"They Gotta Think about the Women First, You Know…?" Does Speaking like a Native Matter?:
A Contrastive Analysis of Indonesian and Anglo-american Students' Speaking

Risa Rumentha Simanjuntak[1]

[1]English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia 11480

Keywords: Contrastive Analysis, Speaking.

Abstract: Speaking well in English is both an important and coveted quality for university graduates. University students in are often asked to pay close attention and even mimic the way naïve speakers use their English for successful learning. This study contrasted the use of English for academic presentations between Indonesian and American students. Indonesian students' corpus of 6-hour presentations was compared to their Anglo American corpus available in MICASE (Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English). Lexical elements, such as choice of words, phrases and collocations, which identify how English was naturally spoken, were investigated. Data were analyzed using (Anthony, 2018) and resulted in different realizations of English speaking between Indonesian and American student presenters. The Anglo-American presenters were more informal and conversational compared to the Indonesian presenters. Meanwhile, the American students used more colloquial expressions compared to the Indonesian students. Implications on teaching and evaluating speaking were further discussed following the ongoing debate of native and non-native dichotomy.

1 INTRODUCTION

In countries where English is taught as second or foreign language such as Indonesia, learning English has not only been seen to provide the abilities to access the international academic communities (Baumgarten, 2016), (Flowerdew, 2012). More to this academic importance is the opportunities to gain greater success as professionals after graduation (Baumgarten, 2016), (Björkman, 2013). English education has since become the barometer and symbol for success (Björkman, 2013), (Smith, 2010). One way to gain success is to gain ability to speak English well (Björkman, 2013), (McNamara, T., & Roever, 2006). In established exams, such as TOEFL, speaking scoring rubrics incorporate a testee's responses to demonstrate "automatic" and "effective" use of vocabulary, and "coherent expression of relevant ideas" (Educational Testing Service, 2011). In other words, learners of English have to be able to perform as accurate as possible as situated by the norm. To speak as the native speakers of English do is much coveted (Baumgarten, 2016), (Björkman, 2013), (Smith, 2010).

Students in university level often need to give presentations in English as a requirement to pass their English courses and this has become one of the problems for English learners (Björkman, 2013), (Flowerdew, 2013), (Meunier, F., & Granger, 2008). In particular learners often find pronouncing certain vocabularies to be quite challenging (Nation I S P, 2001), (Nunan, 2013), (Nesselhauf, 2005). Further problems would to decide be what correct words and expressions to use in certain context of speaking. Other aspects of pronunciation, including the tone, intonation, and stress used, are also considered as problematic for English learners (McCarten, 2007), (Meunier, F., & Granger, 2008). Each of these areas is a potential hindrance in mastering English speaking (Nation I S P, 2001), (Simpson, R., & Mendis, 2003), (Simpson-Vlach, R., & Ellis, 2010).

The act of mimicking the native speaker way has been widely criticized (Adolphs, 2008), (Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, 2008), (Educational Testing Service, 2011), (Flowerdew, 2001). The developments of English as *lingua franca* have widened the boundaries of ownership of English (Flowerdew, 2012). In reality, English is spoken

221

between non-native speakers, which entail speaking like the native speakers as irrelevant (Kachru, 1985), (Smith, 2010). English has become very dynamic that it gains different features from speakers around the world, including words coming from different languages (e.g. boondocks from Tagalog and quite recently pendopo, mendopo, or pendapa from Javanese) (Oxford English Dictionary, no date). English as lingua franca becomes a contextual language, in which acceptability is decided by the participants.

Learning English speaking from the perspective of EFL learners has been proposed by an approach called Contrastive Rhetoric (henceforth CR) (Collins Cobuild Dictionary, no date), (Connor, 1996), (Connor, 2008), (Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, 2008). CR was initially adopted in investigating the learning of language writing, by comparing learners and advances writers (or novice and published authors respectively). By contrasting both corpora, researchers and teachers could identify students' problems or difficulties in writing. This approach has grown into a versatile approach and it has been applied to spoken language as well (Connor, 2008), (Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, 2008), (MICASE, no date), which also incorporate real use of English (Flowerdew, 2013). This new approach called DDL (data-driven learning) (Boulton, 2007) required teachers of English to look for problems in learning but more importantly to use the data from real language use. Contrastive approach becomes an important aspect to orient learners at the center of language acquisition (Flowerdew, 2013), (Nunan, 2013). It is further argued that only by doing so comprehensive knowledge on English acquisition can be gained (Flowerdew, 2013), (Kachru, 1985).

