

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents findings and discussion of students' communication strategies with different levels of communication apprehension in English Education department of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. This chapter is divided into two sections. Part one presented about students' communication apprehension levels as for the result of PRCA-24 questionnaires and about the result of class observations. Part two discussed findings from research questions about students' communication strategies with different levels of communication apprehension in English Education department of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin.

A. Findings

Based on the result of PRCA-24 questionnaires and class observations to the subjects of the study, the researcher presents the findings of the study. The findings of the study are divided onto two findings..

1. Students' Communication Apprehension Level

Using PRCA-24 questionnaires as the instrument, the researcher got the results of students' communication apprehension level as follows:

a. Students with high communication apprehension level

Table 2		
High Communication Apprehension level		
No	Subject	Point
01	N.M	84

02	A	84
03	N.L	84
04	R.A	85
05	F.A.S	84
06	R	88
07	M.D	87
08	F	90
09	M.M.A	85
10	M.R	86
11	M.I.K	88
12	E.S	89
13	S.M	88
14	H.M.S	89
15	M	84
16	W	86
17	J.P	87

Table 2 shows the result of students with high level of communication apprehension. The total students of this level is seventeen (17) students with the point range about 84-90.

b. Students with low communication apprehension level

Table 3		
Low Communication Apprehension Level		
No.	Subject	Point
01	J.P.H	54
02	M.I	43
03	S.M	55
04	M.A.A	49
05	R.M.A	54
06	M.Z.M	54
07	R.H	51
08	F.A	47
09	R.M.Y	54
10	M.A.P	54
11	Z	51
12	E.E.S	54
13	G.H.N.A	52
14	K	53
15	L.M	54
16	C.M.M	53

Table 3 shows the result of students with low level of communication apprehension. The total students of this level is seventeen (16) students with the point range about 43-55.

As for addition information, the researcher also display the result of students who have moderate level of communication apprehension as below:

c. Students with moderate communication apprehension level

Table 4		
Moderate Communication Apprehension Level		
No.	Subject	Point
01	M.A.A	69
02	N.J	73
03	S.I.W	69
04	A.M	60
05	N.R	69
06	M	70
07	N	72
08	M.N	72
09	M.Z	82
10	M.R	78
11	R.M	80
12	R	74
13	N.S	80
14	M	77

15	K	77
16	N.R.A	77
17	S.M.R	74
18	N	73
19	H.A	68
20	M.R	65
21	S.R	59
22	D.D.B.I	56
23	M.H	63
24	N.A.P.E	68
25	G.N	59
26	S.H.D	62
27	K	64

Table 4 shows the result of students with moderate level of communication apprehension. The total students of this level is seventeen (16) students with the point range about 56-82.

As mention at Chapter III the researcher chosen 10%-25% of the population or >30 students. Therefore, based on the results above the researcher chosen 20% of the population specifically 32 students, consist of 16 students from the high

level of communication apprehension and 16 students from low level communication apprehension.

2. Students' Communication Strategies

The following tables of students' communication strategies are from students with high and low level of students communication apprehension. each table consists of 16 students.

a) Students' communication strategies with high communication apprehension level

Table 5

Students' Communication Strategies with high C.A level

no	subject	m.a	t.a	cir	App	u.p	w.co	p.p	u.n	l.t	Fo	c.s	a.h	fi
01	N.M	1												23
02	N.L	1											1	11
03	F.A.S	1			1									16
04	R.A													6
05	R	1			2					3			3	25
06	A	3				1				4				70
07	M.D	4	1			1					2	1		24
08	F	3	2			1				1			1	39
09	M.M.A		3							4	2	1		25
10	M.R	2								1				41
11	M.I.K	2	1							1		2	2	11
12	E.S	1						1			2			30

13	S.M	1	1						1			1	21
14	H.M.S	3							1			3	25
15	M	1	2			1						2	13
16	W	3	1						1			1	10
	TOTAL	27	11	0	3	4	1	0	1	18	2	5	15
													390

