The Analysis Of Communication Accommodation Strategies Used By Students Of English Language Education Of Ganesha Univeristy Of Education

Suputra, D. P. R.[1], Ramendra, D. P.[2], Swandana, I. W.[3]

[1][2][3] *English Language Education, Ganesha University of Education, Bali, Indonesia*

ABSTRACT

Language development affects human speech. Speech is the way of communication. The purpose of communication involves how the information can be transferred to each other. People accommodate their communication in daily life to achieve the goal of communication. Another possible purpose which is expected by communicator is showing an identity. It can be done by using strategy based on Communication Accommodation Theory. Communication accommodation strategy is divided by two, divergence and convergence strategy. Phenomena of the use of convergence and divergence exist on students of English Language Education of Ganesha Univerisity of Education. English Language Education students are prepared as a teacher who needs prior knowledge about communication strategy that is expected for communication skill development. The population of the study is students of English Language Education of Ganesha University of Education who are from each regencies in Bali. This study used qualitative method with descriptive design which is expected can describe the use of Convergence and Divergence strategy within the reason of using each strategy. The variables being analyzed are speech rate, pauses, utterance length and lexical accommodation. The data is collected through observation and interview session. The result of study shows that students are possible to use multiple strategy in each variable based on current circumstance. The circumstance involves the place, interlocutor, intimacy, and speech community. All students uses convergence strategy in all variable and three of them use divergence strategy lexically. The reason of using each communication accommodation strategy is taken from communication accommodation theory.

1. Introduction

Communication is an act of giving and transferring information to each other. According to Douglas (2019), communication involves the ac of conveying meaning from one or group to another by using mutual understood signs, symbols, and semiotic rules. The goal of communication is when the information can be transferred well. On the other hand, people may have another purpose in communication such as showing their identity. To reach those goals, people accommodate their speech and behavior by implementing Communication Accommodation Strategy. CAT is development of Speech Accommodation strategy. CAT is developed by Giles, H., et al., (1973). Communication Accommodation Theory is the ability to adjust, modify, and regulate behavior in terms of responding other people Giles (2016). In CAT, there are two strategies; Convergence and Divergence strategy. Convergence is defined as a strategy used by people to adapt to each other in term of communicative behavior Giles, H., et al., (1991). Theoretically, convergence is used when the speaker wishes to evoke social approval, frequently from a powerless individual, speaker wants to reach communication efficiency, and speaker wants to be attracted by others in communication Giles, H., & Ogay (2007). Divergence strategy is the opposite of convergence strategy where divergence goes to communicator behavior that involves in speech but does not show the similarity among the situation Giles, H. & Coupland (1991). There is also reasons of choosing divergence strategy theoretically as stated by Giles, H. (1991) as follows; In society, they want to protect their social culture or showing social identity and cultural heritage, speakers may have higher positions and different role in communication, speaker doesn't want to communicate because the interlocutor has bad attitude or look. The phenomena of using communication accommodation strategy happen in English Language

Education of Ganesha University of Education. In this study, the researcher described the use of communication accommodation strategy includes the students' reason of using the strategy.

2. Methods

This study was conducted with qualitative research approach which conducted in English Language Education of Ganesha University of Education. The researcher collected the data from the students of each regency in Bali (Gianyar, Karangasem, Bangli, Klungkung, Badung, Denpasar, Tabanan, Buleleng and Negara). The data was collected from observation and interview section. The main instruments of data collection were the researcher, interview guide, observation sheet, field note, and voice recorder. The data was analyzed descriptively. All the data was analyzed through triangulation theory by Hoyo, M.O. & Allen (2006).

3. Result and Discussion

Strategies used by students are both convergence and divergence, but not all of the strategies are used in every aspect. Four aspects are being analyzed: Speech rate, pauses, utterance length, and lexical without non-verbal features (smiling and gazing) because the data is taken through voice recorder and some of the data are taken in not face-to-face situation (phone call). The result of the study provides the use of communication accommodation strategy and the reason of using each communication strategy. Data trustworthiness was made by using three triangulation; data triangulation, method triangulation, and theory triangulation.

