

## **STUDENT SPEAKING PERFORMANCE IN DIALOGUE BY USING REALIA: AN ANALYSIS OF MEANING NEGOTIATION**

**Budi Kadaryanto, Dian Pratiwi**

FKIP Unila, Jl. Prof. Dr. Sumantri Brojonegoro No. 1 Bandarlampung

*e-mail:* kadaryanto@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

**Abstract: Student Speaking Performance in Dialogue by Using Realia: An Analysis of Meaning Negotiation.** The objectives of this research are to determine the types of negotiation of meaning, to investigate which components of negotiation of meaning, to find out the difficulties the students encounter, and to know the students' speaking performance. The subject of the research was XI Social 4 class of SMAN 1 Kalianda consisting of 37 students. The researcher used classroom observation, recording, and interview. The treatment was conducted in one time by using realia. The result of the research showed that all types in negotiation of meaning were used by the students in their conversation. The highest frequency was CCR occurring 15 times and the lowest was CCC occurring 1 time. The difficulties faced by the students were pronunciation, fluency, comprehensibility, vocabulary, and grammar. The students speaking performance's average score was at 60-69.

**Keywords:** dialogue, negotiation of meaning, realia, speaking performance

**Abstrak: Kemampuan Siswa dalam Dialog yang Menggunakan Realia: Sebuah Analisis Negosiasi Makna.** Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah menemukan jenis negosiasi makna, menyelidiki komponen apa saja dalam negosiasi makna, menemukan kesulitan siswa hadapi saat berbicara, serta mengetahui kinerja siswa saat berbicara. Subyek penelitian ini adalah kelas XI Sosial 4 SMAN 1 Kalianda yang terdiri dari 37 siswa. Peneliti menggunakan observasi kelas, rekaman, dan wawancara. Pengamatan ini dilakukan hanya dalam satu waktu dengan menggunakan realia. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa semua jenis dari negosiasi makna yang digunakan oleh siswa dalam percakapan mereka. Frekuensi tertinggi adalah CCR dalam 15 kali dan terendah adalah CCC dalam 1 kali. Kesulitan siswa dalam dialog adalah pengucapan, kelancaran, pemahaman, kosakata, dan tata bahasa. Nilai rata-rata berbicara siswa adalah pada 60-69.

### **INTRODUCTION**

English serves as lingua franca in many parts of the world. As Harmer states that lingua franca is a language widely adopted for communication between two speakers whose native languages are different from each other's and where one or both are using it as a second language (Harmer, 2003).

The objectives of English teaching cover the four language skills i.e listening, speaking, writing, and reading through the mastery of the language components such as vocabulary,

grammar, and pronunciation. Later, the skills should be taught better to master and completed about English itself because each skill has general or specific function in communication. One of the skills that has to be mastered well by the students is speaking because it is seen as the most crucial skill to be mastered by the students. As according to Setiyadi (2006: 61), speaking ability is the most difficult phase of a foreign language to teach and acquire. We could not deny that speaking is the most important one for asking information and conversely for delivering

information, speaking is the direct system of communication. Speaking is the main skill in communication (Welty: 1976).

Based on the researcher's PPL experience in SMA N 2 Punduh Pedada, there were many students' problems in Speaking English. In practicing dialogue, students found some difficulties if they were asked by the teacher to come in front of the class. The problems in speaking were caused by a number of factors such as limited number of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and fluency. In student's speaking performance, they tried to express their ideas in different way. Some of them tried to keep their interlocutor understand about the conversation. They used mimic, body language, or sentences as the feed back to their interlocutor like saying "what", "pardon", "emmm" in the conversation. The way the students made to avoid misunderstanding are examples of negotiation of meaning in speaking.

Negotiation of meaning is regarded to be more effective in order to avoid misunderstanding in the interaction. Negotiation of meaning also functioned as an indication of communication pursuit. The more participants negotiate, the more interaction occurs. It occurs when 2 or more participants involve in oral interaction and they find a potential for the communication breakdown.