Description:

m.a : Message Abandonment u.n : Use of nonlinguistic means

t.a : Topic Avoidance l.t : Literal Translation

cir : Circumlocution fo : Foreignizing

app : Approximation c.s : Code Switching

u.p : Use of all-Purpose words a.h : Appeal for Help

w.co : Word Coinage fi : Use of Fillers

p.p : Prefabricated Patters

From table 5 the students attempted 11 communication strategies in total they are “Message Abandonment”, “Topic avoidance”, “Approximation” , “Use of all-purpose word”, “Word coinage”, “Literal translation”, “Use of nonlinguistic means”, “Literal Translation”, “Foreignizing,” , “Code Switching”, “Appeal for help” and “Use of fillers/ hesitation devices”

1. Students used “*Message Abandonment*” strategy when they tried to said something but forgot all the sentence. For example from the observation, when they said

“*Okay, we are here is to explain about.... I mean we are going to the explanation stage*”

“*My hobby is playing..... Well I love to play many kinds of sport*”

2. For the strategy “*Topic avoidance*” the students seems like have lack of information about the topic so that they often avoid the topic. For example from the observation

“*Cooking is....well let's talking about mukbang instead*”

“*this survey is about.... Okay my partner will explain about it*”

3. As for the strategy “*Approximation*” the students missed the words such as “people” to “person”

4. The forth strategy is “*Use of all-purpose word*” here, the students use “that thing” “the thing” and “stuff”

“*I am going to explain about the thing we already survey..*”

“*well.. talking about that stuff..the..the..survey result*”

“*If I cannot choose between...that thing..I mean the decision*”

5. For “*Word coinage*” strategy the students said “presentator” instead of “presenter”

“we are here as the presentator..are going to..”

6. “*Literal translation*” often used by student because they tended to forgot the grammar rules in English. For example

“and when I go to survey people”, “and the range age is from 18 to 22 age”

7. For the “*Foreignizing*” strategy the student said “Oppa Oppa korea” using the English pronunciation. Surprisingly during the communication using English language the students rarely used their L1 language.

“I choose this company because this company is..... salah satu perusahaan terbesar di Asia”

“We will discussed abou survey yang kami dapat”

8. Seems like the students with high level of communication apprehension used “*Appeal for help*” several times . They often used their hands or asking their friends and the lecturer literally about the words. This strategy used by students when they cannot answer the question . the example from the observation are

“.... Themethod...and...(using hand to asked for help) ya.. that's what I mean”

“what's the name..? ah! Yeah, that's it, sneakers”

9. As for “*Use of fillers*” the most fillers they use are “Aah” “OK” “Um” Hm” and “I think”.

10. “*Use of nonlinguistic means*” is when they try to explain making hand gestures.

11. “*Code Switching*” is when they use their first language after using English when they cannot remember the English word for it. For example when they said “Bukit Batas” because they did not know the equivalent phrase for it.

b) Students’ communication strategies with low communication apprehension level

Table 6

Students’ Communication Strategies with low C.A level

No	subject	m.a	t.a	cir	app	u.p	w.co	p.p	u.n	l.t	fo	c.s	a.h	fi
01	J.P.H	1			1	3				1			1	28
02	C.M.M	1												18
03	.M.I	2				1		1		2		2		8
04	S.M	2			1	1				3				41
05	R.M.A	2												11
06	M.Z.M	2								2				32
07	R.H	1												11
08	F.A	1				2						5		26
09	R.M.Y	1												15
10	M.A.P	1												22
11	Z	1								3				16

12	E.E.S											1	41	
13	M.A.A	2			1					9		1	12	
14	G.H.N.A	3											19	
15	L.M	1				1				3		1	17	
16	K	1				1						1	24	
TOTAL		22	0	0	3	9	0	1	0	23	0	2	10	341

Description:

m.a : Message Abandonment u.n : Use of nonlinguistic means

t.a : Topic Avoidance l.t : Literal Translation

cir : Circumlocution fo : Foreignizing

app : Approximation c.s : Code Switching

u.p : Use of all-Purpose words a.h : Appeal for Help

w.co : Word Coinage fi : Use of Fillers

p.p : Prefabricated Patterns

The communication strategies used by students with Low level of communication strategies are: “*Message abandonment*”, “*Approximation*”, “*Use of all-purpose words*”, “*Prefabricated patterns*”, “*Literal translation*”, “*Code switching*”, “*Appeal for help*”, and “*Use of fillers/ hesitation devices*”.

