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Abstract

This research aimed at finding the characteristics of teaching speaking at English Village of Pare, Kediri which covered four research problems namely; materials, activities, strategies and assessments used by speaking teachers. This study employed descriptive qualitative method. The subjects of the research were three different speaking teachers in RnB course of English Village of Pare, Kediri. The data were collected through observation and in-depth interview. The obtained data were analyzed by four major phases: data collection, data display, data condensation, and drawing conclusion. The results of the study conclude that: (1) The material used by the teacher in teaching speaking show that two teachers used material including articles or writings which taken from online resources, while one teacher used a guidebook that had been provided by course. (2) The activities applied by the teachers were various, depend on the material used when teaching. (3) Strategies used by teachers to improve speaking ability namely; organizing good teaching-plan, being active and communicative, giving appreciation, arranging formal, jokes, being emphatic and monitoring. (4) The kinds of assessment given were daily and periodical assessment. It included teachers and peer assessment. Daily assessment were held every time students had completed individual presentations and question-answer session in the classroom, while periodical assessment were conducted twice a month; every 10th and 25th.
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INTRODUCTION

Speaking is often seen as a talent that is inherent in a person. “The ability to speak a language is synonymous with knowing that language” (Rocio, 2012, p. 21). It is a fundamental skill that is widely used as a way to measure the capability of language learner. Bailey and Savage (1994, p. 7) promotes the position of speaking in a second or foreign language has often been viewed as the most demanding of the four skills. This skill is the most important indicator for students’ success in learning foreign language. Nevertheless, speaking is usually considered as a difficult skill. This is because speaking combines aspect of other language skills such as pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.

Unfortunately, in various cases, it is proven that foreign language learners in Indonesia have difficulties in English speaking. English especially speaking for Indonesian quite challenging to be learned (Songbatumis, 2017, p. 3). Although most of the high school
students have studied English for at least 6 years, the ability and the competence in speaking English are still low (Lie, 2007, p. 7). Even worse, this is also the case for college alumni who took special major in English but have not been able to express their ideas into English actively after graduated. Rocio (2012, p. 19) explains “Indeed, one frustration commonly voiced by learners is that they have spent years studying English, but still they cannot speak it”.

Although there were many strategies and approaches continue to be developed, the speaking skill ability of the students is still showing unsatisfactory result. The difficulties faced by students in mastering speaking skills are caused by various reasons. At first, Oxford (1990) argues that the possible reason is the students think that speaking in English as a stressful thing. It is because they feel afraid of making mistakes related to grammar and the lack of vocabulary. Linguistics differences between English and Indonesian in domain of sounds, words, sentences are barriers that bother English mastery. Another constraint is caused by various challenges including lack of English exposure, classroom size, and shortage of English teachers (Songbatumis, 2017, p. 55).

The failure that often occurs in high school students and college graduates actually looks different from the learning outcomes in the English Village of Pare, Kediri. The results of learning English are precisely inversely proportional to the conditions in Pare. Almost all students who have studied in the English village of Pare proved themselves home with English language skills that were far different than before they left. Not a few, after returning from studying in Pare, their ability can even compete with students who specifically study English in college. This striking difference is a big question for the learning curriculum used by educational institutions in Indonesia for generally. What distinguishes the results of formal and educational schools students than the student of English Village of Pare, Kediri? The quality difference of speaking skill that were experienced by students in English Village of Pare, Kediri becomes the reason for the writer to conduct a research under the title “The Characteristics of Teaching Speaking in English Village of Pare, Kediri”.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Speaking

In social situation and interaction, speaking is more than the ability to make grammatically correct sentences. Speaking in real life interaction is not matter of producing a spoken version of written language. So that, speaking is an active process of negotiating meaning, by using social knowledge of the situation, the topic, and the other speakers. Speaking requires learner in the second language or foreign language to be possession of knowledge about how to produce not only linguistically connect but also pragmatically appropriate utterance (Martinez & Juan, 2006, p. 139). In the practice, the reason someone to speak is depending on the sociable need, to be a tool for expressing feeling and idea, responding to someone else, and exchanging information, referring to an action or event in the past, present, future, and so on (Lindsay & Knight, 2006, p. 58).
The Concept of Teaching Speaking

Teaching is the process of giving instruction to a person and giving knowledge, skill, etc. to the learner while speaking means the using of words in an ordinary voice (Hornby, 2002, p. 37). Teaching speaking could be interpreted as the process of give instruction in order to communicate. It is expression in delivering or sending message from first speaker to the second speaker (interlocutor). Rebecca Hughes in Solcova (2011, p. 16) mentions a methodological point of teaching speaking skill which is concerned one needs to distinguish between “teaching the spoken form of language” and “teaching a language through speaking”. Hughes stresses that unfortunately, comparing to writing skill, the spoken form is under-researched and that this may be one of the reasons why teachers may feel more confident when using stable written form in the learners’ lessons.

