

The YSU French Student Ability Of Explaining Tourism Objects

by Dwiyanto Djoko Pranowo

Submission date: 13-May-2019 01:53PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1129567964

File name: Artikel_ICLA7.docx (40.76K)

Word count: 3060

Character count: 16359

The YSU French Student Ability Of Explaining Tourism Objects

Dwiyanto Djoko Pranowo¹

¹ Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta Indonesia, (e-mail) dwiyanto@uny.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to describe the students' skills of explaining tourism objects in French language, the competence level to interact, and the speaking error. The research data was collected by using the performance test of French speaking skills through video recordings of presentation of tourism objects. The subjects were 21 students of French education majoring in *Francais du Tourisme* courses. The research object was speaking skills and the ability to explain tourism objects in French. The respondent's skills in explaining tourism objects were at level 3 or equivalent to level B1 of The Common European Framework of Reference with indicators 1) *savoir informer*, 2) *savoir expliquer*, 3) *clarte*, 4) *comprehensibilité*, 5) *lexico-semantic*, 6) *morpho- syntaxique*, and 7) *prononciation*. The ability to give information (*savoir informer*) and the French pronunciation ability were approaching the CEFR B2 level. The types of errors are errors in pronunciation, diction, sentences and misrepresentation.

Keywords: speaking ability, explaining skill, tourism objects, errors.

Introduction

Learning and teaching foreign languages, especially French, is increasingly needed in the era of globalization so that students can seize the job market. In addition to English, French and several other foreign languages is one of the foreign languages taught at both the high school (SMA / SMK) and college levels.

The French language taught at high-ranking places, especially in the Faculty of Language and Arts at Yogyakarta State University (YSU), is the teaching of French in the field of education for prospective teachers and the French language in the field of specialization in Literature and Linguistics. While there is still a special interest in providing professional skills such as French Hospitality and Tourism which aims to equip students with applied French in professional communication.

In practice, the only provision of language in directing students to master competence in the world of tourism is not enough, so they need to obtain various other supporting knowledge. Meanwhile, the effort to make students master French to meet the demands of the professional world also turned out not to be as easy as talking about it in theoretical classes. Various knowledge and language skills as a provision of French tourism have been given to students but have not fully fulfilled the quality demanded by the job market.

What exactly is needed to improve the quality of French tourism learning? Some things might be able to answer it. First, the focus of learning and the competencies to be achieved need to be revised and actualized with the demands of the professional world. Second, the learning method needs to be reorientated to the mastery and application of productive language competencies. French tourism learning materials and methods can relate to the tasks of the office of a tourist travel agent in general (*agence de voyage*), tours guide at monuments (*sentier battu*), special interest tours guided (eco tourisme) and others. In fact, the choice of learning material can be done by the instructor based on the analysis of labor market needs. (Dallies, 2008: 193).

Like the language learning in general, learning French Tourism requires adequate language competence, appropriate learning methods and materials so that learning can take place as expected. Until now, the method of teaching French language tourism was still unable to develop students' French language skills effectively. This can be a problem for the lecturers who teach this course. This problem, of course, must be addressed immediately, one of them with various research efforts and studies on the appropriate methods, techniques, materials and strategies so that students can have the French language competencies needed to enter and seize the job market. The issues raised in this study are 1) How do the students' skills explain tourism objects using French. And 2) What types of errors experienced by students both in linguistic competence and mastery of tourist objects and explaining skills in French. By these two issues this research try to get information about the

students' ability and the errors they made. It will be very useful to improve the quality of French tourism teaching and learning.

Method

This descriptive research is an attempt to understand the real conditions in the field in order to improve the learning of French for tourism in the Department of French Language Education YSU. Through comprehensive data can be used to determine the appropriate steps in improving the quality of learning French Tourism or *Français sur Objectif Spécifique* (FOS).

This research was carried out in the Department of French Language Education, YSU, in the year 2018. The subjects of this study were the sixth semester students majoring in French Language Education, faculty of Language and Arts who had taken language skills courses and is taking courses in French Tourism or FOS. All students were included as respondents in this study. The subjects were 21 students of French education majoring in *Français du Tourisme* courses. The research object was the skill of speaking French in explaining tourist objects and language errors that occur which were categorized as pronunciation errors, diction errors, sentence errors, and expression errors.