1. “*Message abandonment*”, example from the observation:

“This survey is about.... The survey we did was found that..”

“here, we are from... I mean we as the first group”

2. “*Approximation*”, was when they said

“*many person*” instead of “*many people*”

3. “*Use of all-purpose word*”. The common all-purpose words are:

“*the thing*” and “*stuff*”

“Um... I’m gonna think about the thing if I choose one or another”

“we are going to .. you know .. adapt with the thing..I mean the new condition”

“the stuff is the best decision that better for me..”

4. “*Prefabricated patterns*” was surprisingly used. And the pattern was:

“can you repeat again please”

5. “*Literal translation*”. The students often speak what they think immediately without thinking about the grammar rules such as:

“the survey result of 11 person”

“I believe that hobby and likes of me is need for you”

“we do this survey for amount 11 peoples”

6. ”*Code switching*”

“ it is a company sell...umm pangan. Yeah pengan ikan that produce in here”

7. “*Appeal for help*”. The students often used their hand to ask their friend to help them. They also ask directly to the lecturer about the words they unfamiliar with.

“what is it X ? oh ya thanks”

“um....ya ya that is right, I mean that”

8. “*Use of fillers/hesitation devices*”

As for this strategy, the students used “Um” “Hmm” “a~” “and~” “but”

During the observation, the researcher notice that several students in the low and high communication apprehension level tended to *repeat* the words they tried to said and *lengthen the tone of their voice* every time they tried to gain more time to speak. These two habits of students become the additional communication strategies.

B. Discussion

This part presents the discussion of the research findings. There are three research questions proposed in this study. The discussion focuses on the findings of the three proposed research questions.

The first discussion is about the communication strategies used by students with different communication apprehension level in speaking class at English Education Department of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. Second, focuses on the communication strategies that highly and lowly used by students with different communication apprehension level in speaking class at English Education Department of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. And for the third, discussed about

which level of communication apprehension students that used communication strategies the most.

1 Communication strategies used by students with different communication apprehension level

The first question is about the communication strategies used by students with different communication apprehension level in speaking class at English Education Department of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. From the research finding (table 5 and 6), the result was very unexpected. Without knowing about strategy of communication—as the researcher asked the students about it in the first meeting—, the students surprisingly used many types of communication strategies. The level are divided into low and high level of communication apprehension as the researcher mentioned at chapter III. Therefore, the discussion is focuses on those two level of communication apprehension students.

a. The students' communication strategy with low communication apprehension level

The students with low communication apprehension level, the total amount of the types of communication strategies they used are 8 (eight) types of 13 (thirteen) types with a high enough frequency as follows:

Table 7

Students Communication strategy of low level C.A

No	Communication Strategy	Total students /of 16	Freq
1	Message abandonment	16	22
2	Approximation	2	3
3	Use of all-purpose words	6	9
4	Prefabricated patterns	1	1
5	Literal translation	7	23
6	Code switching	1	2
7	Appeal for help	6	10
8	Use of fillers	16	341

As for the types of communication strategy that did not used by the students are “*topic avoidance*”, “*circumlocution*”, “*word coinage*”, “*use of nonlinguistic devices*”, and “*Foreignizing*”.

b. The students’ communication strategy with high communication apprehension level

The students with high level of communication apprehension level shown even more surprising result. The total amount of the types of communication strategies are 11 (eleven) types of 13 (thirteen) types as follows:

Table 8

Students Communication strategy of high level C.A			
No	Communication Strategy	Total students /of 16	Freq
1	Message abandonment	14	27
2	Topic avoidance	7	11
3	Approximation	2	3
4	Use of all-purpose words	4	4
5	Word coinage	1	1
6	Using of nonlinguistic means	1	1
7	Literal Translation	9	18
8	Foreignizing	1	2
9	Code switching	3	5
10	Appeal for help	9	15
11	Use of fillers	16	390

As for the types of communication strategy that did not used by the students are: “*Circumlocution*”, and “*Prefabricated patterns*”.