Table 1. List of Strategy used in each variable

| No | Name of Students | Code | Communication accommodation strategy based on speech rate, pauses, utterance length, and Lexical | | | | |
			Speech Rate	Pauses	Utterance Length	Lexical Convergence	Divergence
1	KTF	S 1.0	Convergence	Convergence	Convergence	√	√
2	DW	S 2.1	Convergence	Convergence	Convergence	√	√
3	LK	S 3.1	Convergence	Convergence	Convergence	√	
4	KM	S 4.0	Convergence	Convergence	Convergence	√	
5	TSUD	S 5.1	Convergence	Convergence	Convergence	√	√
6	YW	S 6.0	Convergence	Convergence	Convergence	√	
7	V	S 7.1	Convergence	Convergence	Convergence	√	
8	T	S 8.1	Convergence	Convergence	Convergence	√	
9	CW	S 9.1	Convergence	Convergence	Convergence	√	

The data showed that each student had their way of using communication accommodation strategy. The use of convergence strategy was very dominating during the data collection. Some of the students used the same strategy over all the communication including the variable researched. It is related with Coupland (1980) where the Cardiff Travel Agents used 72% convergence strategy to talk with the interlocutor. Even though the result of the study showed all of the students used convergence strategy, there were still three students who use divergence strategy lexically which was the kind of multiple strategies usage. In Bilous, F. R., & Krauss (1988), the phenomena of multiple strategy happened on sex-mixed talk where female used convergence in speech and used divergence strategy on how they laugh. The motive of using strategy was considered by favorites, charisma, and credibility owned by the interlocutor (Giles, H., et al., 1991). Related with Levin, H. & Lin (1988) found that John Dean used convergence strategy to senior senator who have good reputation and spoken formally and used divergence strategy when talk with junior senator who spoken not as formal as senior senator. Convergence was very efficient to be used. It made the convergence strategy used frequently. The reason of using each communication accommodation strategy was taken theoretically, such as follows;

According to Giles (2016), there are some reasons for people using convergence strategy in communication;
   a) The speaker wishes to evoke social approval, frequently from a powerless individual.
   b) Speaker wants to reach communication efficiency.
   c) Speaker wants to be attracted by others in communication.

According to Giles (1991), there is some reason that people use divergence strategy in communication;
   a) In society, they want to protect their social culture or showing social identity and cultural heritage.
   b) Speakers may have higher positions and different roles in communication.
   c) Speaker doesn't want to communicate because the interlocutor has a bad attitude or look. .

For further explanation about how long convergence strategy was used in each variable and the reason of using the strategies will be discussed as follows;

Speech Rate

In term of accommodation, people may accommodate their speech rate toward the communication interlocutor and shows the similarity itself is called convergence (Giles, H., et al., 1991). To measure the students speech rate, the researcher used the stage of measuring speech rate by Pimsleur et al.(1977) with formula $\frac{words\ in\ total}{second} 60 = wpm$. The speech rate was also divided into five stages. The stages were suggested by Pimsleur, et al., (1977) as follows:

Table 2. List of Speech Rate(source: Pimsleur, et al., 1977)

Fast	Above 220 wpm
Moderately Fast	190-220 wpm
Average	160-190 wpm
Moderately Slow	130-160 wpm
Slow	Below 130 wpm

The data showed that all students average slow speech rate followed by their interlocutor. They used convergence strategy to maintain their speech rate. It could be motivated by some situation. According to Giles, H., et al., (1973), there are social factors that influence how much speaker accommodating its communication. Social factor related with the speech ability that could affect the speech production. It made the difference number of speech rate production. On the other hand, the students were in the same stage with their interlocutor which meant there was an effort of adaptation to achieve the communication goals. It was also supported by Giles, H., et al., (1973) stated that a speaker may accommodate toward or away from the interlocutor to achieve interactional goals: it can make interlocutor do, think, or feel something. Achieving communication goals was also the function of accommodation (Brennan, S. E., & Clark, 1996).