The data was carried out through a video recording of the practice of explaining tourist objects. Respondents were asked to choose one of the attractions then explain the object in French. The duration of the explanation is 3-5 minutes. The results of the video recording were submitted to Rater (4 researchers) to discuss the ability to explain it using 7 indicators with a score range 1 - 5. The seven indicators are 1) *savoir informer*, 2) *savoir expliquer*, 3) *clarte* (clarity of message), 4) *comprehensibilité* (understanding of messages), 5) *Lexico-semantic* (lexical-semantics), 6) *morpho-syntaxique* (morpho-syntax), and 7) *prononciation* (pronunciation).

In addition to the ability to explain, the video about explaining tourism objects also analyzed the error rate using 4 error categories, namely 1) pronunciation errors, 2) diction errors, 3) sentence errors, and 4) expression errors. Identified error data is analyzed qualitatively.

The instrument developed in this study is a test of speaking skills and observation sheets. To guarantee the validity of the instrument, the blueprint of the test is adjusted to the research needs and is validated by experts (expert judgment).

Results and Discussion

Skills to explain tourism objects

The mean score of the respondents' skills is 3.35 from a maximum score of 5 or the average value of the respondents' skills explaining the tourism objects is 67.1. Referring to the table scoring criteria, this score means that the respondent's skills in explaining tourism objects are at level 3 or equivalent to level B1 CEFR. Level B1 has the following indicators.

Table 1. Indicators of speaking skills at level B1 CEFR

No	Indicators	Description
1	<i>Savoir informer</i>	To be able to provide information about the brief history of tourism objects
2	<i>Savoir expliquer</i>	To be able to answer questions related to history (who, when, events)
3	<i>Clarte</i>	Explanations are delivered with French pronunciation that is unclear but still understandable
4	<i>Comprehensibilité</i>	Explanation contains sentences that have been arranged but many questions need to be understood
5	<i>Lexico-semantic</i>	The lexicon used is in part general words without many repetitions and certain terminology that clarifies information about objects
6	<i>Morpho-syntaxique</i>	Discourse is arranged in single sentences and compound sentences that are coherent but with micro errors of grammatical rules on verb conjugation and preposition use
7	<i>Prononciation</i>	French pronunciation has followed the rules of the French pronunciation but the pronunciation error still reaches approximately 40%

With speaking skill level B1 means the average respondent is able to explain tourism objects quite well. In their performance presentation, they have been able to provide information about the brief history of tourism objects. In the explanation the respondent can explain the things related to history about the tourist objects that they explain including information about the events that happened, who the figures are related, and

when the object was made. But the explanation is given with the pronunciation of French which is less clear even though it is still understandable.

Explanations containing sentences that have been arranged are good enough but there are still many questions to understand. The lexicon used is in part general words without many repetitions and certain terminology that clarifies the description of the object. Discourse is arranged in single sentences and coherent compound sentences but with micro errors still being made in the use of grammatical rules such as verb conjugation and prepositions. French pronunciation has followed the rules of the pronunciation of French but pronunciation errors still reach approximately 40%.

Viewing from each indicator, it appears that the *Savoir informer* indicator (Ability to inform) and *Prononciation* (pronunciation) have a mean score that approaches the CEFR B2 level. The ability to provide information has a mean score of 3.62 or a mean score of 72.4 and the ability to pronounce French has a mean score of 3.67 or a mean value of 73.3.

Lexico-semantic mastery (lexical-semantics) and *Morpho-syntaxique* (morphosyntaxis) have the lowest mean scores compared to other indicators. The average *Lexico-semantic* score is 3.14 and the mean *Morpho-syntaxique* score is 3.10. This can be understood because of the huge differences between the rules of Indonesian and French. Repetitions often occur because respondents are less accustomed to using pronouns, as in the following example.

** "Borobudur Temple a été construit and la dynastie Çailendra par Samaratungga. Borobudur Temple a trente-cinq metre de hauteur et deux mille cinq centres de largeur. Borobudur Temple a trois etages. Borobudur temple a cinquante statues Buddhiques, et soixante treize stupas. "*

In the example above there is a repetition of the word Borobudur Temple. For listeners, the sentence feels boring. Actually speakers can replace the word borobudur with 'il' or 'ce temple'.