To differentiate the result, the table of total numbers of communication strategy used by students with low and high communication apprehension level presented as follows:

Table 9

Students communication strategies of High and Low CA

No	Communication Strategy	Low Communication Apprehension level (freq)	High communication apprehension leve (freq)
01	Message abandonment	22 times	27 times
02	Topic avoidance	0	11 times
03	Circumlocution	0	0
04	Approximation	3 times	3 times
05	Use of all-purpose words	9 times	4 times
06	Word coinage	0	1 time
07	Prefabricated patterns	1 time	0
08	Use of nonlinguistic means	0	1 time
09	Literal translation	23 times	18 times
10	Foreignizing	0	2 times
11	Code switching	2 times	5 times
12	Appeal for help	10 times	15 times
13	Use of fillers/hesitation devices	341 times	390 times
Total		8 types	11 types

The researcher noticed that during the observation the students in high and low levels used fillers frequently than another 13 strategies. Using fillers known as the strategy to gain some time to think while try to keep speaking to the interlocutor. From the observation, the researcher noticed that this strategy used by students also as a tool of hesitation. They tend to “blank” while speaking and did this strategy naturally to gain time to think but sometimes the continuation seems unrelated with what they said before, this show that they hesitated to speak confidently because they look uncertain about what the said.

The researcher also noticed that “*Literal Translation*” also used quite high frequent for both level. this result was relatable with the observation did by the researcher, the lecturer allowed the students to speak the target language using their L1, the students only used the target language during the presentation and practice in front of the class. Meanwhile, when they were speaking or asking any questions, they tended to used their L1. Thus, “*literal translation*” cannot be avoid by the students.

During the observation, the researcher found some of students habits when they speak using English. The first habit is to *repeating the word or phrases they conveyed*. This habit was done by several students with high and low level of communication apprehension. another habit which the students did unconsciously was

lengthen the tone of their voice. The students seems to be tried their best to convey their feeling using English and this attempt lead them to this habit. The researcher found that “*Repetition*” is known as another strategies used in other researcher (Tiono and Sylvia’s additional strategy), but because in this study, the focused of the strategies was the 13 strategies made by Dornyei, the researcher did not explain more about this strategy. As for “*lengthen the tone of their voice*”, this habit cannot be counted as additional communication strategy because all of the students in low and high level of communication apprehension did this habit before they used the 13 types of strategies. Sometimes students lengthen their tone of voice in the words they tried to say and other times were in the words they already said as a ‘link’ for the continuation of the words they said before. Other fact was that students often lengthen the tone in the strategies’ words themselves that was why the researcher believed this habit was means to lead the students to the words or sentences they tried to conveyed.

2 Type of communication strategies that highly and lowly used by students with different communication apprehension level

As presented on the table 9 above, the students are surprisingly used many types of communication strategies. The students are naturally used them without even knowing it. As for the communication strategy that highly and lowly used by the students is presented down below:

a. Types of communication strategies that highly and lowly used by students with low communication apprehension level

For the students who have low communication apprehension level, the finding shown that there was only one type of communication strategy that highly used by students, “*Use of Fillers/hesitation devices*”. This type of communication strategy fantastically used by students who have low communication apprehension level for 341 times and it was used by all the students of this level of communication apprehension.

For the type of communication strategy called “*Prefabricated Patterns*”, it is the one which lowly used by the students with low communication apprehension level. This type only used by 1 student in 1 time only.

