CHAPTER II

REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Activities in learning speaking

To help students develop communicative efficiency in speaking, there are some activities used in the classroom to promote the development of speaking skills in our learners. According to Kayi (2006), there are some kinds of activities to promote speaking:

2.1.1 Discussion

Through discussion, the students can share about their idea of event, or find a solution in their discussion group or small group discussion. Purnamasari (2007: 3-4), defines that "discussion is debate or other form of grouped discussion of specific topic, with or without specified sides/positions prearranges". With this way, the students do not spend their time chatting with each other about irrelevant things. They can involved agree/disagree discussion. In this type, the teacher can divides into some groups.

2.1.2. Role Play

Fauzia (2007: 17) stated that "a role play is a good activity to improve speaking ability since each student is given a chance to speak". It means that each student get a role as an opportunity for them to practice the speaking

ability. Kayi (2006) stated that "one other way of getting students to speak is role play. Students pretend they are in various social contexts and have a variety of social roles. In role activities, the teacher gives information to the learners such as who they think or feel. Thus, the teacher can tell the students that „You are David, you go to the doctor and tell him what happened last night, and…."

2.1.3. Information Gap

Based on Kayi (2006) this activity, students are supposed to be working in pairs. One student will have information that other partners will share their information. It has many purposes such as solving a problem or collecting information. They can share the information with his or her partner to complete a task. These activities are effective because everybody has the opportunity to talk extensively in the target language.

2.1.4. Brainstorming

On a given a topic, students can produce ideas in a limited time. Depending on the context, either individual or group brainstorming is effective and learners generate ideas quickly and freely. The good characteristic of brainstorming is that the students are not criticized for their ideas so students will be open to sharing their ideas or opinion.

2.1.5. Story Telling

Story telling is a good way to gain the students" speaking skills and to combine the instruction. It makes them fun; because there are a lot of story who told by the students. Based on Aisyah (2007: 13) "story telling is a good way to combine instruction and entertainment". It also can be an excellent tool for both teaching and assessing listening and talking process and skills. The students can summarize the story or they may create their story by them self. Story telling fosters creative thinking. It also helps students express ideas in the format of beginning, development, and ending including the characters and setting a story has to have.

2.1.6. Interviews

Kayi (2006) stated that "students can conduct interview on selected topics with various people. It is a good idea that the teacher provides a rubric to students so that they know what type of questions can ask or what path to follow, but students should prepare their own interview questions. Conducting interview with people gives students a chance to practice their speaking ability not only in class but also outside and helps them becoming socialized. After interviews, each student can present his or her study to the class. Moreover, students can interview each other and introduce his or her partner to the class". It means that, through interview the students able to speak.

2.1.7. Story Completion

It is well-known as a chain story. In this activity, the teacher tells a story. After a few sentences he stops and let the students continue the story. Usually, every student is supposed to add one sentence to the story. The students are free to add new characters or even to the story. This activity trains the students to express their ideas in a short period of time. So, the students enjoy with this class.

2.1.8   Conversations

According to Murcia (Rahmad 2006: 26) One of the recent trends in oral skills pedagogy is the emphasis on having students analyze and evaluate the language that they or others produce. In other word, it is not adequate to have students produce lots of language; they must become more metalinguistically aware of many features of language in order to become competent speakers and interlocutors in English. One speaking activity which is particularly suited to this kind of analysis is conversation, the most fundamental form of oral communication. One way to approach this activity is to assign students to find a native speaker (or near-native speaker) they know and arrange to tape-record a 20-30 minutes interaction with this person. Of course, not all of the discourse that results from this encounter will be truly natural conversation the native may fall into the role of interviewer and ask all questions while the non-native merely responds; therefore the instructor may want to encourage the learner beforehand to come up with a few

questions to ask native speaker. In any case, the resulting interaction will provide a sample of spontaneous from (and for) the learner to analyze. In a variation of the conversation, learners are required to tape-record an interview with native speaker on a topic of their choices and then repot the result to the class.

