

SEKOLAH TINGGI KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN (STKIP) PGRI BANGKALAN PUSAT BAHASA

Jl. SoekarnoHatta No. 52 Telp/Fax. (031) 3092325 Bangkalan e-mail: admin@stkippgri-bkl.ac.id website: <u>www.stkippgri-bkl.ac.id</u>

SURAT KETERANGAN

Nomor: 021 /B11/PCx/III/2019

Yang bertandatangan di bawah ini

Nama : Arfiyan Ridwan, M.Pd NIDN : 0723078802 Jabatan : Kepala Pusat Bahasa

Menerangkan bahwa artikel di bawah ini:

Nama penulis	: Tera Athena
Judul artikel	: Students' Responses in Speaking: A Conversational Analysis in Intensive Course
Nama jurnal	: Jurnal Pendidikan
Volume / nomor	: Vol. 7, No. 1 (2015)

Telah diperiksa tingkat plagiasinya dengan menggunakan program *plagiarism Checker X pro* dengan hasil yang dilampirkan bersama suratini.

Demikian surat keterangan ini dibuat dan digunakan sebagaimana mestinya.

Bangkalan 2 April 2019 epala Pusat Bahasa iyan Ridwan, M.Pd NIDN 0723078802



Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report

Similarity Found: 10%

Date: Senin, Mei 07, 2018 Statistics: 285 words Plagiarized / 2740 Total words Remarks: Low Plagiarism Detected - Your Document needs Optional Improvement.

36 SUDE' REPONSSPECONVEIONAL ANALYSIS IN INTENSIVE COURSE Tera Athena Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris STKIP PGRI Bangkalan athenatera@yahoo.com Abstract: This exned the responses speaking hrough a conversational analysis, in which it was meaningful for the lecturer to prepare the proper speaking material in the next period.

The subjects of the research are the students of the first semester in English Department STKIP PGRI Bangkalan which were covered in Intensive Course (IC) class. Intensive Course is the English curriculum for the first semester consists of the integrated skill those are listening, speaking, reading and writing. The aim of this subject is as an ice breaketo repa stu, re ess for the following semester.

The focus of the research only took the empirical data from the speaking performance or interaction of students. And then, the data analyzed descriptively using a conversational analysis. Our result suggests that there was an opportunity to investigate communicative style of students.

Key Words: conversational analysis, Ssponse, speakin Abstrak:Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mengetahui respon mahasiswa pada perkuliahan speaking melalui analisis conversation. Hal ini diperlukan dosen untuk memberikan persiapan lebih diwaktu mengajar perkuliahan speaking. Subjek pada penelitian ini merupakan mahasiswa semester 1 pada kelas Intensive Course.

Intensive Course merupaka kurikulum baru yang mengharapkan mahasiswa lebih siap dalam menghadapi mata kuliah semester berikutnya. Sehingga hasil dari <mark>penelitian ini</mark> <mark>dapat</mark> membuat dosen lebih siap memberikan materi kepada mahasiswa dan mahasiswa tersebut juga lebih siap menghadapai materi pada semester berikutnya Introduction In understanding and learning a se- cond language are more difficult than learning our first language.

It happens because the second language has differrent system that must be understood by the second language lear-ners. The differences consist of spelling, pronunciation, grammar and also cultu- ral background. Acquiring good listen- ing and speaking skills in English is the main concern of many second and foreign (Miller, 2005: IX) learners, and toda gliteach lectur needs to be well versed in current approaches to the teaching of oral skill.

In elshers haw?s(2003) - ment that the purpose of Learning Engliis methe arnersneto get knowledge and to communicate 37 Sdts'RonnSeag nrsananlysis In Intensive Course, Tera Athena with everyone in the global commu- nity. Regarding with the English learners, in the first semester of STKIP PGRI Students, especially English Department, the have been taught a new curriculum since three years ego. It is called IC, Intensive Course which the students must learn the integrated skills in every meeting.

The aim of this program to the readi - ness in learning English. Based on the lecturerevin he etest, lecturers found that most of the stu- dent?s knoge f gliskil is still varied. So, the lecturer must focus on the drilling and practicing the integ-rated skill.

One of the main po- ints of the drilling and practicing is the students speaking ability. Speaking is a crucial part of second language lear- ning and teaching. According to Nunan (2003) the purpose of teaching spea- king to ESL Learners are (1) Produce the English speech sounds and sounds patterns (2) Use word and sentences stress, intonation patterns and the rhythm of the second language (3) Select appropriate words and sentences according to the proper social setting, audience, situation and subject matter (4) Organize their thoughts in a meaningful and logical sequences (5) Use language as a me-ans of expressing values and judg-ments (6) Use the language quickly and confidently with few unnatural pauses, which is called as fluency.

