Nagasaki, Japan). They said that anxiety is associated with feeling of uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt, or worry. To overcome this problem, one of

the ways which can be used by the teachers is Community Language Learning. The teachers can use this approach to build students' self-confidence and security so that they can get the braveness and freedom when they are trying to speak in English either in or out of classroom. The students who often become inattentive and reluctant are guided by the teacher and may have more attention to those who are discipline. The Community Language Learning (CLL) method encourages every student to be active during the lesson. In this research, the passive students who always sit on the back row become more engaging to join the lesson and participate. The research otherwise, can get braveness and freedom for students to speak English. In this research, students have self confidence and freedom to write in English and share the idea through written media.

Finally, the research by Forge (2006) entitled "Community Language Learning: A Pilot Study", suggests that most of the individuals who took part in the CLL demonstrations remarked that they feel united and supported by a deeply human psychological bond which aids learning. Just as the individual goes through a number of experiences and reflects upon these, so the whole group, very deeply united almost as a single organism, goes through a communal experience and in a communal way, reflects upon the experience. This direct and reflexes communal experience greatly supports learning in general, and language learning in particular. The research also shows that all students mingle into one communication community and support each other. This fact reveals the Community Language Learning (CLL) method unites the students regardless their background. In this research, the students who usually introvert, inattentive, and reluctant, will be included to the active learning. Based on the observation, those inattentive students engage well to participate and no longer annoy other students that create conducive class situation. The Forge's research results the students to maintain more correct pronunciation after the course, while this research provides the students correct grammar pattern to remember well.

## Method

The subject of the research was the VII E class students of SMP 2 Jekulo Kudus in the Academic Year of 2014/2015. The research model used in this research was a classroom action research of which the sequence of the conducting was planning, acting, observing, and reflecting (Kemmis, S. and McTaggart, 1988).

There were two cycles conducted from April to May 2015 consisting of four meetings each. In the meeting, the students learnt using "suffix –s/-es (verbal sentences)", "*to be* (is, am, are)(nominal sentences)", 'pronoun", modal "can + V1", "has/have + noun", "adjective", and "adverbs". The procedures were as follows: (1) planning, consisted of preparing the material, lesson plan, and the observation instrument (2) acting, the action in teaching the classroom; (3) observing, was seeing and noting the situation of the classroom when CLL was implemented and its weakness and strength (4) reflecting, was analyzing gathered data and information from the action. The strength and the weakness were also be concerned to improve the next cycle.

The cycle provided qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative data were obtained from the questionnaire, research diary, and interview while quantitative data were got from the post-test. To analyze the quantitative data, the average score of the post test was calculated and compared to the pre-test average score in order to find the improvement. The qualitative data was analyzed by using Constant Comparative Method. Hopkins (2008) describe a Constant Comparative Method as a means of analyzing sociological data which is applied in the same study to any kind of qualitative information, including observation, documents, interviews, books, and articles.

## Result

In the preliminary study, a pre-test was conducted to discover the students' prior knowledge in grammar in writing descriptive texts. It revealed had low grammar mastery. The observation, interview, and questionnaire were also held and the result strengthened the fact. During the research, in the acting

phase of each cycle, Community Language Learning method was applied to reinforce the students' grammar mastery. The procedures done in the classroom were as follows:

*Opening*; greeting, explaining the today's topic, and apperception of the descriptive text.

*Main activity*; having the students grouped of 4 each, the worksheet was delivered while the Community Language Learning method was explained so the students would not be confused during its application. In doing the assignment, the students initially wrote the descriptive in their native language (Bahasa Indonesia) and when they wanted to write in English, the teacher translated their writing per individual. After the teacher finished translating, the chosen student was asked to write down the translation on the white board. If there was any error, the teacher circled and fixed while explaining the mistake.

*Closing,* summing up the material, reviewing the explained material, and giving the students a chance to ask and deliver their questions, feeling, and feedback about the teaching learning process moreover about the Community Language Learning (CLL) method.

Initially, when Community Language Learning was implemented, the students were confused and did not know what to do. They tended to make some noise while the teacher explained what to do.

In the rest of the meetings of the first cycle, however, the students looked more excited and interested in joining the class. They looked excited because the activity of practicing the grammar learned was not typical where after teachers explain the grammar, students did the grammar exercises, and teachers check the answers with the whole class.

To revise what was missed in the first cycle, the writer made some revisions of the lesson plan in the second cycle. Those revisions covered the way of teaching and the focus on the students who still performed poorly during the first cycle

In brief, the research shows that there were improvements in the students' grammar mastery in writing descriptive texts. However, some minus points were also spotted.

It can be seen from the mean score of preliminary research, cycle 1 and cycle 2. It is always increasing; from 66.47, 71.65 and finally 82.56. Those score are the sum of seven simple present tense indicators in descriptive text; verbal (suffix –s/-es), nominal (to be), pronoun, ability (can+v1), attribute (have/has), adjective, and adverb. The improvement takes place because the students get their weaknesses covered. In the implementation of Community Language Learning (CLL) method, the teacher recognizes the errors committed by the most students. From here, the teacher decides what indicator she should emphasize in order to meet the students' need.