Previous studies have been done in investigating English speaking learning and teaching (Adolphs, 2008), (Baumgarten, 2016), (Connor, 2008), (Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, 2008), (McCarten, 2007), (Meunier, F., & Granger, 2008), (O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, 2007), (Reppen, 2010), (Simpson-Vlach, R., & Ellis, 2010), which pinpoint the importance of exposure to the natural use of English and not by submerging learners in memorizing words, expressions, and collocations exclusively. More recent studies (Baumgarten, 2016), (Flowerdew, 2013) also challenged the conventional beliefs that English teaching, including the teaching of speaking, should use native speakers as the norm, considering that English has become a *lingua franca* (Björkman, 2013), (Smith, 2010) and there are speaking variations of English which should also be considered as appropriate and accurate (Biber, D., & Barbieri, 2007).

2 METHOD

This study applied a contrastive analysis approach, especially on the language realizations in presentations, namely the lexical options, expressions, and collocations (Sinclair, 1991). Data or corpora used for this study are two sets of transcripts of students' classroom presentations. Indonesian corpus is the transcript of 69 Indonesian students' presentations totalling of 6 hours of presentations from three topics ("About Me", "My Innovation", and "How English can Help Me with My Future"). Whereas the native corpus was the transcripts of Anglo-American students' presentations as appeared in MICASE (Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English) (MICASE, no date). Both student groups were from first academic year and the Indonesian students were considered to be at high-intermediate level of English. Analysis was conducted using a freeware corpus analysis tool developed by Professor Laurence Anthony from Waseda University, Japan. The AntConc 3.5.7 version (2018) (Anthony, 2006), (Anthony, 2018) or the newest version was used. The analysis followed these procedures: files must be in .txt format. Using AntConc, data was generated to see the most frequent use of (using WordList feature). In order to contrast the use of each word, concordance lines from Indonesian students' corpus were contrasted with those from MICASE. Similar procedure was conducted to see the use of collocations from both Indonesian and American students. Lastly, analysis on the use of academic words was conducted using Coxhead's AWL (Academic Word List) as KeywordList.

2.1 Research Aims and Questions

This study aims at finding the gap for learning using contrasting analysis on the use of spoken English in Indonesian and American students as the native speakers, by way of answering these questions:

1. What features of spoken language do Indonesian students use?

2. How different are these features in contrast to the American students?

3. What learning needs arise from these gaps and what other implications are resulted from the contrastive analysis?

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the mutual benefit and protection of Authors and Publishers, it is necessary that Authors provide formal written Consent to Publish and Transfer of Copyright before publication of the Book. The signed Consent ensures that the publisher has the Author's authorization to publish the Contribution.

Results will be presented in three sections. First, spoken features of Indonesian students will be presented. Second, contrastive features between Indonesian and American students will be displayed and analysed. Third, further analyses on learning needs as well as other findings will be presented.

Section 1.01 Indonesian students' features of spoken English

Data generated by AntConc shows a total of 11,731 words are spoken by students. Amongst the 1,407 word types, 106 words are Nouns, 54 Verbs, and 50 Adjectives. Because of the limitation of space only fifteen most frequent words in each word class will be presented. The results are as follows:

Table 1: Lexical options of Indonesian students (Nouns).

Frequency	Words	Frequency	Words	Frequency	Words
561	I	54	gentleman	23	English
290	presentation	46	attention	22	contact
114	morning	31	time	12	time
64	hope	28	expectation	11	product
54	ladies	24	point	10	class

The most frequent Noun to appear in students' presentation is "I" (376 times). The second most frequent Noun students used is "presentation" (appears 290 times). It can be seen from the next Nouns to appear (audience, people, eye-contact, gesture, time, class) that these words are all associated with the presentation task itself. Students often talk about these at the opening of their presentations, such as: "Good Morning. My name is Stelli. I know you are really excited about this." (Student A); "Good morning ladies and gentleman, first we are going to introduce our self*."(Student B); "*Uhm*, this time I want to tell you about E-Floor" (Student C). A pronunciation error was made by student B because it was very clear that the word "self" was pronounced instead of "selves" resulting in inaccurate pronunciation of the plural form of the word "ourselves".

Table 2: Lexical options of Indonesian students (Verbs).