According Harmer (2007, p. 123), there are three main reasons for getting students to speak in the classroom. First, is because speaking activities can provide the opportunities to practice real life speaking in the safety of the classroom. Second, 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 he or she is doing, how successful is he or she and what language problems they are experiencing. Third, through speaking, students have opportunities to be active in the various elements of language, which they have stored in their brains.

Obstacles in Teaching and Learning English Speaking

Speaking is one of the most difficult skill faced by English learner. Ur (1996, p. 121) reveals some causes of the students’ difficulties in speaking:

a. Inhibition; Unlike the other skill, speaking requires confidence of the speaker to express what the speaker want to say.

b. Nothing to say; The fear of making mistakes ultimately causes students never try to talk. The worst impact is that in the end, students cannot say a word.

c. Low or no participation; In the process of classroom interaction, usually in one class, some students will play a more dominant role in speaking. Conversations like this will make a minor student feel bored and reluctant to speak. Good interaction requires each student's participation in a balanced manner.

d. Mother tongue; Most students mostly use mother tongue when interacting both with the other students and with teachers. This affect the reducing of the students’ chance to practice their foreign languages.

In order to achieve the best outcomes of teaching speaking, the role of teachers are very important to know the needs of each student in the class. This is to gain an effective learning process and satisfying results. Teachers must create a classroom environment where students have communication such as in the real life, authentic activities, and meaningful tasks that enhance skills speaking in English. As the matter of facts, this is apart from the good correlation between the taught materials and the activities in the classroom, which carried out with the assessment of outcome students.
RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Learners are not all the same, a lot depends on what level the students are at, how long the students would study at the course and the target of the students for coming to Pare, Kediri. In fact, based on the findings, there were similarities between T1 in the first level, teacher 2 in the second level and teacher 3 in the fourth level in using materials, activities, strategies, and assessments.

This part presents a discussion of the findings obtained from observation and interview. This chapter was divided into four section based on the findings of the study as: Materials used by teachers in teaching speaking, speaking teaching activities of the teachers in the classroom, the strategies used by teachers in speaking class, and the kinds of assessment used by teacher at English Village of Pare, Kediri.

Materials Used by Teachers in Teaching Speaking

In the use of materials, both Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 used article or paper from online resources with English written language. It was facilitated by the teachers. The teachers distributed a printed paper to each students at the first meeting. The given paper was the theme for students to be presented or discussed at the speaking practice session. The learners red and translated the paper to achieve goals for discussion or presentation.

In the selection of themes, a lot depend on the teachers’ creativities to utilize hot issues such as; Valentine Day and any topics which can benefit for the students, for examples; history, biology, or sciences. Regarding this, Harmer (2012, p. 184) states that there is no ban for teachers copy material from books and other sources. There is nothing wrong with the provided material which is not covered by copyright. Any topic was almost used for a large variety of activities and lesson types. As in fact, the selected topic affected the speaking activities to practice their skill. It were seen from the activeness of students in responding to each exercises as well as interactive dialogue that occurred in the classroom between teachers and students. Students activeness was also supporter by teaching activities and strategies in arousing learning enthusiasm. It is correlated to Harmer (2012, p. 220) who defines that teachers need to plan about how to make it personal for learners. It was shown in the class of T1 and T2 where the student enjoy learning and participate in it.

To maximize the teaching materials, dictionaries were one of the resources existed that must be had by the learners. The kind of dictionary used was monolingual dictionaries which in book form, namely; Oxford Dictionary and Longman Dictionary. The students were not allowed to use online of mobile form of dictionary. Monolingual dictionary gave a wealth information when students were translating the papers. The reason is to train students to understand the word and the definition in its own native language.

Meanwhile, Teacher 3 used a course book that has been provided by the course institution as guideline for students. This because the class taught by T3 was ‘Speaking for IELTS’ in fourth level as the highest stage in the course. Learning objective at level 4 was focused on producing students who were able to answers questions in the IELTS test. It then affected the core of activity presented at that highest level which just struggling on
interview. The use of coursebook were all planned. Language progression in T3’s class had been considered, but still combined with the teacher skill. T3 argued that if she followed the coursebook stage per stage, never varying the way she did it, students were not engaged and felt bored. Even so, T3 used to create games or any activities that helped students speak out of the IELTS topic unlimitedly. Sometimes it was also effective to encourage learners back to be excited and not boring.

