


Terbit online pada laman web jurnal : <http://e-journal.sastra-unes.com/index.php/JIPS>

| | | |
|--|--|---|
|  Fakultas Sastra Universitas Ekasakti | JURNAL JIPS (Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Scholastic) | |
| | Vol. 7 No. 3 ISSN : 2579-5449 (media cetak) | E-ISSN : 2597-6540 (media online) |

The Ability of Second Grade Senior High School Students in Speaking Transactional and Interpersonal Conversation at SMA Negeri 7 Padang

*¹Mona Afersa, ²Desi Andriani, ³Pinta Medina, ⁴Asma Alhusna

¹English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Putra Indonesia
YPTK Padang, afersamona373@gmail.com

²English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK
Padang, andrianidesi33@gmail.com

³Informatical Engineering, Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK Padang,
pintamedina28@gmail.com

⁴English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK
Padang, asma.unp@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

Mona Afersa

English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK
Padang, afersamona373@gmail.com

Abstract

Speaking is often tested to the students beside listening, reading and writing. Moreover, speaking is an important skill. Students can express their feeling, ideas or opinion through speaking. In addition, students should be able to retell meaning of the monologue and functional texts or produce a transactional/interpersonal dialogue. The object of the data is the second grade students of SMAN 7 Padang. Speaking test was used to get information about the students' ability in transactional and interpersonal conversation. The indicators are grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency. Based on the findings and discussion above there are four conclusions that can be drawn in this research. First, the ability of the students in speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation viewed from grammar aspect is fair. Second, the ability of the students in speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation viewed from vocabulary aspect is fair. Third, the ability of the students in speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation viewed from comprehension aspect was fair. Forth, the ability of the students in speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation viewed from fluency aspect is fair.

Keywords: Speaking Ability, Transactional Text, Interpersonal Text

© 2023Jurnal JIPS

I INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of the four skills which determine the students' success in learning English. It is because speaking is often tested to the students beside listening, reading and writing. Moreover, speaking is an important skill. Students can express their feeling, ideas or opinion through speaking.

There are three kinds of texts used in teaching speaking. They are monologue text, functional and transactional/interpersonal text. In addition, students should be able to retell meaning of the monologue and functional texts or produce a transactional/interpersonal dialogue.

Transactional and interpersonal texts are stated as one kind of texts in teaching speaking skill. Transactional text is a conversation that primarily involves the exchange of some form of good, service or information. There are two different types of transactional conversation. One

is a situation where the focus is on giving and receiving information and where the participants focus primarily on what is said or achieved (e.g: asking someone for the time). The second type is transaction which focuses on obtaining goods or services, such as checking into a hotel (Burns, 1998).

Moreover, Interpersonal text is a conversation that primarily involves the creation, maintenance and extension of personal and relation such as personal interviews or casual conversation. It's important for the students to be able to produce or create the conversations by themselves since it is close to the students' real life. In addition, school is one of place where the students can get and practice the skill. Thus, the second grade senior high school students should be able to communicate and convey information effectively in spoken English.

II RESEARCH METHOD

This study is a kind of descriptive research. It involves collecting data to answer the research questions. As Gay and Airisian (2000) explain that descriptive study determines and describes the things are. Therefore, this study describes the ability of second grade senior high school students in speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation at SMAN 7 Padang.

The object of the data is the second grade students of SMAN 7 Padang. In taking the sample, cluster sampling technique was used. Thus, two classes from nine classes were chosen randomly as the sample. Since the research sees the students' speaking ability, speaking test was used to get information about the students' ability in transactional and interpersonal conversation. The indicators are grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency.

III RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The students' ability in speaking transactional/interpersonal conversation was scored based on four aspects. They are grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency.

1. Grammar
There were only six students out of 36 students spoke in god quality viewed from grammar aspect.

example:

Table 1. The Rating Qualities for Students' Speaking Ability

| Score | Rating Qualities |
|-------|------------------|
| 4.1-5 | Very good |
| 3.1-4 | Good |
| 2.1-3 | Fair |
| 1.1-2 | Poor |
| < 1 | Very Poor |

A:Hi!
B:Hello!
A: What do you think about there are many beger in our city?
B: beger? I think the begers must get job.
A: I agree with you. But, what your advice to decrease te beger?
B: Maybe government decrease the beger with job vacancy.
A: oh.... I agree with you.

The example above showed that the speakers can control the grammar. They were able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy in informal conversation on social topic.

2.Vocabulary

There only three students out of 36 students were classified good in vocabulary aspect.

example:

A:Hi!
B:Hi!
A: This morning I look many beger, so I feel so sympathy.
B: so, what do you opinion about that?
A: In my opinion, the beger is trouble anywhere. I think to decreased that we need organization with giving skill study to order they can make something and not become beger again.
B: Ok. I agree for you but once I think the government should can introduce the beger for can be for use people.

The speakers above could understand and participate in conversation within range of his experience with a high degree of precision of vocabulary.

3.Comprehension

There were only five students out of 36 students were classified having good quality in comprehension.

example:

A: Fajri, long time no see. How are you?
B: oh... Agung, I'm fine. And you?
A: I'm fine too, thanks.

B: Agung, I heard that MUI stated that smoking is not allowed. What do you think about that?
A: I think that's a good idea but it's not good for our country.
B:why?
A:because many people will lose their job. What about you?
B: I think so. Because cigarette is the biggest tax source in our country.

It can be seen that the speakers above could understand the conversation within the range of his experience. Thus, they were categorized good in comprehension aspect.

4.Flucy

There were only four students out of 36 students were classified good in flucy.

example:

A:Hi!
B:Hi!
A:How do you feel today?
B:one hundred percent.
A:are you have unforgetable experience?
B:yes, I have.
A:please tell for me.
B: ok. In my last holiday, my family and I go to Pekanbaru then I travelling to all the objects in Pekanbaru.
A: oh... it's interesting.
B: thank you. And you?
A: in my birthday two month ago, my father give me new motorcycle.
B: wow....it's good. What name your motorcycle?
A: Suzuki.
B: I hope my father can give me new motorcycle for me.
A: I hope.

The students fulfilled criteria: able to use language fluently on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs.

IV CONCLUSION

As mentioned before, the purpose of this research was to identify the ability of second grade senior high school students in speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation at SMAN 7 Padang. Based on the findings and discussion above there are four conclusions that can be drawn in this research. First, the ability of the students in speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation viewed from grammar aspect is fair. Second, the ability of the students in

speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation viewed from vocabulary aspect is fair.

Third, the ability of the students in speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation viewed from comprehension aspect was fair. Forth, the ability of the students in speaking transactional and interpersonal conversation viewed from fluency aspect is fair.

Bibliography

- [1]Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik* 6th Ed., Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- [2]Brown, J. D. 1995. *The Elements of Language Curriculum*. New York: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- [3]Gay, R. L., Mills, and Airasian. 2011. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (10th ed). The United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [4]Harmer, Jeremy. 1998. *How to Teach English*. United State: Addison Wesley Longman.
- [5]Hamp-Lyons. 1992. *Holistic Speaking Ability for ELP Students*.
<http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/symposia/second/vol2/holistic-ref.htm>.
- [6]Harmer, Jeremy. 1998. *How to Teach English*. United State: Addison Wesley Longman.
- [7]McCarthy, M. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [8]Oxford, R. L. 1990. *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- [9]Savignon, Sandra. 1983. *Communicative Competence: Theory and practice*. Rowley: Addison Wesley.
- [10]Weir, Cyril. 1990. *Communicative Language Testing*. Toronto: Practice Hall International (UK) ltd.