Pronunciation error

The pronunciation error can be identified as shown below. Errors in pronunciation categories can be classified in:

- a. *Liason* error due to confusion in [s] and [z] sounds
- b. Error pronouncing the 'e' sound in the initial prefix or syllable.
- c. Confusion of nasal sounds -on / -om / -en / -am / -em
- d. The confusion of the phonetic sound of the pronominal verb and the word 'roi' and its derivative
- e. Confusion of similar phonetic sounds and sound changes due to adjective adjustment
- f. Misconceptions of the sounds of 'de' and 'du'

In French language, there are three sound classes, namely vowels, consonants, and semi-vowels or semi-consonants. In written language and spoken language, the system of graphies and phonies in French is unlike in Indonesian, which generally requires one phonem for one graphie. In French one phonem may be written in several graphs. In Indonesian, the graph 'aku' will be pronounced [a-k-u], but in French the graph 'monsieur' (mister) is pronounced with [mɔsjø].

According to French reading rules, the last consonant is almost always not pronounced. The writing 'petit' (small) is pronounced [pəti]. Whereas the word 'petites' (plural forms of 'small', femina) is pronounced [pətit]. 'Fils' (boy) read [fis] are exceptions to this rule. But if a word ends with a consonant followed by a word that starts with a vowel (the consonant is followed by a vowel), then the two words are usually connected and read without interruption (*liason*). For example: 'mon appartement' is pronounced [monapartemɑ̃]. The word ends with a consonant 's' when followed by a word that starts with a vowel, it will be pronounced 'z'. Whereas if you meet a word that starts with 's' as well, it will be pronounced with 's'. For example "vous avez" (you have) is pronounced [vuzave] and "vous savez" (you know) is pronounced [vuzave].

It is clear that the rule has the potential to cause difficulties for learners of French speaking Indonesian. Indonesian-speaking learners also tend to have difficulties pronouncing phonemes [v], [œ], [y], [ø]. Phonologically French learners tend to transfer the Indonesian or regional language sound system into French when pronouncing phonemes, words, phrases, and sentences. Thus the errors that appear can be predicted before.

Error of diction

Diction is a choice of words. In Indonesian dictionary, diction is the right choice of words and is aligned (in its use) to express ideas to obtain certain effects. The diction errors identified are as follows.

a. De vous - Devant vous

The choice of the word "de vous" (from you) in the sentence "On va de vous, c'est le temple de Prambanan" (from you, the Prambanan temple) is incorrect. It should be "Devant vous, c'est le temple de Prambanan" (In front of you, it's the Prambanan temple).

- b. *est classée au - fait partie du*
The use of the phrase 'est classée au' in the sentence "Prambanan est classé au patrimoine du mondiale de l'humanité par Unesco" is incorrect. The correct choice of words for this sentence is "fait partie du" so the sentence should be "Prambanan fait partie du patrimoine du mondiale de l'humanité par Unesco"
- c. *Il repose sur - Il se lève sur*
The word "reposer" in the sentence "Il repose sur une structure ..." is incorrect. It should use the word "se lever" so that the sentence becomes "Il se lève sur une structure ...".
- d. *Les paysants travaillent au terrain - au champ*
Selection of the word 'au terrain' (in the fields) in the sentence "le paysant quand il était en train de travailler sur le terrain ..." (The farmer who is working in the field) is incorrect. The correct word is 'au champ'.
- e. *Le temple Kalasan face à l'Est - Le temple Kalasan se donne à l'Est*
The word 'face à' and 'se donne à' have the same meaning, namely 'facing'. However, the use of the word in the sentence 'Le temple Kalasan face à l'Est' is not appropriate. We recommend replacing with "Le temple Kalasan se donne à l'Est".

Sentence error

Sentence is the smallest language unit consisting of at least one subject and one predicate, which can be used to convey ideas or ideas. It can be said to be the smallest language unit because actually above the level of the sentence there is still another language unit that is greater. Errors in sentence can have an impact on failing to convey ideas. The error of the sentence here is an error at the level of the grammatical structure that is not acceptable in the French language. The errors that appear are as follows.

- On peut continuer et pris des photos.* It should be *On peut continuer et prendre des photos.*
- Ce temple s'est construit.* should be *Ce temple a été construit.*
- Ce temple est sorti de ...* should be *Ce temple a été sorti de ...*
- Le temple qui a construit.* should be *Le temple qui a été construit*
- Il a représentant...* should be *Il a été construit.*
- Ces temples, ce sont considérés...* should be *Ces temples, ils sont considérés ...*
- On appelé...* should be *Que l'on appelle.*
- Appartenant au village, ...* should be *Il appartient au village.*
- On y va trouve 3 temples.* should be *On va y trouver 3 temples.*

Error of Expression

In learning foreign languages, the first language (mother tongue) often interferences to the target language. Learners often say something in the target language using their native language rules. Or they say something by translating the word to word from the mother tongue into the target language so that the resulting sentence is not acceptable in the target language expression. This is as seen in the following example.