Lastly for the type of communication strategies that are never used by the students with the low communication apprehension level as mentioned above (in the discussion of research question number 1) are “*topic avoidance*”, “*circumlocution*”, “*word coinage*”, “*use of nonlinguistic devices*”, and “*Foreignizing*”. This result was acceptable because during the observation, the researcher found that even though the students were hesitated to speak, they still speak. Even the lecturer allowed them to used their L1 that was why topic avoidance was not popular for students to used. For the circumlocution, as a tool for the students to explain the word using a description, the students looked

did not need to do that. As for the substitute, the students chosen other strategies that seems easier for them to used such as, fillers and literal translation. As for the “*use of nonlinguistic devices*”, and the researcher observed that the topics were only about Survey and Job Interview and those two topics were kind of hard to be acted. “*Foreignizing*” also never used by students. This result was believed the researcher to be happen because during the observation, none of the students tried to used unfamiliar words without asking for help first because they tried to avoid the false pronunciation of them, That was why nonlinguistic devices and Foreignizing were not used by students.

b. Types of communication strategies that highly and lowly used by students with high communication apprehension level

For the communication strategy that highly used by students with high communication apprehension level is surprisingly got the same result with the students who have low communication apprehension level for this question is “*Use of fillers/hesitation devices*”. This results shown that whether the students have high or low level of communication apprehension, they tend to hesitated while speaking used the Foreign Language and needed time to think every time they used the language.

For the types of communication strategies that lowly used by the high level of communication apprehension students, the result shown that there were two types that rarely used by the students, “*Word coinage*”, and “*Use of nonlinguistic means*”. For the “word coinage” result was believed by the researcher as the lack and of vocabulary and misinterpretation of the student because during the observation, the student who used word coinage was speak quite confident and did not seems to feel hesitated. Thus, that was mean that the students did not afraid to convey the word even though the word they used was wrong. And as mention above, for the types of communication strategies which never used by the students with high level of communication apprehension are, “*Circumlocution*” and “*Prefabricated patterns*”.

3 Level of communication apprehension students that used communication strategies the most

Looking back at the finding the research above, it was clearly shown that the level of communication apprehension students that used communication strategies the most is the students with high communication apprehension level. This result was seen from the findings above, the students with high level of communication apprehension level used 11 types of 13 types of communication strategy with the total amount of frequency was 1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 15, 18, 27, and 390 times for each types. Meanwhile, the students with low level of

communication apprehension level used less communication strategy than the students with high communication apprehension level. They used only 8 strategies of 13 communication strategies with the total amount of frequency was 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 22, 23, and 341 times for each types.

Based on the observation done by the researcher, the findings shown different result with another previous studies done by Grzegorzewska and Horwitz, et. al. These two researcher in their studies stated that the students who used communication strategies the most are the students who have a lower number in communication apprehension. the students. Their studies also supported by Yusparizal, et. al which found similar result with Grzegorzewska and Horwitz, et.al. Yusparizal, et. al found that in speaking, students need to mastery the communication strategies in order to solve the communication problem which they found during oral communication and get across the communicative goals to the interlocutors, which means the lower the students communication anxiety is the more they need to mastery the communication strategies. Thus, students with low level of communication apprehension used a bigger number of communication strategies than the higher one.

Grzegorzewska in her study stated that students with low communication apprehension level used bigger number of communication strategies compared to the students with high-anxiety counterpart, meanwhile the result presented different in this study. Students with low level of communication apprehension used fewer number in frequency and the types of communication strategies than the students with high level of communication strategies . The similarity that the

researcher found between this study and Grzegorzewska's study is the significance difference in the number of strategies used by low and high level of communication apprehension the students. The communication strategies used by students of this research shown a different number between the students with high level and low level of communication apprehension. the students with high level of communication apprehension used 11 types of communication strategies and for each types the frequency is also bigger than the students with low level communication apprehension level which only used 8 types of 13 types of communication strategies.

As for the study did by Horwitz, et. al, they stated that the students with high communication apprehension level tended to avoid delivering a difficult message, while students with low level of communication apprehension level attempted different types of communication strategies to be able to deliver their message. This result was contrary to the result from the researcher observation in the class. During the observation started from the very beginning, the students with high level and low level of communication apprehension attempted to deliver their messages as clearly as possible. The students who have high level of communication apprehension seems to be have less vocabulary to use than the students with low level of communication apprehension. this lead the students with high level of communication apprehension to tried as hard as possible to deliver their message and used any ways they could use which is why the researcher believed that attempts made the students used more communication strategies compared to the high level of communication apprehension students.