Lexical accommodation

In this analysis was about the way of speaker used their branch of knowledge in choosing a proper word that could help the speaker delivering information. In linguistics, a branch of knowledge about word is called lexical. The focus was the words used by students as the subject of this study. There were some words that had the same meaning used together by the students and their interlocutor but on the other hand, there were also some words that cannot be identified by their interlocutor. The identified-word will be categorized as part of using divergence strategy. As stated by Fais L. (1998) in his study, one conversant will adopt the lexical items. The lexical accommodation was chosen by examining the kinds of words used by both communicators. In this variable, three students used multiple strategies (convergence and divergence).

Convergence

The data showed that the students chose some lexical item depends on who they talked with and other motivation such as family tendencies. A student chose *"Lu"*(means "you") and *"Gue"*(means *I*) to her older sister because her older sister did the same. The students were adaptive toward their interlocutor. The other effort of choosing proper lexical item was respecting and calling someone based on their age and position in a family, There were some words that are identified as convergence such as: *"adik"*(younger sibling), *"mamah"*(mother), *"mbok"*(older sister), *"ibuk"*(mother), *"pekak"*(grandfather), and *"mbah"*(grandparent). Family scope related with speech community and it was one of their motivation to use convergence strategy. According to Zhan (2013) speech community is people who use a single language and share notion of what is the same or different in phonology or grammar and it can be categorized into groups. There was phenomena of understanding each other with harmonic communication by choosing lexical item such as "*Coba **nae**"* and *"ada **je**"* . The students designed their speech with their interlocutor and adjusted the lexical coiches. Generally, there was tendency of position and age in a family relationship that needed to be respected by a younger family member.

Divergence

The use of divergence strategy data was collected from three students. One of them talked with her family member and two other talked with people from other regency. The words which were indicated as the use of divergence were not identified word or the students used word which had different form but same meaning. There was no prior reason why the speaker in communication cannot accommodate or conduct their conversation in a completely different style, using different phonology, sentence vocabulary and so on (Fais L., 1998). A students chose some lexical item that not familiar with his interlocutor such as *"kabak"*(boy/girlfriend) and *"baas pipis"*(it was a term of people who go to paranormal). Other student who talked with her family used *"Lu"*(you) to her younger sister. It related with the previous explanation but the situation was different. When this student used that to her younger sister, her younger sister did not use the same lexical. The other student used *"khe"*(you) in her communication with someone who used *"kao"*(you). The students who used divergence strategy were motivated by some situation such as protecting social heritage/identity, self-branding, and showing exclusiveness as stated by Giles, H. & St. Clair (1979) stated that to remain distinct and not similar, a speaker will specify their individual's identity and affiliation to a group that is being endangered and Giles, H., et al., (1973) found that black-British athlete who used Creole English in a press conference for self-branding and showing exclusiveness as a black. It was related with convergence strategy but speaker design was close to style-sifting in general (Geere, M., et al., 2015). They switched their speech lexically to diverge their communication.

Pauses

Pauses have an essential role in communication. Pauses allow speaker and listener by creating the purpose and interpret the speaker (Afroz, A. & Koolagudi, 2019). The pause was divided into types as stated by Reed, M. & Levis (2005), there are filled pauses (em, er, uh) and unfilled (silent pause). The data showed some suitability in the use of pauses. As the purpose of accommodation, the information should be delivered to achieve the goal of communication. Each interlocutor gave their responses. The entire object showed the suitability of using pauses (filled and silent pause). There was no ambiguity made by the pauses. It showed that there was an effort of accommodative communication and it made there was no divergence characteristics exist. It was supported by Giles, H., & St. Clair (1979) that to remain distinct and not similar, a speaker will specify their individual's identity and affiliation to a group that is being endangered. Base on the interview data, most of the students agreed to convergence strategy to reduce their social identity to get more comfortable in communication with a different background in society. Other than no motivation of protecting social identity, the most situations during the data collection the object was in the same speech community with their interlocutor.