2.1.9 Memorization

Memorization is one of the activities that has the important rule in the speaking activity because communication cannot occur without previous structure practice. According to Osbourne (Chung Liu 2006:33), point out some advantages of memorization in language teaching. First, memorization can give students a sense of success and accomplishment because it relatively tangible within students' control. Secondly, memorization can give some students' aesthetic pleasure. Thirdly, some students feel secure and familiar with memorization. Finally, in non-language fields, memorization is still recognized as a means of providing students with a body of material to serve as a foundation for understanding,

Ur (1996) indicates that for beginner or the less confident learners, the memorized dialogue is a good way to get learners to practice the target language utterances without hesitation and within a wide variety of context; and learning by heart increases the learners' vocabulary of ready-made combinations of words or 'formulae'.

2.2 Different Conceptions of Curriculum

The fact that the term *curriculum* does not have any single exact definition ultimately

leads to emergence of various interpretations from different educators. "The

curriculum field is by no means clear; as a discipline of study and as a field of

practice, curriculum lacks clean boundaries…'' (Olivia, 2001, p. 10).

While some educators define the concept of curriculum as subjects or subject matters,

the others define it as experiences that a learner has under the guidance of the school.

Ornstein and Hunkins (2004) provides five different definitions for the concept of

curriculum which can be listed as follows; A curriculum can be defined as a plan for

action or a written document that includes strategies for achieving desired goals or

ends. A curriculum can be defined broadly- as dealing with experiences of the

learner. Curriculum can be considered as a system for dealing with people and the

processes or the organization of personnel and procedures for implementing that

system. Curriculum can be viewed as a field of study. Finally, curriculum can be

considered in terms of subject matter or content. Tanner and Tanner (1980) on the

other hand; defines curriculum as "The cumulative tradition of organized knowledge,

modes of thought, race experience, guided experience, planned learning environment,

cognitive/affective content and progress, an instructional plan, instructional ends or

outcomes, and a technological system of production" (p. 54). A different approach to

defining curriculum was taken by Robert M. Gagne (1987), who wove together

subject matter, the statement of ends, sequencing of content, and pre-assessment of

entry skills required of students when they begin the study of content.

There is also a group of educators who regard curriculum as a production system. To illustrate, Bobbitt (1923) defines curriculum as the series of things which children and youth must do and experience by way of developing ability to do the things well that make the affairs of adult life. Similarly, according to Popham (1972) curriculum revolves around "objectives that an educational system hopes its learners will achieve" (p. 96).

By the 1980s, the concept of curriculum expanded even more with changes in social emphasis. For example; Tanner and Tanner stated that "Curriculum is the learning experiences and intended outcomes formulated through systematic reconstruction of knowledge and experience, under the auspices of the school, for the learners' continuous willful growth in personal-social competence" (Tanner and Tanner, 1984, p. 102). Besides, Jon Wiles and Joseph Bondi not only described curriculum as plan for learning but also considered the curriculum as a goal or set of values, which are activated through a development process culminating in classroom experiences (Wiles and Bondi, 1985). Similarly, Hilda Taba (1962) put forward a similar definition of curriculum. She defined curriculum as a plan for learning and lists the elements:

> A curriculum usually contains a statement of aims and of specific objectives; it indicates some selection and organization of content; it either implies or manifests certain patterns of learning and teaching, whether because the objectives demand them or the content organization requires them. Finally it includes a program of evaluation of the outcomes (p. 47).

Geneva Gay (2000), writing on desegregating the curriculum, offered a broad

interpretation of curriculum: If we are to achieve equally, we must broaden our conception to include the entire culture of the school- not just subject matter and content.

2.3 Curriculum Evaluation

It is a fact that evaluation may be conducted for a wide range of reasons in every part of our life. In terms of education, it can be stated that the main purpose of evaluation is to obtain information about student and teacher performance along with classroom interactions. In the same way, the aims might also include to identify strengths and weaknesses of particular activities in a program.

There is no widely agreed upon definitions of evaluation. While some educators relate evaluation with measurement, the others define it as the assessment of the extent to which specific objectives have been attained. Some view evaluation as primarily scientific inquiry, whereas others argue that it is essentially the act of collecting and providing information to enable decision-makers to function effectively (Worthen and Sanders, 1998). Though it can be said that evaluation can refer to small-scale activities which involves basically a teacher and his\her students, it can also refer to large-scale studies which involves many schools and teachers.