The researcher considers that while the students were speaking in front of the class, they had their own style in expressing what they wanted to say to the interlocutors. It is seen as an effort to keep the conversation in one direction so the listeners could understand what the speaker has said before. There are many components of negotiation of meaning that could appear during process of interaction.

In addition, the learning material and teacher's media have an important role in teaching speaking. If the teaching media are not clear, the students can not understand the material given by the teacher. It would be easy for the students to learn the course by seeing the object directly. The shape, form, taste,

smell, and color of something can be known by them. That's why the researcher chooses realia (real object) as the media of teaching speaking.

In the TEFL classroom, realia is defined as objects and teaching props from the world outside the classroom that are used for teaching and learning (Nunan, 1999). Furthermore, realia is everyday object that surround us by language which the students could use to communicate in the classroom. For example, the teacher could ask the students describing about the realia in their own words to see how far the student's speaking ability.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher was interested to analyze the student's speaking performance in dialogue by using realia based on negotiation of meaning study.

## **METHOD**

This research was intended to find out the types of negotiation of meaning used by the student and to find out which component that mostly used and least used by the students in performing dialogue by using realia, to find out the difficulties that students encounter while speaking by using realia, and also to know the students' speaking performance in dialogue by using realia. This research design was qualitative-quantitative research by using classroom observation, recording, and interview to gain the data.

The population of this research was the second grade students at SMA N 1 Kalianda in the academic year of 2012/2013. The researcher used one class at the second year of SMAN 1 Kalianda, which is class XI Social 4 in academic year 2012/2013 as the sample.

Speaking test was applied as the research instrument. Speaking test aimed to see the negotiation of the meaning used by the students. The Scoring system was an oral ability scale proposed by Heaton (1991).

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After having the transcription of the students's speaking test in written form, the data was analyzed by negotiation of meaning by Pica's study. According to Pica in Yufrizal (2001: 94), negotiation of meaning is a series of exchanges conducted by addressers and addressees to help themselves understand and be understood by their interlocutors. In this case, when the sneakers are involved in an interaction, both of them work together to solve any potential misunderstanding that might happens, by checking each other's' comprehension, requesting clarification and confirmation, and by repairing and adjusting speech.

In order to analyze what components in negotiation of meaning and also the component that mostly used and less used by the student in their conversation, the researcher have transcribed the students' conversation. The change from oral conversation into written conversation aimed to make the analysis easier. All components in negotiation of meaning were used by the students in their conversation. The process of students' conversation was spontaneously and naturally happened. All groups of the student did conversation in front of the class. Most of them seem got difficulties to understand each other because of some misunderstandings. To overcome the obstacles, they used negotiation of meaning.

After having the transcription of students' dialogue, the researcher coded the sentences which took part in Negotiation of Meaning's component. In the students dialogue, all types of negotiation of meaning were used by the

students. The frequency and the percentage are *trigger* 5 items (10.41%), *confirmation check through repetition* 15 items (31.25%), *confirmation check through modification* 4 items (8.33%), *confirmation check through completion* 1 item (2.09%), *clarification of request* 2 items (4.17%), *response self-repetition* 2 items (4.17%), *response other-repetition* 3 items (6.25%), *response self-modification* 5 items (10.41%), *response other-modification* 2 items (4.17%), *confirm or negate response* 7 items (14.58%), and *follow-up* 2 items (4.17%).

The existence of each component of negotiation of meaning in the students' dialogue showed that the students faced some problems in expressing their idea to the interlocutor so they tried to complete, confirm, and revise what the speaker said to the listener. During the conversation, the more the problem the speaker has in expressing idea to the listener, the more negotiation of meaning used by the speaker. Negotiation of meaning is used by the speaker to deliver the idea clearly to the listener in order to avoid misunderstanding in the conversation. The students faced different problem in the dialogue. It could be different obstacle from one person to the others that caused different component of negotiation of meaning that they used. The component of negotiation of the meaning that the students used depended on the situation in the dialogue. It could be the theme, condition, time, the realia itself as the media, etc.