**Speaking Teaching Activities of the Teachers in the Classroom**

It is important to analyze how and what students should learn in class or out of class, either independently or with others, as well as how to conduct in-class and out-of-class activities that effectively employ more active learning strategies. There is no doubt that today's teachers are being demanded many more challenges. According to Harmer (2012, p. 127), follow-up tasks sometimes are needed to exploit some of the language in it. It is because the most important thing in a classroom is not how the teacher teaches, but how the student learns.

Based on the findings, the selection of activities in speaking class all showed similarities. These were appeared from the teachers’ role in the classroom when teaching. In most meetings, the teacher places their selves as facilitator, monitor and editor. During the teaching process, teachers gave their greatest contribution in the speaking teaching activities. The findings revealed that in the class of T1, T2 and T3, the speaking teaching activities used by teachers are classified into two general speaking activity, namely core speaking activities which related to the teaching materials and supporting speaking activities which given randomly. The core activities were classified based on the correlation of the activities in supporting the materials used. These were routinely given in the teaching process in the classroom such as buzzing group or oral presentation, where discussion and question-answers sometime were given unrelated to the material. Whereas the supporting activities were designed randomly based on the students’ need and mood. It were frequently given after giving content based lessons and out of the topic of the material.

Overall, the activities related to the material required students to actively received information and discussed it. The product was speaking where the students should produce language in the form of oral language. Although there were slight differences between T1, T2, and T3, the core of speaking activities engaged language learner to interact with the teacher. Such as when teachers acted as facilitator, teacher always accompanied students’ activities. In some meeting, teachers were also involved as a participant or become a sample for task demonstration. It was good to create learning atmosphere runs smoothly and appropriately for the learners. It was usually paired with the role of teachers as controllers. They explained things, took the class register and told students what to do. This often involved teachers standing in front of the class.

In other way, when teachers acted as monitor, they confirmed that the students were doing their task correctly. It made students feel constantly supervised by teachers. In the process of monitoring, speaking practice occurred when teachers asking their work. The students were obligated to explain what they had done. This role played together with the role of teachers as editor. They were actively evaluated students’ utterance and their performances. As the matter of fact, it could be conclude that the activities used by teachers...
were varieties. To support the core activity, they applied several additional task to be done which out of the topic of the given material, namely; games, discussion, role-play or wrapping up. It were based on the students’ mood. The skill of teachers to read the atmosphere of the learning process were done.

Finally, the teaching activities used by teachers had influenced on students’ activeness in practicing speaking. However, the students’ involvement regarding the target learning had a significant impact on speaking skill improvement of the students combining with the other language aspects. The implication of the integrative language skill in speaking teaching process could be presented as follows:

![Figure 4.1. The Integrated Skills in Teaching Speaking at English Village of Pare, Kediri](image)

**The Strategies Used by Teachers in Teaching Speaking**

The implication of strategies depend on the teachers’ creativities to read the students’ need and mood. The most frequently strategies used were planning, being active and communicative, giving appreciation, applying formal class, adjusting jokes, being emphatic, and monitoring. Teachers revealed various way to overcome students with different characteristics. The teaching strategies occurred were documented in the field notes. These strategies were utilized in the classes by T1, T2, and T3 for various causes.

All reasons used by teachers were inseparable from the practice of speaking English. It were generally viewed by the materials, situational, time, and the students’ mood. In every way that was applied, teachers ensure all students get engaged practicing their speaking. The teachers actively created new way to help students to get used in exploring their oral language. At the teaching process, teachers helped students to always feel happy, eager, and comfortable facing each task. The target of the strategies used was
to build English environment. Those strategies motivated and encouraged students to speak and took a part in every activities. The distinction strategies were also caused by level of the students. Teachers provided diverse method between the lower, intermediate, and the higher level. For example; T1 in first level usually applied active and communicative strategies. T1 was actively checking students’ work by using mixed-code. The class was not obligated to use English for fully. There was also little joke when the students got bored. Students in the lower level showed cooperative response. This way caused learner willing to ask anything to T1. Meanwhile, T2 and T3 who taught in level 2 and level 4 pointed assertive and instructional way. For students in level 2 was classified as intermediate and in level 3 was grouped as the highest level. Both T2 and T3 were more assertive in determining students’ targets in the classroom. Learners were obligated to practice English dominantly. The strategies used by teachers encouraged them to be active. These had impact on the speaking activities who appeared more careful on speaking.

Based on the data, it could be inferred that the strategies used by teacher perfected the method of applying cooperative learning. These can be a solution for classes with different ages, informal and various characters such as courses in English Village of Pare, Kediri. Teachers’ skill created appropriate ways to teach speaking class based on students’ need.