Literature Review As cook in Olshtain, Murcia (2000; 164) quoted that spoken langu- age as has often been pointed out, happens in time, and must therefore be produced proed li There is no going back and changing or restructuring our words as there is in writing; there is often no time to pause and think, and while we are talking our listening, we cannot stand back and view the discourse in spatial or diag- rammc .".

thiterm, people whether in a tempo-rary or more permanent transition to a new culture, need to make themselves understood in another language. They need to be able to speak that language. Using English as a spoken English needs some ele- ments that

must be understood by the second language users. The elements 38 Jurnal Pendidikan Volume 7, Nomor 1, Juni 2015, hlm 36 - 43 are the socio cultural, the contextual, and the per-sonal features.

We need to consider those elements in order our idea or our aims of what we said are unders-tood by the listeners. The Mismatches and Misunder- standing in Oral Communication can be a Result of any of the Following problems or Conditions a. The speaker does not have full com- mand of the target linguistics know- ledge and produces an unacceptable or even unintelligible form (it could be unacceptable or unintelligible in terms of phonology, grammar or lexical choice). b.

The necessary background know- ledge (content, propositions) is not shared by the speaker and the hearer, and they bring a different set of expectations to the spoken interact-tion. c. The speaker and the hearer do not share socio cultural rules of appropriacy, and therefore the speaker may have violated such a rule from the ?s view to prag-matic transfer from the first language (Olshtain, M. 2000 : 165) In producing spoken communi- cation, we need consider those items in order we do not get misinterpret-tation.

It means we do not need just consider the fluency but also the grammatical itself. Such as : Tver : "Here taxi w From the example, we are as a customer will think to catch and under- stand what the driver means. Another unclear utterance happens if we do not conform to rules of social appropriate Host: (Holding a pot of coffee) would you like a cup of coffee? Guest : I care (could "do not mind if I do, which is posive, itcould "P don?t or me", which might be nega-tive or at least polite declina-tion).

Based on those example, the host is y knowwhat does. It can be concluded that the host just puts the pot without pouring the coffeintto guestcup. cases noted that the speaker to be able to produce utterances, that commu- nicate his intended message needs some considerations such as making propositional identification, physical context, shared world knowledge, and socio cultural norms.

39 Sdts'RonnSea ng: A Conversational Analysis In Intensive Course, Tera Athena Choosing The Linguistics Features In Producing spoken discourse spea- kers use their grammatical compe-tence in order to produce linguistically acceptable utterances in the target in order to produce linguistically accep- table utterances in the target language. Based on level in Olshtain, M (2000 : 161) Stated that there are three factors in speech production: demand, arousal, and feedback.

Demand refers to the amount of processing required by a task. This is particularly

evident in foreign or second language interaction take for examples: Tourist : "o ckets K please. Clerk :(hands over the tickets and points in the direction of the tracks) track three! Tourist : What time is the next train? Clerk : Tk Tourist :And the one after that? Clerk : Hmmm.... racthree, please! We can analysis that the repetition words ack ee". eans cl cannot give the tourist further infor- mation?s.

secotual is ar ousal, refers the emotional and cognitive response to a task and relates to the importance that the individual attaches to the commu- nicative interacttion. It can be shown in the previous example, the Clerk felt that he actually had given a complete information. So for the tourist last question, he did not give additional answer or additional information.

The leveltthifisfe the speaker receives from the liste- ner(s) or the wider environment affecting the performance. We can see in the example that the tourist made an additional feedback by requesting the last question in order he could make clear information from the clerk. Methods of Study This study involves a number of students of English Department in the first semester who have been given IC materials.

In STKIP PGRI Bangkalan specially English Department has adap- ted integrated skills inform of IC curriculum. The students are taught 18 credits which consist of speaking, writing, reading, vocabulary and liste- ning skills. The total number of the subjects is seven students of 65 stu dents and they were chosen by using random sampling.

40 Jurnal Pendidikan Volume 7, Nomor 1, Juni 2015, hlm 36 - 43 In conducting this study, the resear- cher did some steps as the procedure as follows: Idfg students? conversation in speaking class (2) Reviewing the content of the simple conversation into the theory (3) and Anal r the simple conversation. Concerning with the previous perspective, it was analyzed some students responses in the form of conversation between students in pairs.

The conver- sational analysis has been done des- criptively as a way to find the kind of discourse students?spg rfor - mance that includes three units (Mc Carthy, 1991:119). Pairs of utterances in talk are often mutually dependent; a most devious example is that a question predicts an answer, and that answer presupposes a question.