The researcher calculated the amount of each component of negotiation of meaning. In order to make it easier to analyze, the researcher wrote the frequency and the percentage into a table below.

**Table 1 Frequency and Percentage of Negotiation of Meaning's Components.**

No	Component of Negotiation of Meaning	Frequency	Percentage
1	Trigger (T)	5	10.41 %
2	Confirmation Check through Repetition (CCR)	15	31.25 %
3	Confirmation Check through modification (CCM)	4	8.33%
4	Confirmation Check trough	1	2.09 %

Completion (CCC)			
5	Clarification of Request (CR)	2	4.17 %
6	Response Self-Repetition (RSP)	2	4.17 %
7	Response Other-Repetition (ROP)	3	6.25 %
8	Response Self-Modification (RSM)	5	10.41 %
9	Response Other-modification (ROM)	2	4.17 %
10	Confirm or Negate Response (RN)	7	14.58 %
11	Follow-up	2	4.17 %
	Total	48	100 %

Based on the finding, the students commonly used CCR in their conversation. It occurred when the students got difficulties in understanding conversation so that the other tried to confirm what their partner had said. In CCR, the students as the interlocutor repeated all or parts of the speaker's utterance. The total number of CCR was 15 items (31.25 %). In the other hand, CCC was the less used component in the students' conversation. The total number of CCC was 1 item (2.09 %).

CCR was mostly used by the students because when a student as the speaker got stuck on the conversation, he/she was helped by the listener's inquiry sentence. If the student as the speaker did not know what to say in the next, he/she could only repeat what the listener said as the CCR. In contrast, CCC became the least used negotiation of meaning's component in students' dialogue because as the listener, it was difficult to guess the speaker's mind by completing or elaborating it into the same direction between the speaker and the listener. To complete and elaborate the speaker's sentence, it needed more vocabulary mastering from the listener.

In the conversation, the students got some difficulties to deliver their idea to the interlocutor. The researcher tried to analyze the difficulties of the students while speaking in front of the class by using realia based on the researcher's classroom observation and the students' interview. Based on the researcher's classroom observation and also field notes, many problems occurred in the students' speaking performance such as pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, grammar, and comprehensibility. The students felt so nervous when the researcher asked them to

come and speak in front of class with the partner. It happened because the student had not any preparation about the material. The student's conversation was spontaneously created. They had misunderstanding about the idea of the conversation. The results showed that from total 16 groups, all groups had difficulty in vocabulary. They had limited vocabulary in the dialogue so they could not mention the name of something in delivering their idea. 14 groups had difficulty in grammar so the sentences that they used were ungrammatical. Only a few of students were good in mastering grammar. 8 groups had difficulty in fluency; they still had some pauses in the dialogue. 4 groups had difficulty in pronunciation and it caused the sentences that they produced were not clear. 2 groups had difficulty in comprehensibility so the interlocutor had to confirm what the speaker said.

The researcher's classroom observation and field notes were supported by the result of the students' interview. It also showed that most of the students were difficult to speak English. They had limited English vocabulary. Sometimes the students knew the name of things in Indonesian but not in English. Difficulty in expressing their idea was became their problem too. They still had a mindset to translate the Indonesian words in their mind before it was spoken to the interlocutor. Some students felt that it was difficult to speak English because the material which had been given by the researcher was spontaneously conducted without any preparation before. The students hadn't understood about the grammar that they

would use in the conversation was depended on the situation.

The result of interview also showed the same case to the explanation above. From 33 participant students, there were only 3 students whodid not have any problem in their speaking performance in dialogue by using realia because it was not difficult to use the English vocabulary according to the dialogue. In contrast, there were 30 students who said that they found some difficulties in performing dialogue by using realia in front of the class. The limited vocabulary became the biggest problem faced by the students besides difficulty in expression (mimic). They thought that it was difficult because they did not have any preparation in speaking test wiyhout having a written conversation first before came in front of the class. It would be more difficult in translating Indonesian into English. For the next, the students needed to train their speaking ability by practicing more and more to speak English fluently and they

had to study about the grammar and add English vocabularies.