The kinds of Assessment Used by Teachers in Evaluating Students’ Speaking Skill

To answer the kinds of assessment used by teachers in evaluating students’ speaking skill, the data were taken from observation and interview. T1, T2, and T3 held favorable technique to assess students’ speaking skill. There were two kinds of assessment applied in English Village of Pare, Kediri namely; formative assessment and summative assessment according to Harmer’s theory. Regarding to evaluate student improvement, formative assessment were conducted routinely at every times students completed oral presentation. Teachers employed teacher and peer assessment. It involved the other participant to give the performer comments and advices. The target was looking for errors in grammar, vocabularies, gestures, contents, fillers, or repetition. By this way, the performer had chance also to evaluate him/herself in the next occasion. The evaluation given from this manner become weekly assessment value for each participant. Teachers may did formative assessment once or two times in a week.

Different from that, summative assessment classified as periodical test held by courses in Pare. It was conducted twice in a month. The assessor were not the participant speaking teacher. The teachers team were randomly divided in different class that they taught. The kind of test was interview or oral test. The assessor usually asked student to describe what they had got in the class and explained simple topic. While listening to students’ explanation, the assessor team noted evaluations. The final score were given after accumulating the formative and the summative assessment.

The kinds of assessment used by teachers represented that the target evaluation of students in each level were similar. T1, T2, and T3 conducted weekly assessment to evaluate students’ performance in the speaking activities. Teachers allowed students to explore their speaking skill using the chosen topic or material. The target was to get them used to speak in public and describe things. The language aspect that were evaluated had
helped student to improve their next performance. It was shown when they perform in the next meeting with a better way. The involvement of the other participant to evaluate the performer affected them to know what should be corrected and what was wrong to do when speaking. Whereas the interview process as the periodical test at Pare, Kediri arouse students to perform better in front of the assessor. This because the final score of the interview test determined whether they deserved to go up to the next level or stay at the same level. It certainly had impact on how long they study at the same place, and overtaken by new students. As a result, the assessment kinds used influenced students to perform better at every test. It forced them to minimize errors and mistakes when performing. The weekly assessment presented that students kept trying to avoid filler, repetition and error in grammar. In the viewpoint, the accumulation of materials, activities, strategies and assessment kinds used by teachers at English Village of Pare, Kediri are presented as follows:

Figure 4.2. The Characteristics of Speaking Teaching at English Village of Pare, Kediri

CONCLUSION

The characteristics of speaking teaching at English Village of Pare, Kediri were not bound to one material, activity, strategy and assessment. To begin, the material used were printed-paper or an article. The sources were from online resource with English language based. The topics were different every new meetings. The topic was changing and updated. Every students who passed one level would not get the same material with their senior. It was according to what was issued at the time.

There were several important activities identified in speaking classes. These activities included oral presentation, discussion, and interview. Teachers developed the selected activity. Although at several meetings teacher gave the similar method, it were combined with another way to support the speaking practice. There was no same activities
which applied by speaking teachers. For example, they usually applied jokes or games to provoke students’ spirit. Teachers implied additional activities that used to inspire learners to practice speaking. Therefore, it affected the speaking class were not bored and saturated. Otherwise, learners were always intrigued to engage in every task. Teachers tried to renew activities based on the students’ need and mood. One material did not have to be resolved in one meeting. This gave teachers chance to complete the material until the students understand it well. In hence, the activities in the classroom not only focused on one meeting- one material.

The most affective teaching strategies included planning material, being active and applicative, giving appreciation, remaining formal, applying jokes, staying emphatic, and controlling. By these ways, teachers made sure that learners were in different level. Teachers concerned to students’ purposes to learner English and what kind of English that they want and need. For instance, teachers in intermediate or in advanced showed emphatic and formal way to assert learners’ target.

The assessment kinds used most by teachers were daily and periodical assessment. It included teachers and peer assessment. Teachers concerned on the same language aspects in evaluating students’ speaking skill. The main target that students were able to speak fluency without filler, repetition, and minimizing grammar errors. It was assessed from how well they performed at the practice time and interview process at periodical test. This study implies that the characteristics of speaking teaching used by teachers at English Village of Pare, Kediri have never been the same. It depend on the creativity of the teachers in developing teaching materials used.

The theoretical and practical implication of this study are presented as follows: (1) Theoretically, the materials, activities, strategies and assessments used by speaking teachers at English Village of Pare, Kediri were not limited to certain methods. Each teacher had opportunity to be creative in developing an active and communication speaking class. Thus, the teacher ensured that the material provided were completed by students in accordance with the learning target at each level and the course vision. Speaking teachers taught based on the student’s need and why students were learning English. Teachers found exactly what learners need and want. To evaluate learners, peer assessment and teacher assessment were identified affective to improve students’ performance in speaking. (2) Practically, the result of this study proved that one material taught was not able to be completed only in one meeting. For medium or larger class, teacher needs more time to give students same chance to perform or practice. Teacher must had chance to complete on teaching materials for at least in two or three meetings.
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