It is possible to state the re- quirements, in a normal conversational sequence, for many types of utterances, in terms of what is expected as a res- ponse and what certain responses pre- suppose. Some example might be: Utterance Function: Expected Response Greeting : greeting Congratulation: thanks Apology: acceptance Inform : acknowledge Leave-taking: Leave-taking From students?pce, there are some first pairs

utterance that different in the second utterance.

Leni : Can I get a seat? Budi : Yes, this is for you Leni : Thank you Budi : Yes.... S e Tina : Dewi, s my - day card invitation. Dewi : How nice it is Tina : Yes, absolutely. Btw, can you come to my party? Dewi : ... Let me check my schedule. I worry I have another Program Tina : Alright Fitri : Hi... good evening Desy : O h...Hi... what are you do- ing here? Fitri : I just want to buy a comic.

In r amplof per - formance, <mark>it can be</mark> seen that the first 41 Sdts'RonnSeag nrsananlysis nItenCorse,TeraAen pair utterance has same response in the second utterance. Shinta : Can <mark>I borrow your</mark> hand book? I have many duties from my lecturer. Dhany : eallthat?s You come to my home and borrow My book as you like Shinta : You?re ry kind.

Thank you Dhany : You?re w elcome Ahmad : Hi... an, good morning Firda : Oh Hi... good morning Ahmad : Ikbal : Sorry, I have to leave now Yayan : that?s I understand Ikbal : Bye Yayan : Bye Based on the Birmingham model, this model of analysis is certainly not the only valid approach to analyzing discourse, but it is a relatively simple and powerful model which has con- nections with the study of speech acts.

Sinclair and counlthard in McCarthy (1991 : 12) stated that in the language of traditional nativespeaker school classrooms a rigid pattern, where tea- chers and pupils spoke according to very fixed perceptions of their roles and where the talk could be seen to conform to highly structured sequ- ences. Here, the lecturer gave follow up by saying and so the students did not have big range of opportunity to take other than the responding roles so the students only had little opportunities to speak up. Here are the following examples : The lecturer : Ok, Danny introduce your name Danny : My name is Muha- mmad Wahyu Maula- dani.

You can call Me danny The lecturer : Oh, next. Mita, you can ask the y?s hobby. Mita : Ok, Danny, what is your hobby? The lecturer : ... etc Shinta : Ok, can I help you? Bonita : Hmm Lecturer : Bonita, you can ask her about much the bag is" Bonita : Oh.. yes. How much is the bag, Sa? Those examples are common happen in the classroom activity.

The lecturer, stimulate the students to ask more questions while they are having conversation. This exchange can be done in classroom because the lectu-rer always encourages the students to be brave in conversation. But, actu-ally this stimulation did not make the students to think creatively to find vary 42 Jurnal Pendidikan Volume 7, Nomor 1, Juni 2015, hlm 36 - 43 sentences or questions as the responses in their conversation. They only focu- sed on what the lecturer gave them.

Another exchange can be done by the students outside the class. In the field, they felt so free to practice their speaking although they cannot translate or understand what the pair said. Here are the examples: Mina : Hi, Susan. Which clothes do you like? Susan : Owh, I like the red one Mina : Hmm...reall ? So, why do you like it? Susan : Becc Fina : Long time no see?! Where did you go? Andre : yes .

I have been Jogjakarta for a week Fina : Great...Hmmyou there alone? Andre : For the example above, the stu- dents tried to encourage themselves to create some question although they were thingking what will be asked. They used latter kind, such as really? Great..., you.... I them used to give them time to think. This model can make the students fell so free to explore their ideas without thinking about the correction of the lecturer.

In conversation, some students or participants try to organize themselves to take turn at talk. Turn taking here happens smoothly, with only little o- verlap and interruption, and only very brief silences between turns (Mc Carthy, 1991 : 127). Naturally, when someone is talking, listeners are atten- tive to make completeness or otherwise of spe?s butiand clues in the pitch level that may indicate that a turn is coming.

The aim a self as the element if turn taking feature is the way speakers predict one another?s e rances and often com- plete them for them, or overlap with them as they complete. It can be shown that bet-ween the speakers will give additional clues by little interrupting just making move understanding about the topic that. They are talking about. Based on the observation, there are turns taking occurred in some students conver-sation.

Here, the students made group that consisted of 4 students. They were given a free topic to be discussed. I have noticed turn taking in one group, that is: Anita : Guys, I have some-thing that I love so much 43 Sdts'RonnSeag nrsananlysis nItenCorse,TeraAen Vita : What is that? Hendra : Mmmm yes what is that? Anita : It must be a boy Danny :Yes, I think so, she is searching a boy that tall and smart Hendra : Caring of herself.

