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Abstract: Library and Information Science (LIS) students as Students of Non-English Department (SNED) need
betterments in terms of approach from their facilitators (lecturers, that is.) The approach should bring with it
an atmosphere of enlightenment of which form should be inspiring, triggering, and entertaining in some way.
As English Language Learners (ELLs) majoring in LIS, they would find it rather discouraging to learn English
since they might not see the importance of studying other than their major. However, as university students,
they are there to exercise their critical thinking. The aim of the present study is to generate flair of this kind
of ELLs through FIESTA (Fun and interesting, Interactive, Explorative, Systematic, Technology savvy,
Autonomous) and PAIKEM (Partisipatif, Aktif, Inovatif, Kreatif, Efektif, Menyenangkan, or Participative,
Active, Innovative, Creative, Effective, Interesting) modes of approach. An approach using a qualitative
method of research with interview and observation as instruments results in significantly positive impact. It
is indicated that any facilitator’s efforts made towards betterments in terms of mainly speaking and, writing
using acceptable English makes room for a possibility.

1 INTRODUCTION

In-class English sessions generate rooms for
betterments in terms of students’ willingness to get communicated with their peers and their facilitators
as well. The teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL) to students of non-English departments
(SNED) as English language learners (ELLs) needs certain approach in encouraging them to mainly speak
in English in a more appropriate way. One of the
SNED groups at Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan (FIP –
Faculty of Education) falling into this category is
Prodi Perpustakaan (Library and Information) group of
students. To obtain a positive impact from the
learning process through English 1 and English 2
lectures to the students of this category, for instance,
a developed learning method through an appropriate
approach is imperative. As university students, they
are there to exercise their critical thinking (Obias,
2015). Rosenthal (2016) insists that although English
is regarded as the common international language of
business, not every business globally use English on
a regular basis. Not being “at home” in both cultures
– English and Indonesian, These ELLs communicate
a bit less acceptable. They are beyond awareness of
the target language (English) as a living phenomenon
when communicating their ideas expressed in
especially a spoken form.

As facilitators, teachers, or instructors, or
lecturers should be aware of their students’ initial
willingness in terms of absorbing any learning
process offered. Instructors, for example, should
emphasize on the learners’ ability. Steinberg and
wendy (1996) believes that there are at least two
abilities on the part of the learners namely Synthetic
and Practical abilities. The present study sees
differences between the initiatives senses generated
by students as something students have to explore on
their own efforts. Thus, students are invited to be
particularly synthetic thinkers. They are to make
connections between things lecturers do not
spontaneously concern. These learners use practical
ability to convince their lecturers that an idea
expressed by the learners is worthy and conducive.

ELLs communicate with less than acceptable
sense on the other party’s part. Part of the reason is
that the ELLs have no room to express their ideas by
involving themselves thoroughly. McIntire (2014)
says that language barriers make it difficult to give
direction, explain your expectations, or provide
performance feedback to those with whom you
cannot communicate effectively. ELLs as
Communicants need to involve themselves well in differences of culture and language, which is difficult to perform: avoiding themselves from being awkward and unnatural to some extent. Hill and Flynn (2006) were cited when saying Language is the air we breathe and the water we swim. It comes as naturally to us as seeing the sky or digesting our food. It is as vital a part of our name and personality. But what if we suddenly had to breathe different air or swim in different waters? Then, again, the culture in which the students in discussion live influences and shapes their feelings, attitudes, and responses to their experiences and interactions with the party they communicate their messages. Experts see this notion by saying that language represents the culture since the words refer to the culture, as belief and practices of a society, but the representation is never complete or perfect. This phenomenon leads to understanding on the learners’ part that what works in their first language (Indonesian language) may not work in English. They are somewhat impeded by this cultural relativity in that their attempts to achieve the other party’s comprehension have proven to result in communicating their ideas being less acceptable: communication breakdowns being unavoidable. McIntire (2014) says that language barriers make it difficult to give direction, explain your expectations, or provide performance feedback to those with whom you cannot communicate effectively. SNED as ELLs should be proficient enough in both their ideas and the other party so that the message they utter to that other party of communication is understood accurately, clearly and naturally. ELLs should be able to deliver their ideas expressed in speaking according to the rules, style, and grammatical points of the target language so that their message is avoided from being awkward and unnatural. Other than that, ELLs’ knowledge of target culture of the language plays a greater role as coined by Cakir (2006) “Most frequently confronted that students to a great extent know the rules of language, but are not knowledgeable enough about the target culture” and, as a communication tool with two parallel streams which prompt to an awareness of a difference between the languages, it makes it possible for any sociocultural and sociolinguistic constraints to hamper the communication.

