

MULTILINGUAL AND MONO-MULTILINGUAL STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN ENGLISH SPEAKING

Saidna Zulfiqar Bin-Tahir¹, Haryanto Atmowardoyo², Syarifuddin Dollah³, Yulini Rinantanti⁴, Aminah Suriaman⁵

¹English Education Department, Universitas Iqra Buru, Maluku

^{2,3}English Education Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar

⁴English Education Department, Universitas Cenderawasih, Papua

⁵English Education Department, Universitas Tadulako, Palu

¹Email: saidnazulfiqar@gmail.com

E-ISSN : 2615-3092

P-ISSN : 2615-3084

Abstract. The present study attempted to investigate and measure the performances of multilingual and mono-multilingual students of the *pesantren* modern IMMIM in Makassar. This study employed the mixed-method approach where the 30 students of the Junior High School were selected randomly and participated as the subject of the research. The qualitative data gained through the interview and observation of the students' behavior in English speaking and the quantitative data obtained through the speaking test. The results show that the multilingual students tend to behave extrovert and ambivert behavior in English speaking while the mono-multilingual students behave introvert. It was strengthened by the speaking test achievement which shows that the multilingual students have the high score in terms of the fluency and comprehensibility while the mono-multilingual students have the high score regarding the accuracy, especially in grammar.

Keywords: multilingual, mono-multilingual, English speaking

<http://sastra.unifa.ac.id/journal/index.php/jes/index>

INTRODUCTION

Multilingual is defined as the ability of someone to use or communicate in three or more than languages, either separately or in degrees of code-mixing and switching in different languages for different purposes and circumstances competence in each varying according to such factors as register, occupation, and education (McArthur, 1992; Edwards, 1994; Vildomec, 1963; Kemp, 2009). Multilingual may not have equal proficiency in or control over all the languages they know (Bin-Tahir, 2015a; Tahir, 2015).

Cruz-Ferreira (2010) stated that multilingualism is not about what several languages can do for the people, but it is about what people can do with several languages. This means that there are some people who master multiple languages but they are not actively using them at the same time and circumstance in daily communications, so they are called mono-multilingual (Bin-Tahir, 2015b, 2018). Thus, a

multilingual person is who actively mastered and communicated in three or more languages at the same circumstance while the mono-multilingual who mastered three or more languages and used those languages in separate circumstance (Bin-Tahir, 2017; Tahir, 2017; Bin-Tahir et al., 2018).

Some previous studies contributed theoretically to the present study. Bin-Tahir (2015) has investigated the multilingual behavior of *pesantren* IMMIM students; he also measured the attitude of students and teachers toward the multilingual education at *pesantren* schools (Bin-Tahir, 2015c); the multilingual teaching and learning strategies and methods implemented by the multilingual teachers (Bin-Tahir, 2017); the multilingual teachers/lecturers competence in English teaching (Bin-Tahir & Rinantanti, 2016); the model of multilingual teaching and learning (Bin-Tahir et al., 2017); and he also measured the effectiveness of the multilingual simultaneous-sequential approach (Bin-Tahir et al., 2018). Those studies indicated that the multilingual students and teachers as well as their teaching and

learning methods at *pesantren* schools are the unique phenomena to be studied.

The term *pesantren* often compounded with the word '*Pondok*' means hotel or dormitory where the santri/student lives. There is no significant difference between the words of *pondok* and *pesantren*. It refers to the place of religious education progress. It can be defined as the educational institution of religious teaching used the non-classical method of *kiai*/teacher to the students based on the Holy Scripture and all *santri*/students must stay inside of *pesantren* (Engku, 2014; Tahir, 2015).

Nowadays, there are 27.218 *pesantren* schools in Indonesia including 240 *pesantren* in South Sulawesi/Makassar. The number of *pesantren* schools will increase from day to day based on its graduate who intends to build the branch or the new one (Depag: Direktori Pondok Pesantren, 2014: 173). This research will focus on Modern *Pesantren* in Makassar which implement two foreign languages such as English and Arabic in teaching and learning process and also used them in daily communication (Bin-Tahir, 2017).

