A Descriptive Study on Students' Speaking Ability in "Daily Conversation" Context at Higher Education

Nurlaela[1], Yuliana Mangendre[2]
[1] Universitas Tompotika Luwuk
Email: elachryzna@gmail.com
[2] Universitas Muhammadiyah Luwuk
Email: ymangendre@gamail.com

Abstract.
Speaking is one of English skill that has been learnt from junior high school until higher education. It means that students in higher education should have good capability in doing speaking in all contexts, include in daily conversation context. For this reason, this study was designed to determine the extent to which students' ability in speaking especially in daily conversation context. This study took 22 students in Educational Faculty of Tompotika Luwuk University as the participants. Descriptive qualitative is a method that chosen in this study. The data have been collected from observation and documentation. Observation and documentation collected when the students doing conversation. The result of this study shows that the students' speaking ability in daily conversation context can be categorized into "poor". It was proven by the students who got only 18,18% in good category, 22,72% in average category, 40,92% in poor category, and 18,2% in very poor category. Finally, it can be conclude that the students' speaking ability in daily conversation context at higher education of Educational Faculty of Tompotika Luwuk University categorized into poor.

Keywords: Students' speaking ability; Daily conversation context

A. INTRODUCTION

English is a subject that taught in Indonesian education system from junior high school until university. Considering English has been studied for a long time, students in higher education should have good ability in English, but the reality many students are unable to use English well, especially in speaking skills. They felt difficult in doing speaking well.

Speaking is one of complex skill in language which combines pronunciation, listening, gesture, and eyes contact. Due to it, (Bafadal, 2019) said that the complex skill in language that involves the knowledge of sounds, structures, vocabulary and culture subsystems of language called speaking. In teaching and learning process, speaking needs direct process to apply its skill like oral communication. Through that, the students are able to build and share their idea, then transfer it by public speaking. (Lucas & Stob, 2020) said that the way to express our idea is through public speaking. It is clear that; human can learn how to follow the social and cultural rules in their surroundings through speaking. In the other words, communication becomes useless without speaking. It because

of their idea in their mind cannot be communicated if the students have no ability in transfer it through speaking.

There are too many speaking context that can practiced by students. One of them is conversation.(Horton, 2017) argued that conversation is arguably the most fundamental means we have of interacting with others. Through conversation, people share information, form relationship, solve problems, and accomplish a multitude of everyday goals. Almost human in the worlds are always doing conversation with the others in their daily life. There is an interaction that occurred with two people or more in conversation. Moreover, (Tampubolon, 2019) opined that conversations are the deal form of communication in some respects, since they allow people with different views on a topic to learn from each other. Participants take turns talking, and the control of a conversation is negotiated by the parties involved.

Conversations classified into four types, namely debate, dialogue, discourse, and diatrive(Angel, 2017). Dialogue is one of conversation that always happens in human's daily life. It is related to (Geikhman, 2019) that pointed out "You speak differently when you're in a professional environment and when you're at a party everything from the location, social status and even age can change the way the conversation sounds". Explicitly, the context of conversation affected toward the ways of students' speaking. There are too many conversation contexts in dialogue form that practice by the students in English subject, such as politic, scientific topics, and also daily life. Daily life conversation context in dialogue form is one of conversation kind that often did by the students.

The students should have good abilty in speaking because it affected the fluency of conversation.(Mukmin, 2021) pointed that the students will be more freely in express their opinion in academic activities or in daily life when they increasing their speaking skill. In the other words, in doing speaking both of the speaker and listener should understand about speaking aspect. (Brown, 2004) argued that there are five main aspects to support speaking skills, namely fluency & coherence, lexical resource, grammatical range & accuracy, pronunciation. The conversation wil be running well if the speakers and listeners (students) understand about those aspects.

But the problem is almost students in higher education not understand about that speaking's aspects. So, they can not speaking English well although they have the basic of English from junior high school. This case also occurred toward students in educational faculty of Tompotika Luwuk University. Educational Faculty of Tompotika Luwuk University have implemented English subject in the curriculum as MKDU (Mata Kuliah Dasar Umum). There are English 1 and English II. The students cannot take English II if they did not pass English I. It means that they have more knowledge and skill about English when they take English II, include in speaking skill.

Based on this case, the researcher would like to analyze the students' speaking ability in daily conversation context at higher education of Educational Faculty of Tompotika Luwuk University.

B. METODHOLOGY

This study used descriptive method, because the researcher would like to describe students' speaking ability in daily conversation context. This study took 22 students in educational faculty of Tompotika Luwuk University in second semester which is consisting of mathematic, guidance &counseling, and civics department. Moreover, they have passed the English 1, and have enough basic to speak English.

There were observation and documentation (video record) as technique in collecting the data. Finally, the data that have been collected will be analyzed by using the research steps, which were preparing, coding, scoring, displaying, and categorizing. Category level of students' speaking ability in daily conversation context was started from 0 as low average and 100 as high average. I used the criterion in measuring students' speaking ability in daily conversation context by using absolute standard of speaking ability level category (Ilnawati, 2021). Here is the level category of students' speaking ability.