Despite this lack of consensus about the phenomenon, Talmage (1982) defines evaluation as the act of rendering judgments to determine value-worth and merit without questioning or diminishing the important roles evaluation plays in decision making. Moreover, "evaluations can differ on many dimensions, among them design (experimental, quasi-experimental, regression discontinuity) intent

(advocacy versus objective assessment), philosophical underpinnings (quantitative versus qualitative), and others" (Frechtling, 2007 p. 104). Cronbach (1991) makes a distinction among three types of decisions that requires evaluation:

1) Course improvement: deciding what instructional materials and methods are satisfactory and where change is needed.

2) Decisions about individuals: identifying the needs of the pupil for the sake of planning his instruction, judging pupil merit for purposes of selection and grouping, acquainting the pupil with his own progress and deficiencies.

3) Administrative regulation: judging how good the school system is, how good individual teachers are, etc.

Evaluation was conceptualized by Ralph Tyler (1991) as a process essential to curriculum development. The purpose of evaluation was stated as to determine the extent to which the curriculum had achieved its stated goals. Evaluation was the basis for the identification of strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum, followed by replanning, implementation and evaluation (Gredler, 1996). Similarly, Worthen and Sanders (1998) stated that evaluation is the formal determination of the quality, effectiveness or value of a program, product, project, process, objective or curriculum. In addition, there are several judgment methods that are used for evaluation during this determination process. These are mainly determining standards for judging quality and deciding whether those standards should be relative or absolute. Secondly, collecting relevant information and finally applying the standards to determine quality. Hence, in the light of these definitions related to evaluation, it can be concluded that Program Evaluation is therefore a systematic inquiry designed

to provide information to decision makers and/or groups interested in a

particularprogram, policy or other intervention. This inquiry might be exemplified as

'How does the program work?', 'Does the program produce unintended side effects

and so on?' (Cronbach, 1980, p. 87).

Program Evaluation generally involves assessment of one or more of five

program domains. a) the need for the program b) the design of the program c) the

program implementation and service delivery d)the program impact or outcomes and

e) program efficiency (cost effectiveness). Similarly, the nature of program

evaluation is described as

☐ Program evaluation is not determination of goal attainment
☐ Program evaluation is not applied social science
☐ Program evaluation is neither a dominant nor autonomous field of evaluation

(Payne, 1994, p. 15).

Mackay (1994) states that in the field of foreign language teaching, the term 'program

evaluation' is used to a wide variety of activities, ranging from academic, theory -

driven research to informal enquiries carried out by a single classroom. Thus,

evaluation may focus on many different aspects of a language program such as

curriculum design, classroom processes, the teachers and students.

2.3.1 The Need for Curriculum Evaluation

Evaluation is a central component of the educational process. Thus, it

is certainly a critical and challenging mission. Kelly (1999) defines

curriculum evaluation as the process by which we attempt to gauge the value

and effectiveness of any particular piece of educational activity. The two common goals of program evaluation, as stated by Lynch (1996) are evaluating a program's effectiveness in absolute terms and/or assessing its quality against that of comparable programs. Program evaluation not only provides useful information to insiders on how the current work can be improved but als offers accountability to outside stakeholders. It aims to discover whether the curriculum designed, developed and implemented is producing or can produce the desired results. The strengths and the weaknesses of the curriculum before implementation and the effectiveness of its implementation can be highlighted by the help of evaluation (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998). Thus, a systemati and continuous evaluation of a program is significant for its improvement, which ultimately leads to the need for curriculum evaluation.

2.3.2 Summative Evaluation and Formative Evaluation

A different way of analyzing curriculum evaluation is in terms of the timing of the evaluation, the ways in which it is made, the instruments used and the purpose for which the results are used. Scriven (1991) introduced into the literature of evaluation the concept of *Formative* and *Summative Evaluation*. Formative evaluation requires collecting and sharing information for program improvement. While a program is being installed, the formative evaluator works to provide the program planners and staff with information to help adjust it to the setting and improve it (Morris and Fitz-Gibbon, 1978).