Frequency	Words	Frequency	Words	Frequency	Words
43	make	33	need	24	presenting
41	hope	30	improve	22	expect
41	think	29	give	22	know
36	like	26	speak	21	say
36	want	25	get	19	help

The students were not using Verbs as frequent as they used Nouns. The most frequent Verb used by the students ("make") appeared in similar arrangement as this one: "Today we are going to make you see the importance of Travel Blenders" (Student G). This construction was used following an assignment to present innovations or business ideas. The next most frequent Verb used by students was "hope" with the example as following: "I hope I can give good presentation today." (Student M). This expression was frequently used by students and it sounded familiar to the Indonesian audience as part of the opening move in a presentation or a talk.

Table 3: 15 Lexical options of Indonesian students (Adjectives).

Frequency	Words	Frequency	Words	Frequency	Words
47	nervous	14	improving	8	fast
41	good	13	interested	8	hard
24	better	12	bad	8	missing
18	confident	11	quickly	7	clear
15	enough	9	big	5	best

The Adjectives are the least frequent category used by students. It is interesting that the most frequent Adjective to appear deals with the feelings of the presenters ("nervous"). The statement, "Thank you for paying attention to me, the presentator*, *err* I'm too nervous and feeling bad," or the variations of it often blurred out in the middle of presentations. In this example the erroneous word "presentator" appeared, which is supposed to mean "presenter". Interestingly, the word "presentator" appeared in the corpus 10 times by 4 speakers. One possible explanation for this is the overgeneralization of creating an actor from the Noun "presentation" which is much more familiar to the students (appears 290 times in the corpus). Other lexical variations used by students are "presentate"," gonna", and "guys". The word "presentate" appears 5 times by 2 students, the word "gonna" appears 3 times by 3 students, and the word "guys" 3 times by 3 students. In total these variations are used by six students, in which all of them are male. The word "presentate" although considered as uncommon has been seen as neologism, and it is explained as "a derivation of the verb present" by The Rice University Neologisms Database; and is defined as "a new word or expression in a language, or a new meaning for an existing word or expression" (Collins Cobuild Dictionary, no date). The arrival of this new word is explained as the student effort to create a verb by adding the –ate suffix, as a common system in English language. Although it makes no rational sense this principle has been easily and confidently used by students. The use of "gonna" is an example

of informal form of "going to", whereas "guys" is used by students to address their audience.

Section 1.02 Contrasting features of Indonesian and American presenters

The first contrasting realizations are in the use of "gonna". MICASE produced a total of 46 cases in 4 transcripts.

Figure 1: Concordance lines of "gonna" in MICASE.

In all 46 occurrences the most frequent combinations are "I'm *gonna*" (13 occurrences) and "it's *gonna*" (18 occurrences), followed by "you're *gonna*" (8 occurrences) and "there's *gonna*" (7 occurences). Contrasting Indonesian students' use of "gonna", there are two occurrences of "it's *gonna* be" and one occurrence of "I'm *gonna* presentate*" and no occurrences of other combinations used by American students. From the data, informal expressions using the word "gonna" as oppose to more formal use "going to" in academic presentations are clearly used more often by American students. American students also use "gotta" and it appears twice in the corpus: "you *gotta* show that', and "they *gotta* think about the women first you know" and none in the Indonesian students' corpus. According to Collins Cobuild Dictionary, "*gotta*" is the informal form of "got to". Synonyms are "have to" or "must", which Indonesian students opt to use in "information that I must deliver".

Other contrasting occurrences are in the use of Noun, Verb, and Adjectives. In the use of Noun, the collocations of "presentation" include "my presentation", "give presentation", "do the presentation", and "memorize the presentation". However, in MICASE there are no matches found for collocations of "presentation" or "present" or "presentate" or other derivations. In the use of "make" the collocations used by Indonesian students are using the structure of "make+Noun Phrase (NP)" (e.g. comment, me, noise, a point, a contribution) and also the inflections of "make", which are "making" and "made" with the similar construction. MICASE shows similar occurrences, e.g. "making a difference", "make it clear", "make that situation up", "make it legal", "made up", "made cheaper", "made a diagram". However, American students use

"make+Adjective Phrase (AP)", which is not used by Indonesian students. These students also never use the Adjective "nervous" but they use "good" in "good+NP" structure. The collocation "real good" is also used by American students but not by Indonesian students. Interestingly, both American and Indonesian students use "make/made it clear" collocations but American students use "clear up" collocation whereas Indonesian students do not use such colloquial expression. In the use of "bad", American students use the expression "too bad", whereas Indonesian students prefer to use "very bad". By this point, it appeared that American students are more informal than their Indonesian counterparts.