The result of interview also showed the same case to the explanation above. From 33 students, there were only 3 students who did not have any problem in their speaking performance in dialogue. It was not difficult to use the English vocabulary according to the dialogue. In contrast, there were 30 students who said that they found some difficulties in performing dialogue in front of the class. The limited vocabulary became the biggest problem faced by the students besides difficulty in expression (mimic). They thought that it was difficult because they did not have any preparation in speaking test without having a written conversation first before came in front of the class.

Each of student performances was scored by both of the researcher and the English teacher. The scoring system was proposed by the oral scale ability by Heaton.

**Table 2 Students' Performance Score**

<b>Students' Total Score</b>	<b>Number of students</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
80-89	-	-
70-79	2	6.06 %
60-69	29	87.88 %
50-59	2	6,06 %
40-49	-	-
30-39	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>33 Students</b>	<b>100%</b>

The students who had 70-79 score were 2 students (6.06 %), 60-69 score were 29 students (87.88 %), 50-59 score were 2 students (6.06 %), and the average score was at 60-69.

The students who had 70-79 score had criteria; 1.) Pronunciation was slightly influenced by mother tongue and most utterances were correct. 2.) In fluency, they had to make an effort at time to search for words. Nevertheless smooth very delivery on the whole and only a few unnatural pauses. 3.) In comprehensibility, the speaker's intention in general meaning was fairly clear.

A few interruptions by other for sake of clarification were necessary.

The criteria of the students who had 60-69 score were; 1.) Pronunciation was still moderately influenced by the mother tongue but no serious phonological errors. 2.) In fluency, although she or he had made an effort and searched for words, there were not too many unnatural pauses. 3.) In comprehensibility, most of the speakers' utterance was easy to be followed. His/her intention was always clear but several interruptions were necessary to help him to convey the message or to see the clarification.

The students who had 50-59 score had criteria: 1.) Pronunciation was influenced by the mother tongue but only a few serious phonological errors. 2.) In fluency, she/he had to make an effort for much of the time; Often gap to search for the desired meaning rather halting delivery and fragmentary. 3.) In comprehensibility, the other could understand a lot of what was said but they should constantly seek the clarification. She/he could not understand many of the speaker's more complex or longer sentences.

The difference of students' score was caused by many factors, for example students' grammar mastering, limited vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and their comprehensibility in speaking. In addition, the students who had a good score even excellent score were also helped by the media in creating a dialogue because the realia that they used was familiar in daily life. So they knew the name, could describe, and could mention the uses of it and the dialogue was good. In other hand, the students who had bad score could not make a smooth dialogue because they were stuck on the vocabulary and could not develop the dialogue well.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the result and discussions of this research, the researcher has concluded several points as follow:

1. All components in negotiation of meaning: *trigger, confirmation check through repetition, confirmation check through modification, confirmation check through completion, clarification of request, response self-repetition, response other-repetition, response self-modification, response other-modification, confirm or negate response, and follow-up* are used by the students in their conversation.
2. The highest frequency of negotiation of meaning's component used by the students is Confirmation Check through

Repetition (CCR) in 15 times. The less used component is Confirmation Check through Completion (CCC) in 1 time.

3. In the conversation most of students have difficulties in speaking English. Limited vocabulary and grammar become the biggest problem that they encounter while they are speaking English.
4. Most of the students' speaking score is at 60-69.29 students (87.88 %) get score 60-69, 2 students (6.06 %) get score 70-79, 2 students (6.06 %) get score 50-59.

## REFERENCES

- Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Malaysia: Longman Group.
- Heaton, J. B. 1991. *Writing English Language Tests*. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Nunan, D. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Setiyadi, B. Ag. 2006. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Welty, D. A. and Dorothy, R.W. 1976. *The Teacher Aids in The Instruction Team*. New York: Mc.Grew Hill.
- Yufrizal, H. 2001. *Language Acquisition. Student Text Book*: Lampung University