Formative evaluation is typically conducted during the development or improvement of a program or product or person and so on and it is conducted often more than once (Scriven, 1991). The purpose of formative evaluation is to validate or ensure that the goals of the instruction are being achieved and to improve the instruction if necessary

by means of identification and subsequent remediation of problematic aspects (Weston, Mc Alpine and Bordonaro, 1995). Therefore, it is apparent that formative evaluation provides data to enable on-the-spot changes to be made where necessary. Students' learning activities can be refocused and redirected and the range and depth of instructional activities of a curriculum can be revised in 'mid-stream' (Tunstall and Gipps, 1996). Hence, it applies to both course improvement and students' growth, although some writers tend to concentrate only upon the former (Pryor and

Torrance, 1996). In brief, formative evaluation is conducted during the operation of a program to provide program directors evaluate information useful in improving the program. For example, during the development of a curriculum package, formative evaluation would involve content inspection by experts, pilot tests with small numbers of children and so forth. Each step would result in immediate feedback to the developers who would then use the information to make necessary revisions.

Summative evaluation, on the other hand, is conducted at the end of a program to provide potential consumers with judgments about that program's worth or merit. For example, after the curriculum package is completely

developed, a summative evaluation might be conducted to determine how

effective the package is with a national sample of typical schools, teachers and

students at the level for which it was developed (Worthen and Sanders, 1998).

The summative evaluator's function is not

to work with the staff and suggest improvements while the program is running

but rather to collect data and write a summary report showing what the

program looks like and what has been achieved. Summative Evaluation is the

final goal of an educational activity. Thus, summative evaluation provides the

data from which decisions can be made. It provides information on the

product's efficacy. For example, finding out whether the learners have learnt

what they were supposed to learn after using the instructional module.

Summative evaluation generally uses

numeric scores or letter grades to assess learner achievement. While formative

evaluation leads to decisions about program development including

modification, revision and the like, summative evaluation leads to decisions

concerning program continuation, termination, expansion, adoption and so on.

Audiences and uses for these two evaluation roles are also very

different. In formative evaluation the audience is program personnel or those

responsible for developing the curriculum. On the other hand, summative

evaluation audiences include potential consumers such as students, teachers

and other professionals, funding sources and supervisors. However, it is a fact

that both formative and summative evaluation are essential because decisions

are needed both during the

developmental stages of a program to improve and strengthen it and again

when it has stabilized to judge its final worth or determine its future.

2.4 Evaluation Models

Evaluation has a long history, which ultimately lead to the use of various

evaluation models by curriculum specialists. Evaluation models differ greatly with

regard to curriculum evaluation approaches. The underlying reasons behind this

variety of classifications are generally related to evaluators' diverse philosophical

ideologies, cognitive styles, methodological preferences, values and practical

perspectives. Due to this diversity in curriculum evaluation, it is not possible to come

up with only one single model. As Erden (1995) states, researchers can choose the

most appropriate model in terms of their purposes and conditions during their

curriculum evaluation models or they can develop a new one making use of the

existing ones. Fitzpatrick, Sanders and Worthen (1998) classify the evaluation

approaches under the categories of objectives oriented evaluation approach,

management oriented evaluation approach, consumer oriented evaluation approach,

expertise oriented evaluation approach, adversary oriented evaluation approach and

participant oriented evaluation approach.

Objectives-Oriented Evaluation Approaches:

The distinguishing feature of an objectives-oriented evaluation approach is that the

purposes of some activity are specified and then evaluation focuses on the extent to

which those purposes are achieved.

Management- Oriented Evaluation Approaches:

Its rationale is that evaluative information is an essential part of good decision making and that the evaluator can be most effective by serving administrators, policy makers, boards, practitioners, and others who need good evaluative information.

Consumer-Oriented Evaluation Approaches:

Independent agencies or individuals who take responsibility to gather information on educational or other human services products, or assist others in doing so, support the consumer-oriented evaluation approach. These products generally include: curriculum packages, workshops, instructional media, in-service training opportunities, staff evaluation forms or procedures, new technology, software and equipment, educational materials and supplies, and even services to agencies.

Expertise-Oriented Evaluation Approaches:

Expertise-Oriented Evaluation Approach depends primarily upon professional expertise to judge an institution, program, product or activity.