In Tiono and Silvia's study, their result also showed that the low level of communication apprehension level used more communication strategies compared to the high level of communication students. In their study, students with low level of communication used all of the 13 types of communication strategies with such a big number for one of the type. As for the students with low level of communication apprehension, the students used 12 types of 13 types of the communication strategies with "*Repetition*" as an additional strategies used the most.

The researcher believed that this differences of the result comes from the way the researchers took the data. In Grzegorzewska, Horwitz, et. al, Yusparizal, et. al, and Tiono and Silvia's study, the technique of data collection they used is using test in the form of a text material, pictures, and procedural text. The students communication strategies were checked and counted based on the test they have given. Meanwhile, in this research the researcher got the data of students communication apprehension as naturally as possible during the classroom activity based on the students communication with their friends or with the lecturer. The students did not lead to such a pattern they need to speak or the words they need to choose during the observation. That is why the researcher believed this has become the main reason why the result of the study is different with other researchers. Also, during the observations, the researcher found that the lecturer was let the students speak freely using their L1 and did not force the students to speak used the foreign language every time.

This study of communication strategy used by students are proposed to help students with mastery the speaking skill. As Yusparizal stated, it is a need to mastery the strategy in communication for students so that they can deliver the message to the interlocutors correctly and the mastery of communication strategy will solve the communication problem of the students themselves.

The findings of this study shown that the students with low or high level of communication apprehension still lack of communication strategies. As the researcher mention before, the students did not know about strategy in communication because communication strategy was not taught for them. This has lead the students to use as many ways as they could to make the conversation going on and to convey their message to the other students or to the teacher. As stated in the findings above, all the students when they tried to speak using the target language the most often strategy used by them is “*Use of fillers/hesitation devices*”. The researcher believes this strategy counted as the easiest strategy to use for the students because this strategy also became their habit even when they speak using their source language inside and outside the classroom. Also, as mention before at chapter II this strategy used by the students to gain more time to think and this reason appeared during the class observation.

This study conducted for 2 months which means supposed to be 8 meetings. At the pre-observation which was the time when the researcher ask about whether the students know about the strategy in communication and about their communication apprehension in speaking class, the researcher

assumed that 8 meeting means 8 materials, but then after the lecturer explained about the method of her teaching, the data that the researcher got were only 3 meetings and as for the 1 meeting before the middle test, the lecturer only give the students online class using "*What's Up*" group and delivered the material there which means the students were not doing any oral practice. This schedules had lead the findings into less than the researcher planned at the started but then the results were surprisingly quite decent.

Another limitation of the findings are the unexpected class situation. As the observation, the researcher need to gain the data as much as possible because this research need to get the data naturally from the students which was means the data cannot be repeated. Every meeting the total amount of students who attended the class was about 16 to 18 students. The lecturer always paired or grouped the students into small group consist of 3 to 4 students. Because the researcher conducted the data all by herself, the researcher need to fully focused on every students to get the data, that was why the researcher video recoded every activity in the class using mobile phone and used that to get more valuable and promising data.

The other expected reason that limit the finding of the research was the students' voice itself. During the observation, the students used various tone of voices especially for the students who have high communication apprehension level. Some of the students from low level of communication apprehension level spook fluent, clear and easy to be catch by the researcher's hearing but another made such a quite small voice than rarely can be heard. Another case

with the students with high level of communication apprehension level, most of them speak clearly and with a loud voice at first but when the communication go harder their voices become smaller and even hard to be heard. This condition has become even worst when the class disturbed by the rain or the noises outside the classroom. But luckily, the lecturer let the researcher to accessed the activity all around the class so that when such conditions happened the researcher could move closer to the students to hear their voices.

The last unexpected matter that limited the finding of this study was the results of PRCA-24 questionnaire. At first, the researcher assumed that from two classes the researcher chosen she would get 30 students into the low level of communication apprehension and 30 students into the high level of communication apprehension. unexpectedly, the total number of students of each level were less than 30 students. This result has made the data only focused on 32 students which is 16 students from each level of communication apprehension level. This result was very unfortunate because the researcher believed the finding would be even more compact and satisfied if the subjects of every level of communication apprehension were at least 30 students in total.