A factor of confidence plays a key role to enhance a good communication among ELLs: feeling secure, intimidation-free atmosphere, being relaxed, and flair-based initiative are necessary, to name a few. A number of ways to help assisting the ELLs towards the end could be encouragement, push, appreciation in its various forms, rooms for creation on the ELLs’ part and lots more. Rusmono (2015) confirms that lecturer, teacher, instructor should find every way possible to “soften” the voice every time showing mistakes takes place. Accordingly, any student being exposed to his failure leading to making him the object of ridicule would surely withdraw from attempting to get understood and received by the whole class. A worth citing, a “true story” account by one SNED student as ELLs is inspiring: Okey guys, this is Multimedia Room. There is place for browsing, searching, downloading, and typing. All facilities this room free for user. And this is postgraduate room. We can access in repository UPI for see this collection. Now we will wend second floor. This library has relict deposits. Okay, this is magazine and France Corner. This room will be relaxing for user and then user can copy essay, thesis, dissertation and other collection in photo copy room. Free from copy can using preservation of collection. Every single letter of the words forming each sentence is copied exactly as it appears in the student’s note, including, one word “untranslated” namely “disertasi” (Cf. English “dissertation”).

The role a facilitator plays in generating flair for the ELLs “colours” the atmosphere of the class sessions. Through two modes of approaching students namely and FIESTA and PAIKEM, for instance, an atmosphere of being monotonous and boring can be avoided. FIESTA stands for Fun and interesting, Interactive, Explorative, Systematic, Technology savvy, Autonomous) while PAIKEM stands for Partisipatif, Aktif, Inovatif, Kreatif, Efektif, Mennyenangkan, or Participative, Active, Innovative, Creative, Effective, Interesting. The “F” in the first mode and the “M” in the second mode are the points of departure in terms of generating the students’ flair. Combined with another mode of approach called IBA (Interest-Based Approach), for instance, a pleasing atmosphere of a learning process in the classroom is more than likely taking place. ELLs’ feeling of secure is maintained in such a way that they are eager to use their English without risks. As experts in the field echoed, students are basically given room to see a good chance to express their ideas in the target language (English) without even feeling worries since a feeling of secure develops instead. One way of making sure that risk-free initiative on the students’ part takes place is by thinly disguising the “unforced” mistakes students have made. As for putting into action the “F” and the “M”, some sort of interactive educational games would be a good start. Altınav (2017) had believed that game-based learning needs to be a basic strategy to prevent awkwardness from happening during classroom sessions. A student-
centered interactive game called SCSA (Student-Centered Speaking Activity) proves to be a possibility in encouraging students to communicate without risks. This way, confidence on the students’ part plays a key role in making sure that they are “on the right track”. There go one student’s remarks from an interview “LM105 class sessions make me feel so happy and anxious at the same time because there are a lot of games”. Other accounts by other students run like: “FIESTA and PAIKEM make the class interactive”; I find it easier to understand the materials through this game”; I think this method is interactive activities in itself is a blessing already. Willingness to speak during the sessions in various interactions among realities in which the researcher directly interacted with the informants.

2 METHODOLOGY

This research employed a qualitative method with interview and observation as tools to collect data from 41 informants. Through a naturalistic approach, the informants’ emic construction was built to put interactions among realities in which the researcher directly interacted with the informants.

2.1 Research Design and Approach

Through naturalistic approach, the present study seeks to attain an understanding on a process (rather than a product) of speaking activity being observed in that a phenomenon resulting from the process is studied (Alwasilah, 2003). In-depth information is gained through interviews by paraphrasing or following-up questions. Neutralization is set to balance possible insufficient information during the interviews.

2.2 Participants and Data Collection Process

Interviews with forty-one informants and observation in which field work and field study are carried out involves documentary analysis. The interviews are set on planned background while the observation is done naturalistically to provide participation of the informants: opinions, perceptions, judgements, intuitions, and experiences; academic behaviours.

3 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

There is a greater inclination towards an atmosphere of being relaxed and accordingly brings with it an encouragement on the students’ part. Approaching with its various ways of friendliness by the facilitator is the key to the successful creation of interesting, entertaining yet still academic in sense of learning which eventually remove any alienations.

When a class is organized into groups, students start feeling secure since each of the members of the group has something unseen to discover his/her weaknesses (mispronouncing words, misusing appropriate acceptable English expressions during exchanges, using L1-Language 1-native language - to express ideas in “the real” English). To explain a concept, for example, students use their “Englishes” to their own classmates and, as long as they’re the classmates understand, no problems seem to arise.