Section 1.03 Learning needs and other implications resulted from the gaps

Results from contrasting features of spoken English between American and Indonesian students inform the gaps Indonesian students might have. Identifying these gaps will help teachers focus on the needed skills for improving their speaking. From the previous data, the comparative aspects are:

Table 4: Comparative aspects in American and Indonesian corpora.

Aspects	American students' presentation	Indonesian students' presentations
Lexical option	more	less variations
Collocations	more	less variations
Formality	informal	formal

American students use more varied options of words compared to Indonesian students. The way American students inflected the words and make combinations of words are more varied and elaborated than Indonesian students. Meanwhile, most interesting aspect found in this study is the degree of formality. It is shown from the data that American students are using informal style in their presentations compared to Indonesian students. One possible explanation for these findings is the different cultures projected by the students through their presentations. Indonesian students projected formality by their selections of words and word combinations. Meanwhile, American students use more informal tone of language by using colloquial expressions and conversational style. Some Indonesian students use a more informal style to cope with the peculiar feelings (as indicated from the frequent confessions of being nervous) of delivering presentations in English. As can be seen from the

data, Indonesian students are having rudimentary errors in pronunciation and overgeneralization.

4 CONCLUSIONS

This study has shown contrasting differences in Indonesian and American students speaking. Differences appear in the use of word combinations, which show more vocabulary repository American students have. In terms of style American students as native speakers of English turn out to be more informal and conversational in delivering academic presentations. It can be implied that English speaking needs to be seen as the result of cultural and social interactions. This means, the teaching of English speaking needs to acknowledge and incorporate these cultural and social aspects. In terms of evaluating students' speaking performance, lecturers or instructors also need to include the informal contexts in mind for more comprehensive evaluation and to better encourage students to use English. Indonesian students will gain more benefit when conversing with other non-native speakers of English by receiving more contexts of speaking.

REFERENCES

Adolphs, S. (2008) *Studies in Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Anthony, L. (2006) 'IEEE Transactions on Prof. Comm.', 49(3), pp. 275–286.

Anthony, L. (2018) 'AntConc 3.5.7'.

Baumgarten, N. (2016) 'Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences', 232, pp. 145–153.

Biber, D., & Barbieri, F. (2007) 'English for Specific Purposes', 26, pp. 263–286.

Björkman, B. (2013) *English as an Academic Lingua Franca*. Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Boulton, A. (2007) 'Proceedings of the BAAL Conference', pp. 13–16.

Collins Cobuild Dictionary (no date) *No Title*. Available at: https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english.

Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, W. V. (2008) *Contrastive Rhetoric Reaching to Intercultural Rhetoric*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Connor, U. (1996) *Contrastive Rhetoric*. Cambridge: CUP.

Connor, U. (2008) *Mapping multidimensional aspects of research*. Cambridge: CUP.

Educational Testing Service (2011) 'TOEFL iBT® Quick Prep', 27.

Flowerdew, L. (2001) *Small Corpus Studies and ELT*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Flowerdew, L. (2012) *Corpus Applications in Applied Linguistics*. London: Continuum.

Flowerdew, L. (2013) 'Language Teaching', 26, pp. 1–18.

Kachru, B. B. (1985) *Asian Englishes*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

McCarten, J. (2007) *Teaching Vocabulary: Lessons from the Corpus, Lessons for the Classroom*. Cambridge: CUP.

McNamara, T., & Roever, C. (2006) *Language testing: The Social Dimension*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Meunier, F., & Granger, S. (2008) *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

MICASE (no date) *Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English*.

Nation I S P (2001) *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: CUP.

Nesselhauf, N. (2005) *Collocations in a Learner Corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nunan, D. (2013) *Learner-Centered English Language Education*. New York: Routledge.

O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2007) *From Corpus to Classroom: Language Use and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Oxford English Dictionary (no date) *No Title*. Available at: http://www.oed.com/.

Reppen, R. (2010) *Using Corpora in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: CUP.

Simpson-Vlach, R., & Ellis, N. (2010) 'Applied Linguistics', 31(4), pp. 487–512.

Simpson, R., & Mendis, D. (2003) 'TESOL Quarterly', 3, pp. 419–441.

Sinclair, J. (1991) *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: OUP.

Smith, U. (2010) *English as a Lingua Franca in Higher Education*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.