Table 1. Categories level of Students' speaking ability

No	Percentage	Categories
1	0-54%	Very Poor
2	55-64%	Poor
3	65-79%	Average
4	80-89%	Good
5	90-100%	Excellent

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Research Result

There are four kinds of daily conversation topics. They were hobbies, sports, holiday, and family. There are four groups, which is the first group consist of five students, second group consist of five students, third group consists of six students, and the last group consists of six students.

Here was one of the pictures when they doing conversation.

Figure 1. Students' performance conversation

Besides topic, there were the important aspects in this study. It is speaking assessment criteria. It is used for measure students' speaking ability in daily conversation context. It can be seen from the table below

Table 2. Speaking Assessment Criteria

No	Criteria	Mark
1	Fluency and Coherence	0-5
2	Lexical Resource	0-5
3	Grammatical Range and accuracy	0-5
4	Pronunciation	0-5
5	Interaction	0-5
6	Task Achievement	0-5

1. Fluency and coherence

Based on observation, it found 63,63% students' percentage of speaking ability in

daily conversation context. According to the percentage, it showed that students' speaking ability is bad because the students get poor categories. The percentage of these categories was about 54-64%.

Table 3. The students' mark in fluency and coherence criteria

No	Mark	Frequency	Percentage
1	5	-	-
2	4	8	8/22 x 100% = 36,36%
3	3	10	10/22 x 100% = 45,45%
4	2	4	4/22 x 100% = 18,18%
5	1	-	-
6	0	-	-
Total		22	100%

2. Lexical Resource

The students who had doing daily conversation, they got 50% on this criteria. This percentage is categorized into average. On my observation, I found that the students who doing daily conversation, when they express their idea they still searching the words and expressions. Moreover some of them just read the note.

Table 4. The students' mark in lexical resource

No	Mark	Frequency	Percentage
1	5	2	2/22 x 100% = 9,1%
2	4	9	9/22 x 100% = 40,90%
3	3	11	11/22 x100% = 50%
4	2	-	-
5	1	-	-
6	0	-	-
Total		22	100%

Based on the table above, it shows that there were no students got low score. So that's

why, the students categorized into average in this criterion.

3. Grammatical Range and accuracy

Based on the data, the percentage of this criteria is about 22,72% and 50%. Its percentage is categorized into poor and average. In the field, it showed that when the students doing daily conversation, grammatical errors always occurred.

Table 5. The students' mark in grammatical range and accuracy

No	Mark	Frequency	Percentage
1	5	3	3/22 x 100% = 13,63%
2	4	3	3/22 x 100% = 13,63%
3	3	11	11/22 x 100% = 50%
4	2	5	5/22 x 100% = 22,72%
5	1	-	-
6	0	-	-
Total		22	100%

4. Pronunciation

The percentage of this criteria is about 18,2%. This percentage is categorized into poor and very poor. Beside that, there was 63,63% in average categories. When the students are doing conversations, most of them did error articulation.

Table 6. The students' mark in pronunciation

No	Mark	Frequency	Percentage
1	5	-	-
2	4	4	4/22 x 100% = 18,18%
3	3	14	14/22 x 100% = 63,63%
4	2	2	2/22 x 100% = 9,1%
5	1	2	2/22 x 100% = 9,1%
6	0	-	-

Total	22	100%

5. Interaction

When the students are doing conversations, every speaker has to give response about what they hear to the speaker. The percentage of this criteria is about 40,90%. This percentage is categorized into poor. In this criteria, the students also get 13,63 % into poor and 4,54% into very poor categories.

Table 7. The students' mark in Interaction

No	Mark	Frequency	Percentage
1	5	1	1/22 x 100% = 4,54%
2	4	8	8/22 x 100% = 36,36%
3	3	9	9/22 x 100% = 40,90%
4	2	3	3/22 x 100% = 13,63%
5	1	1	1/22 x 100% = 4,54%
6	0	-	-
Total		22	100%

6. Task Achievement

The percentage of these criteria is about 59,1%. This percentage is categorized into average. It also showed that there was 22,72%, which is categorized into poor. To see the score or mark whose got by the students in doing conversation, it can be shown as follow

Table 8. The students' mark in Task Achievement

No	Mark	Frequency	Percentage
1	5	1	1/22 x 100% = 4,54%
2	4	3	8/22 x 100% = 13,63%
3	3	13	13/22 x 100% = 59,1%
4	2	5	5/22 x 100% = 22,72%

5	1	-	-
6	0	-	-
Total		22	100%

Based on the explanation above about the speaking assessment criteria, there is more specific explanation about the classification and intensities of students' speaking ability in daily conversation context.

Table 9. The classification and intensities of students' speaking ability in Daily Conversation Context

No	Mark	Frequency	Quantity	%
1	Very Poor	0 – 54%	4	18,2 %
2	Poor	54 – 64%	9	40,9 %
3	Average	65 – 79%	5	22,72 %
4	Good	80 – 89%	2	9,1%
5	Excellent	90 – 100%	2	9,1%
Total			22	100%

By calculating the score above, it can be conclude that the percentage of the students' ability in daily conversation context at educational faculty of Tompotika Luwuk University is categorized in to poor.