Adversary-Oriented Evaluation Approaches:

Adversary-Oriented Evaluation Approach in its broad sense refers to all evaluations in which there is a planned opposition in the points of view of different evaluators or evaluation teams.

Participant-Oriented Evaluation Approaches:

Participant-Oriented Evaluation Approach aims at observing and identifying all of the

concerns, issues and consequences integral to human services enterprise. Worthern,

Sanders and Fitzpatrick (1998) highlighted the aspect of each approach under eight

headings such as proponents, purpose of evaluation, distinguishing characteristics,

past uses, contributions to the conceptualization of an evaluation, criteria for judging

evaluations, benefits and limitations.

2.4.1 Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process, Product Model

Stufflebeam is an "influential proponent of a decision-oriented evaluation

approach" designed to help administrators make good decisions (Worthern,

Sanders and Fitzpatrick 1998, p. 98). His approach to evaluation is recognized

as the CIPP model. The first letters of each type of evaluation-context, input,

process and product-have been used to form the acronym CIPP, by which

Stufflebeam's evaluation model is best known.

This comprehensive model considers evaluation to be a continuing

process (Ornstein and Hunkins, 2004). Gredler suggests that the approach is

based on two major assumptions about evaluation. These assumptions are 1)

that evaluations have a vital role in stimulating and planning change and 2)

that evaluation is an integral component of an institution's regular program.

(Gredler, 1996). Thus, evaluation is not a specialized activity associated with

innovative projects, and the CIPP perspective is not intended to guide the

conduct of an individual study (Stufflebeam, 1980).

Stufflebeam (1971) views evaluation as the process of delineating, obtaining and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives. These processes are executed for four types of administrative divisions each of which represents a type of evaluation. These evaluations may be conducted independently or in an integrated sequence (Gredler, 1996). They can be listed as follows:

Planning decisions — Context Evaluation

Structuring decisions — Input Evaluation

Implementing decisions — Process Evaluation

Recycling decisions to judge

And react to program attainments — Product Evaluation

2.4.1.1 Context Evaluation

Context evaluation involves studying the environment of the program. Its purpose is to define the relevant environment, portray the desired and actual conditions pertaining to that environment, focus on unmet needs and missed opportunities and diagnose the reason for unmet needs (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998). Determining what needs are to be addressed by a program helps in defining objectives for the program (Worthern, Sanders and Fitzpatrick, 1997). "The results of a context evaluation are intended to provide a sound basis for either adjusting or establishing goals and priorities and identifying needed

changes" (Stufflebeam and Shinkfeld, 1985, p. 172). One suggested

use of context evaluation is a means for a school district to

communicate with the public to achieve a shared understanding of the

district's strengths, weaknesses, needs, opportunities and pressing

problems. Other uses are to convince a funding agency of the worth of

a project, to develop objectives for staff development, to select schools

for priority assistance, and to help parents or advisers focus on

developmental areas requiring attention (Gredler, 1996). Context

evaluation is really a situational analysis – a reading of the reality in

which the individuals find themselves and an assessment of that reality

in light of what they want to do. This diagnosis stage of evaluation is

not a one-time activity. It continues to furnish baseline information

regarding the operations and accomplishments of the total system

(Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998).

2.5.1.2 Input Evaluation

The second stage of the model, input evaluation is designed to

provide information and determine how to utilize resources to meet

program goals. Input evaluators assess the school's capabilities to

carry out the task of evaluation; they consider the strategies suggested

for achieving program goals and they identify the means by which a

selected strategy will be implemented. Input evaluates specific aspects

of the curriculum plan or specific components of the curriculum plan.

It deals with the following questions: Are the objectives stated appropriately? Are the objectives congruent with the goals of the school? Is the content congruent with the goals and objectives of the program? Are the instructional strategies appropriate? Do other strategies exist that can also help meet the objectives? What is the basis for believing that using these content and these instructional strategies will enable educators to successfully attain their objectives? (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998). An important component of this analysis is to identify any barriers or constraints in the client's environment that may influence or impede the operation of the program. In other words, the purpose of Input Evaluation is to help clients consider alternatives in terms of their particular needs and circumstances and to help develop a workable plan for them (Stufflebeam, 1980; Stufflebeam and Shinkfeld, 1985).