Community Language Learning (CLL) method can improve classroom situation. It can be seen from the students' activities during learning process; from all students are passive, a half of students pay attention to the teacher and in the end, only 4 students who are still lazy to include learning process. Before Community Language Learning (CLL) is applied, most students do not really understand the simple present tense which is used in writing descriptive text. Like the common phenomenon among students, when they do not understand or do not like the subject, they tend to ignore the teacher and do not care about the lesson. Likewise in cycle 1, when CLL method is firstly applied, the result indicates 53% students state that CLL method is helpful and 47% not. This happens because the students do not really understand and feel surprised to experience the method which they never know. As the result, some students make some noise by chatting with friends because they do not know what to do during the main activity. Only the truly active students who participate in the performance. Cycle 2 shows improvement after the students understand the CLL method application in the classroom; 87% students thought CLL method is helpful and only 13% not. The teacher's role is the key of the classroom conduciveness. The passive students are the prior concern to

perform to make them active. This way, all of the students in the classroom have fair participation in the learning process.

There were some minus points that the writer noticed when implementing the imbalance ratio between the teacher and the students made the teacher get too busy. Some students could do the task well by repeating sentences from the counseling. Correct, but students did not develop new knowledge.

## Discussion

Community Language Learning (CLL) helps the students to master grammar more effectively and easier. This method shifts the paradigm of which usually the students listen more and be less active became more active to say what they needed. The teacher became the counselor who translates students' writing and preaches the structure. Community Language Learning (CLL) method is effective to teach grammar in writing descriptive because of its implication steps. Firstly, the students write their text in their native language. Then, the teacher translates the text in the target language and the students repeat the translation as accurately as possible. The linguistic explanation rules are provided in the beginning and the middle session of the lesson. The students then write the translated text in the whiteboard. The teacher corrects the error if any, ended by explaining the correct grammar.

Brand new method implemented in the classroom brought both excitement and motivation to the students and the teacher without leaving its main purpose; improve students' skill and class situation. Community Language Learning (CLL) offered an interesting way where the students were equally and completely served by the teacher in solving their problem.

In the first cycle, the teacher had a hectic time to translate the students' writing while the students still mostly confused what to do with the method. Gradually, the teacher gained the way to maximize the counseling and the students began to understand their role. In the second cycle, there was no

problem with the CLL implementation and they could focus on improving the grammar mastery in writing descriptive text.

The improvement of grammar mastery in writing descriptive text could be seen from the mean of pre-test and post-test score. It improved from 66.47 to 82.56. Those score were the sum of the seven indicators in descriptive text grammar aspects. Since the students always had repetition, drill, and exposure about correct structure, they became accustomed to use correct grammar too and hopefully it could be fossilized.

The improvement of the students' grammar mastery can be seen from the students' score improvement. Before conducting the action, the writer has taken the students' scores by using pre-test given in the preliminary research. The result shows that the students have problem in understanding English grammar, moreover in writing descriptive text. The mean score of the students is 66.47 and categorized as sufficient. In order to enhance the students' understanding, the writer has collaboration with the English teacher to apply Community Language Learning (CLL) method in the teaching and learning process.

In the first cycle, the students' understanding and mastery are not improved well. The students mean score is only 71.65, categorized as sufficient. It is still far from the maximum score of grammar aspect. Then, the teacher tries to teach the students by using the same way with an improved technique impinged upon the use of Community Language Learning (CLL) method as the teaching method. The teacher focuses on covering the weakness found in cycle 1.

In cycle 2, after the teacher and the writer revises the research action, improvement starts to rise on the students' understanding. The students has better simple present tense mastery in writing descriptive text. As a result, the students' mean score improves into 82.56 and is categorized as good.

In term of class situation, Community Language Learning (CLL) method helps to make the class became conducive because the students had equal

attention from the teacher. Community Language Learning (CLL) is effective in improving the class situation. This method controls the entire students since the seat formation enables the teacher to deal with the children. This way, the students who often make some noise became involved to the classroom and did their role well. The individual counseling also enables the teacher to recognize the students' weakness so that the imminent prevention could be done to eradicate the error fossilization. The findings of the research inform that the use of Community Language Learning (CLL) method improved the students' activities in the learning process from cycle to cycle. Before the action, the result of the preliminary research shows that the students were not active in learning process. When the students are taught, most of them do not pay attention to the teacher. They may not be interested in studying English, especially if discussing about grammar. This phenomenon commonly occurs if the students have in their mind that the subject is difficult.

In order to improve the students' understanding of English grammar, the writer and the English teacher use Community Language Learning (CLL) method in teaching English grammar to write descriptive text. The students' grammar mastery does not improve well in cycle 1. It is only a half of the students in the classroom who pay attention to the teacher.