This way, no feeling of making mistakes is bothering while actually mistakes are in every part of “their English”. No interruptions are done by the facilitator and no revisions are recommended during the interaction between students and their classmates. Let alone blaming students because of their unforced mistakes. Lecturers, teachers, instructors or any facilitators at various levels of education need to always keep the volume down every time correcting student mistakes should take place. “Softening” is exactly what a “notification” of exposing the mistakes is all about. Putting a student in a difficult position will be understood as a penalty, which, at the end, will kill the students’ emotional will to be accepted through his/her efforts to speak in English. Willingness to speak during the sessions in various interactive activities in itself is a blessing already. Every single utterance should be regarded as “correct” in every way. Using pleasant and even funny body language, a facilitator might be looking
more like a comedian in front of the class: gestures used, language used, anger kept down, friendly eye contact. Letting students see a big chance to have an access to an enlightenment pleases their hearts and this would lead them to getting rid of hesitations in expressing their ideas when speaking. This way, self-confidence goes hand in hand with every single idea they express regardless of, unfortunately, almost unacceptable English to especially native speakers. The interviews with the informants indicate that differences among individuals exist from various causes like, for example, locality. This would lead to a social life of people living around a place forming certain environment. Not to mention individual peculiarities difficult or almost impossible to be discussed.

Interviews with the informants result in evidence that flair generated takes place and accordingly shows indications that learners are encouraged to come up with their ideas using English. A question running like “Actually, which one do you like: the lecturer or the material? Please answer with honesty!” Among forty-one informants, seven are worth investigating:

- “I like the lecturer the most, then the material”;
- “Of course I like lecturer beside the materials, because is so funny and the English sessions is so very hard”;
- “I like lecturer and materials because the lecturer delivers with fun, and make student happy”;
- “I like lecturer, because he can make the class become more fun”;
- “I like the lecturer because he is humourist. But material and the lecturer equally pleasant”;  
- “Of course lecturer because the lecturer always has a better mood. Every time I enter this class I always laugh. Love your lecturer”;
- “Of course I like the lecturer because he is so funny”.

Creativity on the part of the students as SNED disappears to some extent. As Steinberg (1996) further insists, ways to develop creativity work well: idea generated is encouraged; rewarding creative ideas and contributions naturally emerge; allowing mistakes blocking the road runs smoothly; finding excitement is supported by playing to generate flair leading to “strengths” on the learners’ part. A key role of a lecturer is evident: limiting what they cannot do. Harris et al. (2012) echoes that a lecturer is considered successful when he applies “orchestrating scientific discourse in classrooms” by way of his beliefs. As of the impact of this achievement, Roehrig (2007) says that the implementation of the curriculum is strongly influenced by the lecturer’s beliefs about teaching and learning, and the presence of a supportive network within the learning center.

Making efforts to make expressions during a dialog in an interesting topic always brings with it some positive impacts. As a facilitator, giving unfavourable remarks on the ELLs’ speaking performance should be avoided. It is a must to give remarks on the students’ performance that will have a positive impact meaning that students as ELLs should be freed from double burdens: linguistic and cultural shortcomings. Even more imperative is that students should be avoided from building a less promising mental achievement. It is suggested therefore that if uselessness is what follows after the remarks, even worse painfulness deep in their heart, giving remarks should be halted. Thus, preventing ELLs especially SNED in this case, from comments unlikely bringing positive impacts is a brilliant idea. The SNED need to be encouraged to adapt what they are really interested in with the aims their instructors are attempting to achieve.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Making effort to generate flair and to eventually elevate any earnest intentions of the SNED as ELLs to use English will never be futile. The instructors playing the role as facilitators approaching the students with enthusiasm results in positive responses from which flair with its energy builds confidence on the ELLs’ part. Although rooms created for the ELLs to fill the gap between their own language cultures and foreign language cultures may still be far from being perfect, an initiative has been launched and will hopefully lead to a bit better promising future. Giving an ounce of credits to the ELLs for any drives of speaking in English proves to be conducive. With their critical thinking, it leads to an emerging self-confidence on their part and, as they go along, will generate more comprehensible communication in spoken form. Varieties of cultural and linguistic backgrounds will not contribute that significant to hampering incomprehensibility and will therefore ameliorate constraints to effective learning since students more than likely benefit from their learning. Temporary “negligence” to linguistic and especially cultural standards has resulted in a conducive process of learning English as a foreign language. It may even enrich the existing students’ “Englishes” in a way. Replacement of the negligence by the facilitator’s artificial conduct of enlightenment drives students to perform with confidence and with the feeling of not being intimidated by risks. Benefits are for the ELLs
to gain since endless efforts of creating a pleasing atmosphere by the facilitator has taken place. The aim is obvious: an initiative to speak in English with confidence and risk-free attempts. The impact is potentially promising in terms of developing and implementing innovative instructional program for the SNED as ELLs.
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