The atmosphere and the phenomena of languages teaching and learning at *pesantren* schools gave the new sense and contribution to distinguishing between multilingual and mono-multilingual terms theoretically. Therefore, this study attempted to investigate the multilingual and mono-multilingual students of *pesantren* modern IMIMIM behavior and their English speaking performance that contributed theoretically and practically for the further researchers and the researchers themselves to design and develop the multilingual learning model and material for the *pesantren* school students.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study applied a mixed-method approach using the sequential design. Mixed-method is a method that combines qualitative and quantitative approaches in terms of methodology (such as in the data collection stage), and mixed

model studies combine two approaches in all stages of the research process (Gay et al., 2006).

Meanwhile, according to Creswell (2014), mixed-method is a research approach that combines or associates qualitative and quantitative forms. Before selecting the subject of the study, the researchers interviewed and observed the students to categorize them into the multilingual and mono-multilingual students as well as the extrovert and introvert behavior. The researchers then selected randomly 30 students of Junior High School of *pesantren* IMMIM from the multilingual and mono-multilingual students as the research participants. The researchers grouped them into the experimental (mono-multilingual students) which treated using the role play technique and control group (multilingual students) which implemented the conventional method. The instrument applied to obtain qualitative data was the interview and observation while the quantitative data gain from the speaking test. The researchers then investigated their English speaking behavior by adapting the Jung (2016) psychological categories then divided them into the experimental and control group to measure their English speaking performance based on the curriculum at the *pesantren* school.

In analyzing the qualitative data, the researchers adapted the three-stage model by Miles et al., (2013) that consisted of display data, reduction, and verification/drawing conclusion. The quantitative data have been analyzed using the SPSS program version 17.0 to measure the students' speaking performance that presenting further descriptively and inferentially in tables and figures.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the observation checklist on the students' speaking behavior by adopting the Jung's psychological categories (2016), the researchers then present the data in table 1 as follows:

Table 1: The Students' Speaking Behavior

Multilingual Students					Mono-Multilingual Students				
No	Activities	Low	Mid	High	High	Mid	Low	Activities	No
1	Pay attention to the teacher's explanation	-	√	√	-	√	-	Pay attention to the teacher's explanation	1
2	Asking the teacher	-	√	√	-	-	√	Asking the teacher	2
3	Group working		√	√			√	Group working	3
4	Indoor	√	√		√	√		Indoor	4
5	Outdoor	-	-	√	-	-	√	Outdoor	5
6	Responding the teacher	-	√	√	-	√	√	Responding the teacher	6
7	Interact with other students in the class	-	√	√	-	√	√	Interact with other students in the class	7
8	Happy to explain the subject	-	√	√	-	-	√	Happy to explain the subject	8
9	Comfortable with the noise class	-	√	√	-	-	√	Comfortable with the noise class	9

The symbol (√) indicates the existed behavior and the symbol (-) indicates the non-existed behavior. Table 1 shows that the multilingual students' behavior categorized as middle to the high extrovert speaking behavior while the mono-multilingual students tend to be passive or introvert in speaking behavior. In other words, the speaking behavior of the multilingual students classified as the extrovert and ambivert (between the extrovert and introvert) behavior while the mono-multilingual students classified into the introvert speaking behavior.

Based on the interview result, it did strengthen the data gained from the observation that is the mono-multilingual students tend to answer the question shortly with many pauses in speaking even in answering the question in the local language or Indonesian. It can be seen through the extract below as a result of the interview with one of the mono-multilingual student (MNF):

"...I want to study English.....emmm...because...mm.. I like foreign language..emmm.... I can read books...mmmm....know the world...mmmm....enrich ...mm..my knowledge and.....mmmm.....information"

The extract above shows many pauses made by the mono-multilingual student in English speaking. In the contrarily, the result of the interview with most of the multilingual students indicated the openness of their behavior and ease of their communication. As can be seen in the extract below with the student (MR):

"Well, English is a crucial language nowadays, so we have to master it if we want to know the whole information and knowledge, English is an international language used by most people around the world, if we don't master it we will become a stranger and late in everything..We know it we win and vice versa we lost...mmm. Oh Gosh, I myself I won't be a loser so I've to study it hard for my future job and life".