In cycle 2, the students' activeness improves well. The number of students who do not pay attention to the teacher decreased. It is only 4 students and they could not follow the teacher's directions and answer the questions. These students definitely do not have self-motivation to follow the lesson well. They confess that they do not like English subject. Instead, the prefer sport or art subject.

Using Community Language Learning (CLL) method in teaching grammar of writing descriptive text can help the students understand the correct forms and the use of simple present tense. This statement is strengthened by the students' response in the questionnaire and the interview. In the preliminary research, all of the students answer that English is "difficult" and not attracted

to Community Language Learning (CLL) method since they do not have any idea what CLL is. In the first cycle, 53% of the students answer that Community Language Learning (CLL) method is helpful and 47% answers that it is not helpful and English is still "difficult". Then, it is improved in the second cycle, only 13% of the students answer that Community Language Learning (CLL) method is not helpful and English is "difficult". 87% answers that Community Language Learning (CLL) method is helpful. The result reveals that the Community Language Learning (CLL) method is effective to solve students' grammar problems.

However, Community Language Learning (CLL) leaves some issues to resolve. There should be lesser students if only one teacher available in order to have maximum result. Also, the students who wait for the translation can be bored and lured to detach their concentration. The writer also suggested to the teachers for recognizing the students' strength and weakness. It is essential to determine the appropriate method. For the research implication, the counseling must run less than 20% of the time allotment. The rest of the time must be allotted to independent students' task, no need a team work, and homework is not necessary to avoid the external intervention (such as: mentor's help, internet resource) that may damage the purity of students' work.

## Conclusion

Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that the materials convey the components of discourse competence. The components as proposed by Celce-Murcia et.al. contain cohesion, coherence, deixis, genre, and conversation structure. However, there are no clear highlights showing each component. Basically, the analysis are related each other. For example, when analyzing a genre, it is also able to analyze the cohesion, coherence, and deixis presented in the text.

Finally, the writer hopes that this research will be useful for language teachers in understanding each component of discourse competences along

with their samples. Therefore, they can be more aware of selecting the textbooks and can develop or create the materials by themselves based on their knowledge. Meanwhile, for the next researchers who are interested in analyzing discourse competence, they may analyze the discourse competence of written materials (document research) or discourse competence in English class (action research).

## References

Agnisa, T. (2012). *The Speaking Ability of Eleventh Grade Students of MAN 1 Kudus in Academic Year 2011/2012 Taught by Using CLL (Community Language Learning) Method.* Muria Kudus.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.* Longman. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.id/books?id=8vPtAAAAMAAJ

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners.* Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.id/books?id=RqEtek4elD0C

Curran, C. (1976). *Counseling-Learning in Second Language.* Apple River Illinois: Apple River Press.

Folse, K. S., & Azar, B. S. (2016). *Keys to Teaching Grammar to English Language Learners: A Practical Handbook.* University of Michigan Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.id/books?id=iU_cjwEACAAJ

Forge, P. (2006). Community Language Learning: A Pilot Project. *University of Michigan Journal*, p.44-61.

Hall, J. E. (1993). *Grammar for Use.* Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.

Harmenita, R. Y., & Tiarina, Y. (2013). Teaching Writing a Descriptive Text by Using Environmental Observation Strategy. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *Vol 1, No.* Retrieved from http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt/article/view/1167

Hopkins, D. (2008). *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research.* Berkshire: McGraw Hill.

Humaidi, M. Al. (2009). *Community Language Learning.* King Saud University.

Kemmis, S. and McTaggart, R. (1988). *The Action Research Planner (second edition).* Geelong, Vic: Deakin University Press.

Koba, Naomi, Naoyoshi Ogawa,  and D. W. (2000). Using the Community Language Learning Approach to Cope with Language Anxiety. *Academic Journal.*

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Mongotjaya, A. (2009). *English Revolution* (Fourth Edi). Jepara: Mawaspress.

Mukrimah, E. a. (2013). The Ability of Students to Apply Simple Present Tense in Descriptive Text. *Journal of English Language Teaching Society (ELTS)*, p.1-11.

Nagaraj, P. (2009). Application of Community Language Learning for Effective Teaching. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(3 May 2009).

Parker, R. (2008). Two Case Studies of Community Language Learning with Possible Implications for the Natural Order Hypothesis. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses 4*, 103–123.

Puspitasari, Y. (2011). *The Effectiveness of Using CLL to Improve Students' Mastery of Speaking Skill for Transaction Conversation (an Experimental Study of the Eight Grade Students of MTs Miftahul Ulum Tambakromo in the Academic Year of 2010/2011*. Universitas Negeri Semarang.

Refnaldi. (2012). The Second Grade Students' Ability In Writing A descriptive Text At SMPN 1 Bandung. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *Vol.1 No.2*, 250–290.

Richards. Jack C & Rogers, T. . (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A description and Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Thornbury, S. (2007). *How to Teach Grammar*. Longman. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.id/books?id=f1FSnQEACAAJ