Utterance length

The utterance can be accommodated as stated by Giles, H., & Johnson (1987) in his book; there are some features of convergence: Utterance length. Speech rate, information density, vocal intensity, pausing frequencies and lengths, response latency, self-disclosure, jokes, expressing solidarity-opinions-orientations, gesture, head nodding, facial affect, and posture. All the students were indicated close to use convergence strategy. Based on the data, length of utterances was not always same as or following the

previous utterance. It made some situation when students were not following the same complexity of the sentence as a barometer of the utterance length itself. But, there was an effort of adaption and it could be divergence strategy implementation Giles, H., et al., (1991). The students adapted the communication through listening and clarifying. Listening meant when they adapt and think that interlocutor just needs to be listened and clarifying means when interlocutor giving question, it needs to be answered. It made the students did not produce the same complexity of utterance. The motive of accommodating utterance length was also depended by the norm as basic principal of CAT and harmonizing the communication. As stated by Giles, H., & Ogay (2007) expectations are based on the stereotype of the member group upon the prevailing social and situational norm. There was a norm that needs to be respected. The norm in Bali that related with this situation was about people need to respect the older one. Those facts could be identified as adaptive communication. There was also no indication that related with divergence strategy. There were no responses related with their social heritage and something that need to be protected. Even there was an utterance that showed students did not want to talk about uninteresting topic; it could not be concluded as divergence strategy because only charisma, credibility, and favorite owned by the interlocutor who could make someone accommodate his/her communication (Giles, H., et al., 1991).

Reason of choosing each strategy

The data below was taken from the interview section. The data provided students' reasons for the communication strategy.

Table 3. List of Reason for choosing strategy

Name	Convergence	Divergence
KTF	a. The speaker wishes to evoke social approval, frequently from a powerless individual. b. Speaker wants to reach communication efficiency. c. Speaker wants to be attracted by others in communication.	a. In society, they want to protect their social culture or showing social identity and cultural heritage. b. Speakers may have higher positions and different role in communication. Speaker does not want to have communication because the audience may have bad attitude or look(look is not the main poin)
DW	a. Speaker wishes to evoke social approval, frequently from a powerless individual. b. Speaker wants to reach communication efficiency. c. Speaker wants to be attracted by others in communication.	a. In society, they want to protect their social culture or showing social identity and cultural heritage. b. Speakers may have higher positions and different role in communication. c. Speaker does not want to have communication because the audience may have bad attitude or look(look is not the main poin)
LK	a. Speaker wishes to evoke social approval, frequently from powerless individual. b. Speaker wants to reach communication efficiency. c. Speaker wants to be attracted by others in communication.	a. In society, they want to protect their social culture or showing social identity and cultural heritage. b. Speakers may have higher position and different role in communication. c. Speaker does not want to have communication because of the audience may have a bad attitude or look(look is not the

			main poin)
KM	a. Speaker wishes to evoke social approval, frequently from powerless individual. b. Speaker wants to reach communication efficiency. c. Speaker wants to be attracted by others in communication.	a. In society, they want to protect their social culture or showing social identity and cultural heritage. b. Speakers may have higher positions and different roles in communication. c. Speaker does not want to have communication because of the audience may have bad attitude or look(look is not main poin)	
TSUD	a. Speaker wishes to evoke social approval, frequently from powerless individual. b. Speaker wants to reach communication efficiency. c. Speaker wants to be attracted by others in communication.	a. In society, they want to protect their social culture or showing social identity and cultural heritage. b. Speakers may have higher positions and different role in communication. c. Speaker does not want to have communication because of the audience may have a bad attitude or look(look is not main poin)	
YW	a. Speaker wishes to evoke social approval, frequently from powerless individual. b. Speaker want to reach communication efficiency. c. Speaker wants to be attracted by others in communication.	a. In society, they want to protect their social culture or showing social identity and cultural heritage. b. Speakers may have higher position and difference role in communication. c. Speaker does not want to have communication because of the audience may have a bad attitude or look(look is not main poin)	
VS	a. Speaker wishes to evoke social approval, frequently from powerless individual. b. Speaker wants to reach communication efficiency. c. Speaker wants to be attracted by others in communication.	a. In a society, they want to protect their social culture or showing social identity and cultural heritage. b. Speakers may have higher position and different roles in communication. c. Speaker does not want to have communication because of the audience may have bad attitude or look(look is not main point)	