- S'il n'y a des questions...* should be *S'il n'y a pas de questions...*
- Qui est entré de la salle principale...* should be *La porte à l'entrée de...*
- Le temple Kalasan face à l'Est.* should be *Le temple Kalasan se donne à l'Est.*
- Le début du développement du temple vient du conseil du chef religion.* should be *Le commencement de la construction du temple a été effectué grâce au conseil du chef religieux.*
- Le terrain de 50, de 60* should be *Le terrain de 50m de largeur et 60 m de longuer.*

Conclusions

The students' skills in explaining tourism objects are at level 3 or equivalent to level B1 CEFR with indicators 1) *savoir informer*, 2) *savoir expliquer*, 3) *clarte*, 4) *comprehensibilité*, 5) *lexico-semantique*, 6) *morpho- syntaxique*, and 7) *prononciation*. Both the ability to provide information (*savoir informer*) and the

French pronunciation ability of the students are approaching the CEFR B2 level. The types of errors that arise are errors in pronunciation, error in diction, error in sentences and misrepresentation. This error is due to differences in rules between Indonesian and French which cause confusion for students in speaking French.

Even though the quality of learning French Tourism has exceeded the learning target (level B1), there are still things that need to be improved by utilizing identified errors. Teachers can take advantage of a list of errors for remediation. The improvements in pronunciation need special attention from the teacher because pronunciation errors can cause communication problems.

Acknowledgments

I would like to say thank you to all of my colleagues and students who helped doing this research and writing this article. I really expect criticism and suggestions from readers for the improvement of my research project. Hopefully, this paper can be useful for the Department of French Language Education UNY, especially in an effort to maintain and improve the quality of teaching so that it can provide the best service to the students.

References

- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles an interactive approach to language pedagogy – 2nd ed.* New York: Pearson Education
- Conseil de l'Europe. (2000). *Un cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues : apprendre, enseigner, évaluer.* Strasbourg: Division des politiques linguistiques.
- Darwis, R., Sumirat, W., & Nurjamal, D. (2014). *Terampil berbahasa.* Bandung: Alfabeta
- Eurin, S. (2000). *Français langue étrangère et seconde: cours en maîtrise de Français Langue Etrangère.* CNED: Poitiers.
- Florence Mourlhon-Dallies. (2008). *Enseigner une langue à des fins professionnelles.* Paris: Didier.
- Lumban Tobing, R. (2003). Analisis kesalahan sintaksis bahasa Prancis oleh pembelajar berbahasa Indonesia: sebuah studi kasus. *Humaniora* Vol XV.No.2/2013
- Nurgiyantoro, B. (2012). *Penilaian dalam pengajaran bahasa dan sastra.* Yogyakarta: BPF UGM.
- Pranowo, D. (2015). *Kesilapan/kesalahan berbahasa.* Jakarta: Gramedia
- Putrayasa, I.B. (2010). *Kalimat efektif (diksi, struktur, dan logika).* Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Tarigan, H.G. (2008). *Berbicara sebagai suatu ketrampilan berbahasa.* Bandung: Angkasa.
- (2011). *Pengajaran analisis kesalahan berbahasa.* Bandung: Angkasa
- Warzée, D.J. (2010). "Construire un module de français sur objectifs spécifiques" Makalah disajikan pada pelatihan FOS, di SCAC Jakarta, 2-5 November 2010

The YSU French Student Ability Of Explaining Tourism Objects

ORIGINALITY REPORT

2%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

1%

PUBLICATIONS

1%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

M. Khairudin, Dessy Irmawati. "Comparison methods of edge detection for USG images", 2016 3rd International Conference on Information Technology, Computer, and Electrical Engineering (ICITACEE), 2016

Publication

<1%

2

Laura Block. "Policy Frames on Spousal Migration in Germany", Springer Nature, 2016

Publication

<1%

3

intralinea.org

Internet Source

<1%

4

jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

5

studylib.net

Internet Source

<1%

6

www.intralinea.org

Internet Source

<1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On

The YSU French Student Ability Of Explaining Tourism Objects

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/0

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5