The extract above shows that the multilingual students can speak and communicate well in English. They also have some tricks to use the fillers like the words 'well' and 'oh my Gosh'. The researchers then conduct the speaking test to know both students' achievement in English speaking. The data of speaking test results from the experimental group can be presented as follows:

Table 2: The Students' Score Achievement in the Experimental Group

Score Range	Classification	Pretest						Posttest					
		Accuracy		Fluency		Comprehensibility		Accuracy		Fluency		Comprehensibility	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
80-100	Very Good to Excellent	2	13.3	3	20.0	3	20.0	13	87.7	4	27.7	11	73.3
66-79	Good	6	40.0	5	33.3	11	73.3	2	13.3	11	73.3	4	27.7
56-65	Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41-55	Poor	7	47.7	7	47.7	1	7.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
< 40	Very poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		15	100	15	100	15	100	15	100	15	100	15	100

Table 2 illustrates that most of the students in pretest were in good in the accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility or the average category. The aggregate percentage of pretest categorized as low achiever was 7 students (47.7% in accuracy, 47.7% in fluency, and 7.7% in comprehensibility) and high achiever was only 8 students (53.3% in accuracy, 53.3% in fluency, and 93% in comprehensibility). Referring to the aggregate of percentage in pretests showed that the good achievers were bigger than high achievers. It

indicated that the students were in average classification and still needed to be improved.

While in posttest illustrated that the students' achievement was improved after the treatment using the role play technique. The aggregate percentage of students spread in high achiever category. The aggregate percentage of posttest categorized as high achiever was 15 students (100%) and most of them have the higher score in term of accuracy. The students' score achievement in the control group can be presented in table 3 as follows:

Table 3: The Students' Score Achievement in the Control Group

Score Range	Classification	Pretest						Posttest					
		Accuracy		Fluency		Comprehensibility		Accuracy		Fluency		Comprehensibility	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
80-100	Very Good to Excellent	0	0	2	13.3	2	13.3	7	46.7	13	87.7	14	93.3
66-79	Good	3	20.0	3	20.0	13	87.7	8	54.3	2	13.3	1	7.7

56-65	Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41-55	Poor	9	60.0	6	40.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
< 40	Very poor	3	20.0	4	27.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		15	100	15	100	15	100	15	100	15	100	100

Table 3 illustrates that most of the students in pretest were in poor in the accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility or low category. The aggregate percentage of pretest categorized as low achiever was 12 students (67% in accuracy, 67% in fluency, and 0% in comprehensibility) and high achiever was only 3 students (20% in accuracy, 33.3% in fluency, and 100% in comprehensibility). The posttest illustrated that the students' achievement was improved after the treatment using the conventional method. The aggregate percentage of students spread in high achiever category. The aggregate percentage of posttest categorized as high achiever was 15 students (100%). Most of them have the higher scores in terms of the comprehensibility and fluency.

The qualitative results show that the mono-multilingual students tend to be the introvert speaking behavior. The introvert is the attitude or character of someone who has a mentally subjective orientation in living his life. Introverted personalities tend to like conditions that are calm, happy to be alone, reflective of what they do. They have a tendency to stay away from interaction with new things. This situation impacted them to have an introvert behavior in speaking (Jung, 2016).

The multilingual students tend to be the extrovert and ambivert of speaking behavior. If introverts prefer to be alone, then an extrovert prefers an interactive environment. They are quite enthusiastic about new things and like to hang out. Ambivert is a special personality; he is an introvert and can also be an extrovert. There is someone who is born directly with an ambivert personality. Generally, an ambivert is more likely to dominate the weaknesses of introverts and extroverts. Those

behaviors impacted them to be fluent in speaking (Jung, 2016).

In general, the students' prior skill in English speaking in both groups was relatively the same based on their pretests where the mean score revolves in 50 and 73 in the posttests. However, there were three items that researcher tries to find out in the experimental group; they were accuracy (82.13), fluency (62.60), and comprehensibility (75.13) while in the control group were 61.57 in the accuracy, 77.34 in the fluency, and 89.00 in the comprehensibility. The highest score was the accuracy in the experimental group (mono-multilingual students) and the highest score was the comprehensibility and fluency in the control group (multilingual students). The accuracy in speaking means that the students can get the good of word choice; vocabulary grammar and can understand what has been said. Harmer (1998: 107) says that if two people want to make a communication with each other, they have to speak because they have different information. If there is a 'gap' between them, it is not a good communication if the people still confuse with what they say. To avoid the gap, the speaker should pay attention to the process of constructing meaning.