The table above provides the students' reasons for choosing both strategies. The data were taken from the interview section. The reasons were chosen based on Giles (2016). Most of students agreed with the reasons which have been provided. There only KTF who disagreed with one reason of choosing divergence strategy. The reason is also supported by other motivation outside the theoretical above. It may be different to each other because point of view and experience of the students. On the other hand, there was also another perspective stated by students during the interview. Some situations made them used convergence strategy. The situations were intimacy between the communicator, place, and position. In this case, intimacy means how close the speaker's feeling toward the interlocutor. They thought that place affect them to use convergence because they believed that when they talked at interlocutor's place, they needed to adapt. The position was also being the factor why they converge. Position could be the scope of family or in society. Family could be respecting the older one. Society refers to respecting people

with higher-position, such as students toward lecturer or public policymaker. On the other hand, there was also an opinion about divergence was better than convergence. The student thought that divergence was able to show the difference and made interesting conversation.

4. Conclusion

Based on the result of finding and discussion that presented previously, it concluded that all students used convergence strategy in each variable. However, just three of them used divergence strategy lexically. Outside of theoretical reason in Communication Accommodation Theory by Giles, there was some situation that motivated them to use each strategy. The situation was speech community, interlocutors' position, age, and intimacy. It can be concluded because the situation of each student during data collection is different. In the case of theoretical reason, every student dealt with reasons which are provided by the researcher based on Communication Accommodation Theory. Convergence strategy was used the most by students to achieve the goal of communication, and divergence was used to show social identity or intimidating in order to state the speaker position.

References

Afroz, A. and Koolagudi, S. G. (2019). Recognition and Classification of Pauses in Stuttered Speech Using Acoustic Features. *2019 6th International Conference on Signal Processing and Integrated Networks (SPIN)*, 921–926. 10.1109/SPIN.2019.8711569

Bilous, F. R., & Krauss, R. M. (1988). Dominance and accommodation in the conversational behaviours of same-and mixed-gender dyads. *Language & Communication*, *8*(3–4), 183–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(88)90016-X

Brennan, S. E., & Clark, H. H. (1996). Conceptual pacts and lexical choice in conversation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *22*(6), 1482–1493. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.22.6.1482

Coupland, N. (1980). Style-shifting in a Cardiff work-setting. *Language in Society*, *9*(1), 1–12.

Douglas, H. (2019). *Online Etymology Dictionary*.

Fais L. (1998). Lexical accommodation in human- and machine interpreted dialogues. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, *48*(2), 217–246.

Geere, M., Everett, J., & MacLeod, A. (2015). My Vocal Cords are Made of Tweed: Style-Shifting as Speaker Design. *Lifespans and Styles*, *1*, 12–20. https://doi.org/10.2218/ls.v1i0.2015.1179

Giles, H., & Johnson, P. (1987). Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *68*, 69–100. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1987.68.69

Giles, H., & Ogay, T. (2007). *Communication Accommodation Theory*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Giles, H., Coupland, J., Coupland, N. (1991a). *Accommodation Theory: Communication, Context, and Consequence*.

Giles, H., Coupland, J., Coupland, N. (1991b). *Contexts of Accommodation*. Cambridge University Press.

Giles, H., St. Clair, R. (1979). *Language and Social Psycology:Language in Society*. Basil Blackwell.

Giles, H., Taylor, D. and Bourhis, R. (1973). Towards a theory of interpersonal accommodation through language: some Canadian data. *Language in Society*, *2*(2), 177–192.

Giles, H. (2016). *Communication Accommodation Theory: Negotiating Personal Relationships and Social Identities Across Context*. Cambridge University Press.

Hoyo, M.O., Allen, D. (2006). The Use of Triangulation Methods in Qualitative Educational Research. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, *35*(4), 42–47.

Levin, H. and Lin, T. (1988). An accommodating witness. *Language & Communication*, *8*(3–4), 195–197.

Pimsleur, P., Hancock, C. and Furey, P. (1977). *Speech rate and listening comprehension, on English as a Second Language*. Regents.

Reed, M. and Levis, J. (2005). *The Handbook Of English Pronunciation*. John Willey and Sons Ltd.

Zhan, C. (2013). Speech Community and SLA. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *4*(6).