2.5.1.3 Process Evaluation

The focus of process evaluation is the implementation of a program or a strategy. The main purpose is to provide feedback about needed modification if the implementation is inadequate. That is, are program activities on schedule? Are they being implemented as planned? Are available resources being used efficiently? And do program participants accept and carry out their roles? (Stufflebeam, 1980; Stufflebeam and Shinkfeld, 1985). In addition, "process evaluation should provide a comparison of the actual implementation

with the intended program, the costs of the implementation, and participants' judgments of the quality of the effort" (Stufflebeam and Shinkfeld, 1985. p. 175). Process evaluation includes three strategies. "The first is to detect or predict defects in the procedural design or its implementation stage, the second is to provide information for decisions and the third is to maintain a record of procedures as they occur." This stage, which includes the three strategies, occurs during the implementation stage of the curriculum development. It is a piloting process conducted to debug the program before districtwide implementation. From such evaluation, project decision makers obtain information they need to anticipate and overcome procedural difficulties and to make decisions (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1988, p. 345). Although the main purpose is to provide feedback on the extent of implementation, process evaluation can fulfill two other functions. They are 1) to provide information to external audiences who wish to learn about the program and 2) to assist program staff, evaluators, and administrators in interpreting program outcomes (Gredler, 1996).

2.4.1.4 Product Evaluation

The primary function of product evaluation is "to measure, interpret, and judge the attainments of a program" (Stufflebeam and Shinkfeld, 1985, p. 176). Product evaluation, therefore, should determine the extent to which identified needs were met, as well as

identify the broad effects of the program. The evaluation should document both intended and unintended effects and negative as well as positive outcomes (Gredler, 1996). The primary use of product evaluation is to determine whether a program should be continued, repeated and/or extended to other settings (Stufflebeam, 1980; Stufflebeam and Shinkfeld, 1985). However, it should also provide direction for modifying the program to better serve the needs of participants and to become more cost effective. Finally, product evaluation is an essential component of an "accountability report" (Stufflebeam and Shinkfeld, 1985, p. 178). At this stage, product evaluation helps evaluators to connect activities of the model to other stages of the whole change process (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1988). As a logical structure for designing each type of evaluation, Stufflebeam proposed that evaluators follow these steps:

A. Focusing the Evaluation

1. Identify the major level(s) of decision making to be served, for example, local, state or national

2. For each level of decision making, project the decision situations to be served and describe each one in terms of its locus, focus, critically, timing, and composition of alternatives.

3. Define criteria for each decision situation by specifying variables for measurement and standards for use in the judgment of alternatives.

4. Define policies within which the evaluator must operate.

B. Collection of Information

1. Specify the source of the information to be collected.

2. Specify the instruments and methods for collecting the needed

information

3.   Specify the sampling procedure to be employed.

4. Specify the conditions and schedule for information collection.

C. Organization of Information

1.Provide a format for the information that is to be collected.

2.Designate a means for performing the analysis.

D. Analysis of Information

1. Select the analytical procedures to be employed.

2. Designate a means for performing the analysis.

E. Reporting of Information

1. Define the audiences for the evaluation reports

2. Specify means for providing information to the audiences.

3. Specify the format for evaluation reports and/or reporting

sessions.

4. Schedule the reporting of information.

F. Administration of the Evaluation

1.Summarize the evaluation schedule.

2.Define staff and resource requirements and plans for meeting

these requirements.

3.Specify means for meeting policy requirements for conduct of

the evaluation.

4.Evaluate the potential of the evaluation design for providing

information that is valid, reliable, credible, timely, and

pervasive (i.e. will reach all relevant stakeholders).

5.Specify and schedule means for periodic updating of the

evaluation design.

6.Provide a budget for the total evaluation program.

(Stufflebeam, 1980, p. 100).

2.5 Review of CLM as intra-curricular program theories

SMP Muhammadiyah 4 Gresik tried to develop the potential of various field, one of them is the development of language, especially English. Generally, the English teaching and learning perceived less on target. This condition can be seen through the amount of students who lack confidence and to speak in English whereas their score in their report card is good. It is due to culture of learning in Indonesia that always identify that success of learning can be seen only from the quantitative score.