An interactive process of constructing meaning involves producing, receiving and processing information (Burn and Joyce, 1997: 63). Its form and meaning are dependent on the context in which it occurs, including the participants themselves, their collective experiences, the physical environment, an acceptable level of language, and the purposes for speaking.

Even though the comprehensibility score was the highest score but most students get problems in speaking to express their ideas so that

the speaker can understand their intention and those caused of inhabitation, lack of vocabularies or nothing to say, and the influence of mother tongue or first language (Ur, 1996). Therefore, to solve students' inhabitation, lack of vocabularies, and mother tongue, the teacher should pay much attention to teaching and learning activities such as monologue, dialogue, question and answer, and speaking method.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, the researchers concluded that the multilingual students have the extrovert and ambivert of speaking behavior while the mono-multilingual students tend to be the introvert behavior in English speaking. Otherwise, the mono-multilingual students have the good performance in term of the accuracy and comprehensibility while the multilingual students have the good performance regarding the comprehensibility and fluency. Thus, to motivate the mono-multilingual students in improving their behavior and speaking skill, the teacher should apply some techniques such as through the more practicing opportunities, the role play technique, and other methods.

REFERENCES

Bin Tahir, S. Z. (2015). Multilingual Education in Pesantren Context. *Yogyakarta: Deepublish*.

Bin Tahir, S. Z. (2015). The attitude of Santri and Ustadz toward multilingual education at Pesantren. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(4), 210-216. 12.

Bin-Tahir, S. Z., & Rinantanti, Y. (2016). Multilingual Lecturers' Competence in English Teaching at the University of Iqra Buru, Indonesia. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5, 79-92.

Bin-Tahir, S. Z., Atmowardoyo, H., Dollah, S., & Rinantanti, Y. (2017). Multilingual Instructional Model of Pesantren Schools in Indonesia. *Journal of*

Language Teaching and Research, 8(6), 1210-1216.

Bin Tahir, S. Z. (2017). Multilingual teaching and learning at Pesantren Schools in Indonesia. *Asian EFL Journal*, 89, 74-94.

Bin-Tahir, S. Z., Atmowardoyo, H., Dollah, S., & Rinantanti, Y. (2017). Multilingual learning program: pesantren students' perceptions of the multilingual simultaneous-sequential model. *JELE (Journal Of English Language and Education)*, 3(2), 44-53.

Bin-Tahir, S. Z., Saidah, U., Mufidah, N., & Bugis, R. (2018). The Impact of Translanguaging Approach on Teaching Arabic Reading in a Multilingual Classroom. *Ijaz Arabi Journal of Arabic Learning*, 1(1). 22-30.

Creswell, W. John. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Third Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Cruz-Ferreira, M. (2010). *Multilinguals are...?.* London: Battlebridge Publications.

Depag: Direktori Pondok Pesantren. (2014). Data statistik jumlah Pondok Pesantren di seluruh Indonesia. (Online) Accessed on March, 11, 2015 from <http://pendis.kemenag.go.id/file/dokumen/>.

Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London: Routledge.

Engku, I & Zubaidah, S. (2014). *Sejarah Pendidikan Islami*. Bandung; PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Gay, L. R, Mills, G, and Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational Research; Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. Eight Edition. New Jersey; Pearson Prentice Hall.

Jung, C. (2016). *Psychological types*. Routledge: Routledge

- Kemp, C. (2009). Defining multilingualism. In L. Aronin & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), *The exploration of multilingualism*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins. (pp. 11-26).
- McArthur, T. (ed). (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: OUP.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage publication.
- Tahir, B., & Zulfiqar, S. (2015). Multilingual Behavior of Pesantren IMMIM Students in Makassar. *Asian EFL Journal*, 86, 45-64.
- Tahir, S. Z. A. B. (2017). Pengembangan Materi Multibahasa untuk Siswa Pesantren (*Unpublish Doctoral dissertation, Pascasarjana*). Universitas Negeri Makassar.