Discussion

The finding of this research showed that the students of Tompotika Luwuk University especially in Education Faculty have poor capability in speaking skill. This finding was supported by (Rukmaryadi, 2020) who found that the Non-English Department Students' Speaking Ability at Universitas Riau categories in fair/enough grade. It is because of the students got difficulties in understanding grammar, vocabulary, and also fluency. These results were different with the research which is conducted by (Harahap &

Rozimela, 2021) that found that the students of UMN Al-Wasiyah Medan possessed good grades in speaking, although they needed some improvements in vocabulary aspects.

Almost aspects of speaking were still difficult to understand by the students of Untika Luwuk. It can be seen from the speaking evaluation result of students who got low or poor ability in fluency criteria. That proved by the observation data that showed in poor criteria (63,63%). (Fulcher, 2007) stated that in measuring 'fluency' is from the speaker's fluent or not. Based on it, the researcher found that almost the students not fluently in doing speaking. Only some of the students spoke fluently in daily conversation context, even though they read book. The next criterion is lexical resource. This criterion was categorized in average (50%). As like explained previous, the students mostly used unsuitable words in doing conversation. Moreover, the grammatical and accuracy competence also categorized in poor criteria, which is in 22,72%. (Ilnawati, 2021) argued that accuracy is when the speakers are required to use grammar, vocabularies, and also pronunciation. The researcher found that there were some students that makes frequent error grammar, even there are some of the students always doing grammatical errors in doing daily conversation. Furthermore, most the students did many mistakes in pronunciation. It caused by they were too focus to the words that they will said, so they careless to its pronunciation. It can be proved that pronunciation is categorized into poor.

(Rai, 2010) states that pronunciation is an acceptable standard of the process of delivering a pronounced word or sentence; correct and clear pronunciation is very important to show that the speaker is very careful and has consideration for the listeners. The next criterion in assessing speaking is interaction. It is categorized in poor criteria. The last is assessment. In this section, task achievement also the students got poor categorized in their speaking ability in daily conversation context. Finally it can be conclude that the percentage of the students' ability in daily conversation context at educational faculty of Tompotika Luwuk University is categorized in to poor criteria.

D. CONCLUSION

Based on the description of the study result and discussion, it can be said that the speaking ability of higher students in Education Faculty of Tompotika Luwuk University is really far from the good average. It proven by the percentage result of Students' speaking ability in daily conversation context, namely 40,92% in Poor category. There are some factors that make them categorized in poor. First, they have no enough vocabulary to express their idea when doing daily conversation. Second, they feel not confidence. Some of them feel afraid and ashamed when perform their daily activities.

E. REFERENCE

Angel, D. (2017). *The Four Types of Conversations; Debate, Dialogue, Discourse, and Diatrive.*

https://medium.com/@DavidWAngel/the-four-types-of-conversations-debate-dialogue-discourse-and-diatribe-898d19eccc0a

Bafadal, M. F. (2019). The An Analysis of Students' Speaking Ability on Specific Purpose of Learning. *Linguistic and Language Teaching Journal*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.31764/leltj.v7i1.1013

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Longman.

Fulcher, G. (2007). *Language Testing and Assessment*. Routledge.

Geikhman, Y. (2019). *Don't Talk Like a Textbook: 8 Ways to Learn Real, Conversational English*. Fluent Fix Limited.

Harahap, Y. O., & Rozimela, Y. (2021). *An Analysis of Students' Speaking Ability in Speech at English Department of UMN Al-Washliyah Medan:* Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Languages and Arts (ICLA 2021), Padang, Indonesia. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211129.001

Horton, W. (2017). *Theories and Approaches to the Study of Conversation and Interactive Discourse*. Routledge.

Ilnawati. (2021). The Study Of The Students' Speaking Performance In Demonstrating Product Advertising. *Journal of English Education, Literature, and Linguistics*, *4*(1), 59–70.

Lucas, S., & Stob, P. (2020). *The art of public speaking* (Thirteenth edition). McGraw-Hill Education.

Mukmin, M. (2021). USING PICTURE STRIP STORY IN TEACHING SPEAKING SKILL. *JURNAL PENDIDIKAN GLASSER*, *5*(1), 45.

https://doi.org/10.32529/glasser.v5i1.896

Rai, U. (2010). *English Language Communication Skills*. Himalaya Publishing house PVT.LTD.

Rukmaryadi. (2020). AN ANALYSIS OF THE NON-ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT UNIVERSITAS RIAU. *International Journal of Educational Dynamics (IJEDs)*, *3*(1), 57–62.

Tampubolon, T. (2019). A Conversation Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in the Ellen DeGeneres's Talk Show with Malala Yousafzai. *Journal of Language Learning and Research (JOLLAR)*, *2*(1), 24–40. https://doi.org/10.22236/jollar.v2i1.3492