The English teaching since several ago still in the context of grammar,

reading, and to answer the exercise. In the time during 3 years of learning English in school, most of the students cannot speak English fluently so that is why school make Central Language Movement (CLM) as intra-curricular program as the alternative of joyful English learning, especially for speaking skill.

CLM or Central Language Movement is the school program of SMP Muhammadiyah 4 Giri that expected to make students have a better speaking skill. There are 3 supported components in the CLM, they are; English teacher, CLM staffs who choose by English teacher to guide the students to read, memorize, and practice the English conversation that written on CLM guidance's book every day before the regular class hours. At Wednesday, the teacher conducted the conversation program in the school yard; all of the students should repeat and memorize the dialogues that have already written in the CLM guidance's book that read by their English teacher or CLM staff. For the 9th grade students, delivering speech is a compulsory activity after pray dzuhur. The English competition, oral test, and written test are the other regular activities in CLM.

There are several schools that have English program which have same goal to make students' have a better speaking skill. These programs can be the review of CLM theories:

2.5.1 English Conversation Class

It is a special program in SMP Negeri 10 Malang that provides the students extra time and opportunities to speak English in daily and natural contexts in a comfortable environment. It is considered to be an intra-curricular program for the students. All the students are required to

participating in the program because it has same status as any other compulsory school subjects. The evaluation of students' performance is included in the students' report book. The intra-curricular program is conducted once a week and last for about 80 minutes for each meeting. (Rusdi, 2011:5).

2.5.2 Speaking Class

It is a special class that is only focused on the teaching speaking. This program is taught once a week and categorize as an intra-curricular program in SMAN 1 Lawang. The speaking class is taught within 90 minutes in each meeting. The main objective of this program is to teach the students to be able to speak English and to provide the student with the opportunities in practicing English communicatively and also to support the development of students' speaking proficiency. (Riefzky, 2011:3)

2.5.3 Let's Speak English

It is English program that conduct in SMA Negeri 1 Kepanjen. It is considered to be an intra-curricular program for the students. All the students are required to participate this program. It conducts every Friday with some activities, such as drama, song analysis, making a telephone call, and speech. The main goal of "Let's Speak English" is that make student have a better speaking skill through some fun activities. (Aini, 2012: 51)

2.6 Previous Study

In conducting this study, the researcher relates this study with the previous findings that conducted. To begin with, one of these studies was done by Rhodes and Torgunrud (1989) in Canada. The purpose of this study was to identify teacher and student needs relative to the implementation of new and revised curricula; determine the effectiveness of current publication and procedures in providing the support needed and identify means for improving them. The researcher benefitted reviews of the pertinent research, interviews with teachers and administrators as well as consultants responsible for curriculum implementation and consultant analyses. The findings of this study indicated that curriculum implementation supports publications and provisions were needed and widely used, but should be augmented and increased when the curriculum change was of a substantive nature or required marked changes in teacher knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and pedagogical practices.

Another evaluation study was carried out by Erdem (1999) who aimed to explore the effectiveness of English language curriculum at METU Foundation High School. Goals, organizations, operations and outcomes were the main aspects of the evaluation study. The researcher collected the data from teachers, students and school principals. Data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, observations and written curriculum documents. The results of the study revealed that the current teacher-centered curriculum should be replaced with a student-centered one. Besides, there is a need to improve in-service training and to set up an ongoing curriculum evaluation system.

Moreover, Erdoğan (2005) conducted a study to evaluate the English curriculum implemented at the 4th and 5th grade primary state schools through the views of the teachers and the students. The findings of the study showed that though the teachers at primary school regarded the objectives and the content consistent, they did not think it was effective. Besides, unless some revisions were made, such a curriculum was not applicable in their opinion. As for the students, they seemed to be happy learning English at 4th and 5th grade.

In the other way, this research, aims to describe the evaluation through the implementation of Central Language Movement as an intra-curricular program. In term of component investigated, this research focuses more on the evaluation use CIPP evaluation through the CLM program.