How romantic is he!! Anita : How do you guys??? Vita : Yeach, we have a spy Hendra : Hihihi, the spy is you! Anita : What!! What do you mean? Danny :We found your book Hendra : And read it. We knew what did you think about boy. That is a simple turn taking that occurrin studendiscussi Actually, turn taking is not always occurred, in the classroom activity, makeover the nts? - tion.

This is influence of the culture itself. It means that, some lecturers for bit the students to

make turn taking (interruption) when other students say something. Conclusion and SuggessTion Concerning the data that has been gotten, it can be concluded that in the IC class-specially in speaking class the students who practiced their short conversation did some discourses that are formed in adjacency pairs, excha- nge and turn taking.

They tried to be active and they felt free to express and explore their words. In the first semester, the students need to speak up so they learn how to produce the words and built a feedback when another speaker says something. So, the suggestions are dedicated to the students in speaking class that they have to be able to encourage themsel- ves and also the lecturers must be able to be the negotiator to develop the conversations. It can make the students are more ready to face following semester specially speaking class. References Flowerdew, J.,

and Miller, L. 2005. Second Language Listening : Theory and practice Cambridge, UK Cambridge University Press. Olshtain, Murcia. 2000. Discourse and context in language Tea-ching a Guide for Language Teachers. Cambridge Univer-sity Press. McCarthy M, 1991. Discourse Analysis for Language Teach-ers. Cambridge University Press. Litosseliti, L. 2010. Research Meth-ods in Linguistics. Continuum International Publishing Group.

INTERNET SOURCES:

0% - Empty

- 1% https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Template:N
- 0% https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ
- 0% https://docs.google.com/document/d/1968A
- 0% http://www.bangladeshsociology.org/BEJS%
- 0% http://www.ijsr.net/archive/v6i1/ART2016
- 0% https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cultu
- 0% https://www.kopertis7.go.id/jurnal_lengk
- 0% http://imadiklus.com/model-kecakapan-hid
- 1% http://journalpro.ru/articles/the-import
- 0% https://www.scribd.com/document/34413270
- 0% https://www.unicef.org/education/files/C
- 0% http://libsysdigi.library.illinois.edu/O
- 0% http://digital.lib.usf.edu/SFS0026090/00
- 1% http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/10393/5/bab2
- 0% https://www.scribd.com/document/27359446
- 1% http://teachingenglishlanguage.blogspot.

0% - https://es.scribd.com/document/59489945/ 0% - https://es.scribd.com/document/305061207 0% - https://wenku.baidu.com/view/9223f82b316 0% - https://www.scribd.com/document/18320656 0% - https://vdocuments.site/documents/respir 0% - https://vdocuments.mx/documents/rush-the 0% - https://www.scribd.com/document/93738506 0% - https://www.scribd.com/document/25371814 0% - http://universaldomainexchange.com/thisw 0% - https://vdocuments.site/philosophy-of-la 0% - http://www.iier.org.au/iier27/shih.html 0% - http://beta.diva-portal.org/smash/get/di 0% - http://www.readbag.com/faculty-ksu-sa-76 1% - https://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/department 0% - https://www.womansdivorce.com/modify-div 0% - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Donal 0% - http://ict4lt.org/en/en_mod3-2.htm 0% - http://www.sfsu.edu/~bulletin/previous b 0% - https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/ar 0% - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sigmund_Fr 1% - http://mybiggestideas.blogspot.com/ 0% - https://www.scribd.com/document/30584982 0% - http://www.tinact.ro/detaliu-calendar/ID 0% - http://www1.cs.columbia.edu/~hgs/papers/ 0% - https://es.scribd.com/document/260905271 0% - https://www.edge.org/responses/what-is-y 0% - https://study.com/academy/lesson/how-the 0% - http://arlingsapri.blogspot.com/2014/02/ 0% - https://indico.tifr.res.in/indico/catego 0% - https://business.ucf.edu/centers-institu 0% - https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/ 0% - https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/te 0% - https://nature.berkeley.edu/ucce50/ag-la 0% - https://vdocuments.mx/documents/the-repu 0% - http://www.academia.edu/1108090/Conversi 0% - https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mad 0% - https://www.scribd.com/document/17182967 0% - https://bmcnurs.biomedcentral.com/articl 0% - https://ieatbugsforbreakfast.wordpress.c 0% - https://www.scribd.com/document/29233829

- 1% http://lib5.leeds.ac.uk/rlists/broker/in
- 0% https://www.scribd.com/document/25923469